



Committee: Directly to Council

Committee Review: N/A

Staff: Vivian Yao, Legislative Analyst

Purpose: Receive briefing and have discussion – no vote expected

Keywords: #Food Security

AGENDA ITEM #11

June 9, 2020

Discussion

SUBJECT

Food Security Issues During COVID

EXPECTED ATTENDEES

- Dr. Earl Stoddard, Director, Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (OEMHS)
- Dr. Raymond Crowel, Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
- Netta Squires, Food Security Task Force Lead, OEMHS
- Maggie Davis, Food Security Task Force Lead, OEMHS
- Mark Hodge, Food Security Task Force Lead, DHHS
- Heather Bruskin, Executive Director, Montgomery County Food Council (Food Council) and Food Security Task Force Lead
- Jackie DeCarlo, Executive Director, Manna Food Center (Manna)
- Radha Muthiah, CEO, Capital Area Food Bank (CAFB)
- Jeanie Dawson, Director, Department of Material Management, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS)

COUNCIL DECISION POINTS & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

N/A

DESCRIPTION/ISSUE

The Council will receive a briefing on the Montgomery County Food Security Task Force “COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy” and an update on the implementation of the strategy and discuss food security issues.

SUMMARY OF KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- County organizations have provided over \$1.57 million pounds of food and 2.82 million prepared meals to its residents since the COVID-19 pandemic began.
- The Food Security Response Strategy highlights the following strategies to increase the supply of food needed to support County residents over a 6-month period and to leverage technology to link residents, food assistance providers and delivery services:
 - Contract prepared meals from local caterers and restaurants
 - Purchase and distribute shelf-stable food and pantry items through the food network
 - Source fresh foods from County farms and local wholesalers

- Expand community farming and gardening efforts to increase resident capacity to grow food
 - Increase benefits access to existing programs
 - Web-based, accessible platform development & administration
 - Distribution hub onboarding & training
 - Delivery support
 - Communications and outreach
 - Community partner coordination
 - Community food resource navigator program
 - Resident survey
- The total six-month budget to execute the food security strategy was estimated at \$41,550,000. The report indicates the need to consider after three months the funding levels and operations beyond December 2020.

This report contains:

Council staff memo	Page 1-7
June 4 Memo from the Food security Task Force Leadership Unit on Response Strategy Implementation	©1-7
Montgomery County Food Security Task Force COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy	©8-97
May 22 Letter from Capital Area Food Bank and Manna Food Center to the Council President and County Executive	©98-102

Alternative format requests for people with disabilities. If you need assistance accessing this report you may [submit alternative format requests](#) to the ADA Compliance Manager. The ADA Compliance Manager can also be reached at 240-777-6197 (TTY 240-777-6196) or at adacompliance@montgomerycountymd.gov

M E M O R A N D U M

June 5, 2020

TO: County Council

FROM: Vivian Yao, Legislative Analyst

SUBJECT: **Food Security Issues During COVID**

PURPOSE: Receive overview briefing on the Montgomery County Food Security Task Force COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy report and discuss food security issues.

Those expected to attend this worksession:

- Dr. Earl Stoddard, Director, Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (OEMHS)
- Dr. Raymond Crowel, Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
- Netta Squires, Food Security Task Force Lead, OEMHS
- Maggie Davis, Food Security Task Force Lead, OEMHS
- Mark Hodge, Food Security Task Force Lead, DHHS
- Heather Bruskin, Executive Director, Montgomery County Food Council (Food Council) and Food Security Task Force Lead
- Jackie DeCarlo, Executive Director, Manna Food Center (Manna)
- Radha Muthiah, CEO, Capital Area Food Bank (CAFB)
- Jeanie Dawson, Director, Department of Material Management, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS)

The Council will receive a briefing on the Montgomery County Food Security Task Force report “COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy” and discuss food security issues. The Food Security Task Force began operations the week of April 7, 2020 and submitted the initial version of the Response Strategy to the Executive on May 1 (see ©8-97). An update on the implementation of the Response Strategy is attached at ©1-7.

Additional recommendations from Capital Area Food Bank and Manna Food Center are provided in a May 22 letter to the Council President and County Executive attached at ©98-102.

Background

The Response Strategy report explains that “the COVID-19 pandemic and the economic crisis triggered by critical response efforts have created a food access crisis in Montgomery County that our existing, decentralized food security resources are insufficient to address.” The crisis has deepened income disparities seen before the crisis and inequities in the local food system.

The Task Force was created by OEMHS to “facilitate coordination and collaboration among government and non-governmental agencies, community organizations, and residents working to address the unique food security challenges created and exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.”

Priorities

The following priorities guided the development of the recommended strategies:

- Support small and Montgomery County-owned businesses;
- Create economic opportunity and promote job retention;
- Build equity in our local food system and economy;
- Strategically allocate resources to close gaps in services for specific populations and geographic locations;
- Maximize Federal and State dollars invested in the Montgomery County food system; and
- Develop sustainable systems that will support short and long-term food access needs.

Foundational Data

Based on a review of data, the Response Strategy report makes the following findings:

- An additional 30,000 residents will need food assistance following the COVID-19 pandemic for a total of 95,000 residents needing support through enhanced operations of Food Assistance providers, based on projected changes to poverty and unemployment from Feeding America.
- Food purchasing has greatly increased as donations to local food assistance providers have reduced by 75%.
- Existing programs, including the Senior Nutrition Program and the Montgomery County Public Schools School Lunch Program, have seen sharp increases (200-300% increases) in demand for food assistance by County residents.

Response Strategies

The report highlights the following strategies to increase the supply of food needed to support County residents over a 6-month period and to leverage technology to link residents, food assistance providers and delivery services. Implementation updates are also reported.

- **Contract prepared meals from local caterers and restaurants:** Ensures reliable in-county production and delivery, preserves jobs, and provides culturally appropriate meals for residents. Estimate of 9,000 additional meals needed per day. Cost: \$33 million

Update:

- The Senior Nutrition Program is distributing up to 1,600 meals per week to seniors and has capacity to expand.
- World Central Kitchen has provided meals to 570 seniors in nine senior living communities five days per week but is anticipated to cease operations in early June. The County will increase its prepared meals program as contemplated in the Response Strategy.

- **Purchase and distribute shelf-stable food and pantry items through the food network:** Make large-scale purchases of shelf-stable food through the Capital Area Food Bank and supplement this procurement and diversify sourcing streams by purchasing additional food from wholesalers and local ethnic grocery retailers. Cost: \$2 million

Update: The Task Force executed an emergency procurement of \$500,000 of shelf stable food through wholesale vendors to supplement the food supply for providers during an increase in demand and supply disruption between May 19 and May 26. **The purchase of shelf stable food will likely require more than the \$2 million projected in the Response Strategy.**

- **Source fresh foods from County farms and local wholesalers:** Contract with local farms to supply produce (regularly scheduled bulk purchase or purchase of excess produce) and invest in regional initiatives connecting small business support to food security strategies. Cost: \$1.1 million

Update: Eight county farms have engaged in initial conversations resulting in two strategies identified to build on the Farm to Food Bank program and engage additional local farms to provide culturally appropriate crops.

- **Expand community farming and gardening efforts to increase resident capacity to grow food:** Distribute bulk purchased gardening supplies and expand programs that help residents grow their own produce. Cost: \$150,000

Update: The Found Council has convened a committee to develop a strategy for expanding home/community gardening education.

- **Increase benefits access to existing programs:** Increase SNAP outreach and farmers market Double Dollars programs. Cost: \$130,000

Update: Developing a SNAP expansion strategy and food resource outreach with Maryland Hunger Solutions.

- **Web-based, accessible platform development & administration:** Deploy proven state-of-the-art technology that provides services screening, incorporates distribution hubs into referral system, and supports delivery services. Annual cost: \$250,000

Update:

- The County is in the process of procuring the new technology platform to synthesize human service response efforts, help coordinate requests for food assistance and integrate with the Food Access Call Center and future Virtual Disaster Assistance Center Operations.
 - The Food Access Call Center began operations on June 1 to connect residents to food resources and other needed items. It is staffed from 8 am until 7 pm on weekdays.
- **Distribution hub onboarding & training:** Hub providers will have additional storage, technology, business process, and personnel costs. Cost: \$200,000
- **Delivery support:** Delivery options will be integrated with the web-based application at an estimated cost of \$720,000.
- **Communications and outreach:** The communications strategy includes direct messaging to residents likely to experience food insecurity, posters and bus advertisements, digital messaging, and traditional paid and earned media. Cost: \$3 million

Update: Created new print and online resources to connect residents to resources and build awareness of new benefits and translated online and print resources. Building partnerships through ongoing outreach to over 100 community organizations interested in supporting food access.

- **Community partner coordination:** Incorporate community voice and leadership in long-term strategy development, implementation, and programmatic initiatives. Cost: \$250,000

Update:

- Weekly calls with 150+ providers and community partners sharing best practices and coordinating food assistance efforts
 - Development of hub models
 - Calendar page on Count COVID-19 Food Resources Website to provide a central location for providers to share information about pop-up food distribution events
 - Developing survey to identify food insecurity in the community and how to best communicate with residents in need
 - Ongoing outreach to solicit information on service gaps and resource sharing
 - Considering holding a Virtual Town Hall to share the Response Strategy and receive feedback from County residents.

- **Community food resource navigator program:** Training and deploying County residents to act as paid navigators as embedded trusted information sources. Cost: \$250,000

Update: Exploring a partnership to hire and train local residents to conduct SNAP and food assistance outreach with the Food Council, Identity, Inc., and Burness Communications.

- **Resident survey:** Administering a culturally competent survey for food assistance program participants by multilingual County staff and trained volunteers. Cost: \$500,000

The total six-month budget to execute the food security strategy is estimated at \$41,550,000. The report indicates the need to consider after three months the funding levels and operations beyond December 2020.

The plan requires that all created or recommended programs should be required to complete an equity impact statement and have a mechanism for receiving and responding to community feedback.

Other Updates

County organizations have provided over \$1.57 million pounds of food and 2.82 million prepared meals to its residents since the COVID-19 pandemic began.

County agencies have supported food assistance providers by providing (1) personal protective equipment and food distribution supplies: 116 gallons of hand sanitizer, 2,315 reusable face coverings, 6,200 food service gloves, and 10,000 grocery bags; (2) transportation assistance for large shipments of food through Department of General Services; and (3) up to 21,000 produce boxes weekly through the USDA Farm to Families grant to MCPS.

The Task Force has been exploring additional financial resources to leverage in funding the Response Strategy including engaging regional philanthropic organizations.

Discussion Issues

Councilmembers may want to discuss the following issues with meeting participants at the June 9 Council briefing and/or the June 11 HHS Committee discussion:

- **Additional Resources:**
 - What additional resources are needed to support the Initiative through the summer? How much of the \$80 million Cares Act Appropriation will be targeted to food security? Do adequate resources exist to implement all of the recommendations in the Response Strategy, e.g., SNAP outreach, technology solutions, etc.

- To what extent do we anticipate the need to grow for shelf stable food and what level of investment should we plan for?
- The food security grants administered by the Healthcare Initiative Foundation elicited \$5.3 million in requests with only \$1.2 million in awards. What amount of additional funding would be required to support the immediate needs for food for organizations that applied but did not receive funding?
- **Geographic distribution:**
 - What hubs are currently being planned? What is the timeline to expect these hubs to become operational?
 - Does data collected by the Task Force demonstrate which areas of the County are underserved and which are overserved? What strategies can be deployed to ensure resources are getting to the places that most need it?
 - Council staff understands that MCPS is waiting to hear whether waivers that allowed it to distribute food at more sites in response to the pandemic restriction will be continued after the school year ends. When will a decision about the waiver be made? What are contingency plans to ensure that young people get the food they need if the waiver does not continue?
 - How is the Task Force ensuring that food distribution is provided to isolated communities or people with limited access to transportation?
- **Coordination of food assistance services:**
 - Understanding that the decentralized network of food assistance providers in the County make coordination challenging, are there additional methods to improve communication and coordination with the Task Force, County Government, Food Council and private partners to ensure coordinated food access and distribution that provides systematic, predictable services, avoids duplication of efforts, and minimizes problems associated with distribution, e.g., traffic jams, confusion about available resources, etc.?
 - What is the Task Force's view about the benefits of one-time grab and go events? Are there ways to improve coordination or management of these events to minimize undesirable consequences, e.g., traffic, maintaining social distancing, etc. How can we ensure that appropriate food access information is available to families who are not able to be served at these events?
- **Culturally appropriate food:** To what extent are food assistance providers meeting the need for culturally appropriate foods during the COVID crisis? Does the Task Force have any information about the extent to which grants to purchase food from local ethnic groceries have expanded access to culturally appropriate foods? Is the Task Force implementing other strategies to provide greater access to culturally appropriate foods?

- **Technology platform:** The Task Force recommends a resident-facing platform to facilitate resident requests for assistance in accessing both culturally appropriate groceries and prepared meals through a distribution hub. Concerns have been raised that the Task Force should invest in existing platforms used by local nonprofits. To what extent will the platform be able to interface with existing technology used by food assistance partners? How will the platform leverage or contribute to the efforts of the County's food assistance network?

The packet contains the following attachments:

	<u>Circle #</u>
June 4 Memo from the Food security Task Force Leadership Unit on Response Strategy Implementation	1-7
Montgomery County Food Security Task Force COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy	8-97
May 22 Letter from Capital Area Food Bank and Manna Food Center to the Council President and County Executive	98-102

MEMORANDUM

TO: MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCIL

FROM: FOOD SECURITY TASK FORCE LEADERSHIP UNIT

SUBJECT: COVID-19 PANDEMIC FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

DATE: JUNE 4, 2020

CC: DR. EARL STODDARD, DIRECTOR OF OEMHS; DR. RAYMOND CROWEL,
DIRECTOR OF DHHS

The Food Security Task Force began operations the week of April 7, 2020 in response to the increased need for food assistance resulting from the COVID-19 Pandemic in Montgomery County. The Task Force is jointly led by the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, Montgomery County Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, and the Montgomery County Food Council to improve access to food by building the capacity of the food assistance network to strategically, safely, and efficiently distribute food to residents. With an intensive effort, the Food Security Task Force developed the COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy (Response Strategy) outlining the strategy to increase food capacity within Montgomery County's food assistance provider system, providing the initial version of the strategy to the County Executive on May 1, 2020 for review.

In the intervening month, the Food Security Task Force has begun implementing crucial sections of its strategy. This memorandum provides an overview of the Food Security Task Force operations to date and the status of the implementation of its Response Strategy.

I. Operational Updates

The Food Security Task Force has been collecting data from non-profit food assistance providers since April 7 to track the amount of food distributed to residents, the number of residents served and other metrics. This data is submitted voluntarily by providers, and beginning the first week of May provider requests for items like hand sanitizer were integrated into the snapshot. Based on these voluntary responses, Montgomery County Food assistance providers have distributed 1,567,257 pounds of food and approximately 56,000 prepared meals at Montgomery County sites. Additionally, Montgomery County Public Schools have provided over 2.4 million meals to youth at over 50 sites and the Senior Nutrition Program has provided over 360,500 meals to approximately 2,000 senior residents. In sum, **Montgomery County has provided over 1.57 million pounds of food and 2.82 million prepared meals to its residents** since the COVID-19 Pandemic began .

a. Coordinating Among Food Assistance Providers


Early in the response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Montgomery County Food Council established a weekly coordinating call among food assistance providers. This weekly call has become a space for 150+ providers and community partners to share best practices and coordinate food assistance efforts throughout the County. For example, the organizations leading hub coordinating efforts at the Black Rock center shared their experiences within this space, leading to the development of an additional hub in Gaithersburg that began operations on June 1. There are also multiple additional hubs in development throughout the County. Issues identified through the Food Council weekly calls are shared with the broader Food Security Task Force structure to help develop necessary resources and resolve issues as they arise.

Throughout the crisis, there have been many community efforts to provide food to residents in need outside of the traditional food assistance network. These “popup” food distribution efforts have not been directly coordinated with the Food Security Task Force, however the Food Security Task Force has worked to provide [best practices information](#) and resources as available. Recently, the Food Security Task Force launched a calendar page as part of the County COVID-19 Food Resources Website. This calendar allows providers to add information about food distribution events directly by [using this form](#). Listings are then approved by a staff member at the Montgomery County Public Information Office before appearing live on the website.


The Food Security Task Force Weekly Snapshot provides a glimpse into the assistance provided throughout the County by the non-profit partners. From the information provided, the top served ZIP Codes in by Food Assistance Providers and MCPS Distributions are:

20850	20852	20874	20876
20877	20878	20879	20886
20901	20902	20903	20904
20906			

Furthermore, the image below shows the reported ZIP codes served by non-profit partners the week of May 19 along with the locations of our non-profit food assistance providers (red dots).



Additionally, Montgomery County Public Schools have created a number of food distribution sites around the County to reach youth experiencing food insecurity.



b. County Resources Supporting Food Assistance

The Food Security Task Force leverages County resources to provide direct support to the County's non-profit food assistance network in several ways. First, the County has been providing sanitation and personal protective equipment to providers who request it as the resources are available. Since the first week of April, the County has provided 116 gallons of hand sanitizer, 2,315 cloth reusable face coverings, and 6,200 food service gloves to providers to enable them to operate safely. Additionally, the County has provided 10,000 brown paper grocery bags to support distribution efforts.

Second, the County is providing transportation assistance for large shipments of food through the Department of General Services. Providers are able to submit requests for transportation assistance through [this web portal](#), and the County will provide large trucks to transport the food, with refrigerated trucks included among the assets available. The week of May 26 saw five large transports of food to providers.

Third, Montgomery County Public Schools secured a grant from the United States Department of Agriculture's Farms to Families program, which is providing produce boxes directly to MCPS sites, as well as some distribution via the MCPS School Bus routes, to reach communities with transportation barriers. This grant goes through June 30 and MCPS has filed for an extension through December 2020. The week of May 26th, this program distributed 17,000 produce boxes to the County, and during the week of June 2nd it will provide 21,000 produce boxes.

c. Increase in Demand for Pantry Items and Responding to Supply Chain Disruptions

Since the beginning of this response, the food assistance network has seen a dramatic increase in demand in reference to the same point in time the previous year. At the end of May, the network saw its most dramatic rise in demand, with an 82.7% increase in food distributed between the week of May 19 and the week of May 26. Unfortunately, this increase in demand coincided with increasing supply disruptions to the food bank network, resulting in some providers having to purchase some items at retail prices to meet the community demand. To address this issue, the Food Security Task Force altered the implementation of increasing the supply of shelf-stable pantry items contemplated in the Response Strategy to execute an emergency procurement of \$500,000 of additional shelf-stable food items through wholesale vendors to directly supplement food assistance providers' food supply for eight weeks. The first purchases through this initiative were made on June 1, with three providers receiving shelf-stable pantry items that day. Another six providers will be receiving direct shipments on June 4. Looking forward, the Task Force is working with Capital Area Food Bank, Manna Food Center, and other providers to identify the amount of food to procure through the food bank supply chain to meet future demand and mitigate against further supply chain disruptions.

The response strategy contemplated a total of \$2 million for the purchase of shelf-stable food, including a portion of funds designated to enhance provider capacity to stockpile shelf-stable items to mitigate the risk of future supply chain disruptions. With the increase in demand for pantry items seen over the past week and supply chain disruptions, the Food Security Task Force will likely need to designate more funding to support this effort.

d. Prepared Meal Delivery to Seniors

The Senior Nutrition Program has enhanced operations, now distributing up to 1,600 meals per week to seniors, and is prepared to expand further should there be a demand. Beyond the expanded Senior Nutrition Program, the non-profit organization, World Central Kitchen, has been providing prepared meals to nine senior living communities five days per week. The program has served approximately 570 seniors daily, but is anticipated to cease operations in early June, necessitating the County to take over the feeding responsibilities for these additional seniors. As contemplated in the Response Strategy, the County will increase its prepared meals program to support this effort by partnering with local restaurants and caterers near these sites in a similar manner to World Central Kitchen.

e. Food Access Call Center

On June 1, 2020 the Montgomery County Food Access Call Center (FACC) began operations. The call center is staffed from 8am until 7pm on weekdays and is equipped to connect residents to food resources and potentially, other needed items. Residents can reach the center by calling 311, and will be routed to the FACC. A FACC rep will call the resident and make referrals to appropriate and suitable food pantries and programs. When possible, FACC reps will follow up with residents to make sure they were connected to food. FACC reps received training on resources available, including a comprehensive overview of food assistance benefits programs and available tools to find local food assistance sites. In addition, FACC reps have access to utilize the County's Language Line to accommodate a request in any language. The FACC also works closely with other Centers who can provide information in their respective languages. The line is expected to expand operations to include Saturday hours, as well as be able to make

referrals to other supporting services. As of June 4, over 50 call takers have been trained to staff the FACC.

II. COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy Implementation

In addition to supporting current operations, the Food Security Task Force is in the planning phase of operationalizing several other portions of its proposed response strategy:

- **Levering a New Technology:** Montgomery County is in the process of procuring a new technology platform to synthesize human services response efforts across a number of areas, including food assistance. This technology, which is the underlying structure supporting New York City's Taxi and Rideshare food delivery model, will integrate with other platforms used within the County to help coordinate resident requests for food assistance. This technology will integrate with the Food Access Call Center and future Virtual Disaster Assistance Center Operations.
- **Fresh Food From Local Sources:** The Montgomery County Food Council, Montgomery County Office of Agriculture, Capital Area Food Bank, Manna Food Center, and Montgomery County Economic Development Corporation are working to support the increase of fresh food from local sources component of the Response Strategy. In initial conversations in May 2020 with 8 County farms, the workgroup identified two strategies to build on the Farm to Food Bank program and engage additional local food producing farms that can provide culturally appropriate crops.
- **Community-level Engagement and Coordination:** Led by staff from the Food Council, the Food Security Task Force is developing a survey for residents to help identify the level of food insecurity within the community as well as information on how best to communicate with residents in need. Extensive outreach is ongoing with County and municipal government employees, faith based groups, and community organizations to establish communication and feedback loops for identifying service gaps and sharing resources at the neighborhood-level. The Task Force is considering scheduling a bilingual, public Virtual Town Hall to share the Response Strategy with Montgomery County residents and gather feedback on its implementation, service gaps and outreach strategies.
- **SNAP Outreach and Community Resource Navigator Initiatives:** Food Council staff have been working with Maryland Hunger Solutions to develop an expansion strategy for SNAP and local food resource outreach efforts. The Food Council, Identity, Inc. and Burness Communications are exploring a potential partnership to hire and train local residents to conduct SNAP and food assistance community outreach at food assistance distribution sites in a pilot program for the eventual expanded SNAP Outreach and Community Resource Navigator Strategy.
- **Increasing communications and referral tools:** A variety of new print and online resources have been created to more effectively connect residents to available food assistance resources, and build awareness of new benefits like P-EBT and online SNAP. These resources include flyers, social media images, a video, a distribution event

calendar, and a resource map and list that is updated daily. Existing online and print resources have also been translated into multiple languages and partnerships with community organizations have been established for translation and language-appropriate resident support in Spanish, Amharic, French/French-Creole, Korean, Vietnamese, and Chinese.

- **Building partnerships:** The Food Council is conducting ongoing outreach to over 100 community organizations with expressed interest in supporting food access resources, providing information on resources including funding, food supplies, volunteer and staffing support, discount PPE access, technical assistance, culturally-appropriate food retailers, and tools to identify existing local food assistance partners for collaboration.
- **Expand community-level food production:** The Food Council has recently convened a committee, in partnership with the Montgomery County Master Gardeners, UMD Extension, Montgomery Parks, Crossroads Community Food Network, Harvest Share, and others, to develop a strategy for expanding home/community gardening education, including resource creation that will enable more residents to contribute to the local food supply and addressing barriers to donating produce that has been grown in at-home/community gardens (zoning, food safety, and logistics).
- **Fostering public-private partnerships and private sector investment:** The Finance and Administration Unit of the Task Force has been convening representatives of local philanthropy, government, nonprofit, businesses, and community organizations to identify additional financial resources to leverage in funding the Food Response and engage regional philanthropic organizations to raise awareness of food insecurity in our County and leverage additional resources to support local initiatives.
- **Federal and State Program implementation advocacy:** The Food Council's Policy Committee, Maryland Hunger Solutions, Manna Food Center, Share Our Strength, MCPS, and other partners and Task Force members are closely following and advocating around policy and program implementation issues that will significantly impact food access resources at the County level, including P-EBT rollout, online SNAP implementation, and USDA Summer Food Service Program waivers.
- **Regional Engagement:** The Food Council and members of the Task Force connect weekly with food security leaders in Prince George's County, the District of Columbia, Fairfax County, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, and other local jurisdictions to identify regional resources, best practices, and partnership opportunities.



COVID-19 Pandemic Food Security Response Strategy

Version 1

May 1, 2020

Executive Summary

The COVID-19 pandemic and the economic crisis triggered by critical response efforts have created a food access crisis in Montgomery County that our existing, decentralized food security resources are insufficient to address. The income disparities, high cost of living, and societal structures that resulted in an estimated 7% of the County's population experiencing food insecurity prior to March 2020 have deepened inequities in our local food system as unemployment, small business closures, and health disparities rise during the pandemic.

This Food Security Response Strategy outlines the initial strategies to both expand our current food assistance network, and build new capacity to connect residents to food assistance in the short-term response, while making investments in systems, programs, and partnerships that will last longer than this crisis. Ultimately, the County's response to the COVID-19 crisis is an opportunity to transform our local food system through a process led by resident voices and representation. Through our response we can create economic opportunities, highlight the diverse food traditions of our residents and local businesses, and promote environmental sustainability in order to foster a permanently resilient and equitable food system in Montgomery County.

The framework for our strategy is to **connect more food** - through a diverse sourcing strategy that bolsters local businesses and maximizes federal, state, philanthropic, and community funds - **to more people** by leveraging technology to efficiently connect residents to food in accessible, community-coordinated ways. Thirteen actionable strategies to achieve these two primary goals for the near-future response, each including estimated cost and high-level implementation considerations, are presented here. Right at this moment, thousands of Montgomery County residents are hungry and without the money, service information, transportation, or other resources needed to get food. There is an urgent need to achieve this critical goal of more food to more people as soon as possible, and we have the resources available to do so.

This Food Response Strategy sought the input, research, and feedback of more than 115 Task Force members, and was compiled over a two-week period to provide recommendations on how the County can meet the food insecurity challenges created by the COVID-19 pandemic. Food access is one component of a broader emergency response, and these recommendations should be incorporated as much as possible into a wraparound service model for residents. However, this document is merely the first step in a long-term effort to be adapted, amended, and informed in the months to follow through community engagement, operational planning, and resource development.

Summary of Recommendations

Montgomery County has an extensive food assistance distribution system, but with significant increased demand in services, more supply is needed to support that system. The capacity of the current distribution system needs to be increased to deliver **nutritious, culturally appropriate**, food items and meals that represent a healthy mix of protein, produce, and shelf-stable goods. The pandemic has caused a surge in both the number of food insecure individuals who cannot cook as well as a significant need to increase access to all types of food assistance. This increase in demand is coupled with a precipitous drop off in common sources of food donations, and increased uncertainty about the stability of the food supply chain.

- **More Food** will be provided in the form of:
 - Prepared meals contracted for from local sources;
 - Shelf-stable food and pantry items purchased and distributed through the food bank network;
 - Fresh foods from local sources like County farms and local wholesalers;
 - Community farming and victory gardening; and
 - Increased benefits access to existing programs.
- **To More People** leveraging modern technology to link residents, assistance providers, and delivery drivers.
 - Individuals facing food insecurity will be able to ask for help via an accessible web-portal in their native language, or via 3-1-1. Their requests will be screened to get food delivered to them from a “distribution hub”.
 - Existing food assistance providers will be able to register as “distribution hubs” and indicate the type and quantity of food assistance they can provide.
 - New food assistance distribution hubs will be added to the system as needed to increase quantity or diversity, getting food from local businesses and suppliers.
 - For those residents who can afford food, but still need delivery assistance, local businesses will be able to register as delivery-assistance-only hubs, preparing or boxing food up for sale to be delivered for free.
 - Technology will facilitate contactless pick-up and delivery of food from these distribution hubs to local residents in need, or last-mile community food assistance programs who can safely distribute food at the neighborhood level.
 - The system is flexible, as it can accommodate the addition or removal of hubs, and resilient because it does not rely on any single point of failure.
- **Equity, communications and outreach** will be critical to response success.

A budget for the implementation of this strategy appears as **Appendix A: Budget**. Background on Culturally Appropriate Food Access in Montgomery County appears as **Appendix B**.

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	5
Potential Increased Long Term Food Insecurity	6
Potential Disruption of Supply Chain for Months	7
Increase in Demand Through Existing Programs	8
More food...	11
Prepared Meals	11
Shelf-stable Foods and Pantry Items	12
Fresh Food From Local Sources	13
Victory Gardening & Community Farming	15
Increased Benefits Access	15
... to more people.	17
Leveraging Technology to Efficiently Scale	17
Platform Accessibility and Data Protection Requirements	17
Resident Sign-up	18
Services Screening	19
Distribution Hubs	19
Delivery Drivers	22
Getting the word out.	22
Directed Messaging to Residents Likely to Experience Food Insecurity	22
Posters and Bus Advertisements	22
Digital Messaging	23
Traditional Paid and Earned Media	23
Community-level engagement and coordination	23
Community Partners Coordination	23
Community Food Resource Navigator Program	24
Resident Survey	24
Applying an Equity Lens	24
Measuring Progress	25
Next Steps	26
Summary	26

Introduction

The COVID-19 crisis has exacerbated the food access challenges for the 60,000+ residents in Montgomery County already experiencing food insecurity. In addition, 51,177 County residents filed initial unemployment claims between March 21 and April 25 as a result of the COVID19 pandemic, many of whom are experiencing food insecurity for the first time. Social distancing, health concerns, and changes in retail models have further limited food access for homebound seniors and residents with disabilities, people experiencing homelessness, and many other residents of our County.

The Food Security Task Force was created by the Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (OEMHS) to facilitate coordination and collaboration among government and non-governmental agencies, community organizations, and residents working to address the unique food security challenges created and exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Adapting the Incident Command System framework, the Food Security Task Force is led by a leadership team with representatives from Montgomery County Government and the Food Council. The Food Security Response Strategy development was launched by the Task Force on April 17, 2020 and incorporates the input of more than 110 representatives of County government and nonprofit agencies, philanthropists, food assistance providers, the Food Security Community Advisory Board, regional food system experts, entrepreneurs, farms and food producers, community organizations, and residents.

In developing this Food Security Response Strategy for the County, the following priorities have been established to maximize the impact of the dollars spent and support the long-term overall economic health of the County:

- Support small and Montgomery County-owned businesses;
- Create economic opportunity and promote job retention;
- Build equity in our local food system and economy;
- Strategically allocate resources to close gaps in services for specific populations and geographic locations;
- Maximize Federal and State dollars invested in the Montgomery County food system; and
- Develop sustainable systems that will support short- and long-term food access needs

Foundational Data

This Food Security Response Strategy assumes that an additional 30,000 residents will need food assistance following the COVID-19 pandemic, for a total of 95,000 residents needing support through enhanced operations of Food Assistance Providers. These numbers are based on the Feeding America estimates of a potential 47% increase of food insecurity throughout Maryland following the COVID-19 crisis, should unemployment rates increase by 7.6%.

Potential Increased Long Term Food Insecurity


Feeding America has used its Map the Meal Gap study to predict the change in food insecurity based on projected changes to unemployment and poverty.¹ Feeding America produced three sets of projects they refer to as: scenario A, scenario B, and scenario C. “Scenarios A and B represent the same changes to unemployment and poverty that occurred during the Great Recession after one year and two years, respectively. ... Scenario C represents a more severe possibility: if unemployment increases by 7.6 percentage points and poverty increases by 4.0 percentage points, 17.1 million more people will experience food insecurity.”² According to Feeding America, “a recent Wall Street Journal poll of 60 economists predicted rates which, when considered across the year, are close to the unemployment rates assumed in Scenario C.”³ This Food Security Response Strategy takes a “hope for the best, but plan for the worst” approach, **using Scenario C as a guide.**

Table 1. Food Insecurity Projections by Scenario

	Scenarios		
	A	B	C
Unemployment rate increase (% pts)	1.1	4.5	7.6
Poverty rate increase (% pts)	1.5	2.6	4.0
Food insecurity rate increase (% pts)	1.3	3.3	5.3
Increase to number of food-insecure individuals	4.1 million	10.6 million	17.1 million

Source: Calculations by Dr. Craig Gundersen with data from the 2014 to 2018 Current Population Survey, December Supplement.

Figure 3. Food Insecurity Trends & Projections



¹ **The Impact of the Coronavirus on Food Insecurity (Brief)**, Feeding America, available at <https://hungerandhealth.feedingamerica.org/resource/impact-coronavirus-food-insecurity/>


² Id. at 3.

³ **The Impact of the Coronavirus on Food Insecurity: State-Level Estimates For the Overall Population**, Revised 4/20/2020, Adam Dewey, Emily Engelhard, Monica Hake, Dr. Craig Gundersen (Technical Advisory Group Member).

Feeding America Estimate of the Impact on Food Insecurity (FI): State Level Estimate for Maryland ⁴				
Scenario	Projected FI Rate	Projected Additional FI people	Projected Total FI People	Change
A (Poverty +1.5, Unemployment +1.1)	12%	60,000	727,000	+9%
B (Poverty +2.6, Unemployment +4.5)	14.1%	183,000	850,000	+27%
C (Poverty +4.8, Unemployment +7.6)	16.7%	316,000	983,000	+47%

Potential Disruption of Supply Chain for Months

Food purchasing has greatly increased as retail donations have reduced by 75%.



5


As an example, currently local area food assistance providers are facing a 75% decline in donated food overall. Food suppliers are indicating that diminished levels of donations will return eventually, although not to previous levels until November or December of 2020.

⁴ Data From, *The Impact of the Coronavirus on Food Insecurity*, fn 3.

⁵ Capital Area Food Bank, March 23rd - April 19th 2020 Inventory Receipts.


Increase in Demand Through Existing Programs

The COVID-19 pandemic has already resulted in increased demand for food assistance among Montgomery County residents, as shown by increased demand on existing providers and programs. For example, the Senior Nutrition Program operated by the Department of Health and Human Services traditionally provides both congregate and home delivered meals to residents who are over the age of 60 or have a serious illness. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Senior Nutrition Program has ceased congregate meal distribution and is now providing all meals through delivery to further encourage social distancing measures among a high-risk population. The Senior Nutrition Program has seen a dramatic increase in meals requested since COVID-19 social distancing measures went into place, with the capacity of the program being reached in mid-April, resulting in a waitlist for residents to receive meals. Funds have already been allocated to enhance the Senior Nutrition Program distribution, so all residents that had been waitlisted began receiving services the week of April 27, with more spaces available should the demand continue to increase as expected.




In addition to increased demand for the Senior Nutrition Program, the School Lunch program facilitated by Montgomery County Public Schools, has also seen a sharp increase in demand. The school lunch program saw an approximately 275% increase in demand from the week of March 20 to the week of March 27, with the higher level of demand persisting as the pandemic shutdowns continue.

FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGY




These increases in demand are not uniform across the county, with a higher volume of meals delivered in the red and yellow colored ZIP codes in the graphic below.



FOOD SECURITY RESPONSE STRATEGY

The Montgomery County Public Schools meals program provided 383,356 breakfasts, 386,333 lunches, and 373,172 dinners for a total of 1,143,572 meals between March 16 and April 20.

In addition to the Senior Nutrition Program and School Lunch Program, there are non-profit food assistance providers throughout the County that have seen an increase in demand. Beginning the week of April 7, the Food Security Task Force began collecting data from the community food assistance providers in an attempt to measure the increase of demand. Many providers have participated in the Weekly Provider Capacity Snapshot Survey, however, there are often different providers responding each week and only a small portion of providers in the County submitting responses. The resulting information has provided a general sense on the increase of demand, but because there is no uniform way to collect and track clients seen by providers it is difficult to fully capture the level of demand experienced through the system.



The Weekly Provider Capacity Snapshot has refined its measurements over time, and beginning in May will be better able to demonstrate the level of demand by individuals or by households, since there is not a consistent metric to track service across providers (e.g. some track households while others track the number of individuals).

More food...

Prepared Meals

The Coronavirus pandemic, and response thereto, has created a significant increased need for prepared meals. This includes individuals who are ill, or are taking care of someone who is ill, and/or have limited ability to cook, such as seniors, homeless people, or residents with disabilities. While some residents are able to access meals through restaurant delivery services, many residents lack the financial resources to purchase meals. Almost 55,000 children in Montgomery County depend on school meals. While schools are closed, children 18 and under are able to access free meals at 51 MCPS sites four days a week, however, these meals are not available to older family members and many families cannot access existing meal sites. Mass cancellations of special events and restaurant closures have resulted in significant decreases in food recovery of meals. To provide meals to residents on a dramatically greater scale than pre-pandemic service levels requires an efficient, centralized procurement strategy.

Contract with local caterers and restaurants. Montgomery County can meet this demand for meals by contracting with local area restaurants and caterers whose businesses have been greatly impacted by closures and cancelations. Buying meals from local providers not only ensures reliable in-county production and delivery of the meals, but also helps preserve and even create new jobs in the county. Moreover, local caterers and restaurants reflect the diverse cultural traditions of our County's population and sourcing from a variety of vendors will offer flexibility in order to provide culturally appropriate meals for residents.

Depending on the scale, nature, and location of the need for prepared meals, meals purchased from local caterers and restaurants could either: (1) provided directly to local food assistance providers for distribution, or (2) be provided using the distribution "hub" model described in detail below.

Cost and timeline. Meals can be purchased from local caterers and restaurants for \$6.50 - \$7 per meal. The County can establish procurement agreements with preselected vendors, potentially with fixed options and rates and a monthly invoicing schedule. 9,000 additional meals per day will likely be needed, which will have a cost over six month of \$33,000,000. Meal production and distribution could be put in place very quickly, and likely be fully implemented in less than a week. Meal production can continue as long as there is a sustained need, at an appropriate level that will likely decrease as social distancing measures are eased and the number of quarantined and isolated households decreases.

Currently, MCPS is providing thousands of meals per day for children under 18 while schools are closed. This number has increased from around 12,000 meals per day in the first week of school closure to 55,000 meals per day in the week ending 4/24, resulting in more than a million

meals having been served since schools closed. Further data on any increased demand for school meals must be obtained from MCPS, as well as information on program expansion capability and resulting costs.

Although the specific demand for meals will likely decrease earlier than the overall demand for food assistance, extended school closures and the economic impact of this pandemic will likely mean long-term prepared meal needs for many Montgomery County households.

Shelf-stable Foods and Pantry Items

Shelf-stable foods are a particularly important component of food assistance resources when frequency of distribution is decreased to promote social distancing and supply chain disruptions are possible. Montgomery County's strong network of existing food assistance providers provides a reliable foundation for obtaining and distributing shelf-stable food. The current challenge is that this food distribution network is struggling under a massive **increase in demand** as food insecurity grows, and a substantial **decrease in the supply** of items typically donated by individuals and large organizations such as big-box grocers. These combined pressures mean that while the food distribution system is working, there is an urgent need to get more food into that system quickly while controlling costs.

The most cost-effective and efficient way to get more food into the system quickly is to leverage the existing infrastructure by making large-scale purchases of shelf-stable items through the Capital Area Food Bank (CAFB), for distribution to larger Montgomery County food assistance providers. These providers will serve as hubs capable of receiving, storing, and redistributing those goods to smaller community organizations and directly to residents. Ideally distribution hubs and their community partners will have sufficient food supply and operational resources to provide services to residents seven days a week. To supplement this procurement from the Capital Area Food Bank and diversify sourcing streams, the County can also purchase additional food from wholesalers and local ethnic grocery retailers for distribution out of these large provider hubs. These purchases would serve two purposes: (1) help meet the current need, and (2) build a reserve of goods to mitigate the risk of food supply chain disruptions that could occur in the months to come.

Building partnerships with local retailers is critical both to leverage private sector resources, connect with residents at trusted community locations, and increase the availability of culturally diverse foods in the assistance pipeline.

Cost and timeline. Currently, local food banks are estimating that to meet the increased level of food insecurity, they will need to surge their output of food by 20% or more. To meet that demand for six months and secure Montgomery County's place in the procurement pipeline, it will take roughly \$1,000,000 to purchase 2 million pounds of food. Given the potential for significant variation in demand and the unstable nature of the current food supply chain, in addition to a large initial purchase to meet current demand, another \$500,000 should be set aside to build a reasonable stockpile of those goods that can be efficiently stored. Dry goods

storage and handling of that quantity of food at both hubs and distribution sites will cost an additional \$500,000, which is why this response strategy recommends a total of \$2,000,000 for the purchase of shelf-stable food and pantry items for distribution and stockpiling.

After six months, Montgomery County should assess the use of the food, the continued demand, and the potential need for additional purchases given food supply chain disruptions and donation levels.

Fresh Food From Local Sources

Produce, meat, and dairy are often the most sought-after items in the food assistance network. They are critical components of healthy diets, but often the most difficult type of food assistance to source, store, and deliver. In addition to increased sourcing of fresh foods from local wholesalers and ethnic grocers, Montgomery County should support a dramatic expansion of existing “farm to food bank efforts” aimed at buying fresh produce from local farms and local wholesale food distributors in this crisis. The market rate for high-quality farm products is typically too prohibitive for food assistance providers to accommodate in large volumes in their purchasing budgets. However, this crisis has left local farms and food distributors in financial strain and with excess capacity which instead of going to waste can be redirected to feed local residents. This strategy will preserve the economic sustainability of our local food producers,, increase the nutritional value of food consumed close to its harvest date, and reduce the negative environmental impact of long-haul food transport, while fostering long-term increased local food production and procurement, which are critical pillars of our County’s long-term food system resilience.

Contract with local farms to supply produce. There are two main ways to obtain food from local farms: the County either directly, or indirectly through expanding a program like Farm to Food Bank at Manna Food Center, can (1) contract with a farm for scheduled, regular bulk purchase of produce and/or (2) buy excess or unsold produce from County farms at or near market rates. In either case, a local food assistance provider hub can receive the product from local farms and serve as the central distribution point to aggregate and distribute fresh produce to County food assistance partners and directly to residents.

Farms interested in a contracted sourcing relationship can enter into agreement with the County regarding prices, invoicing schedule, delivery, etc. with an assigned provider distribution hub. As the 2020 planting and growing season is actively underway, the County should act quickly to secure formal procurement relationships with local farms.

A separate fund should be established for last-minute purchase of surplus or unsold crop from local farmers at market rates. As pick-your-own and other traditional sales mechanisms for local farms are uncertain, and every growing season is unpredictable, it is likely that a number of County farms that do not want to commit to contract growing for the County would still benefit from a backup sales opportunity for their product at near-market rates, particularly if the product is sold for distribution to food insecure residents.

Purchase from local wholesalers and grocers. Similar to the process and reasoning outlined above for dry goods, the County can also purchase additional meat, produce, and dairy from wholesalers and local ethnic grocery retailers for distribution out of these large provider hubs.

Invest in regional initiatives connecting small business support to food security strategies.

The Mid-Atlantic Food Resilience and Access Coalition (MAFRAC) is a 501(c)3 organization that facilitates the procurement of local goods by non-profits. It was developed to cover the gap between local food producers' costs and the price that local nonprofits can afford to pay. County funds invested in this initiative could be earmarked to be directed to local producers in a cost-sharing partnership with local non-profits.

[Capital Impact Partners](#) is developing a strategy for a DMV-focused "Good Food Fund," aiming to equitably support food-focused entrepreneurs who typically have limited access to capital while integrating healthy food access and food sovereignty into the strategy.

Cost and timeline. The total estimated cost of food procurement, additional transportation and storage capacity is **\$1,100,000** (details below). Fresh food can be purchased and delivered within a week, with more becoming available as contracts with farms are finalized.

Fresh food procurement will cost an estimated \$950,000. This number is based on an estimate of \$10,000 per month for contracted food purchase from ten different farms for 6 months, a \$50,000 fund for unscheduled purchases of seconds or surplus crops, and an additional \$300,000 should be set aside for purchases from local wholesalers and retailers who have fresh goods they are struggling to distribute due to the pandemic.

Expanding capacity of climate-controlled transportation resources is likely to cost \$50,000, which includes 3 refrigeration trucks rented at \$2000 per month for six months, plus additional amounts for drivers for those trucks and fuel costs.

Expanding fresh food storage capacity by adding refrigeration and freezer capacity at food assistance distribution centers will cost an estimated \$100,000. This is based on an estimated cost of \$6000 per commercial unit, with 6 distributors adding one refrigerator and one freezer, along with associated delivery and installation costs.

Worth noting is that the Montgomery County Alcoholic Beverage Service has some temporary capacity that is available while bars remain closed, but will become unavailable after social distancing measures are eased. Other fresh food storage options may exist at the County and regional level, including temporarily shuttered commercial capacity.

Victory Gardening & Community Farming

Provide resident access to yard and patio gardening supplies, space, and educational materials. Bulk purchase of gardening supplies by the County will increase cost efficiency and reduce supply chain challenges currently limiting individual purchases of these products. Supplies can be distributed at community and food assistance sites along with informational materials. The County can consider expanding programs like Growing Gardeners, a partnership of Master Gardeners and Manna Food Center, which provides food assistance participants with the materials and education to grow their own tomatoes, peppers, and herbs in pre-filled 5 gallon containers. Community garden plots in the County are currently full for Summer 2020, and the County should creatively explore additional food production locations, including private land shared by faith communities and other community sites, as well as fund staffing support for establishment and maintenance of additional new sites, as well as to ensure best practices in land management and social distancing.

Community-level sharing of home-grown produce, or central collection of excess home and community garden produce for distribution at a food assistance site, can be encouraged while practicing social distancing and food safety. Local gardeners can plant a few extra vegetables this spring and designate the additional produce for donation back to the community.

Cost and timeline. The estimated cost for expansion of community farming and gardening efforts is **\$150,000**. Because many of these programs are already in place, these efforts can begin immediately.

Increased Benefits Access

Expanding County residents' use of Federal benefits at retail locations such as grocery stores and farmers markets increases the investment of Federal funds in our local economy while increasing access to nutritious food. Social distancing and best practices in both retail settings allow their continued operation as safe and reliable food access sites.

SNAP Outreach. According to Maryland Hunger Solutions, Montgomery County has the highest percentage of residents who are eligible, but not enrolled, for the Supplemental Nutrition Program (SNAP) in the State of Maryland. Federal COVID-19 relief packages feature numerous additional benefits for SNAP participants, but many County residents are hesitant to enroll due to concerns and misconceptions about SNAP eligibility. Four multilingual SNAP outreach workers with internet and phone access could be hired and trained to work remotely conducting phone screening and application support, and potentially onsite at food distribution locations if social distancing is possible. These Outreach Workers could be hired on a contract basis for 3-6 months and could be trained to do other outreach including census and healthcare enrollment as well. The estimated cost for additional SNAP Outreach workers for six months is **\$55,000**.

Expanding Farmers Market Double Dollars. Many farmers markets in Montgomery County offer double dollar programs, matching each dollar spent (up to a set maximum) purchasing food with SNAP funds. These programs make access to nutritious, locally produced food more affordable while supporting local food businesses as well. The County should establish a fund for Montgomery County markets' Double Dollars programs, with an initial investment of **\$75,000**, that could be used to match program funds leveraged by the Markets through the Maryland Market Money program or raised through philanthropic support and individual donations.

... to more people.

Leveraging Technology to Efficiently Scale

Residents who are unable to access food or prepared meals as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and its resulting economic effects are located throughout the County, have varied transportation options, and have diverse food needs. Information on available food resources is often disconnected from other services, as well as difficult to find and language-inaccessible, for many residents. To address the challenges in connecting residents to food that is accessible and culturally and diet-appropriate, the Food Security Task Force proposes purchasing a web-based platform to coordinate and facilitate resident requests for assistance in accessing both groceries and prepared meals. Because of the myriads of challenges many residents face in traveling to receive food assistance, the technology solution contemplated here focuses on enhancing delivery mechanisms for residents to secure food assistance that is culturally appropriate.


In developing this platform, Montgomery County should draw on the best-practices and real-life-lessons of other communities who have tackled food insecurity challenges with similar solutions, including Washington D.C. and New York City. This platform will leverage proven, state-of-the-art, technology solutions to help Montgomery County scale its existing food assistance infrastructure to meet the massive fluctuations in demand created by the pandemic. In general, the process involves: **Web-based intake** → **Screening for Appropriate Services** → **Food Delivery**. A broad description of what such a platform and process would look like is provided in the sections that follow. This system will be designed to work alongside existing, smaller solutions (like the Chow Match program, for example), with direct technology integration where possible. It is not the intent of this Response Strategy to reinvent the wheel.

The total estimated cost of this web-based, accessible platform development and administration is \$250,000 per year.

Platform Accessibility and Data Protection Requirements

The resident-facing platform must be web-based, mobile friendly, and accessible to devices and software used to support individuals with specific and/or functional needs. It should not require residents to download any external application. Additionally, it should be navigable in at least the top 10 languages spoken in the County so residents are able to interface with it in their written native language. Any data collected by the platform should be considered protected Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and only shared with external partners—such as food assistance providers—with the express consent of the resident.

A graphic representation of how the platform will connect residents to resources is below:



Resident Sign-up

The web-based platform will consist of a public facing website that any resident, regardless of immigration status, can directly access, or be directed to from the Montgomery County COVID-19 Resources page. Residents unable to access a computer or the internet will be able to call MC311 for assistance in their native language in filling out their sign-up application. This sign-up form will include an opportunity for individuals to specify if they need culturally specific meals or food boxes.

When a resident signs-up on the platform, they will create a basic household profile. This household profile will enable the users of the platform to track what services are provided to each household, the timeliness of the services, as well as receive resident feedback on the type of services provided. For the purposes of the Food Security Task Force, the platform is to determine what food resources a resident needs and to deliver food to them. This platform should be scalable to include other non-food services, such as Census referrals, should

Montgomery County decide to enhance the use of the platform beyond Food Assistance at a later date.

The household profile will capture the contact information for the head of household and ask basic screening questions to help connect the resident with services that are available through the County or its partners. By answering the screening questions, the system will identify what assistance the resident is eligible to receive and will automatically send the referral to the identified services.

For the avoidance of doubt, as in the case of Census completion, any personal information entered into the platform will be kept securely, and no information beyond that which is necessary to effect the delivery of food or services will be held or shared outside of the platform with any organization or government agency. Any citizenship questions asked in the screening will be used solely for the purposes of determining eligibility for services, and will be optional.

Services Screening

Once a resident completes their household profile, there should be a series of questions to help determine what services the resident needs. These questions should also help determine what existing programs the resident qualifies for, such as the Senior Nutrition Program.

At a minimum, the screening to determine the most appropriate food assistance should determine:

- Does the resident qualify for an existing food assistance program?
- If the resident does not qualify for an existing program, or demand on the existing programs exceeds capacity, does the resident need prepared meals or pantry items?
- Does the resident have the funds to purchase food and only need assistance in delivery?
- Does the resident have cultural, religious or dietary meal requirements? (e.g. Kosher, Halal, vegetarian).

Based on the answers provided by the resident, their assistance needs will be referred to one of several distribution hubs to complete the necessary services. For the purposes of this initial draft of the Food Security Response Strategy, the hubs would be focused on food items, but the system is designed to be scalable and would be able to incorporate distribution hubs of other items such as diapers, feminine hygiene products, and other consumables as needs arise.

Distribution Hubs

A distribution hub, in general, is a designated organization or facility that will coordinate delivery of a resource to the resident identified as needing the resource. Based on the screening process, the resident's order will be sent to the appropriate distribution hub to fulfill the order.

There should be no limit on the number of distribution hubs that can be registered within the web-based platform described above, but each distribution hub will need to register with the

platform and provide parameters of its level of service. Each hub will set the parameters of what services it offers, and the program will connect residents to the hubs closest to their residence geographically that provide the services they need. The distributions from hubs will occur daily, with resident orders submitted by close of business the evening before delivery.

As graphically shown in the logic tree above, the distribution hubs for food will be in one of three categories: existing programs, new programs, delivery only support. Each will be addressed in turn:

Existing Programs

Existing programs, such as the Senior Nutrition Program, already provide delivery services to residents. This connection will automate the referral process between the resident and the program, with the program distribution hub indicating how many additional residents can be accommodated within the program. Additionally, Food Assistance Providers that already provide delivery to residents can be registered as a distribution hub for their services through the platform.

For example, if a resident profile indicates that the resident is 70 years old and not already receiving meals from the Senior Nutrition Program, the resident will be connected with the Senior Nutrition Program hub to have the requisite food assistance delivered to the resident.

Expanding Delivery to New Programs

To address the recognized challenges residents face in reaching available food assistance, whether due to transportation challenges or health concerns, current providers and organizations that do not already provide delivery assistance will be able to register as a distribution hub so that the County will facilitate the delivery portion of the distribution. Existing Food Assistance providers will need to register as a hub on the platform and agree to provide timely information regarding their capacity to fulfill food assistance requests. This includes indicating the type and number of orders a distribution hub is able to fulfill, which will need to be provided at least 24 hours in advance of distribution in order to link residents appropriately with a provider.

For example, a resident profile is completed indicating that the household of two individuals ages 40 and 45. Based on the services screening, it is revealed that the household is not able to travel due to COVID-19 related exposure and do not have the resources to purchase food. However, they are able to prepare food at home and are only seeking grocery assistance. The resident request will be sent to one of the available hubs that provide pantry assistance. The following day a delivery driver will pick up the pantry goods from the distribution hub and take it to the household. Alternatively, if the same household were to indicate that they are unable to prepare food, the request would be sent to a hub that provides prepared meals.

As the operations begin, the Task Force will periodically assess whether there are sufficient hub providers to meet the community food needs. Should the need for new delivery options exceed the capacity of the current food assistance providers, the County will work with local businesses to establish new hubs for grocery and meal delivery in a manner that provides culturally appropriate food.

Delivery Only Support

Another challenge residents are facing is the delivery of food to their homes, even if they have the ability to purchase food. Specifically, this is a challenge for residents who frequent ethnic and specialty grocery stores within the County for a large portion of their food shopping. Many of these smaller grocers are unable to provide delivery options to residents. Additionally, many existing grocery delivery options have met or exceeded capacity and are unavailable to many residents who need assistance.

To address this challenge, Montgomery County restaurants and grocery stores will be able to register on the platform to be a hub. This registration will link them to residents who need delivery assistance, but have the financial means to purchase items themselves. Providers and community partners that register as a hub in this platform must have a process for residents to pay them directly for goods, as with the County support solely for the purpose of transporting items.

For example, a smaller grocer that serves a specific ethnic population may register as a distribution hub and indicate a defined list of packages available for purchase. Residents that indicate that they are financially able to purchase food, but are unable to leave their home due to quarantine measures, would then be connected to the existing grocery hubs based on the available ethnic and cultural options. The household would then select which of the defined packages they would like to receive and complete the payment with the grocer.

As with the other hubs, the resident request for support will be received by the close of business the day before delivery and will need to prepare resident orders. As soon as Maryland implements the Online SNAP pilot, any hub that accepts payment for food items must participate in the pilot to allow SNAP recipients to use their benefits to purchase food online.

All hubs will receive resident orders by the close of business the day before delivery is to occur, or at an agreed upon time over the weekend. The web-based platform will then identify the most efficient routes for delivery of goods from each hub and provide the hub a list of delivery routes for which they are to prepare items. The hub will then need to prepare the orders for each route the morning of the day of the delivery.

Food assistance providers and small community retailers serving as hubs will have additional storage, technology, business process, and personnel costs - this response strategy recommends that \$200,000 be budgeted to help offset these costs.

Shoppers who are less tech savvy might need more education on how to best shop online. And the communications strategy contemplated in this plan should include information on how to shop on-line and others might need info and support on how to surmount some of the obstacles when living in multi-family dwellings (how to get the packages, theft, etc).

Delivery Drivers

The web-based application will be integrated with a number of delivery options, including existing County delivery and transportation options. The application will determine the most efficient routes for a driver to take from a hub to a residence. Drivers will gather the items for their route from a designated hub and deliver the items using contactless-delivery best practices. For example, on arriving at a residence, the delivery driver should leave the delivery at the door of the residence. The driver will then be able to denote a delivery completed through the web-based application and the resident will receive an automatic message by phone, email, or text notifying them that the delivery has arrived. The total estimated cost of delivery support is \$720,000. This estimate assumes that drivers will be paid a minimum of \$15/hour for 2,000 hours of work over six months.

Getting the word out.

A significant barrier to connecting residents to services is informing residents of the resources available to them through culturally competent, accessible methods. A communication strategy to reach all residents in one of the most diverse communities in the County necessitates a communications program that provides strategic and diverse communication mechanisms in areas of the County most likely to have high levels of food insecurity based on existing zip code and demographic data and models.

Directed Messaging to Residents Likely to Experience Food Insecurity

Using existing food insecurity data in the County, including information gained from demands on current food assistance providers, the County will develop multi-language mailers that describe the resources available to food-insecure individuals. These mailers will be sent directly to all residents in the top 10 food insecure ZIP codes. This mailer will direct the residents to access the web-based platform and resident survey, as well as the existing County resources page and information.

Posters and Bus Advertisements

The County will develop a series of posters and Ride-on-Bus advertisements educating residents on the availability of food assistance resources. These advertisements and posters will be developed in coordination with the Office of Community Partnerships to promote the greatest accessibility throughout the County.

Digital Messaging

The County will develop media campaign branding to be used across social media platforms in multiple languages to promote the resources available. These digital advertisements will be sent to IP addresses located geographically in Montgomery County. The County has already created a WhatsApp account for Spanish speaking residents, and new WhatsApp groups should be created for other languages, which residents can sign up for through the web-based technology platform described above. The creation of a specific WhatsApp group relating to food assistance information and resources could also be explored.

Traditional Paid and Earned Media

The County should develop audio and video advertisements in several languages promoting the resources available. These advertisements should be distributed across local outlets throughout the County, with an emphasis on outlets that service non-English speakers. The County already has two radio shows in Spanish that go live weekly on 900AM, Radio America. One is “Montgomery Al Dia hosted by Lorna Virgili, Latino Liaison to the County Executive, and the other is “En Sintonia con el Concejo del Condado” hosted by Lilian Mass, Bilingual Communication Specialist for the County Council. These shows often have guests who are able to share important information and resources in Spanish to the Latino community. Another media opportunity is the recently created [Corona TV](#) on the County’s PEG channel.

The total cost of this outreach and communications strategy is proposed to be \$3,000,000 to support the development of artwork, language accessibility, and procurement of advertising space.

Community-level engagement and coordination

In a County as demographically and geographically diverse as ours, County-level strategies will never effectively identify and address the unique challenges and resources present in each of our neighborhoods. A strategy must be developed through extensive community engagement and representation and implemented with community-level leadership. This initial response strategy recommends both extensive continued community involvement in long-term strategy development and implementation as well as programmatic initiatives to formally embed community voice and leadership in the Countywide effort.

Community Partners Coordination

Many residents have strong connections and trusted relationships with non-governmental partners, faith-based organizations, and other community groups. The Task Force will work with the Office of Community Partnerships and build on the broader multicultural communication COVID-19 response efforts as well as Census outreach mechanisms to identify partners in the County community to serve as communications pathways to distribute materials to existing community partners for the partner to provide and distribute to the residents that they are

connected to. To enable these materials to be developed in collaboration with the partners, the Food Security Task Forces recommends that \$250,000 be allocated to specifically support these efforts.

Community Food Resource Navigator Program

A Community Food Resource Navigators can be designed to build awareness of food insecurity issues and resources among residents in Montgomery County communities while also identifying and communicating neighborhood-level food access challenges. County residents, perhaps through a partnership with a local institution of higher education, will participate in a training program on eligibility for federal nutrition assistance benefits and available food assistance programs for residents. Following the training, Navigators will be paid contractors serving as embedded, trusted resources of information in our County's communities, reducing stigma, providing peer-to-peer support, and connectivity to a wide range of services. To fund this program, the Food Security Task Forces recommends that \$250,000 be allocated to specifically support these efforts. Navigators will work closely with community partners, organizations, and food distribution sites and hubs, to identify resource and service gaps and communicate this information to coordination efforts at the hyper-local and County-levels.

Resident Survey

A brief, culturally competent survey for food assistance program participants should be developed and administered by multilingual County staff or trained volunteers at food assistance sites Countywide to gather data on food access challenges, culturally-appropriate food needs, and service barriers. In order to gather as much data as possible, surveys and administration guidelines should be provided to all food assistance providers for use at their sites. To fund this program, the Food Security Task Forces recommends that \$500,000 be allocated to specifically support these efforts.

Applying an Equity Lens

Disasters like pandemics tend to exacerbate pre-existing inequities, and rapidly developed or scaled-up assistance programs, no matter how well intentioned, can fail to adequately address inequities or lead to inequitable results. For that reason, all programs created or recommended herein should be required to complete an equity impact statement, and have a mechanism for receiving and responding to community feedback. The web-portal contemplated above should include a form for community members to provide feedback, and should include a mechanism for following up with those served. Special attention should be paid in the food procurement and distribution process to providing culturally appropriate foods. When implementing the programs and initiatives recommended herein, the advice of the Chief Equity Officer, and the feedback of the Food Council's Food Security Community Advisory Board should be sought.

Measuring Progress

The Montgomery County Food Security Task Force Data Unit is currently the main body collecting and analyzing food security response data for the County. As such, this group will be responsible for collecting and analyzing data on success and impact of the strategies described in this document. One of the major challenges of crafting this response strategy was the lack of real-time data to support decision making. Two major gaps in current datasets are: (1) reliable information on how many meals have been prepared and delivered by the myriad providers working on food assistance, and (2) how many individuals are in need of food assistance but do not know how to get help, or are not getting enough help. The recommendations in this strategy to create a unified intake mechanism and distribution tracking platform capable of producing real-time will address the first of those problems. The recommendations on communications, outreach, and community engagement will address the second.

Weekly, data should be gathered about:

1. How many prepared meals are being served, and the anticipated demand for prepared meals the next week, to make decisions about the scale of operations.
2. The volume of shelf-stable and pantry good items delivered and current inventory levels, to support ongoing procurement and distribution decisions.
3. The time it is taking to get food to individuals and their satisfaction with the delivery process, to make decisions about staffing, drivers, routes, and other logistics.
4. The demand for, and supply of, culturally appropriate foods to ensure that the overall system is meeting those needs appropriately.
5. The volume of food being provided by distribution hubs to make decisions about the scale of those operations, and the potential need to add or remove hubs.
6. The overall nutritional quality of the content delivered (specifically, the amount of fresh food provided), to support procurement and distribution decision-making.
7. The satisfaction of the community with the response strategies employed, to support decisions to update, change, or discontinue efforts.

Monthly, data should be gathered about:

1. The volume of shelf-stable foods in the system as a whole, to make decisions about long-term procurement and stockpiling strategies.
2. The volume of food wasted by the system, to address any gaps that might exist in storage, distribution, etc.
3. Economic trends likely to impact the demand in the coming months to support decisions about scaling the response.
4. Public health trends that are likely to impact the demand in the coming months to support decisions about scaling the response.
5. Relationships and contracting with farms to support decisions about scaling farm purchases in future months.

After three months, decisions about funding levels and operations beyond December 2020 should be carefully considered.

Next Steps

This Food Security Response Strategy is a “living document” that represents the best ideas, estimates, and inputs that could be gathered in the limited time afforded by this pandemic, and represents a balancing of the need to develop a response strategy quickly, with the need to seek broad input and feedback. As such, the budget numbers provided are “best guess” numbers from the contributors. It is the intention of the Food Security Task Force that as work continues and the situation evolves this document will grow to include additional feedback and higher levels of detail.

Following submission of this initial draft by the Task Force’s Strategic Planning Unit to OEMHS on Friday May 1st, it will be shared with the County Executive and County Council in a timely manner to inform CARES Act, disaster relief, and other pandemic-related funding allocation decisions. This Response Strategy, along with a comprehensive summary of the detailed operational strategies developed by Task Force members, will be used to inform and build on the continued work of the Task Force’s various units, and guide implementation by those units of the Response Strategy’s recommendations. In addition, this draft of the Response Strategy will be communicated widely to the public (as soon as approval is received from the County Government), through email, social media and other physical and online channels, as well as to food assistance providers on the Food Council’s weekly COVID-19 update call. Feedback will be gathered from community residents, agencies, nonprofits and food assistance providers through the use of an online survey as well as through email and telephone. This feedback will inform the continued updating of this initial draft of the Response Strategy, as community needs change, unique new challenges and opportunities for food access are identified, and the circumstances of the pandemic evolve. It is of paramount importance that the strategies identified by the Response Strategy are initiated and implemented quickly, in order to promote job growth and economic opportunity and address root causes to ultimately reduce and eliminate food insecurity in our County.

Summary

This Food Security Response Strategy sought the input, research, and feedback of more than 115 Task Force members. Task Force members compiled over a two-week period to provide recommendations on how to **connect more food to more people** during this crisis.

While Montgomery County has an extensive food assistance distribution system, the County is facing significant increased demand for food assistance during a period of dramatically decreased supply. The capacity of the current distribution system needs to be increased to

deliver nutritious, culturally appropriate, food items and meals that represent a healthy mix of protein, produce, and shelf-stable goods.

The Montgomery County Food Security Task Force believes that the response strategies laid out in this document will help support small and Montgomery County-owned businesses and create economic opportunities that promote job retention by buying food directly from local caterers, restaurants, wholesalers, and farms. The strategies will build equity in our local food system and economy, and strategically allocate resources to close gaps in services for specific populations by implementing a flexible distribution hub model, strengthening existing community partnerships, and helping guarantee the availability of culturally appropriate food assistance. These strategies maximize Federal and State dollars invested in the County food system by making sure that individuals who need food assistance and qualify for Federal or State assistance (1) know that food assistance is available, (2) know how and where to ask for help, and (3) have their requests for help acted on quickly. The strategies in this plan also work to build sustainable systems that will support short- and long-term food access needs by making investments in systems, programs, and partnerships that will last longer than this crisis.

Appendix A: Budget

Six Month Budget to Execute Food Security Strategy		
Prepared Meals	\$	33,000,000
Shelf-stable Foods and Pantry Items	\$	2,000,000
Fresh Food From Local Sources	\$	1,100,000
Victory Gardening & Community Farming	\$	150,000
SNAP Outreach	\$	55,000
Double Dollars Fund	\$	75,000
Web-based, Accessible Platform Development & Administration	\$	250,000
Distribution Hub Onboarding & Training	\$	200,000
Delivery Support	\$	720,000
Communications & Outreach	\$	3,000,000
Community Partner Coordination	\$	250,000
Community Food Resource Navigator Program	\$	250,000
Resident Survey	\$	500,000
TOTAL		\$ 41,550,000

APPENDIX B: Culturally Appropriate Food Access in Montgomery County

(Begins on next page)

!

!

!

Culturally!Appropriate!Food!Access! in!Montgomery!County!

!

Gap!Analysis!and!Action!Plan!Report!

!



Health Studies Department

COLLEGE of ARTS & SCIENCES • AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

!

Montgomery!County!Food!Council!
American!University!Capstone!Team!

Laurel!Booth,!Camille!Bridger,!Kayla!Gangemi,!Abhishek!Patel,!Michael!Sprague,!Lorraine!
Twohey!Jacobs!

April!30th,!2018!

!

!

!

!

!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!

Acknowledgments.

!

The success of our project relied heavily on guidance and assistance from many partners. We not only give credit to those listed below, but also to the stakeholders who participated in our surveys. The farmers, food assistance providers, and citizens of Montgomery County did not merely generate data and guide us to the further resources. They served as steadfast reminders of the ongoing battle to claim the right to food. We are continuously inspired by their unwavering determination.

!

Amanda Nesher, Food Security Programs Manager, Montgomery County Food Council!

!

Heather Bruskin, Executive Director, Montgomery County Food Council!

!

Jenna Umbriac, Director of Programs & Policy, Manna Food Center!

!

Food Recovery and Access Working Group (FRAWG) members, Montgomery County Food Council!

!

Dr. Jolynn Gardner, Director of Public Health, Department of Health Studies, American University!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

Table of Contents.

Introduction!	!4!
Methods!	!5!
Montgomery!County!Demographics!	!6!
Literature!Review!	!8!
Survey!and!Interview!Findings!	!13!
Gap!Analysis!	!19!
Limitations!	!21!
Action!Plan!	!24!
New!Survey!Tools!	!29!
Appendices!	!38!
Appendix!A!EProject!Proposal!	!38!
Appendix!B!EOrganization!Overview!and!SWOT!(Strengths,!Weaknesses,!Opportunities,!and!Threats)!Analysis!	!41!
Appendix!C!EVMOSA!(Vision,!Mission,!Objectives,!Strategies,!and!Action!Plan)!and!Logic!Model!	!47!
Appendix!D!EStakeholder!Contact!Directory!	!53!
Appendix!E!EOriginal!Survey!Questions!and!Results!for!Food!Assistance!Providers!	!54!
Appendix!F!EOriginal!Survey!Questions!and!Results!for!Food!Assistance!Recipients!	!55!
Appendix!H!ESelf!Sufficiency!Standard!and!Demographics!of!Montgomery!County!	!57!
References!	!59!

!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!

Introduction.

Nutrition!and!prosperity!are!inextricably!linked.!As!such,!society!attempts!to!ameliorate!food!
insecurity!in!multiple!ways:!benefits!programs!such!as!the!Supplemental!Nutrition!Assistance!
Program!(SNAP),!private!charities,!and!civil!society!initiatives!such!as!food!banks.!Many!such!
food!assistance!programs!exist!in!Montgomery!County,!Maryland.!Some!food!security!
stakeholders!have!coordinated!under!the!stewardship!of!the!Montgomery!County!Food!Council!
(MCFC)!to!form!working!groups!and!address!five!specific!aspects!of!food!insecurity:!Food!
Recovery!and!Access,!Food!Economy,!Food!Literacy,!Environmental!Impact,!and!finally,!the!
Food!Security!and!Food!Action!plans.!Included!in!the!Food!Recovery!and!Access!Working!
Group's!(FRAWG)!objectives!is!to!evaluate!the!supply!and!demand!for!culturally!appropriate!
foods!amongst!foreign!born!populations!within!Montgomery!County.!In!this!endeavor!MCFC!
partnered!with!a!team!of!Public!Health!consultants!from!American!University!(AU),!who!
accepted!the!task!as!part!of!their!senior!capstone,!following!a!project!proposal!created!by!
MCFC!and!Dr.!Jolynn!Gardner!from!AU!(see!Appendix!A).!

[illegible]

Methods..

! The capstone team conducted a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis and organizational overview of MCFC (see Appendix B). The SWOT analysis and MCFC project proposal informed the team's VMOSA (Vision, Mission, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Plan) and Logic Model (see Appendix C), which provided guidelines for the project's activities.

! The capstone team conducted both primary and secondary research. Much of the primary research took place in the form of informal interviews through phone calls and surveys. Lists of questions for food assistance providers, food assistance recipients, and local grocers were created through collaboration of the capstone team and edits from Dr. Jolynn Gardner at American University and Amanda Nesher and Catherine Nardi from MCFC.

! Food assistance provider contacts were provided by Amanda Nesher at MCFC and Jenna Umbriac at Manna Food Center (see Appendix D). Members of the MCFC FRAWG listserv were also contacted. Contacts responded to questions over the phone, through a Google form survey, or through Qualtrics. A total of $n = 16$ responses were received from providers. Questions and responses for food assistance providers are recorded in Appendix E.

! Food recipient answers were collected in person through survey administration at Silver Spring Christian Reformed Church food bank. A total of $n = 17$ responses were collected, one in Spanish and six in English. Questions and responses for food assistance recipients are recorded in Appendix F.

! Grocer contacts were identified based on the Johns Hopkins University Maryland Food System Map (see Appendix D). The capstone team took a randomly generated sample, $n = 15$, of the 61 groceries classified as "international foods" by the Hopkins map. Two of the businesses were closed and one was listed under an invalid number, therefore the capstone team reached out to survey 12 grocers. No grocer responses were obtained. Obstacles are detailed in the limitations section. Questions for grocers are recorded in Appendix G.

! Simultaneously, the capstone team conducted secondary research on the population of Montgomery County. The Self Sufficiency Standard tool provided an introduction to the largest foreign born populations in the county and where the largest need (geographically) exists in the county. To gain more insight about these foreign born populations in the county, the team researched common food ingredients and recipes from the countries of origin. Additionally, the team conducted a literature review of research and strategies used to address food insecurity and culturally appropriate food access in other communities in the US. Results from the primary and secondary research were synthesized to inform our gap analysis and action plan for MCFC.

!
!
!
!
!

Montgomery County Demographics..

Montgomery County is a geographically large and diverse county located in Maryland, adjacent to Washington, DC. The county is one of the wealthiest counties in the United States, spans across nearly 500 square miles, and has a population of over 1 million (U.S. Census Bureau 2017). However, significant barriers to food access prevail, particularly for foreign born populations and ethnic and racial minorities.

Montgomery County is a relatively food secure area. 66% of the population was food insecure in 2015 (Johns Hopkins, 2018). However, one third of the population is foreign born, this population is especially vulnerable to food insecurity. Looking at the population of Montgomery County, the most common countries of origin include: El Salvador, China, and India (Montgomery County Food Security Plan, 2017).

Foreign Born Country of Origin (Top 10 Countries) in Montgomery County




Figure 1: Foreign Born Country of Origin (Top 10 Countries) in Montgomery County for 2010 and 2014 (Montgomery County Food Security Plan, Montgomery County Food Council, 2017, p. 14.)

The Self Sufficiency Standard is a tool developed by Montgomery County's Community Action Agency and County Stat. This tool details the demographics of those in the county who fall below the Self Sufficiency Standard (SSS). SSS is a measurement of how much income a family needs to be able to sustain themselves with expenses, including food costs. Burden varies across different regions of the county, as well as by world area of birth (Self Sufficiency Standard, 2016). 59% of householders born in Latin America and 56% of householders born in Africa are below the SSS (Self Sufficiency Standard, 2016). Countries of origins with the highest rates of householders living below the SSS are El Salvador, Ethiopian, Peru, and the Philippines. Over 40% of householders born in each of those countries are below the SSS (Self Sufficiency Standard, 2016). In certain regions of the county, these percentages are even higher. See Appendix H for graphs of percent below SSS by area of Montgomery County, World area of birth, and countries of origin.

Country	Percentage
El Salvador	74%
India	6%
China	26%
Ethiopia	64%
Korea	18%
Peru	54%
Vietnam	42%
Philippines	49%
Iran	29%
Taiwan	8%

! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !

Literature Review.

! Vulnerability of immigrant/foreign born populations!

Among food insecure populations, significant numbers who face additional barriers are foreign born. One study concluded that food insecurity rates among immigrant families can be nearly triple that of non-immigrant families (Hofferth, 2004). However, specific ratios of foreign born representation among the food insecure population vary by geographic location. A recent study of immigrant families based in San Diego, CA by Greenwald (2017) examined the difference between immigrant and non-immigrant households in terms of food insecurity. In their study, there was no significant difference in food insecurity between populations. The study found that immigrant families were more likely to use food assistance services such as SNAP and food pantry assistance than non-immigrant families. Food insecurity in immigrant families was found to continue over time. Household size and poverty level are predictors of food insecurity (Greenwald, 2017). Similarly, Anderson, et al., (2016) found that households with food insecure children were more likely to be recent immigrants. MCFC has recognized the need to connect with the foreign born populations to achieve its mission of providing food security to the county as a large portion of the county is foreign born (Montgomery County Food Security Plan, 2017).

! Difference by culture!

Different populations use various strategies to access traditional or desired foods. In a study conducted by Tang (2017), when it came to accessing traditional foods, word of mouth networking was the most efficient method noted among the target group of Eritrean mothers. The research team found that multicultural groups in the Edmonton community discussed where to buy preferred products such as organic or halal meat. Similarly, word of mouth was the marketing approach most successful in marketing East African specific food baskets to local populations (Washington Food Coalition, 2012). The Filipino population in the Tang study sought to maximize traditional food access by planting traditional foods in community gardens. The study noted these efforts to maintain traditional connection to the food but also admitted that the local Canadian options of more processed foods and inorganic meat were also blended into the diet over time (Tang, 2017). While national origin and years spent in the US were not valid predictors of food insecurity in the Greenwald study, national origin did impact dietary choices particularly in terms of fruit and vegetable intake (Greenwald, 2017). This is a natural reflection that dietary practices differ by cultural background due to traditional practices and available ingredients.

Differences in diet are also important to consider when discussing first and second generations of foreign born individuals. A 1995 study examined dietary shift between generations of Mexican American women and found significant decline in the quality of diet (specifically a decrease in vitamins A and C, folic acid, and calcium) in the second generation. This decline is due to the adoption of a diet that resembled white non-Hispanic women, despite significant increases in education and income status (Guendelman & Abrams, 1995). Similarly, a study of Asian immigrants found that higher education level as well as greater English ability was found to increase acceptance of American diet practices. The study also noted changes in diet pre and post immigration and found an increase in cholesterol (particularly in saturated fats), a decrease in carbohydrate and fiber consumption. American diet practices such as incorporating butter and cheese may have been responsible for the fat increase, while limited access to culturally familiar noodles and bean products are expected to be responsible for the decrease in carbs and fiber. The most missed available product was fresh fish (Yang, 1996). A cross sectional analysis of Korean American Women born in both Korea and the US revealed that compared to Korean born women, American born women experienced increased fat intake level and lower levels of carbohydrates, vitamin C, beta-carotene, and sodium consumption.

American-born women ate less vegetables and fruits than those born in Korea (Park, 2005). This further supports evidence of dietary shifts upon immigration.

!

Food Profiles Research

As indicated in the Montgomery County demographics section, El Salvador, India, China, Peru, and Ethiopia make up a large percent of the foreign-born population in Montgomery County. Moreover, a high percentage of those from El Salvador, Peru, and Ethiopia live below the SSS. This suggested to the capstone team that these populations may make up a large percent of the population that food assistance providers serve. Therefore, the capstone team conducted preliminary research on common foods and diets in those countries.

- *El Salvador Food Profile*: Pupusas and tamales are the staples of El Salvadorian food. Other key ingredients in their diets include maize, meat (pork and chicken), beans, and plantains. (Visit El Salvador, 2018)
- *India Food Profile*: Millet is the staple of diets in India. Other common foods include rice, lentils, and a variety of beans. (Topa, 2015)
- *China Food Profile*: Both rice and noodles are staples of their diet. Pork, soy, and eggs are the major protein sources, while various vegetables like Chinese cabbage and eggplant. (China Highlights, 2018)
- *Peru Food Profile*: Chicken, pork and fish are the main protein sources in Peru. Potatoes, maize, and beans are also cornerstones of Peruvian diets. (Dunnell, 2017)
- *Ethiopia Food Profile*: Injera, chicken, rice are major staples of Ethiopian cuisine. Cabbage and Chili Peppers are also common parts of meals. (Noll, 2017)

!

Barriers to food assistance

Language barriers are one of the most frequently cited limitations for participation (Greenwald, 2017; MCFC, 2017). Similarly, there is a lack of knowledge around eligibility and opportunity to access services, which includes federal assistance for non-food related services as well such as health insurance and housing assistance (Altman & Becker, 2015; Greenwald, 2017). Cultural stigmas around receiving assistance can produce shame which is an additional barrier (Tang, 2017; Greenwald, 2017). Further barriers include difficulty for non-Christian recipients to utilize food access resources through religious organizations, or do pickup at churches (Greenwald, 2017). Fear about legal status is another barrier (Altman & Becker, 2015). These barriers have all been noted as barriers that continue for the target population in the Montgomery County Food Security Plan 2017 (Montgomery County Food Security Plan, 2017).

!

Limitations of food assistance reach

Beyond the limitations that prevent eligible populations access, food assistance providers face further limitations. Food assistance programs such as SNAP and WIC have limitations in the types and quality of foods they are able to provide. These programs provide mostly shelf-stable foods, and tend to have limited fresh and healthy options (Greenwald, 2017). Among the food security programs described in the Greenwald study, food pantries were rated as least convenient and least likely to provide healthy and high quality food by survey respondents. Key informant interviews with food assistance providers suggest that the stigma of waiting in public to be served reduces utilization and satisfaction with these outlets (Greenwald, 2017). Being presented with unfamiliar foods or unfamiliar packaging are additional challenges to newcomers. Specific challenges include difficulty transitioning to using new cooking utensils (such as can openers), and transitioning from fresh to frozen produce and meats (Tang, 2017). Concerns also revolve around if the meat is halal (Greenwald, 2017).

!

!

Concerns of providers!

Provider concerns frequently revolve around funding and sustainability, as many programs are grant based or rely on the changing political scene for funding (Greenwald, 2017; Edwards, 2014). Providers also are concerned about the dietary changes seen in some populations, away from fresh foods towards processed foods of a typical American diet (Greenwald, 2017). Providers also have noted a lack of traditional foods to be a concern in establishing food security and thus have incorporated access to traditional foods into their definition of food security (Tang, 2017; Wilson, et al., 2016).

!

Implementation recommendations from the literature!

Methods to decrease these barriers include further outreach. Community engagement helps to develop culturally appropriate interventions, in particular using culturally adapted outreach materials and language accessible materials for recruitment and retention (Bender, 2013). Connecting with specific cultural groups with high risks of food insecurity can be facilitated by identifying a community navigator. This strategy was found to be effective in a Canadian study conducted by the Edmonton Multicultural Coalition to evaluate success of their community garden program among three "ethnocultural communities" (Tang, 2017).

!

In a compilation of best practices among Washington State food providers, the Asian Counseling and Referral Service was noted for being particularly successful in its approach to providing culturally appropriate foods such as tofu, soy milk, ramen, fish and rice. While these are not common products in the donation stream the provider makes an effort to purchase them specifically. Additionally, bilingual staff, who cover over 30 languages, and who are representative of the community serves provide this agency with an extra advantage to increase community engagement and accessibility. The agency also has adopted a client choice model to decrease the foods thrown away and better the experience of food assistance (Washington Food Coalition, 2012).

!

Similarly, the Lifelong AIDS Alliance provided outreach to the East African community by developing a special foods bag that includes staples of the traditional diet such as injera (flatbread) along with fruits, vegetables and proteins. The special foods bag was a success due to the partnership with local Ethiopian grocery store which helped identify and donate the culturally specific foods. Success has spread through the community via word of mouth (Washington Food Coalition, 2012).

!

A 2014 analysis determined trends and best practices among food distribution systems and was conducted to guide philanthropic investment in North Carolina. By researching four food banks in North Carolina, one in Georgia, one in Maryland, one in Minnesota and two in New York, key areas of need were identified in order as: financial support, quantity of food and cold storage. Additionally, barriers included: recruitment and coordination of volunteers, fundraising assistance, transportation of food, need for equipment and facilities, staff and volunteer training and development, technology, engagement of the board members, quality of foods, coordination and connectivity of programs, navigating rules and regulations (Edwards, 2014).

!

General best practices were identified, those that pertain to this project's mission are: Enhance coordination through geographic zoning. Increase the amount of fresh foods and proteins received and distributed by increasing farmer and farmers market partnerships. Facilitate client choice pantries. Develop mobile food pantries to reach out to hard to serve populations. Encourage cash donations to purchase the needed and desired foods (Edwards, 2014). Some of the practices are already in process amongst the MCFC partners such as Manna Food Center.

Further Recommendations Specific to this Project from the Edwards study include:

- Develop positive relationships with grocery chains and large corporate chains to donate goods. In addition, build relationships with trucking companies. (Second Harvest Food Bank of Metrolina @ Charlotte, NC)
- Have Food Banks partner closely with Food Pantries to increase community engagement and cultural competency. Local community members may be pathways to future donors. (Food Bank of Central and Eastern North Carolina @ Raleigh, NC)
- Engage with the community by facilitating culinary training programs and community kitchens, as this is a way to promote food access, nutrition and share skills. (InterFaith Food Shuttle @ Raleigh, NC)
- Expand capacity to receive fresh foods as they are more popular in grocery stores and will likely be donated at higher rates. (Second Harvest of South Georgia @ Valdosta, GA)
- Engage the community and make food more accessible to recipients from different cultures by offering cooking demonstrations. (Maryland Food Bank @ Baltimore, MD)

!

Research Recommendations

Groups of leading organizations and concerned citizens tackling food insecurity work together to implement community food security strategies. Community food security extends beyond access to affordable foods to include safe, nutritious, and culturally appropriate foods (Wilson, *et al.*, 2016). Many of the research methods employed by other counties include surveys, key informant interviews and Geographical Information System (GIS) mapping.!!

!

When collecting data on residents' access to food, previous research strategies involved surveying individuals at several locations throughout neighborhood, including senior centers, community association meetings, WIC sites, and other popular areas (Smith, *et al.*, 2009). Researchers performed key informant interviews with emergency food assistance agencies, including regional food banks, local pantries, school gardens, mobile markets, and food cooperatives, on their knowledge of recipients' food preferences, access to healthy, culturally appropriate and affordable food, among other key topics (Wilson, *et al.*, 2016). In addition, food and hunger committee stakeholders were contacted regarding research on community food security, through semi-structured interviews or surveys (Wilson, *et al.*, 2016). Research methods have also involved surveying consumers at grocery stores and other various food providers on food preferences, access, and affordability (Jackson and Union County, 2011). Finally, researchers also interviewed food assistance recipients regarding their food shopping habits, food consumption habits, transportation methods, and access to cooking and storage facilities (Jackson and Union County, 2011).!!

!

When identifying and researching food suppliers, previous studies have employed research methods including GIS mapping of food deserts (Luke, 2015) and food providers/retailers (Grauel & Chambers, 2014). Researchers often followed up on GIS mapping by canvassing streets to identify food stores by site (Smith, *et al.*, 2009). Researchers asked residents during data collection of any nearby food stores. This instance of community engagement is important in truly understanding and addressing the assets and needs found within communities. Finally, researchers surveyed grocery store managers in order to understand consumers' access to food and any perceived barriers (Jackson and Union County, 2011).!

!

!

!

!

!

Additional!Research!Resources!

The!Community!Food!Assessment!(CFA)!conducted!by!the!Jackson!and!Union!County!CFA! Team!provided!a!good!example!of!a!survey!tool!for!consumers/recipient!and!a!survey!tool!for! grocery!store!managers!(Jackson!and!Union!County,!2011).!The!survey!may!act!as!a!template! for!future!research!on!food!assistance!providers'!knowledge!of!and!recipients'!access!to! culturally!appropriate!food.!Furthermore,!many!research!methods!found!in!the!literature!were! based!off!the!U.S.!Department!of!Agriculture's!Community!Food!Security!Assessment!(CFA)! toolkit!(Cohen,!et!al.,!2002).!The!USDA!CFA!includes!guides!for!profiling!community!food! resources!and!materials!for!assessing!community!food!security,!including!household!food! security,!food!resource!accessibility,!food!availability!and!affordability,!and!community!food! production!resources.!This!appeared!to!be!the!foundational!“gold!standard”!for!community!food! security!research!methods.!Depending!on!the!scope!and!focus!of!future!studies,!combinations! of!these!research!strategies!may!be!employed!to!gain!the!appropriate!data!needed.!

! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !

Survey and Interview Findings.

!

Food Assistance Providers Survey Results

The capstone team created a survey to be administered to food assistance providers in Montgomery County. Respondents to the survey play a variety of roles in food assistance provision in Montgomery County. Most of the organizations have a food pantry open once a month or on a weekly basis. The food pantries were either mobile or stationary. Many organizations said they engage with the community to learn about their food needs. Some of the other respondents were not traditional food assistance providers, such as the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which provides public land and park space for people to grow their own food, and the Montgomery Department of Health and Human Services, which provides grants to nonprofit organizations to do food recovery and provide food assistance to community members dealing with food insecurity.

Questions in the survey asked about the providers' experiences providing food, including culturally appropriate foods, the barriers providers faced in accessing and distributing foods, providers' perspectives on food assistance recipients' desires for culturally appropriate foods and barriers to access, and providers' knowledge of the foreign born people within their food assistance recipient population.

!

Seven of the sixteen questions were highlighted for further analysis and are presented below. The complete survey and answers for food assistance providers can be found in Appendix E.

!

Question 5: What barriers do your clients encounter in accessing culturally appropriate food?!

- ❖ Many providers listed clients' lack of financial resources as a barrier to accessing culturally appropriate food.
- ❖ Providers also noted distance to markets that carry cultural foods and limited means of transportation as barriers.
- ❖ Some providers noted that when foods are donated, the donors often do not account for culturally appropriate food.

!

Question 6: What are the most common (3E) foreign born populations that you serve?!

- ❖ *South and Central America* (17): Hispanic, not specified (5), Latino, not specified (4), Guatemala (2), El Salvador (2), Caribbean (2), Central America (1), Haiti (1)
- ❖ *Asia* (11): Asian, not specified (3), Vietnamese (3), Chinese (3), Pacific Islands (1), Korea (1)
- ❖ *Africa* (8): African, not specified (6), African American (1), Ethiopia (1)
- ❖ *Europe* (2): Romanian (1), Caucasian, not specified (1)
- ❖ *Middle East* (2): Middle East, not specified (1), Kosher (1)

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!




Figure 3: Most Common Foreign Born Populations as Indicated by Food Assistance Providers in Montgomery County from Survey Results for Question 6

Question 7: What percentage of your clients are foreign born?

- ❖ Percentages ranged from 35% to 0%

Question 9: What types of food are in highest demand? (In order of highest demand).

- ❖ *Fresh*fruits* (8): Fresh fruit, not specified (7), watermelon (1)
- ❖ *Vegetables* (10): Vegetables, not specified (6), tomatoes (2), onions (1), potatoes (1)
- ❖ *Cereal*Grain* (13): White rice (5), beans (3), corn (2), cereal (2), white bread (1)
- ❖ *Meat*and*Fish* (6): Meat, not specified (4), fish, not specified (1), sardines (1)
- ❖ *Dairy* (2): Dairy Products, not specified (1), Milk (1)
- ❖ Peanut Butter (2)
- ❖ Silverware (1)
- ❖ Bottled Water (1)
- ❖ Frozen Meals (1)
- ❖ Pupusas (1)
- ❖ Cooking oil (1)




Figure 4: Most Demanded Foods as Indicated by Food Assistance Providers in Montgomery County from Survey Results for Question 7.

Question 10: What types of traditional/cultural foods are in highest demand? (In order of highest demand):

- ❖ Fresh fruits (3): Fresh fruit, not specified (2), jackfruit (1)
- ❖ Vegetables (6): Fresh vegetables, not specified (2), greens (1), sweet potato (1), onions (1), corn leaves (1)
- ❖ Grain (11): Rice (4), corn (2), beans (2), specialty breads (1), masa flour (1), chipilin (1)
- ❖ Pupusas (1)
- ❖ Lamb (1)
- ❖ Ensure (1)
- ❖ Cooking Oil (1)
- ❖ Baby formula (1)



Figure 5: Most Demanded Traditional/Cultural Foods as Indicated by Food Assistance Providers in Montgomery County from Survey Results for Question 7.

Question 11: Are some foods requested, but not easy for your organization to obtain?

- ❖ Meats!
- ❖ Tropical fruits/fresh fruits and vegetables!
- ❖ White rice!
- ❖ Dried beans!

!

Question 14: What are the barriers you experience in accessing, storing, and distributing culturally appropriate foods?

- ❖ Financial! lack of funding/cost of food!
- ❖ Lack of storage!

!

As evidenced by figures 4 and 5, there is large overlap between food assistance providers' most demanded foods and most demanded cultural foods. Moreover, food assistance providers indicated that high demand items from both of these lists prove difficult to obtain.

!

Overall, some of the biggest barriers for providers included financial issues, i.e. being unable to afford certain foods that their clients might request, a lack of storage (specifically refrigeration and shelving space). In addition, providers that relied on donations often found that donated foods did not meet the preferences or requests of their clients. These findings are consistent with previous literature on food assistance providers' challenges.

!

To mitigate some of the stigma surrounding seeking food assistance, one provider suggested congregate meals as an opportunity to engage with the community and promote access to culturally appropriate foods.

!

Food Assistance Recipients Survey Results!

The food profile of some of the most common countries of origin in the county provided the capstone team with information on what culturally appropriate food is wanted in the county. To supplement this research, the capstone team conducted in-person interviews with food assistance recipients at Silver Spring Christian Reformed Church (SSCRC) food pantry. SSCRC food pantry currently opens once a month and relies on donations (from Capital Area Food Bank, and Manna Food Bank), and small grants to obtain the items they offer. All of the results recorded were from participants born outside of the United States. Questions in the survey were informed by secondary research, and asked about: identity food consumption habits food preferences access to food retailers/providers and barriers to accessing culturally appropriate food in particular.

!

Eight of the twelve questions were highlighted for further analysis and are presented below. The complete survey and answers for food assistance recipients can be found in Appendix F.

!

Question 1: Where were you born?

- ❖ Africa (Nigeria) (3)
- ❖ Africa (Cameroon) (2)
- ❖ Africa (Sierra Leone)
- ❖ Central America (Guatemala)

!

Question 4: What food do you eat most often?

- ❖ Rice (3)
- ❖ Chicken (2)
- ❖ Fish

- ❖! Cornmeal!
- ❖! Beans!(dried)!(2)!
- ❖! Fruits!(bananas,!oranges,!lemons,!etc.)!
- ❖! Cassava!leaf!
- ❖! Plantains!
- ❖! Macaroni!and!Cheese!
- ❖! Vegetables!(broccoli,!cauliflower,!corn,!potatoes,!etc.)!

!

Question!5:!!Where!do!you!normally!go!to!purchase!or!receive!groceries?!

- ❖! The!local!grocery!store!(3)!
- ❖! Silver!Spring!Christian!Reformed!Church!food!pantry!(4)!
- ❖! Red!Apple!Farmers!Market!(Takoma!Park,!Maryland)!
- ❖! La!Mart!(Silver!Spring,!Maryland)!
- ❖! Giant!Food!
- ❖! HEMart!
- ❖! Other!local!food!pantries!!

!

Question!6:!!Does!one!or!more!of!these!locations!meet!your!cultural/traditional!food!preferences?!

- ❖! Yes!(4)!
- ❖! Somewhat!(2)!
- ❖! No!(1)!

!

Question!7:!!How!long!does!it!take!you!to!travel!where!you!normally!purchase/receive!food?!

- ❖! Less!than!30!minutes!(3)!

!

Question!8:!!Do!you!travel!to!another!location!for!cultural/traditional!foods?!What!is!the!name!of!this!location?!

- ❖! The!local!grocery!store(s)!(2)!
- ❖! Red!Apple!Farmers!Market!(Takoma!Park,!Maryland)!
- ❖! La!Mart!(Silver!Spring,!Maryland)!
- ❖! H!Mart!(various!locations,!Maryland)!

!

Question!9:!!If!you!travel!to!another!for!cultural/traditional!foods,!how!long!does!it!take!you!to!get!there?!

- ❖! Less!than!30!minutes!(3)!

!

Question!10:!!Are!there!any!traditional/cultural!foods!that!you!want!that!are!difficult!for!you!to!get?! Which!ones?!

- ❖! Rice!
- ❖! Chicken!
- ❖! Meat!
- ❖! Fish!
- ❖! Eggs!
- ❖! Milk!
- ❖! Beans!(dried)!
- ❖! Black!eyed!beans!
- ❖! Red!palm!oil!
- ❖! Corn!meal!
- ❖! Asian!foods!
- ❖! Salt!

Many of the foods that recipients indicated as difficult to obtain are generally considered to be staples. These foods are common across multiple foreign-born populations. Moreover, these findings mirror the foods indicated as most in demand as determined by providers.

Recipients also mentioned a necessity for foods that may be considered more unique to specific cultures, including:

- ❖! Corn!meal!
- ❖! Plantain!
- ❖! Black!eye!beans!
- ❖! Red!Palm!oil!
- ❖! Cassava!leaves!
- ❖! Asian!foods!

When asked about recipients' travel time to where they obtain regular groceries and cultural/traditional foods, all indicated travel time was less than 30 minutes. However, only three responses were gathered.

!

Gap Analysis.

! This! gap! analysis! looks! at! the! population! of! Montgomery! County! Maryland! and! considers! the! access! to! culturally! appropriate! foods, !specifically! for! food! insecure! individuals! and! communities.! In! order! for! the! gap! of! resources/opportunities! to! be! determined,! the! capstone! team! looked! at! what! is! currently! wanted! by! the! community! and! what! is! currently! available! in! the! community.! The! gap! analysis! thus,! looks! at! the! 'gap'! between! what! is! wanted! and! what! is! available! in! the! county.! !

! What! is! Wanted!

As! previously! discussed! in! survey! results,! there! are! various! foods! that! appear! to! be! in! greatest! demand! from! foreign! born! food! assistance! recipients.! Many! of! these! foods! can! be! considered! staple! foods/ingredients! in! many! cultures.! Based! on! survey! results! from! food! assistance! providers! and! recipients,! foods! in! greatest! demand! from! these! populations! include! rice,! beans,! fruit,! vegetables,! corn! meal,! meat,! chicken,! fish,! eggs,! fresh! milk,! salt! and! cooking! oil.! !

! It! is! important! to! note! that! according! to! the! survey! results! from! food! assistance! providers! and! recipients,! fresh! foods! were! in! higher! demand! than! canned! foods! but! were! less! available! at! locations! where! recipients! go! to! purchase! or! receive! food.! These! requests! were! made! for! produce! the! majority! of! the! time! (fruits! and! vegetables).! However,! it! is! interpreted! that! fresh! meat,! chicken,! fish! and! eggs! would! be! preferred! to! processed! varieties! of! these! foods! as! well.! !

! Additionally,! many! survey! responses! reported! that! specific! kinds! of! food! items! are! often! in! short! supply! or! not! made! available! at! food! assistance! sites.! These! foods! are! white! rice,! dried! beans,! tropical! fruits! (e.g.! jackfruit)! and! vegetables,! corn! meal! and! masa! flour! (to! make! pupusas,! etc.).! !

! What! is! Available!

Looking! at! the! common! foods! in! the! major! cultures! represented! in! Montgomery! County,! and! the! responses! from! food! bank! recipients,! many! of! the! foods! requested! are! widely! available! in! stores.! Particularly! staple! foods! that! the! recipients! mentioned! as! culturally! appropriate,! such! as! salt,! meat,! and! cooking! oil.! Some! of! the! rare! culturally! appropriate! foods! listed! are! available! at! smaller! international! food! stores,! and! even! some! at! large! grocery! stores.! There! are! 61! grocery! stores! in! the! county! that! are! labeled! as! selling! 'international! food.'! ! according! to! the! Johns! Hopkins! University! Maryland! Food! System! Map.! These! stores! are! where! many! of! the! foods! listed! could! be! purchased.! The! capstone! team! found! through! a! food! recipient! interview! that! palm! oil! was! very! rarely! available,! even! in! international! grocery! stores.! !

! With! many! of! these! foods! being! sold! in! stores! in! the! county,! the! issue! appears! not! to! be! necessarily! having! or! finding! the! foods! the! recipients! want,! but! having! it! available! in! a! convenient! and! affordable! location.! The! food! banks! in! the! area! struggle! to! get! access! to! the! culturally! appropriate! food! for! their! recipients,! despite! the! foods! being! sold! nearby.! !

! Another! way! culturally! appropriate! foods! can! be! available! in! the! county! is! through! congregate! meals.! The! Montgomery! County! Senior! Nutrition! Program! provides! funding! for! congregate! meals! for! seniors! in! the! county.! In! one! interview! that! the! capstone! team! conducted,! the! program! manager! said! that! the! groups! that! apply! for! the! congregate! meals! are! ethnic! groups,! and! that! they! purchase! meals! from! local! culturally! appropriate! restaurants! for! their! communities.! The! groups! who! have! used! this! funding! include! Korean,! Chinese,! Kosher,! and! Vietnamese.! !

!
!
!

What!is!Wanted!but!not!Available!

There!are!gaps!between!what!is!wanted!and!what!is!currently!available!and!accessible!to!food!
insecure!communities!in!Montgomery!County.!The!biggest!gap!appears!to!be!the!lack!of!access!
to!foods!that!are!staple!foods/ingredients!in!many!cultures.!While!white!rice,!poultry,!fish,!meat,!
eggs,!and!salt!may!not!be!what!comes!to!mind!as!culturally!appropriate!food,!from!our!research!
these!are!the!types!of!foods!that!are!the!most!in!demand!across!many!different!cultures.!Also,!a!
variety!of!fresh!fruits!and!vegetables!are!consistently!listed!by!food!assistance!providers!as!
highly!demanded!but!low!in!availability.!Securing!these!staples!for!food!pantries!and!other!
affordable!platforms!would!fill!a!major!gap!in!this!situation.!!

!

Another!gap!is!finding!ways!for!food!pantries!to!have!access!to!the!more!unique!requests!for!
food!recipients.!Foods!like!palm!oil,!jackfruit,!and!cassava!leaves!seem!to!be!impossible!for!
many!in!the!community!to!get!at!all.!Finding!ways!to!secure!these!types!of!items!as!often!as!
possible,!even!if!it!is!just!occasionally!would!be!a!big!improvement.!It!seems!that!getting!a!hold!
of!these!items!is!very!challenging!for!food!banks,!which!is!why!once!they!can!get!access!to!
these!items,!they!should!be!given!distributed!strategically,!possibly!to!choice!pantries!where!
they!will!go!to!only!those!who!truly!want!them.!!

!

Why!these!are!not!Available!

Significant!barriers!exist,!which!explain!some!of!the!gaps!in!food!access!that!are!prevalent!in!
Montgomery!County.!As!presented!by!food!assistance!recipients!who!participated!in!the!survey,!
often!times!individuals!must!travel!to!more!than!one!location!to!attain!culturally!appropriate!foods.!
As!noted!by!food!assistance!providers,!lack!of!funds!to!be!able!to!store!dry!staple!foods!or!afford!
refrigeration!of!fruits!and!vegetables!may!prevent!providers!from!being!able!to!offer!foods!highest!
in!demand.!Moreover,!food!assistance!providers!rely!on!donors,!who!do!not!always!have!the!
foods!most!in!demand.!This!may!be!particularly!relevant!for!more!unique!cultural!foods!that!may!
be!in!high!demand!in!some!locations!but!not!others.!Plans!to!mitigate!these!barriers!and!others!
are!included!in!the!Action!Plan!on!page!24.!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

Limitations.

As described in our Methods section, this endeavor was based in primary and secondary research. The limitations incurred by the survey component of this phase are addressed here in order to inform future efforts.

!

Food Assistance Provider Survey Limitations

The survey that was administered to food assistance providers (e.g., county food banks, and public agencies) produced a sample size of 14 respondents. Of the 16 questions asked by the survey for food assistance providers, seven questions did not produce a response from at least one participant. Certain questions asked were not relevant to the stakeholders participating which accounts for some of the non-response.

!

In addition, although the survey was sent to 26 food assistance organizations and the entire FRAWG listserv, only 13 responses occurred. There were some difficulties for some in accessing the initial format of the survey, which was a Google Survey. The survey was converted to Qualtrics, which the capstone team thought would warrant many more responses, but only seven came in within our collection period. The lack of response may have been due to “survey fatigue”, a term used to describe exhaustion experienced by many food assistance providers who have been asked to respond to a multitude of surveys. Many of the food assistance providers receive surveys from various other organizations and groups which can be taxing and lead to issues with the quality and quantity of responses. Additionally, the initial provider survey may have been too long. In the future, a shorter, more concise survey may help reduce survey fatigue.

!

Many organizations seemed eager to participate, but often wanted the capstone team to visit the food assistance location. Due to scheduling and transportation conflicts on all parts, it was difficult for such visits to occur. In the future, face-to-face encounters and visits with food assistance providers may lead to better quality responses and more responses from various organizations.

!

Finally, due to many of the blank responses on many of the questions in the survey, it is possible that the capstone team did not reach out to the most appropriate sources. Certain survey participants may not have felt knowledgeable on all of the subjects asked about. While it is important to gain diverse perspectives on the issue from a variety of partners, the areas of overlap on these perspectives may be small. Additional research and networking to appropriate respondents may be necessary.

!

Based on recipients and provider responses about access to culturally appropriate foods, it was noted that many staple foods (such as many of the foods mentioned that recipients wanted: fresh fruits, vegetables, meat, chicken, beans, rice, etc.) are found in many different cultures. It may be important to expand the focus of future surveys, and when asking about preferred foods follow up with specific fruits and vegetables.

!

The new survey aims to address the issues encountered in the initial provider survey.

!

Food Assistance Recipient Survey Limitations

The partnership with MCFC facilitated direct survey distribution to food assistance providers. However, MCFC has less direct contact with food assistance recipients which may have contributed to our low number of responses.

!

Achieving comprehensive responses from both food assistance recipients and providers proved challenging as the team faced time constraints. With regard to food assistance sites, due to the fact that many food pantries are seldom open (i.e. once a month), the number of opportunities for information collection from recipients was minimal. Thus, a lack of resources preventing food pantries from being open on a more frequent basis was also identified as a limitation to informing our gap analysis, as well as the food insecure residents of Montgomery County.


!

The survey for food assistance recipients was administered in person at the Silver Spring Christian Reformed Church food bank on two occasions. In total, this survey produced a sample size of seven respondents. This survey was administered in English or Spanish when appropriate. Of the twelve questions asked by the survey for food assistance recipients, eight questions did not produce a response from at least one participant. The survey was modified once within this time, and some questions were subsequent to questions preceding, which accounts for a portion of the non-response.

!

Perhaps, an alternative method to obtain insight from food assistance recipients in the future would be more effective. However, we suggest that the method with which information is obtained from food assistance providers and recipients be as consistent as possible. With regard to limitations of administering surveys in person and verbally, language barriers should be expected.

!



US Census American Community Survey 2010-2014, 5 Year Estimates and CountyStat calculations.

Figure 6: Second Most Common Language Spoken at Home for Residents of Montgomery County (Montgomery County Food Security Plan, Montgomery County Food Council, 2017, p. 13.)

!

Finally, the administration of the survey to a population unfamiliar to the administrators was limiting. A result of this mutual lack of familiarity and trust between surveyor and those surveyed was that respondents were reluctant to answer questions. An important factor which may have contributed to this limitation is the nature of questions asked. For example, question 11 from the food assistance recipient survey (are there any other barriers you've experienced in assessing culturally appropriate foods?) was adapted for the new survey tool in response to observed

hesitation! towards! discussing! individuals'! personal! experiences! with! food! insecurity.! Moreover,! for! future! methods! it! may! be! more! effective! to! have! food! assistance! providers,! and/or! on-site! volunteers! conduct! this! inquiry.!!

!

The! new! survey! aims! to! address! the! issues! encountered! in! the! initial! recipient! survey.!

!

Grocer! Limitations!

The! capstone! team! faced! significant! difficulty! engaging! our! sample! of! grocers.! Difficulty! in! accessing! this! population! was! also! mentioned! as! a! challenge! among! food! assistance! providers.! It! is! likely! these! limitations! occur! because! grocery! stores! are! busy! areas! and! management! is! restricted! in! their! availability! to! meet! with! researchers.! Additionally,! store! employees! may! be! concerned! about! the! legality! of! meeting! with! food! assistance! providers.! Finally,! language! differences! continue! to! be! a! possible! barrier,! and! care! should! be! taken! to! have! bilingual! translators! administering! surveys.! Similar! to! food! assistance! providers,! grocers! may! also! present! survey! fatigue.!!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

Action Plan..

The action plan below synthesizes information from the capstone team's literature review, survey and interview findings, gap analysis, and limitations. The plan recommends actionable items for MCFC to follow in order to mitigate barriers to culturally appropriate food access, improve research strategies, and connect with both food assistance providers and recipients. When appropriate, the plan references sections from MCFC's 5 Year Security Plan (2017) recommendations for Years 1-3.

Strategy 1. Engaging Providers.	Corresponding FYSP Recommendation..
<p>Recommendation 1.1: Further research on food assistance providers!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administer the new survey to expand knowledge on barriers to obtaining culturally appropriate foods. Identify foods in highest demand. Identify existing best practices and suggestions for improvement from the perspective of food assistance providers. Prioritize in-person meetings with food assistance providers and grocers when possible. To maximize partner responses, administer the survey to all MCFC FRAWG and other working groups members during meetings. 	
<p>Recommendation 1.2: Improve storage capacity for both shelf stable and fresh foods!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns of the Montgomery County food insecure population mirror concerns found in the literature surrounding access to fresh fruits, vegetables, and meats. To meet demand, expand refrigeration/freezer access for food assistance providers. Consider partnerships to increase storage opportunities. Partnerships with universities, refrigeration vendors, and the hospitality industry may result in donations of excess fridges and freezers. The demand for shelf stable foods (rice and beans) indicate further need for storage spaces for these bulk products. 	<p>5.1: Strengthen Food Assistance Infrastructure!</p>
<p>Recommendation 1.3: Increase quantity of both shelf stable and fresh foods through connections with grocers and farmers in Montgomery County!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategize ways to increase accessibility and patronage of international/small grocery stores through promotion of stores that accept food assistance benefit programs (ex. SNAP). 	<p>7.2: Retail Food Businesses!</p> <p>12.2: Increase Availability of Locally Produced Fruits, Vegetables, & Meats!</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! Reach!out!to!grocers!in!person!with!multilingual!survey!tools!to!translate!the!survey!into!additional!languages!as!needed!. •! Encourage!equitable!distribution!of!healthy,!fresh!foods!through!improved!communication!and!transportation!networks!with!regional!farmers!. •! Strategize!with!providers!and!MCFC!working!group!members!on!best!practices!for!obtaining!more!shelf!stable!foods!that!are!most!in!demand!as!determined!by!providers!and!recipients!. •! Set!aside!funds!to!purchase!difficult!to!obtain,!culturally!traditional!foods!as!determined!by!best!practices!found!in!the!literature!. 	
<p>Recommendation!1.4!Mitigate!transportation!barriers!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! While!our!recipient!survey!results!did!not!indicate!transportation!as!a!significant!barrier,!the!limited!sample!size!and!contradictory!literature!and!findings!of!the!FSYP!indicate!continued!need!for!expanded!transportation!services!. •! Consider!feasibility!and!expansion!of!mobile!food!distribution!systems!to!impact!isolated!communities!. 	10.2!Invest!in!New!Transportation!Resources!and!Access!Programs!
Strategy.2.F.Engaging.Recipients	
<p>Recommendation!2.1!Further!research!on!food!assistance!recipients!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! Administer!survey!included!in!next!section!. •! Engage!community!members!themselves!and!food!assistance!providers!in!distributing!the!survey!to!come!from!volunteers!than!“bureaucracy!of!MCFC”,!may!reduce!stigma,!improve!trust,!decrease!language!barrier,!and!in!turn!increase!responses!. •! Gain!information!on!where!(geographically)!different!populations!have!the!most!need!in!order!to!provide!those!specific!pantries!with!those!foods!so!that!waste!is!reduced!(also!related!to!GIS!mapping)!. 	3.1!Increase!Education!and!Outreach!Mechanisms!
<p>Recommendation!2.2!Expand!community!engagement!strategies!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! Encourage!community!centers!and!food!assistance!providers!to!host!congregate!meals!to!increase!access!culturally!appropriate!meals!this!may!benefit!recipients!by!fostering!a!sense!of!community!within!and!between!ethnic!groups!. •! Promote!the!cultivation!of!traditional!foods!in!existing!community!food!gardens!to!empower!residents!to!meet!their!own!needs!and!build!community!within!and!between!ethnic!groups!. 	<p>8.2!Enhanced!Communication!Strategies!for!Connecting!with!Food!Insecure!Residents!&!Support!Providers!</p> <p>11.2!Increase!Outreach!Network!&!Capacity!</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! Create!a!community!advisory!board!of!food!assistance! recipients!and!cultural!community!organization! representatives! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o! Promote!a!dialogue!between!recipients!and! providers!about!prioritizing!what!foods!are!most! needed!and!the!feasibility!of!obtaining!these! items!. o! Use!community!knowledge!of!local!resources!to! engage!previously!unknown!existing!traditional! food!providers!in!donation!of!traditional!foods!. o! Promote!sharing!of!recipes!that!blend!available! products!and!traditional!cooking!practices!and! flavors!. 	12.1:!!Increased!Home!&! Community!Gardening! Opportunities!
Strategy.3.F.Strengthening.Partnerships.and.Communication.within.FRAWG	
<p>Recommendation!3.1!E!Maximize!use!of!existing!data!tools!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! Synthesize!data!from!the!tools!below!to!aid!in!the! creation!of!strategies!to!reduce!food!insecurity!! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o! Johns!Hopkins!University!Maryland!Food!System! Map:!includes!research!on!supermarkets,!local! markets,!farmers!markets,!and!international!food! stores!in!the!county!. o! The!FoodStat!tool:!includes!information!on! population!distribution,!public!transportation! routes,!the!number!of!children!on!free!and! reduced!meals,!the!number!of!elderly!people! who!are!food!insecure,!and!the!locations!of! grocery!stores!and!restaurants!. 	1.2:!!Create!County! FoodStat!for!Data! Collection!and!Annual! Updating!
<p>Recommendation!3.2!E!Facilitate!clearer!data!collection!and! sharing!procedures!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! Share!existing!datasets!between!providers!in!a! centralized!location!(such!as!a!Google!drive!file)@this! may!reduce!survey!fatigue!among!food!assistance! providers!. •! Announce!emerging!research!projects!(specifically! surveys!and!recipients!interviews)!to!MCFC!working! group!members@this!may!reduce!redundancy!among! research!projects!conducted!and!reduce!survey!fatigue! among!food!recipients!. •! Explore!options!for!data!presentation!in!GIS!format@ identify!geographic!areas!where!the!greatest!need!for! certain!items!exists!! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o! Allow!GIS!mapping!to!inform!recommendations! for!redistribution!of!culturally!appropriate!foods!to! high!demand!areas!. 	8.1:!!Centralize!Data! Sharing!and!Collection!

Strategy 4.F.Redefining “Culturally Appropriate Food Access”.

<p>Recommendation 4.1: Prioritize access to foods that are requested across many foreign born populations.!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews revealed many ‘culturally specific’ items requested by both providers and recipients. Moreover, there was significant overlap among items requested across different foreign born populations (i.e. rice and beans and fresh produce).!! • Maximize benefit to many foreign born populations through provision of commonly needed items such as fresh fruits, vegetables, and shelf stable foods. How recommendations in strategies 1 and 2. 	<p>12.2: Increase Availability of Locally Produced Fruits, Vegetables & Meats!</p>
<p>Recommendation 4.2: Work to meet culture specific food needs!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use GIS mapping, recipient research, and census tract demographic information to locate areas of food insecure foreign born populations who share demands for culturally specific foods. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Recognize that different locations have different needs.!! • Partner with farmers, international grocers, and foreign born community leaders to provide these foods to areas with high demand for specific food products.! 	<p>12.3: Increased Production of Culturally Diverse Crops! 3.4: Increase Availability of Culturally Appropriate Food Assistance!</p>
<p>Recommendation 4.3: Broaden the “culturally appropriate” message!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect and accommodate dietary diversity. The interviews conducted by this project found that recipients eat and want a variety of foods both from their cultural background, but also foods from the standard American diet and other cultures’ cuisines. Dietary diversity should be expected due to acculturation and the availability of affordable ingredients.!! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Provide cooking demonstrations using a variety of traditional flavors or dishes to increase community knowledge about how to use ingredients.! ◦ Provide simple recipe booklets that offer multiple recipes that use the same ingredients, prepared differently. could reduce waste, increase familiarity with certain food items, and promote diversification of diet practices.!! ◦ Support congregate meals, which may provide further platforms for food assistance recipients to eat traditional foods as well as try new foods.!! • Consider using terms alternative to “culturally appropriate foods” when marketing to foreign born populations. “Traditional cultural foods” may be a less prescriptive term.! 	<p>3.4: Increase Availability of Culturally Appropriate Food Assistance!</p>

Strategy.5.F.Funding.strategies

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •! Dedicate!intended!expense!outlook!funds!allocated!from! FYSP!(pg.!157!&!148)!for! 'Culturally!Appropriate!Foods'! to!achieve!strategies!14.! •! Include!this!report!and!subsequent!findings!from! suggested!research!as!a!justification!for!seeking! additional!funding!via!grant!applications,!local! government!funding,!and!partnerships!with!private! foundations.! | <p>4.1:!!Strengthen!Grant! making!Processes:!!County! and!Private! Foundations!</p> |
|---|---|

4.1: Strengthen Grant making Processes: County and Private Foundations!

New.Survey.Tools..

Below are two survey tools designed and modified from the previous surveys indicated in Appendices E and F. These surveys are intended to be distributed to food recovery providers and recipients in Montgomery County through paper format or phone calls. They can also be put into online survey software such as Google Forms, Qualtrics, or Survey Monkey.

Survey!for!Providers!

- 1.!! Email!Address:!!_____!
- 2.!! Name!of!Organization:!!_____!!!
- 3.!! Describe!your!organization's!efforts!in!providing!access!to!foods!in!Montgomery!County:!!
!!_____
!!_____
!!_____
- 4.!! Do!you!make!any!specific!efforts!or!have!any!experience!in!providing!culturally*
appropriate*foods?!!_____!
!!_____
!!_____
!!_____
- 5.!! What!barriers!do!your!clients!encounter!in!accessing!food!in!general?!!_____!
!!_____
!!_____
!!_____
- 6.!! What!barriers!do!your!clients!encounter!in!accessing!culturally*appropriate*foods?!!

!!_____
- 7.!! What!are!the!most!common!(3E5)!foreign!born!populations!that!you!serve?!(Please!try!to!
be!as!specific!as!possible,!for!instance,!provide!country!of!origin)!

!!_____
- 8.!! What!percentage!(approximately)!of!your!clients!are!foreign!born?!!_____!

!!_____
- 9.!! What!types!of!food!are!in!highest!demand?!!_____!
!!_____
!!_____
!!_____
- 10.!! What!types!of!traditional/cultural!foods!are!in!highest!demand?!!_____!

!

11.! Are!some!foods!requested,!but!not!easy!for!your!organization!to!obtain?!Please!name!them!_____!

_____!

!

12.! What!foods!would!you!like!to!be!able!to!offer!in!greater!quantities?!_____!

_____!

!

13.! What!are!the!barriers!you!experience!in!accessing,!storing,!and!distributing!culturally!appropriate!foods?!_____!

_____!

!

14.! Would!you!be!interested!in!partnering!with!Montgomery!County!Food!Council!to!work!on!ensuring!foreign!born!populations!have!access!to!culturally!appropriate!foods?! !

_____!

_____!

!

15.! Is!there!any!additional!information!relevant!to!this!topic!that!you!would!like!to!provide?!_____!

_____!

!

!

Survey!for!Recipients!(English)!

!

1.! Where!were!you!born?!_____!

!

2.! Do!you!identify!with!a!country!or!culture!outside!of!the!United!States?!!

! ! ! Yes! ! ! No!

!

o! *If*yes*[name*a*country*or*culture]:!*

▪! _____!

▪! _____!

!

3.! Please!list!specific!foods!within!each!category!that!are!normally!included!in!your!diet!(*If*you*do*not*normally*consume*foods*within*a*category,*you*may*leave*it*blank*):!

o! Red!Meat!(example:!beef)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

o! White!Meat!(example:!chicken)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

o! Fish!(example:!trout)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

o! Vegetables!(example:!collard!greens)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

o! Fruits!(example:!pineapple)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

o! Grains!(example:!white!rice)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

o! Legumes/Beans!(example:!lentils)!

1.! _____!

2. _____!

o! Oils!(example:oliveoil)!

1. _____!

2. _____!

o! Herbs/Spices!(example:cilantro)!

1. _____!

2. _____!

o! Others!

1. _____!

2. _____!

! 4. How often do you eat traditional foods that come from this culture or country outside of the US? (1-2 times a week, 3-4 times a week, every day) _____!

! _____!
! _____!

! 5. Where do you normally go to purchase or receive groceries? _____!

! _____!
!

1. Does one or more of these locations meet your cultural/traditional food preferences? (None, At least one, More than one, All) _____!

! 6. How long does it take you to travel where you normally purchase/receive food? (Less than 30 minutes, Approximately 1 hour, Approximately 2 hours, More than 2 hours) _____!

! _____!
! _____!

! 7. Do you travel to another location for cultural/traditional foods?

Yes! ! No!

!!

o! If yes:

i. What is the name of this location? _____!

ii. How long does it take you to get there? _____!

8. Are there any traditional/cultural foods that you want that are difficult for you to get?

Yes No

- If yes: Please list specific foods within each category that are difficult for you to get. (If you do not have difficulty finding foods within a category, you may leave it blank):

1. Red Meat (example: beef)

2. White Meat (example: chicken)

3. Seafood (example: trout)

4. Vegetables (example: collard greens)

5. Fruits (example: pineapple)

6. Grains (example: white rice)

7. Legumes/Beans (example: lentils)

8. Oils (example: olive oil)

9. Herbs/Spices (example: cilantro)

10. Others

!

!

!

!

!

9. Which food assistance programs have you or your family used in the past year? (check all that apply)?

- ☐ None
- ☐ Food Pantry
- ☐ WIC
- ☐ SNAP/Food Stamps
- ☐ Free and reduced price meal programs (FARMS) (National School Lunch Program, Maryland Meals for Achievement Program, MCPS Summer Food Service Program, etc.)
- ☐ Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
- ☐ Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP)
- ☐ The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)
- ☐ Senior Brown Bag Program
- ☐ Senior Nutrition Program (Congregate Meals, Meals on Wheels, etc.)
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ I don't know

!

10. Is there any other information you'd like to share?

!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!
!

Survey!for!Recipients!(Spanish)!

!

1.! ¿Dónde!nació!usted?!_____!

!!

2.! ¿Usted!se!identifique!con!algún!país!o!cultura!afuera!de!los!Estados!Unidos?!!

! ! ! ! Sí! ! ! ! No!

1.* Si*su*respuesta*fue*afirmativa:*

1.! ¿Cual!país!o!cultura!(o!múltiple)?!

2.! _____!

!

3.! Por!favor,!indique!los!alimentos!específicos!dentro!de!los!siguientes!categorías!que!
normalmente!están!incluidos!en!su!dieta!(si*no*consume*ningún*alimento*dentro*de*alguna*
categoría,*puede*dejarlo*en*blanco):!

!

a.! Carne!roja!(ejemplo:!res)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

b.! Carne!blanca'!(ejemplo:!pollo)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

c.! Pescado/Mariscos!(ejemplo:!trucha)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

d.! Verduras!(ejemplo:!col!rizada)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

e.! Frutas!(ejemplo:!piña)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

f.! Granos!(ejemplo:!arroz!blanca)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

g.! Legumbres/Frijoles!(ejemplo:!lentejas)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

h.! Aceites!(ejemplo:!aceite!de!oliva)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

i.! Hierbas/Especies!(ejemplo:!cilantro)!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

j.! Otros!

1.! _____!

2.! _____!

!

!

4.! ¿Con!qué!frecuencia!come!comida!tradicional!de!su!país!o!cultura!afuera!de!los!
Estados!Unidos?!(1!2!veces!por!semana,!3!4!veces!por!semana,!diariamente)!_____!

_____!

!

5. ¿Donde se va usted para comprarlo/recibir alimentación? _____

!

1. ¿Esto(s) lugar(s) cumple(n) con sus preferencias culturales/tradicionales para la comida? (ninguno, por lo menos uno, más que uno, todos)!

!

6. ¿Cuánto tiempo tome usted para llegar donde normalmente compra/recibe comida? (menos que 30 mins., aproximadamente 1 hora, aproximadamente 2 horas, más que 2 horas) _____

!

7. ¿Usted se vaya a algún otro lugar para encontrar alimentos tradicionales/culturas?!

! ! ! Sí! ! ! No!

!

a. Si su respuesta fue afirmativa:!

!

1. Como se llama este lugar? _____

2. ¿Cuánto tiempo tome para llegar allí? (menos que 30 mins., aproximadamente 1 hora, aproximadamente 2 horas, más que 2 horas)!

!

8. ¿Hay ciertos alimentos tradicionales/culturales que usted se siente un dificultad accediendo?!

! ! ! ! Sí! ! ! No!

!

1. Si su respuesta fue afirmativa: Por favor, indique los alimentos específicos dentro de los siguientes categorías que son difíciles para que usted consiga (si no tiene dificultad para encontrar ningún alimento dentro de alguna categoría, puede dejarlo en blanco):!

1. Carne roja (ejemplo: res)!

1. _____!

2. _____!

2. 'Carne blanca' (ejemplo: pollo)!

1. _____!

2. _____!

3. Pescado/Mariscos (ejemplo: trucha)!

1. _____!

2. _____!

4. Verduras (ejemplo: col rizada)!

1. _____!

2. _____!

5. Frutas (ejemplo: piña)!

1. _____!

2. _____!

6. Granos (ejemplo: arroz blanca)
1. _____
2. _____
7. Legumbres/Frijoles (ejemplo: lentejas)
1. _____
2. _____
8. Aceites (ejemplo: aceite de oliva)
1. _____
2. _____
9. Hierbas/Especies (ejemplo: cilantro)
1. _____
10. Otros
1. _____
2. _____

!

9. Cuales programas de asistencia alimentaria ha utilizado usted o su familia en este año?

- ☐ Ninguna
- ☐ Banco de Alimentos
- ☐ Mujeres, bebés y niños (WIC)
- ☐ Programa de Asistencia de Nutrición Suplementaria (SNAP/Food Stamps)
- ☐ Comidas gratis y reducidas (FARM)
- ☐ Programa de alimentos para el cuidado de niños y adultos (CACFP)
- ☐ Programa de Nutrición del Mercado de Granjeros de WIC (FMNP)
- ☐ El Programa de Asistencia de Alimentos de Emergencia (TEFAP)
- ☐ Programa Bolso Marrón Mayor (Senior Brown Bag Program)
- ☐ Programa de nutrición para personas mayores
- ☐ Otras: _____
- ☐ No sé

!

!!!!10. Hay más información que usted desea compartir?

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

Appendices.

Appendix A: Project Proposal



American University Public Health Capstone Project Spring Semester 2018

The Organization

The Montgomery County Food Council (MCFC) is an independent nonprofit bringing together a diverse representation of stakeholders to improve the environmental, economic, social and nutritional health of Montgomery County, MD through the creation of a robust, local, sustainable food system.

MCFC's vision is to cultivate a vibrant food system in Montgomery County that consciously produces, distributes, and recycles food, making it accessible to all residents while promoting the health of the local food economy, its consumers, and the environment. The organization is an active participant in urban and rural policy and process change, leading the way to a more healthful and sustainable community by bringing together producers, retailers, consumers, and educators in a coordinated effort to address the broad range of issues surrounding food and food sourcing in our county. MCFC engages constituents with the local food system through job opportunities, volunteer projects, and purchasing practices, and educates Montgomery County residents and institutions to promote a greater awareness of the entire food cycle: where food comes from, where it ends up, and its social, environmental, and economic impacts.

The activities of the MCFC are accomplished primarily through our Working Groups, led by Council Members and populated by concerned residents with a shared commitment to making a positive impact in our food system. These subcommittees develop and execute initiatives, support policies, and facilitate partnerships connected to their specific goals. MCFC's four Working Groups are Environmental Impact, Food Economy, Food Literacy and Food Recovery and Access.

Background

In early 2017, MCFC co-lead the creation of the Montgomery County Executive's 5 Year Food Security Plan (www.montgomerycountymd.gov/foodsecurity), which outlines the path towards building a Montgomery County in which all people have access to safe, sufficient, and nutritious food, with dignity. The Plan (FSP) offers extensive recommendations to guide future research, analysis, funding, and policy actions to work toward enhancing food security in Montgomery County.

!!

One of the key findings of the FSP is that food insecure foreign born people can experience difficulty accessing culturally appropriate foods via food assistance programs. Food assistance services of all sizes are striving to increase supplies of culturally appropriate food for a growing foreign born population. Current resources, however, do not meet current demand. As such, MCFC's Food Recovery and Access Working Group has identified increasing access to culturally appropriate foods in Montgomery County as one of their key goals.

!!

The Project

For this project, the AU Capstone Team is asked to conduct a needs assessment to strengthen our understanding of the need for and the barriers to culturally appropriate food access in Montgomery County, and to develop strategies and action plans to mitigate these barriers.

1. Conduct research to develop a better understanding of (1) the countries of origin represented by the Montgomery County immigrant population and where within the County they reside (2) the food preferences by country of origin for these immigrant populations and (3) the locations of greatest demand for these specific ethnic food types. Research findings should describe what types of foods are needed and where in the County they are needed.
2. Conduct research to explore where culturally appropriate foods are currently available around the County for purchase by retail consumers.
3. Using data gathered in previous MCFC surveys on what culturally appropriate food assistance is currently provided and what foods are desired by clients but not accessible, the students will develop a new survey to capture any additional data needed in order to have a comprehensive view of the current state of culturally appropriate food assistance in the County.
 - MCFC staff will administer the survey created by the student team, and provide them with the data collected for synthesis into their findings.
4. Prepare a gap analysis that synthesizes the findings from steps 1-3 above. This analysis should describe the gaps that currently exist in Montgomery County between the demand for culturally appropriate foods (types and locations) and the foods that are currently available to the populations at risk for food insecurity.
5. Recommend strategies and action plans to mitigate the gaps identified in step 4 above. Strategies and action plans may include (but are not limited to) recommendations on:
 - The education programs and tools that would enable food assistance providers and nutrition educators to better understand the culturally diverse dietary needs of residents in Montgomery County
 - The resources needed to help educate donors on the importance of culturally appropriate and nutritious foods
 - Strategies to increase the availability of culturally appropriate foods through increased donations and food recovery from farmers and ethnic and international grocery stores.
 - Strategies to more effectively distribute culturally appropriate foods by geographic region in Montgomery County.

!!

Final Deliverable

A substantive report that provides:

- Analysis of the **need** for culturally appropriate foods in Montgomery County
- Description of the **availability** of culturally appropriate foods in Montgomery County, both through retail locations and through food assistance providers

- !!

The!project!!liaison!will!be!Heather!Bruskin,!Executive!Director!of!the!Montgomery!County!Food!
Council.!Additional!support!will!be!provided!by!MCFC!staff!and!the!Food!Recovery!and!Access!
Working!Group.!

!!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

1

!

!

!

!

1

!

!

1

!

1

!

!

!

!

!

!

!

•

Appendix B: Organization Overview and SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) Analysis

!

Organization Overview

..!!

Mission/Goals of Organization

The Montgomery County Food Council's (MCFC) mission is "to bring together a diverse representation of stakeholders in a public and private partnership to improve the environmental, economic, social and nutritional health of Montgomery County, Maryland through the creation of a robust, local, [and] sustainable food system." (Montgomery County Food Council: About, 2017).!

!

The individual goals contained within the mission of MCFC manifest in four existing public and private partnerships which are officially recognized as "Working Groups". Each working group is tasked with a specific priority: Food Recovery and Access, Food Literacy, Food Economy, and Environmental Impact. Whilst it is important to remain mindful of MCFC's various goals, this project focuses specifically on the goals and objectives of the Food Recovery and Access Working Group (FRAWG). FRAWG's mission is "to support the increased recovery of, equitable access to and advocacy for more healthful food for Montgomery County residents" (MCFC: Priorities, "Food Recovery and Access", 2017). More specifically, FRAWG has been working to produce and provide more culturally appropriate food for foreign born populations in Montgomery County. This is in addition to their goals of increasing access to nutritious locally produced food for all food insecure populations in the county, disseminating information, promoting other local stakeholders with similar food access goals, and bolstering food recovery efforts.!

In the pursuit of their goals, MCFC has thus far achieved two of their specific objectives. Namely, the development and distribution of a Food Assistance Resource Directory which is a living archive of all hunger relief resources and emergency food providers in the county. In addition to contributing critical input to the Montgomery County Food Security and Action Plan (MCFSAP), which aims to strategically reduce food insecurity over a period of 5 years. Food Insecurity specifically being defined in the MCFSAP as "the state of being without reliable access to a sufficient quantity of affordable, nutritious food".!

The Community/Groups or purpose Served

According to the Five Year Food Security Plan (MCFSAP 2017), MCFC aims to serve 77,780 county residents (7% of the population) who are experiencing food insecurity, with particular attention to the 33,000 children who are food insecure. Its goal is to reduce the 7% to 5.5% by year three of its five year plan. Tackling food insecurity in the county involves working with several vulnerable demographics including children, the elderly, people living with disabilities, people living below the self-sufficiency standard, and foreign born residents.!

This project will deal principally with the rapidly expanding population of foreign born residents, although it should be noted that there is crossover between priority groups. Existing data indicates that the largest ethnic groups living in Montgomery County come from El Salvador, mainland China, India, and Ethiopia. Additionally, it should be noted that East Asian residents make up the largest minority group of Seniors, a group which experiences additional burdens when it comes to food access and poverty. Foreign born community members live most commonly in census tract areas: East County, Silver Spring/Takoma park, Wheaton/Glenmont, Aspen Hill, Rockville and Gaithersburg (MCFSAP, 2017).!

The MCFSAP identified that food insecure foreign born residents face barriers of access which include limited English proficiency which reduces knowledge about and access to existing services concerns about immigration status which may prevent or discourage individuals and families from seeking services High rates of poverty (estimated at 50,000 to 60,000 residents at or below 150% of the poverty line) difficulty using accessible foods and food literacy information which may promote foods that are not culturally familiar and a lack of resources to provide culturally familiar foods to residents. The Five Year Plan acknowledges that further work should be done to particularly to reach out to African and Asian foreign born residents.

In previous scholarship on foreign born and immigrant communities noted for their vulnerability to food insecurity with similar findings to the MCFSAP. One study in Georgia noted that immigrant families are twice as vulnerable (39%) to food insecurity as U.S. born families (Gravitt & Ares, 2011) and listed barriers of language fluency, issues of trust and misunderstanding of eligibility requirements for food service. These issues as well as greater likelihood of economic hardship, and reduced likelihood of using social service assistance were noted in a 2014 report on Hunger and Food Security by RTI International. Likewise, Greenwald and Zajfen (2017) identified feelings of shame for accepting free foods, lack of eligibility knowledge, scarcity of traditional foods and distribution of foods to non-Christian populations through churches as additional barriers in their foreign born sample population from Southern California. All studies note that there are significant difference in the needs of different immigrant populations and note the necessity to not consider immigrant groups as a homogenous entity. A takeaway which is evident in the MCFSAP which highlights cultural sensitivity and respect as key considerations in serving foreign born resident.

Basic Details

MCFC is a non-profit organization focused on addressing issues surrounding food and hunger in the county. The council is made up of two full-time employees, one part-time employee, an intern, and many volunteers. The two full-time employees, Heather Bruskin and Amanda Neshier, serve as the Council's Executive Director and Food Security Programs Manager, respectively. Massa Cressall serves part-time as the Development and Communications Manager, while an intern assists with communication duties. Additionally, the rest of the 25 food council members are volunteers from various stakeholder positions in the area.

!

The food council is mainly funded by the county government, including funding through the Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services and grants from other departmental funds. The council also receives private sector funding for some areas of its work, but currently not for the food security working group. The food council also receives donations from individuals and businesses.

!

The food council does not have its own facilities, but through collaborative organizations such as Bethesda Green and the Montgomery County government, they are able to hold meetings and events when needed. The organizations the food council collaborates with also provide them with other resources including printed handout materials and other information.

!

Since 2014, numerous MCFC stakeholders have held listening sessions and focus groups with food insecure communities throughout Montgomery County, which contributed to further assessments on the availability of foods throughout the area. These preliminary measures informed resources including the Montgomery County Food Access Report (2015). Following the completion of their initial projects, MCFC launched the 5 Year Food Security and Action Plan (MCFSAP). The MCFSAP compiles existing resources and a series of recommendations that

!

!!


M

!

T

[illegible]

SWOT Analysis!



Strengths!

MCFC has a dedicated team of council members and volunteers, who have a variety of interests, skills, and stakeholder positions within the county. Together, council members are passionate and motivated to address specific food-related issues in the county through their four working groups. Similarly, the food council benefits from their partnerships with many food banks and food assistance organizations. Additionally, they have a clearly developed Five Year Plan and laid out goals for each year, reflecting their intensive research on existing food needs, distributors, and food sources in the county. Finally, MCFC team has open communication with the capstone team, connecting the capstone team with a variety of resources beneficial to the project.

Weaknesses!

As a council of community stakeholders, MCFC is inherently collaborative in its functions. By way of this, MCFC's Working Groups rely on their members as advisors on the council's initiatives, as well as resources for corresponding data and capacity building. Although MCFC is divided into four Working Groups with respect to their priorities, each of these Working Groups comprise of various members that represent a range of community organizations whose interests align (2018). Therefore, while MCFC provides a platform for collaboration, it is also critical that MCFC maintain an organized system for the direct integration of these inputs in the

development of MCFC initiatives. Hence, having a limited staff may limit MCFC's ability to maintain a consistent agenda among its members. Additionally, the first of FRAWG's challenges in conducting research may be the scope of the data that is needed. The second challenge may be including data from partner organizations in such a way that it is coherently represented as a resource for the development of FRAWG's initiatives. In this effort, the creation of a database or an evolving tool would facilitate next steps in FRAWG's agenda.

!!

Opportunities!

MCFC has many opportunities given their existing partnerships and collaborations in the county. Their partnerships with other organizations can provide them new and existing data that may help guide their actions and goals of the working groups. Moreover, these partners have vast connections across the county to other food banks and food assistance programs. One example of this is Manna Food Center, which is heavily involved in the food recovery and access working group, and functions both as a food bank and food distributor.

!

Upcoming elections in the county and state provide an opportunity for the food council. If elected county council members could prioritize food-related issues in their platform and positively impact the five-year plan by assisting MCFC in achieving immediate and long-term goals.

!

MCFC has an opportunity to further benefit from their connections with stakeholders and partners by utilizing available resources. In the scope of the capstone project, knowledge of multicultural food distributors in the area will certainly prove useful. Moreover, MCFC may stand to benefit from additional connections with culturally diverse grocery stores and food providers throughout the county, which could provide additional data for the current capstone projects and future MCFC projects in the future.

!!

Threats!

The external threats that face MCFC come mainly from funding sources and logistics. The food council's funding predominantly comes from government agencies and grants that are evaluated and awarded yearly, this makes the MCFC's long-term goals reliant on fluid funding. This instability is particularly notable in the coming year, as Montgomery County is holding elections and public opinion and policy toward food security as a priority may change. In addition to it being an election year, another threat for the council's funding is that Montgomery County is experiencing budget cuts and hiring freezes due to the county's large debt. This makes sustainable funding from the county government even more of a challenge.

!

Logistical issues also threaten the success of the food council. Montgomery County is a large, diverse county which presents logistical issues for the relatively small food council. Collecting data across the county on cultural food preferences from food assistance recipients is a difficult task due to the size and diversity of the county, which include language barriers. Similarly, one issue that combines funding and logistical threats is the transportation and storage of refrigerated food. There is a shortage of refrigerated transportation and storage areas for the food collected by distributing organizations. This makes it difficult to accept refrigerated foods and distribute them across the county where they are needed.

!

Additionally, while the food council action group has twenty-five volunteers, managing their collaborations, the large number of partners are a potential logistical and political challenge. There are many partners and food distributors in the county that present logistical issues when moving materials and donations between organizations. Also, with the large number of food

[illegible]

Appendix C (*VMOSA (Vision, Mission, Objectives, Strategies, and Action Plan) and Logic Model (

(

Montgomery*County*Food*Council*AU*Capstone*Project*VMOSA*&*Logic*Model(

(

VMOSA

Vision: *To ensure all residents of Montgomery County ((MC) have access to a wide variety of nutritious and culturally appropriate food F (thereby increasing their overall health and well*being, thus helping the community prosper.					
Mission: *To provide Montgomery County Food Council ((MCFC) with comprehensive information on residents' (countries of origin, (culturally appropriate food preferences and needs, current culturally appropriate food availability, and recommendations in order to strengthen MCFC's understanding of the need for and barriers to culturally appropriate food access in MC. (The capstone team will develop strategies and action plans to mitigate these barriers.					
Objectives:	Strategies:	Action*Plan:			
		Parties* Responsible*& Collaborators:	Strategy* Completion* Date:	Resources:	Challenges:
1. (By April 12th, (2018: (Collect and (compiled information (on the current need (for culturally (appropriate foods (amongst the food* insecure and (foreign (born population of (Draft email (template to food (assistance stakeholders, (send out email	Abhishek (Edits from (Amanda	Email draft to (Amanda by (Feb 26th (Send to (stakeholders (by March 9th	Master (document of (stakeholder (contacts ("Race and (Ethnicity by (Site" ((Manna (Food Center)	MC is geographically (large and (demographically (diverse (Cannot ensure that a (diverse group of (stakeholders respond (to emails or are (

MC:(countries(of origin,(food preferences,(geographic(location (2.(By(April(12th,(2018:(Collect(and(compile(information(on(the(current(availability(of culturally(appropriate foods(in(MC,(both(through(retail(locations(and(through(food(assistance(providers.	Conduct(preliminary(research(on(the(countries(of origin(of(MC(residents(and(culturally(familiar(foods(of(these(countries	Capstone(team	March(22nd	(MCFC's(Food(Assistance(Resource(Directory((FARD) (Food(Recovery(and(Access(Working(Group's((FRAWG)(Healthy(Food(Availability(Index((HFAI)	interested(in(speaking(to(the(team (Language(barriers(between(food(distributors,(volunteers,(and/or(recipients(of(food
	Draft(interview(questions,(which(may(differ(by(stakeholder((distributors,(farmers,(volunteers,(etc)	Kayla,(Michael (Edits(from(Amanda	Email(draft(to(Amanda(by(March(22nd		
	Schedule(dates(to(meet(with(stakeholders((or(speak(on(the(phone)	Capstone(team	Stop(interviews/(data(collection(by(April(12th		
	Individually(collect(information(from(phone(calls/interviews(with(stakeholders	Capstone(team	Ongoing(until(April(12th		
	Draft(findings/observations(in(shared(google(doc	Capstone(team	Ongoing(until(April(12th		

3.(By(April(19th,(2018:(Provide(analysis(describing(the(gaps(between(residents'(needs(and(availability(of(culturally(sensitive(foods(as(determined(by(objective(1(and(2.	Compile(information(from(phone(calls/interviews	Capstone(team	Begin(by(April(5th (Complete(April(19th	MoCo(Census/ Data (Community(Action(Agency(and(CountyStat(interactive(Self(Sufficiency(Standard(tool (MC(Food(Access(Report((2015):(PDF((pp.(190*2017)	Gap(analysis(can(only(be(holistic(and(is(based(on(the(quality(of(responses(from(stakeholders (Needs(analysis(will(be(mostly(derived(from(food(bank(volunteers(and(providers,(not(recipients
	Review(additional(census(data(and(interactive(Self(Sufficiency(Standard(tool provided(by(MCFC	Capstone(team	Ongoing(until(April(19th		
	Draft(written(summaries(detailing(findings	Kayla,(Laurel	Begin(April(12th (Complete(April(19th		
	Draft(graphics(from(data	Abhishek,(Kayla	Begin(April(15th (Complete(April(19th		

4. (By April 19th, 2018: Recommend strategies and action plans to mitigate gaps illustrated in objective 3.	Refer back to gap analysis	Capstone team	Begin April 12th (Complete April 19th	Retailers in the county that sell food from other cultures (Action plans from other counties/areas	MCFC has limited organizational and funding capacities (MCFC serves a geographically large, and diverse population (MC) (MCFC currently has no established partnerships with retail grocery stores
	Review previous strategies counties have used to mitigate barriers in providing culturally competent food	Laurel, Rainey	Begin March 19th (Complete April 19th		
	Design action plan based on information obtained in previous strategies for objective 4	Capstone team (Edits from Amanda	Begin March 19th (Complete April 28th		
5. (By April 23rd, 2018: Recommend future research on the topic of culturally appropriate food provision in MC.	Review previous strategies/research counties have conducted to address provision of culturally appropriate foods	Michael, Camille	Begin March 19th (Complete April 28th	Literature compiled in objective 4 (Potential partnerships	Recommendations will be dependent on the success of supporting project pieces

	Construct(survey(for(MCFC(to(administer(to(fill(remaining(information(gaps	Rainey,(Michael Camille	Begin(March(26th (Complete(April(28th	discovered(in(stakeholder(interviews	
6.(By(April(30th,(2018: Provide(final(deliverable(to(MCFC(that(compiles(results(from(objectives(3*5.	Compile(all(content	Capstone(team	By(April(28th	((
	Final(Review	Capstone(team(members(individually (Send(to(Amanda	April(29th		
	Final(Compilation(and(submission(of(project	Laurel,(Abhishek	April(30th		

(

MCFC-AU Capstone Team LOGIC MODEL

Situation

MCFC has identified providing culturally appropriate food for foreign born and food insecure populations as an integral step in their 5 years strategic plan. However, they realize that they do not possess key information about the current availability and demand for culturally competent food in Montgomery County. Our mission is to provide sufficient context to MCFC and aid them in their aforementioned endeavor.

Inputs

- Capstone Team
- MCFC Team
- FRAWG Committee members
- Jenna from Manna
- Montgomery County Census data
- Community Action Agency and CountyStat interactive Self Sufficiency Standard tool
- American University Library databases

Activities

- Interview key stakeholders: farmers, food distributors and assistance providers, volunteers
- Review existing data on the countries of origin of Montgomery County Residents
- Research the strategies other organizations have used to mitigate barriers and address provision of culturally competent food
- Develop a new survey that MCFC can use to further understand the scope of culturally appropriate food concerns in Montgomery County

Outputs

Final Report Including:

- Needs Assessment
- Gap Analysis
- Recommendations and action plans to mitigate gaps
- Recommendations for future research: (i.e. survey)

Outcomes

To provide MCFC with comprehensive information on:

- Residents' countries of origin, culturally appropriate food preferences and needs
- Current culturally appropriate food availability
- Recommendations in order to strengthen MCFC's understanding of the need for and barriers to culturally appropriate food access in Montgomery County
- Develop strategies and action plans to mitigate these barriers.

Impact

To ensure all residents of Montgomery County have access to a wide variety of nutritious and culturally appropriate food; thereby increasing their overall health and well-being, helping the community prosper.

Appendix(D>(*Stakeholder(Contact(Directory(

(

The(link(below(is(to(a(google(sheets(directory;(the(directory(includes(a(list(of(variety(of(stakeholders(in(food(access(in(Montgomery(County,(the(Johns(Hopkins(Maryland(Food(Systems(Map(grocers,(and(the(FRAWG(member(contact(list.(

(

Stakeholder(Contact(Directory(

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1RwNZvyx95HAmre0V3awC5P3fxqORuz5rYVS2PgzsGKI/edit?usp=sharing>((

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

(

1. Email(Address(
2. Goal/Mission(of(Organization(
3. Describe(your(organization's(efforts(in(providing(access(to(foods(in(Montgomery(County(
4. Do(you(make(any(specific(efforts(or(have(any(experiences(in(providing(culturally(appropriate(foods?(
5. What(barriers(do(your(clients(encounter(in(accessing(culturally(appropriate(foods?(
6. What(are(the(most(common((3*5)(foreign(born(populations(that(you(serve?(
7. What(percentage((roughly)(of(your(clients(are(foreign(born?(
8. Do(you(know(of(any(other(locations(in(the(area(where(recipients(often(receive/purchase(food?(
9. What(types(of(food(are(in(highest(demands?(
10. What(types(of(traditional/cultural(foods(are(in(highest(demand?(
11. Are(some(foods(requested,(but(not(easy(for(your(organization(to(obtain?(Please(name(them.(
12. What(foods(would(you(like(to(be(able(to(offer(in(greater(quantities?(
13. Who(are(your(food(suppliers?(
14. What(are(the(barriers((broadly)(you(experience(in(accessing,(storing,(and(distributing(culturally(appropriate(foods?(
15. Would(you(be(interested(in(partnering(with(Montgomery(County(Food(Council(to(work(on(ensuring(foreign(born(populations(have(access(to(culturally(appropriate(foods?(
16. Is(there(any(additional(information(relevant(to(this(topic(that(you'd(like(to(provide?(

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1fpuV9RWgnS9tpHLEuvY*t2Lj6ONUqB3*76tKYBNzOO0/edit?usp=sharing((

[illegible]

Appendix(F>(*Original(Survey(Questions(and(Results(for(Food(Assistance(Recipients(

(
English(Version(
(

- 1.(Where(were(you(born?(
- 2.(Do(you(identify(with(a(country(or(culture(outside(of(the(United(States?(Which(one((or(multiple)?(
- 3.(How(often(do(you(eat(traditional(foods(that(come(from(this(culture(or(country(outside(of(the(US?((1*2(times(a(week,(3*4(times(a(week,(every(day)(
- 4.(What(foods(do(you(eat(most(often?(
- 5.(Where(do(you(normally(go(to(purchase/receive(groceries?(
- 6.(Does(this(location(meet(your(cultural/traditional(food(preferences?(
- 7.(How(long(does(it(take(you(to(travel(where(you(normally(purchase/receive(food?(
- 8.(Do(you(travel(to(another(location(for(cultural/traditional(foods?(What(is(the(name(of(this(location)?(
- 9.(If(you(travel(to(another(location(for(cultural/traditional(foods,(how(long(does(it(take(you(to(get(there?(
- 10.(Are(there(any(traditional/cultural(foods(that(you(want(that(are(difficult(for(you(to(get?(Which(ones?(
- 11.(Are(there(any(other(barriers(you've(experienced(in(accessing(culturally(appropriate(foods?(
- 12.(Is(there(any(other(information(you'd(like(to(share?(

(
Spanish(Version(
(

- 1.(¿Dónde(nació(usted?(
- 2.(¿Usted(se(identifica(con(algún(país(o(cultura(afuera(de(los(Estados(Unidos?(
- 3.(¿Con(que(frecuencia(come(comida(tradicional(del(país(o(cultura(afuera(de(los(Estados(Unidos)?(
- 4.(¿Cuales(comida(s)(come(usted,(o(su(familia,(por(la(mayoría(de(tiempo?(
- 5.(¿Donde(se(va(usted(para(comprar(o(recibir(comida)?(
- 6.(¿Esto(s)(lugare(s)(cumple(n)(con(sus(preferencias(culturales/tradicionales(para(la(comida)?(
- 7.(¿Cuanto(tiempo(toma(usted(para(llegar(donde(normalmente(compra/recibe(comida?(menos(que(30(mins.,(aprox.(1(hora,(aprox.(2(horas,(más(que(2(horas)(
- 8.(¿Usted(vaya(a(algún(otro(lugar(para(encontrar(alimentos(tradicionales/culturas?(Como(se(llama(este(lugar)?(
- 9.(¿Si(usted(respondió(<<si>>(por(la(pregunta(anterior,(cuanto(tiempo(toma(para(llegar(allí?((menos(que(30(mins.,(aprox.(1(hora,(aprox.(2(horas,(más(que(2(horas)(
- 10.(¿Hay(ciertos(alimentos(tradicionales/culturales(que(usted(se(siente(un(dificultad(accediendo?(¿Cuales(son?(
- 11.(¿Hay(otras(barreras(que(usted(encuentra(en(accediendo(alimentos(culturales,(o(los(que(usted(prefiere?(
- 12.(¿Hay(mas(información(que(usted(desea(compartir?(

(
These(questions(and(results(are(included(in(google(sheets(link(on(tabs(“Recipient(Questions(English)”),(“Recipient(Questions((Spanish)”),(and(“Recipient(Answers”):(

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1fpuV9RWgnS9tpHLEuvY*t2Lj6ONUqB3*76tKYBNzOO0/edit?usp=sharing(

(

(

Appendix/G*(Original(Survey(Questions(for(Grocers(

(
English(Version(
(

- 1.(What(is(the(name(of(your(organization?(
- 2.(How(many(people(do(you(serve(in(a(week?(
- 3.(What(types(of(food(are(in(highest(demand?(
- 4.(You(were(listed(as(a("international(foods"(grocery(store(in(the(Johns(Hopkins(Food(
Systems(map*(do(you(agree(that(your(store(could(be(categorized(as(such?(
(If(yes:(
 - i.(Which(cultures/populations(do(you(serve?((
 - ii.(Are(there(culturally(specific(foods(that(you(get(many(requests(for?(
 - iii.(Which(distributors(do(you(purchase(these(items(from?((
 - iv.(Do(you(know(of(other(locations(in(the(area(where(recipients(often(
receive/purchase(these(food(items?(
 - v.(Are(there(culturally(specific(foods(that(you(have(in(excess?(- 1.(Have(you(ever(donated(to(a(food(assistance(organization?(Or(would(you(be(interested(in(
doing(so?(
- 2.(Would(you(be(interested(in(partnering(with(MCFC(to(help(with(food(assistance(in(MC?((

(
Spanish(Version(
(


- 1.(¿Que(es(el(nombre(de(su(tienda/organización?((
- 2.(¿Cuantas(personas,(mas(o(menos,(sirven(en(total(por(una(semana?(
- 3.(¿Puede(nombre(los(alimentos(específicos(que(están(en(mayor(demanda?((
- 4.(Su(tienda/organización(está(enumeroado(como("alimentos(internacionales"(en(una(mapa(
de(sistemas(de(alimentación(organizado(por(la(Universidad(Johns(Hopkins.(¿Están(de(
acuerdo(que(su(tienda/organización(puede(ser(considerado(como(tal?((
(Si(su(respuesta(fue(si:(
 - 1.(¿Qué(o(cuales(población(es)((por(ejemplo,(identificada(por(su(s)(
país(es)(de(origen)(sirven?(
 - 2.(¿Hay(alimentos(culturales(que(sus(clientes(piden(mucho?(
 - 3.(¿Usted(es)(puede(n)(proveer(los(nombres(de(los(distribuidores(de(
que(compra(estos(artículos?(
 - 4.(¿Conoce(otros(sitios(locales(donde(gente(normalmente(
reciben/compran(estos(mismos(artículos?((
 - 5.(¿Hay(alimentos(específicos(que(usted(es)(normalmente(tiene(n)(
en(exceso?(Puedes(nombrarlos?(- 2.(¿Ustedes(han(hecho(donaciones(de(alimentos(a(organizaciones(de(asistencia(
alimentaria((como(un(banco(de(alimentos)?((
- 3.(¿Le(interesaría(involucrar(más(con(el(Consejo(Alimentaria(de(Montgomery(County(para(
avanzar(la(seguridad(alimentaria)?((

(
These(questions(are(included(in(google(sheets(link(on(tabs("Grocery(Store(Questions((English)"(
and("Grocery(Store(Questions((Spanish)"(
(

(
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1fpuV9RWgnS9tpHLEuvY*t2Lj6ONUqB3*76tKYBNzOO0/edit?usp=sharing(


Appendix(H>(*Self Sufficiency Standard and Demographics of Montgomery County)

Foreign Born Country of Origin (Top 10 Countries) in Montgomery County




Figure(1:(Foreign(Born(Country(of(Origin((Top(10(Countries)(in(Montgomery(County(for(2010(and(2014((Montgomery*County*Food*Security*Plan,(Montgomery(County(Food(Council,(2017,(p.14.))


Percent Below SSS by Top 10 Countries/Places of Origin



Figure(2:(Percent(Below(SSS(by(Top(10(Countries/Places(of(Origin(in(Montgomery(County((Community*Action:*Self&Sufficiency*Standard*&*the*Interactive*Self&Sufficiency*Standard,(Montgomery(County(Government,(2018.))



(
 Figure(3:(Percent(Below(SSS(by(area(in(Montgomery(County(and(World(Area(of(Birth((Community*Action:*Self&Sufficiency*Standard*&the*Interactive*Self&Sufficiency*Standard,(Montgomery(County(Government,(2018.))(
 (
 (
 (
 (



(
 Figure(4:(Graph(of(Percent(Below(SSS(by(World(Area(of(Birth((Community*Action:*Self&Sufficiency*Standard*&the*Interactive*Self&Sufficiency*Standard,(Montgomery(County(Government,(2018.))(
 (
 (
 (
 (

References

- (
- Altman(&Becker.((2015).(The(challenge(of(serving(undocumented(and(immigrant(families:(A
(guide(for(case(managers(at(the(Siemer(Institute(for(Family(Stability.([PowerPoint(slides)
(Retrieved(from:(<http://povertylaw.org/files/webcasts/ServingUndocumentedFamilies>((
- Anderson,(P.(M.,(Butcher,(K.(F.,(Hoynes,(H.(W.,(&(Schanzenbach,(D.(W.((2016).(Beyond
(income:(What(else(predicts(very(low(food(security(among(children?(Southern(Economic
(Journal,(82(4),(1078*1105.(doi:10.1002/soej.12079(
- Bender,(M.(S.,(Nader,(P.(R.,(Kennedy,(C.,(&(Gahagan,(S.((2013).(A(culturally(appropriate
(intervention(to(improve(health(behaviors(in(hispanic(Mother–Child(dyads.(Childhood
(Obesity,(9(2),(157*163.(doi:10.1089/chi.2012.0118(
- Cohen,(B.,(Andrews,(M.,(&(Kantor,(L.((2002).(USDA(Community(Food(Assessment(Toolkit.(United
* States*Department*of*Agriculture. ([https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub](https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub_details/?pubid=43179)
(details/?pubid=43179(
- China(Highlight.((2018).(Chinese(Food(Ingredients*(What(Chinese(Eat.(Retrieved(April,(2018,
(from(https://www.chinahighlights.com/travelguide/chinese*food/chinese*food*type.htm(
- Data(USA.((2017).(Montgomery(County,(MD(Data.(Retrieved(April(29,(2018,(from
(https://datausa.io/profile/geo/montgomery*county*md/#global_diversity(
- Dunnell,(T.((2017).(Essential(Ingredients(in(Peruvian(Cuisine.(Retrieved(April(29,(2018,(from
(http://www.newperuvian.com/essential*ingredients*in*peruvian*cuisine/(
- Edwards,(M.((2014).(Trends(&(Best(Practices(in(Food(Distribution(Systems:(A(Focus(on(Food
(Banks(&(Partner(Agencies:(Report(for(the(Kate(B.(Reynolds(Charitable(Trust.(Retrieved
(from:(http://www.kbr.org/sites/default/files/Trends%20Best%20Practices*FINAL.pdf(
- Grael,(K.(&(Chambers,(K.((2014).(Food(deserts(and(migrant(farmworkers:(assessing(food
(access(in(Oregon's(Willamette(Valley.(*Journal*of*Ethnobiology*,*34(2):(228
(250. [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1031&context=geog](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1031&context=geog_fac)
([fac](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1031&context=geog_fac)(
- Gravitt,(K.(and(Ares,(E.((2011).(Food*Insecurity*within*Immigrant*Communities*in*Georgia.
* Hunger(Center.(Retrieved(February(13,(2018,(from([https://www.hungercenter.org/wp/\(\(\(content/uploads/2011/07/Food*Insecurity*Immigrant*Communities*GA*Are](https://www.hungercenter.org/wp/(((content/uploads/2011/07/Food*Insecurity*Immigrant*Communities*GA*AreGravitt.pdf)
([Gravitt.pdf](https://www.hungercenter.org/wp/(((content/uploads/2011/07/Food*Insecurity*Immigrant*Communities*GA*AreGravitt.pdf)(
- Greenwald,(H.(P.,(&(Zajfen,(V.((2017).(Food(insecurity(and(food(resource(utilization(in(an(urban
(immigrant(community.(*Journal(of(Immigrant(and(Minority(Health*,(19(1),(179*186.
(10.1007/s10903*015*0331*9(
- Guendelman,(S.,(&(Abrams,(B.((1995).(Dietary(intake(among(mexican*american(women:
(Generational(differences(and(a(comparison(with(white(non*hispanic(women.(*American*
(*Journal(of(Public(Health*,(85(1),(20*25.(doi:10.2105/AJPH.85.1.20(
- Jackson(and(Union(County(CFA(Team.((2011).(Community(food(assessment(for(Jackson(and
(Union(Counties(in(Illinois.
(https://www.fwsoil.org/uploads/6/7/8/8/67889187/cfa_report.pdf(
- Jones,(A.,(Ngure,(F.,(Pelto,(G.,(Young,(S.((2013).(What(are(we(assessing(when(we(measure(food
(security?(A(compendium(and(review(of(current(metrics.(*Advances*in*Nutrition*,*4(5):(481
(505. (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3771133/>(
- Luke,(J.((2015).(Assessing(culturally(appropriate(food(choices:(a(need(for(Hispanic(specific(food
(choices(as(illustrated(by(GIS(mapping.(*Journal*of*Nutrition*Education*and*Behavior*,
* 47(4S).
* [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282489764_Assessing_Culturally_Appropriat](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282489764_Assessing_Culturally_Appropriat_Food_Choices_A_Need_for_Hispanic_Specific_Food_Choices_as_Illustrated_by_GI_Mapping)
([Food_Choices_A_Need_for_Hispanic_Specific_Food_Choices_as_Illustrated_by_GI](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282489764_Assessing_Culturally_Appropriat_Food_Choices_A_Need_for_Hispanic_Specific_Food_Choices_as_Illustrated_by_GI_Mapping)
([Mapping](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282489764_Assessing_Culturally_Appropriat_Food_Choices_A_Need_for_Hispanic_Specific_Food_Choices_as_Illustrated_by_GI_Mapping)((

Park, S., (Murphy, S. P., Sharma, S., & Kolonel, L. N. (2005). Dietary intakes and health-related behaviors of Korean American women born in the USA and Korea: The multiethnic cohort study. *Public Health Nutrition*, 8(7), 904-911. (doi: 10.1079/PHN2005740)

Manna Food Bank. (2017). FY17 Race and Ethnicity by Site Unduplicated [Xlsx]. Montgomery County Food Council. (2017). Montgomery County Food Assistance Resource Directory. Montgomery County Food Council. (2018, February 8). *Food Recovery and Access Working Group (FRAWG) 2018 Priorities Discussion*. Held at Dennis Avenue Health Center. Silver Spring, MD.

Montgomery County Food Council. (2018, February 5). *Initial meeting regarding capstone project*. Held at Bethesda Green. Bethesda, MD.

Montgomery County Food Council. (2017). *Logic Model for the MCFC's implementation of the Montgomery County Food Security Plan (FSP)*. [PDF]. Montgomery County Food Council.

Montgomery County Food Council. (2017). *Montgomery County Food Council*: About. Retrieved February 12, 2018.

Montgomery County Food Council. (2017). *Montgomery County Food Council Working Groups: Activities and Achievements*. [PDF]. Montgomery County Food Council.

Montgomery County Food Council. (2017). *Montgomery County Food Security Plan* (Rep. No. 1). Bethesda, Maryland: Montgomery County Food Council.

Montgomery County Food Council. (2018). *Montgomery County Food Council: Priorities*, "Food Recovery and Access". Retrieved February 12, 2018.

Montgomery County Food Council. (2018, February 8). *Food Recovery and Access Working Group (FRAWG) 2018 Priorities Discussion*. Held at Dennis Avenue Health Center. Silver Spring, MD.

Montgomery County Government (2018). *Community Action: Self-Sufficiency Standard* (& the Interactive Self-Sufficiency Standard. Retrieved February 26, 2018, from <http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/HHS/Program/OCA/CommunityAction/CommunityActionIndex.html>

Noll, D. (2017). *Ethiopian Food* (An Overview of Ethiopian Cuisine). Retrieved April 29, 2018 from <https://uncorneredmarket.com/ethiopian-food/>

RTI International (2014). *Current and Prospective Scope of Hunger and Food Security in America: A Review of Current Research*. Retrieved February 14, 2018, from https://www.rti.org/sites/default/files/resources/full_hunger_report_final_07*24*14.pdf

Smith, J., (Palmer, A., Haering, S., & McKenzie, S. (2009). *Understanding and Addressing Food Security in Southwest Baltimore*. Johns Hopkins School of Public Health. Retrieved from https://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-a-livable-future/pdf/research/clf_reports/OROSWreport2009*1*1.pdf

Tang, K. (2017). *Yodit (tesfamichael) - Food Security Research Project* - (Edmonton Multicultural Coalition. Edmonton Food Council. Retrieved audio presentation via SoundCloud from: <https://soundcloud.com/user-376074677/yodit-tesfamichael-food-security-research-project-edmonton-multicultural-coalition>

Toppa, S. (2015). *This is Why Indian Food is So Delicious*. Time Magazine. Retrieved April 29, 2018, from <http://time.com/3731111/indian-food-curry-cuisine-tasty/>

U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Montgomery County, Maryland. (2017, July 1). Retrieved April 29, 2018, from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/montgomerycountymaryland/PST120217>

Visit El Salvador. (2018). *Culture, Art & Gastronomy*. Retrieved April 29, 2018, from <http://www.visitelsalvador.net/en/culture-in-el-salvador.php>

Washington Food Coalition (2012). *Best practices, innovations and solutions developed by hunger relief agencies in Washington state*. Retrieved from: https://agr.wa.gov/FoodProg/docs/Best_Practices_Manual.pdf

Yang, W., (& Read, M. ((1996). (Dietary (pattern (changes (of (asian (immigrants. **Nutrition *Research*,
* 16(8), (1277*1293. (doi:10.1016/0271*5317(96)00137*6(

(
(
(

(

(
(
(
(

May 22, 2020

Marc Elrich
County Executive
101 Monroe Street, 2nd Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Sidney Katz
President, Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue, 6th Floor
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear County Executive Elrich and Council President Katz,

The Capital Area Food Bank (CAFB) and the Manna Food Center (MFC) have a long history of serving the approximately 65,000 food insecure residents in Montgomery County; between our organizations, we have nearly 80 years of experience alleviating hunger. CAFB is one of 200 food banks in the national Feeding America network, and distributes 30+ million meals each year to over 450 nonprofit food distribution partners, throughout the Washington Metropolitan region; 39 of these partners are in Montgomery County, and the largest of them is Manna Food Center. Manna was created by the county and grassroots organizations with the singular mission of ending hunger. Its diverse staff and volunteers, alongside a network of referral and food assistance partners, share food, build skills, and bring neighbors together to strengthen community.

CAFB and MFC contributed significantly to the development of the recently issued COVID-19 Food Security Response Strategy (FSRS), and we agree it is imperative to act quickly to address rapidly growing need, and to enact policies to help do so. Below, we detail how we can continue to aid in meeting demand, and we respectfully submit some recommendations that build upon the FSRS for the County's administrative and legislative bodies to consider as they work towards further improving the outcomes we collectively seek.

Our Impact in the Acute Response Term of the Pandemic

From the onset of COVID-19, we have worked to continue providing our neighbors with the most basic of necessities: food. Doing so has required making modifications to our operations to meet unprecedented levels of demand, and to address the challenges of social distancing, stressed supply chains, and widespread partner closures. Our organizations, along with dozens of partners who serve as a lifeline for nearly 65,000 food insecure residents, have responded to a surge in need:

- CAFB distributed 693,000 meals between March 2nd to May 8th and Manna shared 31,161 weekend bags at MCPS sites, while also serving more than 1,000 new food recipients.
- Despite the closure of half of CAFB's partner network, we have nearly doubled food distribution per open partner, relative to the same time period last year. In March, MFC purchased 4.3 times the normal amount of food.

We were able to achieve this by rapidly adapting our service delivery models:

- CAFB established three temporary partners, six hubs (nonprofits, like MFC, with capacity to distribute additional food), and continued service to established partners. MFC retrofitted its choice model for low-contact drive-thru service, expanded service days and hours, and created delivery services by re-engineering its technology.
- CAFB distributed a significant amount of food in 25-pound "to go" boxes to aid partners with social distancing requirements and fill in regional gaps in service due to partner closures during the pandemic. MFC created "Stay Put Packs" for delivery and to assist residents in housing complexes and residential sites.

- With the reduction of more than 75 percent of food donations from private grocers and retailers—a source of food that typically accounts for 60 percent of our overall inventory—CAFB has rapidly switched our procurement strategy in order to keep inventory levels steady, purchasing significantly more food and ordering months in advance to account for longer lead times.

Food Security Response Strategy: A Step in the Right Direction

We commend the efforts and leadership of the Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (OEMHS) and its Food Security Task Force for their attention to the issue of hunger throughout this pandemic. We also deeply appreciate that the County Executive and the County Council have empowered this task force to strategically identify solutions and amplify the voices of residents and partners that play a fundamental role in fulfilling our missions. Our organizations were pleased to offer significant input into the FSRS by incorporating food insecurity data, assessing the operational viability of various economic scenarios, and detailing requisite service modifications based on our professional track record of service delivery. Our intent in this letter is to highlight what we are equipped to do to support the county; reinforce specific items in the FSRS; and underscore some priorities that should be acted on immediately.

What We Can Do to Support the County:

- **Procure and Methodically Distribute Food through Existing Network:** In this moment of intense demand for emergency food, focus must remain on getting food out as safely as possible to neighborhoods with the highest need. We are equipped to help accomplish this by identifying service gaps where more emergency food should be allocated. The FSRS notes that, “The most cost-effective and efficient way to get more food into the system quickly is to leverage the existing infrastructure by making large-scale purchases of shelf-stable items through the Capital Area Food Bank (CAFB), for distribution to larger Montgomery County food assistance providers.” As the major distributor of emergency food in the Washington Metropolitan region, CAFB specializes in procuring truckloads of food at little to no cost and passes that savings onto the hubs and smaller community organizations throughout the county. And as one of six regional food distribution hubs, Manna specializes in procuring food from sources such as CAFB, rescuing surplus food, and providing it to soup kitchens, pantries, clinics, and service sites to the public with targeted, direct distributions. Our region’s hunger relief infrastructure, which includes organizations of every size from large multi-service organizations to small pantries and soup kitchens – is already robust, and does not need reinvention. Through this approach, we stand ready to support the county and the residents to alleviate hunger as effectively and efficiently as possible.

What We Want to Reinforce:

- **Continue to Source from Local Entities:** The FSRS underscores that local sources of food must be a resource to the county to meet demand, and we wholeheartedly agree. The report notes: “This crisis has left local farms and food distributors in financial strain and with excess capacity which instead of going to waste can be redirected to feed residents. This strategy will preserve the economic sustainability of our local food producers, increase the nutritional value of food consumed close to its harvest date...while fostering long-term increased local food production and procurement, which are critical pillars of our County’s long-term food system resilience.” We are in full agreement with this statement. Both our organizations source from local entities and MFC will continue sourcing from the *Farm to Food Bank* program. These investments will support our county-based farmers, distributors, and businesses—along with the workers who comprise them. This focus will not only reduce lag times in delivery because of the proximity of product, but it will ensure that we are investing in our local economy to thoughtfully alleviate community-based hunger and food insecurity.

We strongly encourage the county to continue to find ways to incorporate this practice into its daily operation.

Priorities Requiring Immediate Action:

- **Expand Upon Purchasing Power and Food Acquisition:** A new reality of this pandemic is that consumer demand for grocery products has skyrocketed; families are rarely dining out and therefore, are dependent on products at supermarkets and grocery stores at an unusually high rate. This has left hunger relief organizations without donations from their primary source of food: private grocers and retail corporations. The FSRS rightfully notes that, "...currently local area food assistance providers are facing a 75% decline in donated food overall. Food suppliers are indicating that diminished levels of donations will return eventually, although not to previous levels until November or December of 2020." With this being the case, it should be expected and budgeted for that hunger relief organizations across the board will need to purchase food at much greater – and more resource-intensive – rates than before. We remain cautiously optimistic that programs such as the long-standing TEFAP (The Emergency Food Assistance Program) and newly created CFAP (Coronavirus Food Assistance Program) will help to fill this gap, but the Task Force's acknowledgement of limited supply is a reality we must continue to consider and integrate into all facets of our response. We recommend that the county prioritize the investment of CARES Act, other stimulus funding, and emergency reserve funds in hunger relief efforts—so that we can meet the need and maintain our rate of purchasing as declinations in food donations continue to pervade.
- **Invest in Both Shelf Stable & Perishable Items Immediately:** The FSRS prioritizes shelf-stable items as the preferred type of food to procure initially. However, non-perishable foods alone will not be enough to meet demand in the face of supply chain disruptions and incredibly long lead times for food arrival. We strongly recommend the Task Force expand procurement to both perishable and non-perishable items, and we are prepared to support in this effort and move forward immediately.

Resist Temporary Technological Solutions:

The Food Security Task Force's recommendation regarding "Leveraging Technology to Efficiently Scale" is well-intentioned, but somewhat misguided. The FSRS simplifies the development and implementation processes of a technology solution that "focuses on enhancing delivery mechanisms for residents to secure food assistance that is culturally appropriate." Delivery of food is an important access service for many residents. Sourcing culturally appropriate foods is also absolutely necessary, however, there are a number of assumptions embedded in this proposal that do not take into account the following: many smaller, locally owned grocery stores that typically sell culturally appropriate foods are closed; supply of these products is sparse in most, if not all, grocers; and the costs of implementing this platform are not justified by the benefits to do so—both in the short and long-term. Also the digital divide is real in our community, and this proposed technology presupposes access to and comfort with sophisticated technology, including among our senior population. The Task Force would be well served to invest the proposed allocations in existing platforms that our respective agencies and partners utilize and other means of ensuring access to culturally appropriate foods for communities in need.

Focus on Reducing Long-term Impact of Heightened Food Insecurity through County Level Policy Change:

Both the FSRS and Feeding America agree that in almost any scenario, food insecurity rates will significantly increase as a result of the pandemic's economic fallout. Even if the worst does not come to pass, there is no vaccine for the economic disaster currently unfolding. Long term, food distribution will be necessary, but not enough. Alleviating hunger takes effort on multiple fronts: short-term and acute demand must be met today through direct food distribution, but steps must also be taken to strategically reduce that demand through pragmatic policy changes. The

Food Security Task Force notes that an essential intention of the report is to “address root causes to ultimately reduce and eliminate food insecurity in our County.” We believe that the FSRS did not sufficiently consider county-level policy actions at its disposal. Specifically, we recommend the following for consideration:

1. **Expand the Working Families Income Supplement:** Montgomery County has a long history of utilizing this form of stimulus—a match of the Earned Income Tax Credit—to improve the lives of low-income and working-class residents. An opportunity exists to immediately support those in the most need by further expanding one of the most effective anti-poverty tools in the American social safety net. Hunger, food insecurity, and poverty rates will be immediately reduced in the event that the County Council enacts a 50 percent increase of the maximum amount currently refundable to residents. This would be very timely, considering that the IRS and the Treasury Department have extended tax filing deadlines to July 15th.
2. **Invest in SNAP Outreach:** SNAP plays a critical role in our community’s social safety net and helps protect families—especially women, young children, and seniors—from poverty and hunger. The most effective way to feed our neighbors in need is by providing them resources so they can purchase the foods they prefer, just like other consumers. Maryland Hunger Solutions estimates that of individuals who are eligible for SNAP in Montgomery County, 64 percent do not participate in the nation’s most effective anti-hunger program; this is the highest rate of non-utilization throughout the entire State of Maryland.¹ To think about this figure differently, there are nearly 110,000 residents in the county who are not receiving an average benefit of \$128 per month. As an entirely new population finds itself facing the harsh realities of food insecurity and economic strife, an investment to identify, inform, and enroll eligible Montgomery County residents through SNAP outreach is warranted now more than ever. It is clear these investments to increase SNAP utilization rates are well-justified; subsequent to the Great Recession in 2008, Moody’s Analytics found that for every \$1 of SNAP invested in a struggling economy, \$1.73 in economic activity was generated.² We recommend DHHS and local agency outreach and enrollment efforts are, at the very least, maintained at their current funding levels.
3. **Provide Subsequent Emergency Assistance Relief Payments to Low-Income Residents:** The County Executive and County Council set an excellent standard by providing emergency assistance checks to residents with incomes less than 50 percent of the federal poverty threshold who were also not eligible for economic impact payments through federal stimulus. This assistance was designed to offer relief to individuals who did not benefit from the direct payments included in the CARES Act: immigrants and their legalized children; the undocumented; college students who are tax dependents; and other adult dependents—many of whom have serious disabilities. As this crisis continues, we ask that these payments be provided every quarter through the end of the year.
4. **Pursue and Develop Public Private Partnerships to Address Technology Shortfalls and Market Failures:** Cities and counties throughout the United States are pursuing this form of partnership to leverage existing technological infrastructure, private investment, and efficiencies of diverse retail markets. For example:
 - Creation of a Grocery Vouchers Program for Residents at Risk for Food Insecurity: Following the model of the Seattle city government, we recommend exploration of a public-private partnership that would provide at least 5,000 families grocery vouchers of \$800 each. These vouchers, distributed in two installments, would be given to low-income families enrolled in various county-operated social

¹ Maryland Hunger Solutions, “Missed Opportunities: An Analysis of SNAP Participation in Maryland by County,” January 2019: <https://www.mdhungersolutions.org/pdf/analysis-snap-participation-by-md-county.pdf>.

² Mark Zandi, “Assessing the Macro Economic Impact of Fiscal Stimulus 2008,” Moody’s Analytics: <https://www.economy.com/mark-zandi/documents/Stimulus-Impact-2008.pdf>.

welfare and food assistance programs. In Seattle, the Mayor partnered with Safeway to ensure that the city and the grocery store chain worked in tandem to share the costs and identify the neediest of residents. This approach would leverage the resources of the private sector and it would equip food insecure households to purchase food, cleaning supplies, and other household goods at the grocery store of partnership—throughout the entire State of Maryland.³

- [Taxi and Ride Share Food Delivery Service for Elderly, Sick, and Low-Income Households](#): The City of New York has partnered with the Taxi and Limousine Commission to pay taxi and ride share drivers \$15 an hour and \$5 an hour for expenses to deliver food to the neediest of residents. Eligible recipient's sign-up through the city's website or call 311. The program has been deemed a citywide success, and it has effectively employed local drivers, while ensuring at-risk populations are not exposed to the general public. Both our organizations have strong relationships with the Department of Transportation along with ride share companies, and we encourage exploration into the viability of such services.

Moving Forward

We could not accomplish our work without the support of your respected bodies. The FSRS is a powerful indication that you consider food insecurity to be a critical issue, with a profound impact on the lives of Montgomery County residents. We thank you for your level of attention to this problem. As leaders of a diverse food assistance system that is collectively working to serve our neighbors, we ask that you kindly consider our perspectives in ongoing deliberations of resource allocation, food procurement practices, and policy change.

Thank you,

Radha Muthiah



Chief Executive Officer | Capital Area Food Bank

Jackie DeCarlo



Chief Executive Officer | Manna Food Center

³ City of Seattle, "Mayor Jenny Durkan Announces \$5 Million in Grocery Vouchers for Families Impacted by COVID-19," Office of the Mayor, Jenny A. Durkan: <https://durkan.seattle.gov/2020/03/mayor-jenny-durkan-announces-5-million-in-grocery-vouchers-for-families-impacted-by-covid-19/>