Food: Too Good to Waste
Implementing a campaign in your community
After introductions, ask the group to name several behaviors that stand out as leading to significant amounts of household food waste, e.g.:

- Buying too much food based on stock levels and likely use rates
- Buying ingredients for special recipes that are partially used
- Buying more fresh products, especially fruit and vegetables
- Improper storage and lack of storage and preservation knowledge and skills
- Preparing and serving too much food
- Not eating food while it is still fresh
- Not eating older stock and leftovers first
- Dissatisfaction with freshness or taste
- Time availability seems to be a major indirect factor in food waste
What does TBL mean?

On the left from Wikipedia... Triple bottom line is an accounting framework with three parts: social, environmental and financial. Some organizations have adopted the TBL framework to evaluate their performance in a broader perspective to create greater business value.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Triple_bottom_line

At K-State’s PPI, we call this sustainability.

The right graphic is the food system from Univ of Hawaii West O’ahu. You can see how a sustainable food system needs to be concerned with the environment, the social system, and economics.

Source on the right: Agroecologist and UH West O’ahu Assistant Professor of Sustainable Community Food Systems Albie Miles and colleagues at the Union of Concerned Scientists and Stanford University published “Triggering a positive research and policy feedback cycle to support a transition to agroecology and sustainable food systems,” in a special edition of the Journal of Agroecology & Sustainable Food Systems. https://westoahu.hawaii.edu/ekamakanihou/?p=5767
Overview – Part 1: Food Waste

- Food production/food loss and waste information
- EPA Food: Too Good to Waste (FTGTW) Tool
  - Objective—become familiar with the materials so as to be able to implement a food waste reduction campaign with minimal effort.
- Feed people not landfills

Food waste is also a triple bottom line issue. There are environmental, financial/economical, and social reasons for being concerned with food loss and food waste.

Wasted Food occurs all along the food value chain - from farm to fork.
- For example, food is sometimes left in the fields because it costs more to harvest than what it could be sold for.
- Food that travels long distances is more likely to perish in route.
- At the retail level, food is wasted when grocery stores or restaurants buy more of a perishable food item than they can sell.
- And we do the same at home...
So what percent of food grown in the US goes uneaten?
We need to make our food system more efficient and less wasteful. Even with the most sustainable practices, our food system uses enormous resources.
This graphic shows some equivalents to that 40% of food that we in the US do not eat.

In one year, wasted food generates 2.6% of all the US GHG emissions. This is the GHG emissions that 37 million vehicles generate (1 in 7 cars on the road). The majority of those greenhouse gases are released by growing the food, though a portion is released as methane as food decays in landfills.

With Kansas’s concern for the depleting Ogallala Aquifer, note that wasted food equates to 21% of the US agricultural water usage.

And to look at that with another perspective...next slide.
Each apple that’s thrown away uses enough water to flush a toilet seven times.

Source: Waste. 2013. UNEP (Video)
Food accounts for 21% of the American waste stream

Source: EPA Food: Too Good to Waste Implementation Guide and Toolkit

Food is the number one contributor to landfills today; This does not include food and beverages disposed of in other ways, such as down kitchen drains. Only about 5 percent of all food in the waste stream is currently “recycled” by composting or anaerobic digestion (a process that makes energy).

As food scraps in landfills decompose, they produce methane, a potent greenhouse gas.

Food waste = 18% of the US landfill methane.
Food accounts for 17% of what Kansans send to the landfill.

In KS, food waste increased from 13% (2009) to 17% (2012).

According to the 2016 State SW Mgt Plan, possibly because other waste streams have decreased, e.g., less newspapers sold, less grass clippings collected, more recycling occurring, more yard waste composting.

The 2016 report said, “It appears that the one sure area of increase and opportunity for waste reductions is food waste.”
(http://www.kdheks.gov/waste/reportspublications/stateplan16.pdf)
Households are responsible for the largest portion of all food waste (followed by restaurants/food service institutions, then farms and supermarkets). Throwing food away at the consumer level has a larger resource footprint than at any other point of the food chain. It has undergone more transport, storage, and often cooking,

ReFED (Rethink Food Waste Through Economics and Data) estimates U.S. household food waste totals 76 billion pounds, or 238 pounds of food per person annually. This costs $450 per person, or $1,800 per year for a household of four. [The USDA estimates that 21 percent of the total food supply is lost at the consumer level, amounting to 90 billion pounds. However, the agency’s definition includes both households and “out of home” consumption (e.g., in restaurants).]
This is the EPA Food recovery hierarchy. It looks at not only environmental benefits, but also financial and social in its establishment of the hierarchy. EPA established the Food Recovery Hierarchy to help guide priorities for managing excess food.

This hierarchy has a similar approach to the reduce—reuse—recycle philosophy to solid waste; e.g., prevent food waste (reduce), divert surplus food (reuse), compost food scraps (recycle)
Source reduction can also be thought of as prevention. Our program, PPI, focuses on this level of the hierarchy. It is the most effective action for addressing food loss and waste, not only environmentally, but financially.

Financial benefits – reduce cost of purchasing, handling, and ultimately disposing food that doesn’t get used
Environmental benefits – conserving water, ag chemicals, energy

To design strategies for action, need to conduct a food waste baseline assessment...
One of the ironies of today’s food system is that enormous amounts of food are wasted at the same time that more than 42 million people in the United States lack a secure supply of food to their tables (food insecurity). Only about 3 to 10 percent of unsaleable food from manufacturers, retailers, restaurants, and food service providers combined is donated each year. At the farm level, only a small portion of the largely undocumented losses of fruits and vegetables are recovered and donated for food.

The United States has excellent liability protection and tax benefit laws to encourage food donation.
Good Samaritan Food Donation Act

http://www.publichealthlawcenter.org/resources/kansas-healthy-food-resources
Food recovery “is the collection of wholesome food for distribution to the poor and hungry.” There are four basic types of food recovery:

Field gleaning: the collection of crops from farmers’ fields that have already been mechanically harvested or on fields where it is not economically profitable to harvest. This term can also be used to describe the donation of agricultural products that have already been harvested and are being stored at a farm or packing house.

Perishable produce rescue/salvage: the collection of perishable produce from wholesale and retail sources, including wholesale markets, supermarkets, and farmers’ markets.

Perishable and prepared food rescue: the collection of prepared foods from the food service industry, including restaurants, hospital, caterers, and cafeterias.

Nonperishable processed food collection: the collection of processed foods, usually with long shelf lives, from sources such as manufacturers, supermarkets, distributors, grocery stores, and food drives.

Feed Animals

Food Recovery Hierarchy

- Provide to area farms and zoos
  - Vegetable trimmings
  - Post-consumer plate waste

- Barriers
  - Some states ban food donation for animal feed
  - Strict diets in corporate operations
Industrial Uses

- An aerobic digestion for energy recovery
- Biofuels from waste oils

Wasted food can be turned into energy
As food scraps in landfills decompose, they produce methane, a greenhouse gas up to 86 times more powerful than carbon dioxide in terms of its global warming potential. By contrast, properly managed composting is not a major source of methane.

Sources:
Landfilling destroys useful organic matter and nutrients, which could otherwise be repurposed into new products. Landfilling results in increased greenhouse gas emissions and pollution.
EPA Food: Too Good to Waste Tool
Implementing a campaign in your community
The Goal is to prevent household wasted food. EPA has another program called the Food Recovery Challenge that’s geared for businesses and institutions.

The premise behind the FTGTW campaign is that by making small changes in our food management behaviors, we can have a large impact, both for ourselves and for the environment and our communities (triple bottom line). When we make small changes in how we shop, prepare and store food.... we can waste less, save money, and keep the valuable resources used to produce and distribute food from going to waste.

The campaign is relatively simple. You as the community leader, decide on food waste objectives; select the group you want to target; give the audience compelling reasons to waste less food; then give them tools to accomplish it. EPA’s FTGTW tool consists of an implementation guide and tool kit. The tool kit has behavior change and outreach tools.
This slide is from the West Coast Climate and Materials Management Forum Webinar Series. The WCCMMF conducted the first FTGTW campaign in 2012.

The FTGTW tools uses community based social marketing (CBSM) principles. CBSM is an approach to driving behavioral change through community initiatives that remove barriers to desired behaviors. **At the same time, it enhances the benefits to the desired behaviors.** A CBSM campaign typically consists of outreach strategies and tools; messaging; and behavior change tools.

CBSM is based on a book, *Fostering Sustainable Behavior* by Doug McKenzie-Mohr. One of the main messages is information alone does not change behavior. Another is identifying and addressing barriers and benefits.
Relatively recent brain research shows that we really dislike waste, especially when it is something that we consider ours. It is called *loss aversion*. Essentially, we are wired to hate losing the resources we have in hand. So the good news here is that we have an in-built motivation to waste less!

Explanation of loss aversion: Losses are more powerful behavioral motivators than gains. Owning something increases its value. Losing $100 worth of food has a greater impact on how satisfied we are, than saving $100 on food.

We often act automatically instead of reflecting on what we are doing.

For example, you are likely to serve yourself more if your plate is bigger or if the color contrast between the plate and the food is low. In this picture, the green plate has more beans than the orange plate. Serving more food can lead to not finishing what’s on our plates and plate waste.

Our brains are often on automatic when we do routine tasks such as shopping and clean-up after meals, so we might forget what leftovers we have in the refrigerator or that we still have tomatoes in the refrigerator from the last time we went to the store.

Source: Cornell University Food and Brand Lab
Another big culprit in wasted food is our dynamic lifestyles.

Planning is one thing and following through on plans is another. We want to eat nearby or have work or volunteer commitments. Both of these may take precedence over going home to cook that meal you planned on.
While researchers can point to some general behaviors leading to wasting food, for different families there will be different barriers to reducing food waste. Feeding a household is a complex series of activities. There’s meal planning, shopping, storing, preparing and cooking food as well as choosing what to eat at any given moment.

Some of the barriers to making changes in how we carry out these activities are:

• not having enough information to make a change,
• a lack of time, and
• food preferences. Children especially can favor one type of food over another and though you try to get them to eat food that is good for them, it seems that just as often its still on the plate at the end of the meal.
In addition to having a built-in aversion to waste, other benefits of keeping good food from going to waste include:
- Saving money – family of 4 $1800/year
- Keeping fruit and vegetables fresh for longer periods of time may help to increase their consumption
- By trying different ways to buy and prep food, we can simplify our lives
- Basic satisfaction that comes from wasting less
The FTGTW Toolkit identifies five behavior changes that have significant potential to reduce wasted food in households. The Toolkit identifies strategies to achieve these behavior changes, and it provides tools based on the strategies to help people make the behavioral changes.

---

Get Smart purpose: Actively engage participants in learning about how they manage food in their household; measuring progress

Smart Shopping: Encourage participants to plan their food needs ahead of time and only purchase what they will use

Smart Storage: Provide information for participants to safely store their food so it is good for the meals they planned

Smart Prep: Provide tips on saving time in the kitchen by preparing foods ahead of time

Smart Saving: Visually remind participants to eat foods while they are fresh

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Get Smart:</strong></td>
<td>Waste aversion</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See how much food (and money) you are throwing away</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smart Shopping:</strong></td>
<td>Waste aversion</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy what you need</td>
<td>Saving $</td>
<td>Dynamic lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smart Storage:</strong></td>
<td>Waste aversion</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep fruits and vegetables fresh</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saving $</td>
<td>Not enough room in fridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smart Prep:</strong></td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep now, eat later</td>
<td>Saving $</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smart Saving:</strong></td>
<td>Waste aversion</td>
<td>Gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat what you buy</td>
<td>Saving $</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Two additional outreach tools are included to support the general strategy of raising awareness and education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and Education</td>
<td>Fact Sheet: “Consider the Tomato”</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Educate participants and potential participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and Education</td>
<td>Workshop Presentation</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Educate participants and potential participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The FTGTW Challenge asks participants to track their wasted food generation for a period of two weeks or more before adopting new FTWGW strategies. By tracking the food they discard in their homes, participants become aware of the often surprisingly large quantities of food they are wasting.

The Challenge actively engages participants in learning about how they manage food in their household. Early campaigns showed that awareness plays an integral role in motivating participants to adopt new strategies to reduce waste.

Waste aversion is a strong psychological motivator, but most households are not aware of how much they waste and may even question if they waste food. In addition to raising awareness about wasted food behaviors in participating households, this tool presents an opportunity for organizations to evaluate the small-scale campaign’s effectiveness and impact.
The Get Smart: Take the Challenge tool consists of instructions and worksheets for households to collect and measure how much food they waste over the course of, ideally, a six week challenge. This is the tool that will raise awareness on how much food is going to waste. There is much flexibility with this challenge.

Wasted food can be measured on either a volume or weight basis or both. In general, the volume method is more easily accomplished in most households. However, the weight method is more accurate. Campaigns may choose to provide scales as an incentive for weight measurement.

Most challenges have averaged four to six weeks in length. The suggested length is six weeks – two weeks to establish a measuring routine and four weeks to test different strategies and create new habits. The length, however, can be varied based on campaign objectives. If the purpose of the Challenge is to raise household awareness of wasted food in their homes, two weeks may be a sufficient length of time.

Depending on the goals of the Challenge, wasted food may be defined to include both
preventable and non-edible wasted food, or only preventable wasted food.
Get Smart: Take the Challenge (cont.)

- Wasted food types
  - **Preventable** wasted food is food grown or purchased (and prepared or not) but not eaten because it is spoiled or not needed, and then thrown away.
  - **Non-edible** wasted food is food parts that are typically discarded during food preparation or consumption—includes items such as egg shells, bones, fruit pits, and non-edible peels.

Preventable wasted food is...

The length of time of the Challenge, the choice between measuring waste by volume or by weight, and the choice between tracking and collecting data on preventable and/or non-edible waste will depend on campaign objectives. There is a trade-off between keeping measurement simple and how much data you wish to collect.

Keep participation convenient. Recruitment and retention may be greater if scales are offered for weighing wasted food.
The **Smart Shopping: Shop With Meals in Mind** strategy is a little simpler than all-out meal planning and it leaves flexibility for buying what is local and seasonal.

The object in making a shopping list with meals in mind is both to check what you already have on hand, what they call “shopping your kitchen first” but also to consider how many meals you will be likely to eat at home before you next go shopping and buy accordingly.

By making a list with meals in mind, you will waste less, eat better, and save time and money.

This strategy also focuses on buying only the quantities you need until your next shopping trip. The effort here is to be aware when you are shopping how much you are putting in your cart rather than being on autopilot when shopping. By buying no more than what you expect to use, you will be more likely to use it up and keep it fresh.

Discuss what methods the audience uses. Apps?
This tool is a visual prompt to remind participants how to keep produce fresh. Prompts are particularly useful when designed to engage people in positive behaviors and presented in close proximity to where the action takes place. The prompt provides useful information on keeping produce fresh. It is printed in bright colors on a half sheet suitable for posting on the refrigerator. The prompt can also be distributed at tabling and community workshop events. In FTGTW pilots many households found this guide to be very effective.
The **Smart Prep: Prep Now, Eat Later** strategy provides consumers helpful tips on preparing perishable foods soon after shopping (like right after you get home). This strategy helps with busy lifestyles. By preparing perishable foods post-shopping, you’ll make it easier to whip up meals later in the week, saving time, effort and money.
The final strategy is to eat what needs eating first. The "Eat First" tool is designed as a visual prompt. Households are encouraged to designate an area in the refrigerator for food that should be eaten relatively soon like aging ingredients and leftovers.

Another way to eat what needs eating first is to learn flexible recipes. Casseroles, frittatas, soups, stir-frys and smoothies are great ways to use leftovers, and odds and ends.
We just looked at the EPA FTGTW five behavior change strategies and tools.

Now we will look at two Outreach tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get Smart:</td>
<td>Get Smart: Take the Challenge</td>
<td>Actively engage participants in learning about how they manage food in their household; measuring progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See how much food (and money) you are throwing away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Shopping:</td>
<td>Smart Shopping: Shop with Meals in Mind</td>
<td>Encourage participants to plan their food needs ahead of time and only purchase what they will use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy what you need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Storage:</td>
<td>Smart Storage: Fruit and Vegetable Storage Tips</td>
<td>Provide information for participants to safely store their food so it is good for the meals they planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep fruits and vegetables fresh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Prep:</td>
<td>Smart Prep: Prep Now. Eat Later</td>
<td>Provide tips on saving time in the kitchen by preparing foods ahead of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep now, eat later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Saving:</td>
<td>Smart Saving: “Eat First” Sign</td>
<td>Visually remind participants to eat foods while they are fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat what you buy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Awareness and Education Fact Sheet: “Consider the Tomato”

• Designed to attract attention/raise awareness
• Tells a story about why wasted food matters
• Provides context for wasted food as an environmental and economic issue
• Formatted as a poster

Formatted as a poster so could be used as a conversation starter; messaging is important in community campaigns and advocacy
The Workshop Presentation tool is designed for FTGTW campaign organizers to use to make presentations at workshops or community meetings. The presentation can be used to introduce the FTGTW campaign and the tools to community members and to recruit participants. Stats need updating. Will do before posting.
Small-Scale Campaign Implementation Guidance
Steps to Implementation

• Step 1 – Design the (small scale) campaign
• Step 2 – Adapt the FTGTW tools
• Step 3 – Conduct outreach and recruitment; increase retention
• Step 4 – Monitor and support
• Step 5 – Data collection
• Step 6 – Analyzing and sharing results
Two principal target populations were selected in crafting the FTGTW campaign messaging and strategies: (1) families with young children and (2) young adults (of ages approximately from 18 to 30). The two principal target populations were chosen on the basis of previous research that indicated these two demographics generate the largest amounts of wasted food in households.

Examples of a target population may be neighbors in a residential association, members of a church congregation, grade school class,, etc.
Step 2 – Adapt tools

- May want to change from the default FTGTW Challenge instructions
  - Households measure their waste for six weeks with a two week baseline period.
  - Households collect and measure preventable waste.
  - Households measure both the volume and weight of wasted food.
  - The community partner provides households a kitchen scale.
  - Households can try any strategy or set of strategies.
  - The community partner is the contact for assistance and to return results

Time should be allotted for adapting the FTGTW behavior change and outreach tools to the your organization’s specific needs or planned objectives.
A major task of FTGTW campaign implementation is outreach and recruitment. Communication channels should be many and varied.

Two CBSM principles that govern successful outreach and challenge recruitment plans are 1) delivering at the community level and 2) emphasizing personal contact. A good rule of thumb in household recruitment and retention is to engage early and often.

Campaign volunteers and staff reported lively discussions and expression of interest at tabling events and spirited conversations at workshops. A campaign staff person said that in 10 years of doing community outreach, she had never seen such interest in an issue. People expressed gratitude for bringing the issue forward.

Source: Viki Sonntag Lead Researcher, EcoPraxis
4 – Monitor and support

• Important for retention
• Need to engage often during the challenge
5 – Data collection

• For calculating
  ▪ Effectiveness
  ▪ Impact

The reason for data collecting is to determine whether the campaign resulted in a quantifiable reduction in wasted food. The participating households would compare their baseline measurement to amounts measured after practicing the strategies they select.

Organizations can calculate impact by comparing the average amount wasted in the initial weeks to the average for the final week.

This could be a research project that also collects demographic information.
6 – Analyzing and sharing results

Food: Too Good To Waste
An Evaluation Report for the Consumption Workgroup of the West Coast Climate and Materials Management Forum

Major Findings

- There are strong indications that households have a significant interest in reducing their wasted food.
- FTGTW behavioral changes are relatively easy for households to make.
- Creating awareness is key to motivating people to sustain their behaviors.
- It is possible for households to reduce preventable food waste up to 50% and more by weight.
  - A 50% reduction is roughly a half pound per person per week or 20% of total food waste.
  - In addition, it is likely that the inedible fraction of waste is also reduced as households purchase less food.

Viki Sonntag Lead Researcher, EcoPraxis
Here are 17 campaigns that featured a range of strategies. This allowed each household to focus on the strategy or strategies that work best for them but all had the ultimate goal of reducing wasted food at home.”

**Targeting an audience and adapting to it appropriately is very important to effectiveness and retention.** (Tables detail and retention rates in different communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Location</th>
<th>Outreach and Engagement Methods</th>
<th>Conducted Challenge</th>
<th>Length of Challenge</th>
<th>Fraction Measured</th>
<th>Measurement Method</th>
<th>Target Population (Desc)</th>
<th>Number of Households Recruited</th>
<th>Final Sample Size</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Date: Xth. Campaign outreach included traditional media, newspaper and publicaton print ad, a set from the, and outdoor media (billboards, radio, and posters). Transitioning to greater emphasis on peer-to-peer and direct personal contact outreach in 2014.</td>
<td>Yes (limited)</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Preventable fraction only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>City population</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gresham</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>Preventable fraction only</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>City population</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Knox County 2019 Strategy was to drive awareness and engage with the community through broad-based communication such as advertising, social media and media relations.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rhode Island Engagement workshops focused on hands-on demonstrations of waste prevention strategies. Campaign arranges for low-income participants to receive community credits as incentive to participate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Preventable fraction only</td>
<td>Both weight and volume</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Iowa City IA Intensive personalized recruitment: an invitation to participate was sent to select neighborhoods followed by door hangers and neighborhood open houses. Extensive social media presence was maintained with targeted social media expenditures made to a variety of community groups and schools.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Preventable fraction only</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>50 households</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Thurston County, WA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Preventable fraction only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>County population</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Location</td>
<td>Outreach and Education Methods</td>
<td>Conducted Challenge</td>
<td>Length of Challenge</td>
<td>Fraction Measured</td>
<td>Measurement Method</td>
<td>Target Population Size</td>
<td>Number of Households Recruited</td>
<td>Final Sample Size</td>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oak Park, IL</td>
<td>Blanket recruitment through notice in Village of Oak Park's newsletter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>All solid waste</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>City population</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Addison County, VT</td>
<td>Outreach occurred through partnerships and educational workshops; also, a recruitment ad was placed in local newspaper among priority customers for participation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Preventable and non-edible fractions</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>District population</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jersey City, NJ</td>
<td>Recruitment to composting program with community gardens where these were presented as first step in composting process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>All solid waste</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>1200 network members</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 King County, WA</td>
<td>Trained master composters to stakeholders (WPCF volunteers and other challenge participants at farmers markets)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Preventable fractions only</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Farmers market customers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Hawaii, HI</td>
<td>Messages focusing on reducing unsustainable food waste were shared through Hawaii’s 20,000+ member network on an almost daily basis; these messages included images, text, and video.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Aurora, CO</td>
<td>Promoted through city’s intranet website to most employees who visit it at least once per week</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>All solid waste</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>2650 city employees</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 2016
“An unexpected finding from the early pilots was that having households measure their waste strongly motivates their desire to reduce waste”
Highlights from lessons learned

• Means of outreach are a more important factor in determining participation
• Campaigns designed to leverage social networks and create social norms were among the most effective
• Community-scale direct outreach was more effective than recruitment through indirect means such as social media outreach
Feed People, Not Landfills

Kansas Case Studies

Example PPI projects funded by other grants
2018 Food Recovery Projects - NE KS

- Two projects
  - KDHE/CDC grant
  - Lawrence – Douglas County Health Department grant
- Goal is to:
  - Identify resources for food diversion,
  - Identify best practices,
  - Recommend change, and
  - Develop guidance for future technical assistance with sources in food waste management
2018 Food Recovery Projects - NE KS

CDC/KDHE grant

- Shawnee and Wyandotte counties (Topeka and Kansas City, KS)
  - High rates of food and health disparity as well as food deserts
  - Target up to 20 industrial, commercial and institutional facilities
  - Food recovery focusing on source reduction and diversion to hungry populations and animals.
2018 Food Recovery Projects - NE KS

CDC/KDHE grant

- 18 partnerships secured for research and technical assistance.
  - K-12 schools (public and private) – 5
  - Grocers – 5
  - Workplace cafeterias – 2
  - Hotels/convention center – 1
  - Hospitals/Skilled nursing facility – 4
  - University – 1

- Feeding America’s MealConnect app for mobile and desktop -
  - Harvesters and their agency partners
  - Kansas Food Bank and their agency partners
Important to emphasize that under this project data represents capturing just a one-day “snapshot” of what food recovery opportunities existed at the facility. The data was then extrapolate for an annual number.
2018 Food Recovery Projects - NE KS

Lawrence -Douglas County Health Department funding

  - 6 public schools
  - 1 university
- Data still under review
- Food recovery guidance for public schools and universities in review for publication on the PPI website, www.sbeap.org
App available for Apple, Android and desktop – basically connects donors with approved agencies that can pick up excess food and use it to feed food insecure populations. Donors get receipts to write off as tax donations.

From Mealconnect’s website:

To source more meals and help end hunger in America, Feeding America has created MealConnect™, a technology platform that makes it easier than ever to connect donors with surplus food to their local Feeding America member food banks and their partners.

With MealConnect, you have easier pickups, easier tracking and easier receipt recording for any type of donation. Plus, you’ll feel great knowing you’re reducing food waste while providing hunger relief right in your community.
PPI researched several different Apps and even considered designing their own before determining that MealConnect was the most stable and sustainable. (our research found many Apps started, but not maintained or are fee for service).

App research and Wichita-area work completed with a funding from the Kansas Health Foundation.

Grocery chains like Dillon’s food stores have regular pick ups three days a week. For this reason, those with regular pick ups do not need to use the App.
Food recovery resources website updates coming soon...

http://www.sbeap.org/services-programs/food-recovery

Also, coming soon...
Questions?

Barb Goode
barblj@ksu.edu

Nancy Larson
nlarson@ksu.edu

Lynelle Ladd
lladd@ksu.edu

800-578-8898
Love Letter to Food
(https://www.foodpolicy.umn.edu/files/love-letter-food)

https://www.foodpolicy.umn.edu/files/love-letter-food