

AN ANALYSIS OF STATE RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION MEMBER'S
KNOWLEDGE ABOUT "GLEANNING " IN FOOD RECOVERY

by

Barbara A. Koukol

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
With a Major in

Hospitality & Tourism

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

Investigation Adviser

The Graduate College
University of Wisconsin-Stout

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751

ABSTRACT

Koukol Barbara A.

An Analysis of State Restaurant Association Member's Knowledge About "Gleaning" in Food Recovery

Hospitality & Tourism Brian C. Bergquist 05/2000 135

American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual

The following is a study of the Wisconsin State Restaurant Association members' regarding gleaning and food recovery. The problem was to identify if the Bill Emerson Food Donation Act is being utilized at the grass-roots level throughout the state. A select group of the members, were surveyed about their knowledge about hunger, The Bill Emerson Good Samaritain Food Donation Act, food recovery programs and their participation. The primary objective was to determine if managers/owners of food service establishments are knowledgeable about the Bill Emerson Good Samaritain Food Donation Act. The members do know that there are millions of Americans that go hungry each year but are unaware of the vast amounts of food that is thrown away. They are unaware of the millions of people that could be fed if food was gleaned, recovered and donated to the food recovery programs that are available. The majority are unaware of the benefits that their business can receive directly or through social perceptions. The individuals that did participate, would like to learn more about the Bill Emerson Good Samaritain Food Donation Act, the local programs in their areas, and information on gleaning and food recovery.

Acknowledgments

At this time, I would like to thank all of the hospitality managers whose participation in this study has made it possible. I would like to thank all those friends and family that have encouraged me to continue my education. I want to express my gratitude to those faculty mentors who have instilled the desire and determination in me to complete the master's program.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgments.....	3
Chapter One	
Introduction.....	6
Statement of the Problem.....	8
Research Objectives.....	9
Justification for the Study.....	10
Definition of Terms.....	11
Methodology.....	12
Chapter Two	
Literature Review.....	13
Chapter Three	
Sample Selection.....	75
Instrumentation.....	76
Data Collection.....	77
Data Analysis.....	77
Chapter Four	
Results.....	78
Chapter Five	
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	86
Bibliography.....	89

Table of Contents

Appendix A
 Cover Letter..... 95

Appendix B
 Survey..... 96

Appendix C
 Participants..... 98

Appendix D
 Citizen’s Guide to Food Recovery..... 113

Appendix E
 World Wide Web Sites for Food Recovery..... 134

CHAPTER ONE

There is a misfortune that strikes the most vulnerable people in society. It has been a part of the history of the World and has not left America untouched. Americans have experienced it in every period of history since arriving to settle this land and to make it strong, wealthy and powerful. In the past, it had been kept hidden, it was a common experience of life and thought to be normal and a condition of life. America, today with its great resources, is still battling this misfortune. It effects the young, elderly, single-parent families, unemployed, and homeless. It has no racial boundaries and can be experienced by individuals from all socio-economic levels. It denies people one of the most basic human rights- the right to enough food to eat. Hunger has become a social issue because people can no longer battle this on their own and have to reach out for assistance.

The United States Senate and the House of Representatives have formulate many Bills that have provided funding for programs to feed the needy. Yet, millions of Americans have gone hungry. In the 1960, there were 40 to 50 million people hungry and malnourished. There were efforts that created programs to eradicate hunger and it was declared under control in the 1970s. The era of the 1980s, was a time of denial. There were reports both supporting and contradicting hunger existed. Many programs were terminated or reductions in benefits resulted because of reductions in the national budget. Our country experienced a recession during the early 1980s. There were reports of hunger on the rise and emergency food programs had great increases in the number of people that participated in the programs. Hunger was increasing in America. It existed in cities and rural areas and touched diverse groups, not only the poor. Malnutrition was becoming widespread. Studies were being conducted and it was believed

that in the middle 1980s, 20 million Americans were hungry at some time during each month. The studies raised an awareness and charity organizations began to raise funds for the hungry and provide meals for those in need. Many refuted that there was hungry in America and others believed many experienced it each day.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census performed the first comprehensive measurement of food insecurity and hunger in April 1995. It was a national study of U.S. households. The results of the study revealed that 11.9 percent of the households in America were food insecure. There were 11,900,000 almost twelve million households experiencing some level of food insecurity. The survey again conducted in 1998, revealed that there were 10.5 million households in the U.S. that were food insecure. There were 36 million people that didn't have access to enough food and 14.4 million of this group were children.

Many nonprofit organizations have formed to help feed the millions in need. They have not been able to provide for all that are in need and have had to reduce the amounts of food given or turn people away completely. The Economic Research Service did a study and found that more than one-quarter of all food produced in the nation is lost. It was estimated 96 billion pounds of food was lost at retail, consumer and food service levels and that there is even a greater loss. The consumer and food service losses were at 90+ billion pounds. If we could salvage five percent of the loss, 4 million people could be fed, a twenty five percent recovery could mean that 20 million people would eat for the day.

To encourage donations of food products to food recovery programs, Congress created the Good Samaritan Food Donation Act. This act provides protection for donors from civil and criminal liability, which provides a way

for food donations to be made easy. Since 90+ billions pounds is lost at consumer and food service levels, the USDA addressed the National Restaurant Association among other anti-hunger organizations at a Summit. Each organization was to develop a program to increase food recovery and end hunger. The National Restaurant Association has cooperated with the United States Department of Agriculture and created a handbook about how restaurants and food services can donate excess food. This handbook, "Food Donation: A Restaurateur's Guide," became available in November 1997. The National Restaurant Association has state organizations within its membership. The study that has been proposed is to survey the state membership of their knowledge of the Good Samaritan Food Donation Act, also known as the Bill Emerson Food Donation Act and the protection it provides to those business so that they can make food donations to food recovery programs to eradicate hunger in America.

Statement of the Problem

The United States Senate and the House of Representatives created the Model Good Samaritan Food Donation Act, otherwise known, as the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act. This act is a public law, which is to encourage donations of food and grocery products to nonprofit organizations for distribution to the needy without the threat of retribution. There have been significant contributions from large corporate institutions. The Department of Agriculture developed the "Food Recovery and Gleaning Initiative" to empower states, local governments, religious, and nonprofit organizations to become involved in grass roots gleaning and food recovery

efforts. The problem is to determine if proprietors and managers are adequately knowledgeable about this law, to donate products to the nonprofit organizations to feed the hungry. Is the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act being utilized at the grass-roots level throughout the state and region particularly in the food service facilities to donate food to food recovery programs to reduce the number of hungry Americans.

Research Objectives

The following objectives will be met through the study.

They are:

1. To determine if managers/owners of food service establishments are knowledgeable about the Good Samaritan Food Donation Act.
2. To determine if grass roots facilities, local food services are donating food and other products to food recovery programs for disbursement to the needy.
3. To become aware of how much food is being donated to food recovery programs.
4. To determine the reasons why food service managers are not donating food to food recovery programs.
5. To determine the reasons why food service managers are not donating food to food recovery programs if they have recoverable food.
6. To determine to which nonprofit organizations the grass root food service facilities donate food.

Justification for the Study

There are 34.7 million people in America that are hungry. The Bureau of the Census in 1995 utilized the Food Security Supplement to collect data about hunger in the United States. It was found that there were 34.7 million Americans who were at hunger or food security. The data in 1997 revealed were at risk of hunger. The United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service completed a study, in 1995, the first in twenty years, on food loss. They estimated that there was 96 billion pounds of food lost at the retail, consumer and food service levels. The loss of the amounts of food was anticipated to be greater because losses on the farm, farm to retail and wholesale losses were not calculated. The food could be "gleaned" and donated to nonprofit programs that feed the hungry. It is estimated that with as little as a five percent recovery of food, 4 million people could be fed for a day and with a twenty five percent recovery, we could feed 20 million people a day nationwide. The contributions made to regional or local nonprofit organization can also provide for those that are hungry or at risk of hunger or food security.

The study will inform those that do not know about the Good Samaritan Act. The information that this study is collecting will make individuals and businesses at the grass roots level aware of hunger and the need for gleaning and food recovery. The businessperson can participate in food recovery without worry or threat of lawsuit due to the creation of the Food Donation Act. The donors are protected from civil and criminal liability. Gleaning and food recovery provides an option to the entrepreneur that is socially acceptable, gratifying, environmentally beneficial and financial rewarding for the business through tax credits for the donation.

The information from the study will inform those nonprofit agencies

of that business' they need to target for donations. the information gathered in the survey can be valuable to the donors and nonprofit organization. Possible donors can be made aware of programs that need food resources and donations. The leaders of the nonprofit organizations can target specific businesses for donations. The donors and hungerrelief programs are both benefiting. The hungry will be receiving the much needed food and local business will be making contributions that are utilized in fighting a national battle.

Definition of Terms

The following terms have been defined to better understand the literature and content of the study.

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.

Food rescue - the collection of prepared foods from the food service industry.

Food recovery - the collection and distribution of food to disadvantaged individuals.

Kwashiorkor - is the severe malnutrition in infants and children that is characterized by failure to grow and develop, changes in the pigmentation of skin and hair.

Marasmus - is to waste away, progressive emaciation especially in the young because of malnutrition due chiefly to faulty assimilation and utilization of food.

No-holds-barred study - is a study that is free from hampering rules or conventions.

Nonperishable food collection - the collection of processed foods with long shelf life.

Perishable food rescue or salvage - the collection of perishable produce from wholesale and retail sources.

Rickets - a bone disease caused by insufficient Vitamin D.

USDA - an acronym for the United States Department of Agriculture.

Methodology

The study that is being conducted will be done in a form of a survey. The survey will be electronically mailed to those individuals and business' generated from the membership of the State Restaurant Association. The survey will be filled out by members of management of each of the facilities and returned for analysis. The survey was developed by the investigator. It is in the appendices. The following chapters consist of the review of literature, methods and procedures, report of findings, and summary, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

Hunger is a problem that plagues the entire world. It effects those that are the most vulnerable, the young, elderly, the sick and feeble. Photographs provide depictions of those in the advanced stages of malnutrition, hunger and starvation. If hunger does not result in death, it leaves scars that are physically, mentally and emotionally evident for the rest of one's life. At other times hunger may not be as severe and is hidden behind the dirty faces of children and those that are less fortunate.

Hunger is not a new phenomenon. It has been part of history through the ages. The Egyptians first recorded famine in 3500 B.C. The Roman Empire had recorded periods in it's history of starvation. The Chinese have recorded 1,800 instances of famine in the past 2,000 years. Great Britain has reported 200 famines in the last 1,000 years (Aaseng, 1991).

In the eighteenth century, France lost millions of people to starvation. When Lafayette left to come to America, children were abandoned along the road because their parents couldn't afford to feed them, (Smith, 1987). Also during the eighteenth century, between 1848 and 1854, Ireland's potato crop failed. Its population was reduced to half. In Bengal, India, one-tenth of the people died of starvation in the 1800's. China lost 9 to 13 million people in the late 1800s due to hunger and it's related causes (Aaseng, 1991).

The early 1900s were a time of war. In 1914 World War I was occurring. Many countries were devastated because of the war and many people suffered misfortune. Germany allocated bread tickets in early 1915, Britain started rationing in 1917, every European nation began regulating consumption during those years. Each country used trial and error to

develop a policy or program for consumption but not until shortages had become severe. There was much hardship and disarray, (Newsweek, 1940).

The 1920s began with people having a substandard amount of food. “The standard of diet in Europe is very low – in Europe as a continent. It is higher in England than it was before the war, for the poorer class. But that is largely a question of government subsidy. Everywhere in Europe where the government is not paying for the food and giving it away, the standard of living is very much reduced; and in most countries even where the government is paying for food and giving it away, the same conditions exist,” (Taylor, 1921, p. 4). Europe, not including Russia, consumed about 80 percent of the bread grain than it had before the war. People consumed less animal products than before the war. There was an increase in vegetables in people’s diets, which are poor in calories. Europeans suffered a loss in bodyweight and food was scarce. The Germans were not especially heavy consumers of meats; they did not consume as much meat as Americans or the British. They were massive consumers of fat. In 1920 the German diet was very low in fat though, (Taylor 1921).

The populations were increasing cereal intake dramatically. In Poland and Austria in 1920, the people had a diet of cereal like Japan had before the war. The European diet had become full of cereal. Great Britain had raised its intake of cereal from 37 percent before the war to 50 percent of their total calories from cereal. In France it went from 50 to 60 percent. Italy was at 60 percent and had risen to 70 percent. The Italian crop of maize in 1920, was good, as well as, in the Balkans and it was expected that Southern Europeans would increase maize in their diets, (Taylor, 1921).

The United Nation’s Food and Agriculture Organization completed a study/survey called the World Food Survey. It found that in the 1930s only

one-sixth of the population of the earth lived in countries having a per-capita food supply of 3,000 calories per day. The countries were northwestern European countries and New World countries in middle latitudes. For half of the global population though, the food supplies were 2,250 calories or less. The people were from Asiatic and tropical countries. Their diets were short in protein, especially from animal sources, and short in recommended amounts of vitamins and minerals, (DeGraff, 1951).

The amounts of calories available for consumption may be deceiving. There are variations in the amounts that were wasted. The waste may be as much as one-sixth of what is available because of waste in the store, kitchen or at the table. Therefore, what is available for consumption and what is actually consumed may be of a tremendous difference, (DeGraff, 1951).

The Food and Agriculture Organization projected world food needs from 1935 to 1960. It was shown that there would be a need for an increase of 90 percent in calories over the time period to meet the goals of adequate feeding. Two-fifths of this was projected for increases in population and three-fifths for dietary improvements. They wanted a 21 percent increase in cereals, 27 percent increase in roots and tubers, a 12 percent increase in sugar, a 34 percent increase in fats, 163 percent increase in fruits and vegetables, 46 percent in meat, and 100 percent increase in milk. The goals were very high and world food production had to be increased significantly, (DeGraff, 1951).

Many European countries were prepared for rationing when World War II began. They were hopeful to eliminate the problems that occurred during WW I. "Germans received their ration cards five days before the invasion of Poland. Though for months before that the nation had suffered from a chronic shortage of meat, butter, lard, coffee, wheat, sugar, eggs and

fresh fruits, the rationing system further reduced consumption of meat and butter by nearly one-half and that of other edible fats and oils by about one-fourth,” (Newsweek, 1940, p. 24). The game and fish were restricted by supply; the only “free” foods were skimmed milk, fruit and fresh vegetables. The Germans were also going to put those foods on the rationing system, (Newsweek, 1940).

The Reich was the only country where virtually all food was rationed except fish, greens and wild game. It was the only country in which the civilians were divided into three classes of rationing each with a progressively larger ration. The classes were (1) average citizens, (2) heavy workers, and (3) heaviest workers. The German restaurants also rationed their patrons. They had loud speakers in them that would blare at intervals. They told patrons that the kitchen was speaking and what food it was out of for the day, (Time, 1940).

Britain distributed ration cards in November of 1939 but were not activated till January 1940. Sugar, ham, butter and bacon were the first items restricted. The British were allowed three-fourths of a pound of sugar a week, and 3 to 4 ounces of ham, butter, and bacon. Eventually, the bacon was replaced with cured mutton called “macon.” The butter was replaced with “nutter” the national butter of Britain, (Newsweek, 1940).

Europe’s neutral countries had or were preparing to do rationing at this time. The Yugoslav Government was preparing for rationing. Bulgaria already had rationing and had three meatless days a week. Hungary already had rationed flour, oil, butter, cooking fats and sugar. Iceland had rationed cereals, bread, sugar and coffee. Denmark, the Netherlands, Estonia and Latvia rationed sugar. The Swiss Government issued cards for a two months supply of food and urged people to buy it immediately. In Italy food cards

were going to be distributed by mid-January 1940 as a precautionary measure. Coffee which was already prohibited since the war began would be available in limited quantities, (Newsweek, 1940).

Information from Russia was from captured Soviet prisoners. They spoke of having little food. Before Russia censored the press, Moscow correspondents reported butter was virtually unobtainable, milk was scarce, and canned goods were hard to get except for some very expensive Japanese crab. Moscow had a bread scandal. People had to stand in lines for hours to get bread, (Time, 1940).

Italians had a diet that was restricted but it had been since Benito Mussolini, their leader had claimed his policy of self-sufficiency. Rationing continued by the State controlling the prices. The prices were adjusted so the average Italian would buy and eat only what the Dictator wanted them to. Olive oil was very high so many people used cottonseed oil. The Italians ate 50,000,000 rabbits a year because the Dictator ordered them farmed. The Dictator did distribute ration cards but at that time they were for coffee, (Time, 1940).

France was agriculturally self-sufficient. They had not restricted consumption. France's only shortage was coffee, but they had seized a German supply of 4,000 pounds of coffee from a ship, (Newsweek, 1940). Another country where foods were not scarce was Finland. Finland exported \$12,000,000 in dairy products before the war so they had a lot of dairy products to eat. Finland had been 100 percent self-sufficient in potatoes and meat and 87 percent self-sufficient in all cereals. In December of 1939, the Lapp reindeer herdsman rounded up the reindeer so the Finns had potentially eight million pounds of meat on reserve, (Time, 1940). The only thing that was forbidden in Finland was the smorgasbord, which is a

lavish outlay of food, (Newsweek & Time, 1940).

The average diet in 1950 was of lower quality than the prewar diet. In the 1950s there was still reports in the news columns about hunger, malnutrition and starvation affecting large numbers of persons. “Aside from abnormalities and disruptions of normal food supplies is the further fact that much of the world’s population has, at best, a diet grossly substandard when measured against western ideas of nutritional adequacy. Out-and-out starvation is periodic and localized. In the sense of sufficient calories to sustain life and at least limited physical activity, the whole of the world’s population is normally fed. If modern nutritional standards are correct, malnutrition must be widespread,” (DeGraff, 1951, p. 412).

Africa and South America have had numerous times of starvation (Aaseng, 1991). In 1984, the African countries of Mali, Mauritania, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Ethiopia were experiencing famine and conditions were expected to worsen because there had been no rainfall for three years (Leinwand, 1985).

Droughts and other weather calamities, in 1988, crippled harvest in the U.S., Canada, the Soviet Union and Argentina. The worldwide grain stores were at their lowest levels since the 1970s. The grain harvests in 1989 added enough grain to the reserves to feed the world’s citizens for only 54 days. The director of the U.N.’s Food & Agriculture Organization, stated, that the world’s food supplies were at a crucial turning point and that more bad weather could completely deplete supplies and cause a food crisis, (Smith, 1989). Many experts believed food safety was not of the greatest concern but food shortages over the next several decades. The population has continued to grow but production is not growing fast enough according to Peter Newhouse, a food expert with FAO in Rome, (Smith, 1989).

The middle 1980s, the countries of India, Indonesia, Mexico and China had grain production hit a plateau. Shortages in Africa, Asia and Latin America forced those countries to increase imports between 1980 and 1988. In the years of 1986, 1987 worldwide production of grain fell short of demand. Since 1986 grain production dropped 9.5 percent from a 1,682 million metric ton level. Reserve grains had to be used. Grain production in 1988 fell 25 percent failing to meet demands for the first time since records were kept. Economists at the Department of Agriculture in the U.S. point out that despite the shortages and famine in certain regions, the rise of agricultural productivity over the last 30 years is a miracle, (Smith, 1989).

In 1980s, at least 700 million of the world's population of 5 billion suffered from a serious shortage of food. Twice as many people also did not have an adequate diet with the required amount of nutrients to sustain normal life activities (Aaseng, 1991).

The 1990s brought warnings of a prolonged era of global food scarcity because of agricultural estimates. Global grain prices were high because global grain reserves were low. There was a good crop in 1994 in the United States. Due to such a good harvest in 1994, the U.S. government put many acres for corn and wheat on reserve. There was a high demand for exports after that and there were bad weather conditions. There was not grain going into the supply and exports were draining it. The U.S. corn crop in 1995 was expected to be higher. The total world production of grain of corn, rice and wheat was estimated to be higher by six percent. We will have a problem feeding a growing population going into the next century. The food production capabilities have increased though, through improved seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and methods of farming, (Samuelson, 1996).

Hunger in the neighboring countries or those across the oceans may

be easier to find than in our own country. Hunger has been a part of the American history as well as it has been in other countries. Hunger has not been a social issue because it was part of everyone's life in the beginning of our country. It was a hardship that was common in America and not thought of as out of the ordinary. As our country and society has grown, our country has progressed through many stages of development. We have become a nation that has used its resources to make ourselves strong, wealthy and one of the most powerful nations in the world. Yet, we still have battled with the ghost of hunger. It has been hidden in our country throughout history and is lurking in our country, sometimes unseen, sometimes hidden because of pride; sometimes it has reached a point that those that are enduring it have to reach out.

In 1920, the United States had enough wheat in this country to sustain an over-normal wheat consumption without restrictions and still sell Europe 240,000,000 bushels of grain. In the West, there was a large crop of coarse grains. There was a bumper crop of corn. There was, however, a scarcity of animals, so there could not be a large production of animal products. There was an enormous consumption of fruits and vegetables, at all seasons of the year from all over the globe, (Taylor, 1921).

The image that depicts America in the 1930s was that of people selling apples for a few pennies to buy food. The 1930s had widespread hunger. There was high unemployment "and 28 percent of American people had no income at all. Those who worked were often paid starvation wages. People could not afford to buy food even at the low prices that then prevailed," (Leinwand, 1985, p. 6). People fought over contents of garbage cans. In harbor cities, mothers waited for rotten fruits and vegetables to be discarded from ships. "In Pennsylvania some country people ate wild roots

and dandelions. In Kentucky they chewed violet tops, wild onions, forget-me-nots, wild lettuce, and weeds that were accustomed fodder of grazing cattle,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 7).

People lived in “Hooverilles,” named after President Hoover, which were shanties by railroad tracks or under bridges. They were the homeless. Fortune magazine called these people the “wandering population,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 5). The drifters were former bankers, engineers, farmers, and sharecroppers, (Leinwand, 1985).

In New York City’s public schools, it was reported by the Department of Public Health that one-fifth of the children were malnourished. “The secretary of American Friends Service told a congressional committee that in the mining counties of Ohio, West Virginia, Illinois, Kentucky and Pennsylvania over 90 percent of the children were afflicted with “drowsiness, lethargy, sleepiness and mental retardation,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 7)

In the early 1940s, several studies revealed that American children were not well nourished. In Vermont 85 percent of children showed healed rickets; in New York a study was completed and 21 percent of high school students from low-income families had less than two-thirds of the daily calorie requirements needed; in North Carolina, 24 percent of the children examined, had low vitamin C levels and swollen gums. When men were recruited or drafted into or for the armed services during World War II, it was found that many of the men had nutritional deficiencies thus they were rejected for the service. As a result of the Second World War there was a food shortage (Leinwand, 1985).

Time magazine in November of 1945, printed information from the Department of Agriculture report. The U.S. farms had been untouched by

the war, it was a cornucopia land. It was predicted that in 1946 citizens would probably eat better than before during a time of plenty. The report was positive. It stated, “Plentiful supplies of most foods are in prospect...More ice cream, cheese, condensed and evaporated milk, fluid cream, canned vegetables, fresh and frozen fish will be available. Eggs and fluid milk will continue plentiful...Chicken, turkey, sweet potatoes, cereal products will continue substantially the same...Supplies of some meats and fats will be larger than before the war...Sugar supplies should improve..” (Time, 1945, p. 21). It was forecasted that the average citizen would get more food of all kinds than they did in 1945 and probably more than 1944, which was more than before the war. “The only remaining shortages will be in pork, high-grade beef, butter, sugar and canned fish – where there will not be enough to satisfy the demand at present price and prosperity levels,” (Time, 1945, p. 21).

The first weeks of April 1946, brought a scare to some Americans. In early April, “the nation last week was face to face with the greatest shortage of wheat, meat and butter in its history. The facts, not even approached during the peak war-time shortages,” Newsweek, 1946, p. 29). The nations largest wheat market, Kansas City, had its slowest day on April 9, 1946. In 43 years of history, besides the flood of 1903, the market never had so little amount of grain arrive from the farms, (Newsweek, 1946).

The cattle market, in Chicago, received its lowest delivery of cattle in 36 months. Swift & Co. which was the biggest packer, slaughtered no cattle on Thursday, April 11, 1946. For that entire week they only slaughtered 270 head against 4,103 head the same week in 1945. It was suspected that the available cattle were going to the black market, (Newsweek, 1946).

Butter production was at its lowest level in 25 years. It had fallen one-third compared with 1945. For 1946, it was estimated that 840,000,000 pounds would be produced or six pounds per person versus eight pounds per person in 1945 and 14 pounds per person in 1941. Again the black market was blamed. Much of the milk was made into cheese. The farmers could get more money for the cheese and when making cheese, they made more end product from the same amount of the raw product-milk. They sold the cheese per pound for a higher price than they could get for the butter-so they made cheese. This created the butter shortages but there were not the stockpiles created by over-production, (Newsweek, 1946).

In 1959, there were 40 million Americans, which was 22 percent of the population at that time, that lived in poverty. Poverty was defined as three times the economy food plan of the Department of Agriculture, (Dict. Of Amer. Hist, 1996).

Three decades had passed by the time Lyndon Baines Johnson had become President. Johnson told congress, in 1964, “There are millions of Americans – one fifth of our people – who have not shared in the abundance which has been granted to most of us, and on whom the gates of opportunity have been closed,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 8). In the 1960s, 40 to 50 million people were poor and hungry. The Citizens’ Board of Inquiry did a study of Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States. The report was released in 1968 and revealed that hunger and malnutrition did exist in America. Also it was increasing in severity and intensity from year to year, (Leinwand, 1985).

“The Citizens’ Board of Inquiry report revealed the following facts about hunger in the 1960s:

- Substantial numbers of infants who survive the hazards of birth and live through the first month die from malnutrition between the second month and their second birthday.
- Lack of adequate protein between the ages of six months and a year-and-a-half causes permanent and irreversible brain damage to some children.
- Nutritional anemia, stemming primarily from protein and iron deficiencies, is commonly found in 30 to 70 percent of children from poverty backgrounds.
- Teachers report children who came to school without breakfast, who are too hungry to learn and who are in such pain that they must be taken home or sent to the school nurse.
- Mothers in region after region report that the cupboard is bare, sometimes at the beginning of the month, sometimes throughout the month, and sometimes only during the last week of the month.
- Doctors personally testify to case after case of premature death, infant deaths, and vulnerability to secondary infection, all of which are attributed to or indicative of malnutrition.
- In some communities, people band together to share what little food they have, living a hand-to-mouth existence.
- The aged living alone often subsist on foods that provide inadequate sustenance.”

(Leinwand, 1985, p. 9)

“The report also found that 14 million Americans were going to bed every night without enough food to keep them healthy,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 8).

In April of 1968, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, compared hunger in America with African and Latin American conditions of hunger. He stated he saw “swollen bellies, crippled bodies, vacant stares of hopelessness and despair in the nation which contains half the worlds wealth; among negro cotton choppers in the delta of Mississippi, among white former coal miners in Eastern Kentucky, among migrant workers in the San Joaquin Valley of California, among the Indians of Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma. Starvation in this land of enormous wealth is nothing short of indecent,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 9).

President Richard Nixon, in 1969, addressed Congress, “he said: Something very like the honor of America is at issue...the moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time. It is a moment to act with vigor; it is a moment to be recalled with pride,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 10). Also in 1969, Nixon, called the White House Conference on Hunger. There were 10 to 15 million hungry poor people and 10 million more needing some form of nutritional help (Leinwand, 1985).

The earlier reports released from the Field Foundation of widespread hunger and malnutrition inspired many efforts to create programs and policies to terminate hunger. The Field Foundation in 1979, declared hunger was under control in America (Lochhead, 1988).

The decade of the 1980s brought controversy and questions of denial about hunger in America. Politicians and special interest groups both gathered information supporting or contradicting the certainty that hunger did exist in the strongest nation in the world. At conferences, meetings, subcommittee, and committee meetings of special interest groups, the House of Representatives and the Senate, surveys and questions were being formulated about, to what extent hunger was present in America.

The 1982 Conference of Mayors reported that there was a serious need for food in the cities that were surveyed. In August of 1983, President Reagan, named a task force to do a no-holds-barred study of the problem of hunger. Bread for the World, a Christian citizens' lobby, which works on hunger issues released information in September 1983. The data was, due to budget cuts, 1 million people were dropped from programs, 17 million people had benefits reduced and the reductions were to be permanent. "About 80 % of the cuts in food stamps were at the expense of families living below the official government poverty line," (Leinwand, 1985, p. 12).

Senator Edward M. Kennedy made a report on December 22, 1983, to the Committee on Labor & Human Resource of the United States Senate. The Senator reported that "hunger in America is overwhelming. There is clear, undeniable, authoritative evidence of widespread and increasing hunger in America," (Leinwand, 1985, p. 13). The Kennedy Report also found; "(1) for the first time since the 1960s, perhaps since the Great Depression (1930s), hunger is on the rise in America; (2) the principal causes of the problem are the recession of 1981-1982 and the simultaneous cut backs in funds for the basic federal nutrition programs; (3) hunger is not a new phenomenon in America, but it is one problem we know how to solve," (Leinwand, 1985, p. 13).

Information released with the Kennedy Report also included data on the increasing growth of hunger. It reported that 350 emergency food programs had increases of 75 to 400 percent participation. The San Francisco Bay area had a 200-400 percent increase in the needy. The cities of Pittsburg and Detroit reported 300 to 400 percent increase in people using services from 1979 to 1983. In the Minneapolis-St.Paul area, since 1982 there was a 150-400 percent increase in emergency food assistance above

1981 (Leinwand, 1985).

In the same month that Senator Kennedy released the information that warranted hunger was very evident in this country, Edwin Meese made opposing statements. In December of 1983, Edwin Meese, stated during an interview, “I’ve heard a lot of anecdotal stuff, [about hunger], but I haven’t heard any authoritative figures.” Meese denied that hunger exists in America as a statistical, identifiable problem and went on to say that based upon his “considerable information” many people at soup kitchens for free meals did not need to be there,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 12).

Edwin Meese was the presidential counsel. The staff that he supervised included the Office of Policy Development, and the Office of Planning and Evaluation. The responsibility of this segment of White House staff was to prepare policy options and proposals for the President to consider. (CQ, 1996). “As Counselor to the President he coordinates the business of the Cabinet, plays an important role in the formulation of both domestic and foreign policy, and acts as a key spokesman for the Administration,” (Current Biography, 1982, p. 285).

January 1984 the President’s Task Force on Food Assistance released a report. The report revealed, “General claims of widespread hunger can neither be positively refuted or definitively proved. We have not been able to substantiate allegations of rampant hunger. There is no evidence that widespread undernutrition is a major health problem in the United States,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 13). There was no official count of those that were hungry because they used indirect means of gathering information. They used extent of poverty, the number of people seeking food assistance and those people who could but were not participating in food assistance and those people whose food stamps ran out before the end of the month. The

task force report found that the fore mentioned “do not accurately indicate the extent of the hunger problem.” The report concluded: “Since general claims of widespread hunger can neither be positively refuted nor definitively proved it is likely that hunger will remain as an issue on our national policy agenda for an indefinite future. The report did not deny the existence of hunger in America, but it did oppose an alarmist view of the problem,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 13).

Another report released in 1984, from the Citizens’ Commission on Hunger supported the Kennedy Report. The study was based in New England. The report emphasized that hunger is in America. “Thousands of our citizens face the daily drama of trying to find food for themselves and their children. Elderly people resort to a diet of cereal for extended periods of time when they have anything at all. Mothers give their children what food they have in the home and then eat whatever is left. Unemployed men stand in bread lines with children in their arms hoping for a bowl of soup or a roll. This is America in 1984,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 14).

There also was hunger in every state investigated and it was widespread and increasing. Malnutrition was evident as well. The report continued to state, “Hunger in America is no longer confined to the traditional poor or to ethnic minorities...hunger is no longer confined to the South or to Indian reservations or to Appalachia...It exists in cities and rural areas. It exists in middle-class suburbs. It brings together in a unique manner diverse groups of citizens: elderly...children and infants...parents who cannot find work...homeless people...formerly middle class women whose jobs ended...former executives who lost their jobs...unemployed factory workers,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 14). Hunger had touched many.

The Harvard School of Public Health, in 1984, investigated hunger in

New England. In their report, they found that hunger was getting worse, not better. It was believed that it was effecting those people who did not recover from the recession of the early 1980s (Leinwand, 1985).

Furthermore, in 1984, Leon E. Panetta, Representative from California and Chairman of House Agricultural Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition participated in a tour. Mr. Panetta “found hunger to be a serious problem...Everywhere we went, we saw and heard that the suffering was very real and more widespread than at any time in recent memory,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 11).

A Physician Task Force on Hunger in America released a report in February 1985 called *Hunger in America: The Growing Epidemic*. The study after a year-long investigation found, “Clinics in poor areas reported cases of kwashiorkor and marasmus, two “third world diseases of advanced malnutrition, “ as well as vitamin deficiencies, diabetes, “stunting,” “wasting” and other health problems traced to inadequate food,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 20). From statistical data of the United States Bureau of Census and United States Department of Agriculture information was collected. The national poverty line was used as an income level determination point in conjunction of those not receiving food assistance. It was determined that there were 20 million Americans that might be hungry for some period of time each month, (Leinwand, 1985).

The task force also found that “Second Harvest, an organization of food banks, reported a 700 percent increase in food distribution since 1980. The task force concluded that in 1985 hunger has returned as a serious problem across this nation. To be sure, hunger is not yet as bad as two decades ago, but the situation has greatly deteriorated. The task force estimated that it would cost about 7 billion dollars a year to eliminate

hunger,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 22).

A 1986 charity event to raise funds for the hungry was staged. Hands Across America was inspired by the Physician Task Force Report. It made many Americans aware of the problem facing their fellow countrymen and generated reserves for organizations to disperse. Soon after this event though, Policy Review, noted that television reporters went out to find examples of the hungry. “ABC’s Rebecca Chase scoured the small towns of Mississippi for days, sometimes traveling through places where many or most of the people were on food stamps. But she could find no hungry people. “While there are certainly needy people out there, the evidence shows that we have a food-stamp program that works pretty well,” (Lochhead, 1988, p. 118).

Richard Freeman, a Harvard economist affiliated with the National Bureau of Economic Research, held the opinion that the growth in the number of the food banks and soup kitchens did not constitute a real measure of hunger. The numbers of recipients increased at the pantries, but according to Freeman, “If I announce that we’re going to have free cheese tomorrow a lot of people will stand in line and get free cheese. These are no doubt poor people, but not necessarily hungry people,” (Lochhead, 1988, p.118).

Another individual, a sociology professor from Tennessee, Dan McMurry has meandered around the country. He poses as a homeless person to investigate hunger. “He found that in Nashville,” Tennessee, which is the capital of the state, “charitable organizations serve as many as nine group meals each day. He stated, “I gained four pounds in five days just wandering around trying to find out what services were available. There is a world of food out there,” (Lochhead, 1988, p. 118).

The U. S. Conference of Mayors (1987) surveyed 26 cities and the need for food assistance had increased by 18 percent in the last year. Originally a temporary project, “Let’s Help,” in Topeka, Kansas began in 1982. It became a permanent institution in the capital and served more than 600 meals a day. Between January to October 1986, “Help,” distributed 6,000 food baskets. During 1987, 12,000 baskets were distributed during January to October. Another group in Brooklyn, New York, “Neighbors Together,” served 75 meals when it began in 1982. In 1987-1988 it served more than 300 meals per day. New York City had 30 private hunger organizations in 1982. There were 500 organizations in 1987-1988 dispensing 1.2 million meals each month. In an average 30 day month that is an astonishing 40,000 meals per day (Commonweal, 1988).

In the late 1980s, shelters for the homeless were serving increasing numbers of working people, including families with young children; soup kitchens and food pantries were filling at the end of each month with people whose wages didn’t or couldn’t last all month. Those people that received benefits were left hungry. An example of this was that some of the elderly and disabled individuals on food stamps received \$10 per month. Broken down, \$.10 per meal was allotted to these individuals for each meal. There was still the need for food assistance and long waiting lines remained. Ms. Nancy Amidei, a former director of the Food Research and Action Center wrote, “It’s time to stop asking for more soup kitchens and pantries, and to call ourselves and our neighbors to account for actions that cause -and tolerate- so much avoidable hunger,” (Amidei, 1987, p. 51).

Dr. Larry Brown, Head of the Harvard Task Force on Hunger, wrote in 1987, “We have discovered an epidemic of hunger in the U.S. born out of political ideology and government policy, a man-made disease caused by

leaders, who... stood firmly at the helm and purposely dismantled programs that had been successful at preventing widespread hunger in our nation for years, “ (Commonmeal, 1988, p. 5).

There were millions effected by hunger in the 1980s. The Food Research and Action Center, an organization devoted to the study of hunger and malnutrition, insists that those who are forced to stand on food lines constitute, statistical, factual proof that hunger is widespread in America,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 11). The hungry of the 1980s were those people that had temporary situations like relocation, job loss or unemployment or financial emergencies. The unemployed that had assets did not qualify for food stamps. Other individuals or families who used up their food stamps before the end of the month may have had nothing to eat. The number of people going to food lines was increasing, even though there had been reports that hunger was not on the rise. Many individuals believed there was poverty in America and that many children and adults went to bed hungry (Leinwand, 1985).

April of 1995, the U.S. Bureau of the Census did the Current Population Survey, additionally there was a Food Security Supplement. The Food Security Supplement was the first comprehensive measurement of food insecurity and hunger. The survey was with 45,000 households and was a national representation of U.S. households. The Study was undertaken by several agencies which included the Food and Consumer Services (FCS) under the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Center for Health Statistics/Center for Disease Control and Prevention (NCHS) of the Department of Health and Human Services, academic and private research experts in food security and hunger measurement. The responsibility of the various groups and individuals was to develop a standard measure of food

insecurity and hunger for the United States for experts to use at the national, state and local levels, (Hamilton, 1997).

The study was actually of food insecurity beginning in April 1994 and ending in April 1995. The study used a sophisticated questionnaire, statistical measurements and estimates of food insecurity and hunger. A simpler measure was formulated to classify the U.S. households. The categories included: food secure, food insecure without hunger, food insecure with moderate hunger, and food insecure with severe hunger. Food security is “assured access to enough food, the food should be nutritionally adequate, it should be safe, and the household should be able to obtain it through normal channels.” The word “enough” is important and it was the perception of the adult in the household, which was interviewed, (Hamilton, 1997, p. 2).

The survey asked questions about five types of household food conditions, events, or behaviors. The questions addressed specific time frames of within the past 12 months or the past 30 days and how often the condition has occurred in that time frame. The conditions consisted of;

- “Anxiety that the household food budget or food supply may be insufficient to meet basic needs.
- Perceptions that the food eaten by the household members was inadequate in quality or quantity.
- Reported instances of reduced food intake, or consequences of reduced food intake (such as the physical sensation of hunger or reported weight loss) for adults in the household.
- Reported instances of reduced food intake or its consequences for children in the household.

- Coping actions taken by the household to augment their food budget or food supply (such as borrowing from friends or family or getting food from emergency food pantries).”

(Hamilton, 1997, p. 4)

In further analysis, the results of the research agreed with other research that characterized food insecurity as a “managed process” that proceeds through several stages of severity. “The households first note serious inadequacy in their food supply, feel anxiety about the insufficiency of their food to meet basic needs, and make adjustments to their food budget and food served. As the situation becomes more severe, adults experience reduced food intake and hunger, but they spare the children this experience. In the third stage, children also suffer reduced food intake and hunger and adults’ reductions in food intake are more dramatic,” (Hamilton, 1997, p. 5).

Based on the behavioral stages of the managed process of food insecurity and hunger the four categories of food security were defined.

- **Food secure** – Food secure households show no or minimal evidence of food insecurity.
- **Food insecure without hunger** – Food insecurity is evident in the households’ concerns and in adjustments to household food management, including reduced quality of diets. Little or no reduction in household members’ food intake is reported.
- **Food insecure with moderate hunger** – Food intake for adults in the household has been reduced to an extent that it implies that adults have repeatedly experienced the physical sensation of hunger. Reductions are not observed at this stage for children in the household.

- **Food insecure with severe hunger** – Households with children have reduced the children’s food intake to an extent that it implies that the children have experienced the physical sensation of hunger. Adults in the household with and without children have repeatedly experienced more extensive reductions in food intake at this stage.

(Hamilton, 1997, p. 5)

The measurement models were tested with three different population groups: households with children; those without children but with one or more elderly members (age 60 or older); and those with neither children nor elderly members. Tests showed that a single scale can be used with all three populations, (Hamilton, 1997).

The results of the study revealed that a majority of the American households were food secure. Approximately 88.1 percent of the 100 million households were food secure and 11.9 percent were food insecure. Those households that were food insecure, 7.8 percent were food insecure without hunger; food insecure with hunger was 3.3 percent; unfortunately the households that were found insecure with severe hunger was 0.8 percent. There are 800,000 households classified as food insecure with severe hunger. Another 3,300,000 households have some hunger. Together there are 11,900,000, almost twelve million, households in America that experience some level of food insecurity, (Hamilton, 1997).

The study revealed that poverty is related to food security but it is not exacted. Not all poor households were insecure. More than one third of poor households were food insecure and 8 percent of the households that have above poverty incomes were food insecure but they have near-poverty incomes, (Hamilton, 1997).

The state of Minnesota in 1996, had a statewide program that is an advocate for public policies which alleviate hunger and attacks its causes. It is called the Minnesota Food Education and Resource Center, (MNFERC) housed by the Urban Coalition. The MNFERC produces reports and surveys that reflect the extent of need and the factors related to hunger from food shelf users. The MNFERC did a survey in 1995, previous studies had been conducted in 1990, and 1985 at Minnesota food shelves. The 1995 survey was of 15,300 clients using food shelves and on-site meal programs around the state. Most of the surveys were at the food shelves; 1,000 surveys were filled out at the meal programs. The meal program was added to the 1995 survey for the first time, (Rode, 1996).

The survey revealed that two-thirds of food shelf households were families with children. More than half of those families had children under six years old. One-third of the households using the programs indicated they had paid employment as their major income source including AFDC and Social Security. Many working Minnesotans must rely on food shelves to supplement their food budgets because the wages they received was not enough to support a family without getting food assistance. The survey disclosed that 55 percent of the people that ate at the meal programs did so because they had no money for food. The households of people with children eating at the meal sites were 37 percent. Many participants' only meal for the day was at the site, which was 20 percent of the people. Fifty-three percent of the food shelf respondents reported adults in the household had skipped meals in the past month because of lack of money to buy food. There had been children, 25 percent, that had skipped meals because of no money for food. There was a reported 85 percent of the families that had below poverty level incomes. It was estimated that 251,600 people made 3.1

million visits to the food shelves in 1995. The short term recommendations or solutions is that food stamps, school breakfast and lunch programs continue to serve low income families to help them meet their nutritional needs, (Rode, 1996).

There was an increase in hunger in the United States since 1990. One of the indicators that there was an increase in hunger was the growing reliance on food stamps. Bread for the World, in its 1996 report stated that prior to the 1990 recession, there were 20 million Americans in the food stamp program. There was a drop in the numbers during 1995, there is still approximately 26 million who participated as of May 1996. Half of the participants in the program are children, almost 13 million kids are in need. Mr. Zy Weinberg, director of inner city food access programs at Public Voice for Food and Health Policy in Washington, D.C., states that the above “shows up the falseness of the image of food stamp recipients as lazy adults. Overall, there’s no starvation but there are tens of millions of Americans who have difficulty getting enough to eat, especially children,” (America, 1996, p. 3).

Another indicator of growing hunger was the increase in poor Americans relying on food pantries and soup kitchens. Second Harvest did a study of 181 food banks from around the country. The organization found 26 million people rely on the food banks. Three-fourths of the people that used the food banks had annual incomes under \$10,000. Over 35 percent of the participants were employed. Christine Vladimiroff, president and C.E.O. of Second Harvest, stated, “since the study was conducted in 1993, the number of working poor relying upon pantries and soup kitchens has increased,” (America, 1996, p. 3). Many people have used both food stamps and the food banks to meet their needs. Second Harvest found that 60

percent of the people that have gone to the soup kitchens and food pantries had been receiving food stamps for a year or more, (America, 1996).

The demands on the emergency resources were so demanding that some food pantries found that they were categorizing the requests. They began portioning out limited supplies to the neediest of the needy. Several agencies, pantries and organizations had to shorten their hours or put less into each bag of food or even turn people away. The New York City Coalition Against Hunger, reported, beginning in 1995, the soup kitchens and food banks, in the boroughs of New York, turned away over 50,000 people per month. The director of the coalition, Judith Walker, released information from a survey in February 1996, which found the demand for emergency food increased by almost 20 percent. The need for food pantries when they became known in the 1970s was thought to be temporary. When Ronald Reagan was elected President, there were 35 food pantries, in 1996 there were 800 food pantries. Walker believed that this was reflective of the cuts in social services and aid to those that are needy, (America, 1996).

In the shipyard city of Newport News, Virginia, the regional unemployment rate was low in 1997. Within the past year, the food pantry had a 69 percent increase in the number of persons requesting help. Greeley, Colorado, which is north of Denver, at the end of June 1997, reported that the demand for emergency food was up 50 percent. Not only did Second Harvest find increased demand at their facilities but Share Our Strength also did. Share Our Strength, provided funding for more than 500 food-based groups in Washington. Bill Shore, the executive director, found many of the agencies supported to be having increases. "Phil Shanholtzer, a U.S. Department of Agriculture spokesman, says the federal agency is hearing anecdotal evidence of food-demand increases through its state and regional

offices,” (Rivera, 1997, p. 38).

A Tufts University study found that the government is distributing 13.4 percent of publicly distributed food, which is down from 1991 in which it was 22.2 percent, the private sector will have to make up the difference. It was estimated that the difference would/will be 24.5 billion pounds of food between 1997 until 2003, (Rivera, 1997).

The state of New Jersey, has at any one time, 292,000 children under 12 that are hungry or at the risk of hunger. Over 7 percent of the children in New Jersey live in extreme poverty. The diets of the children lack essential vitamins and minerals, which come from fresh produce, (New Jersey, 1997).

The Catholic Charities USA, found that they had an increase of 14 percent in the number of people receiving food as of their December 10, 1997 report. Elizabeth Kelliher, director of a food pantry in the Spanish Harlem section of New York, had requests double between June 1997 till January 1998. In Idaho, where benefit eligibility limitations for welfare has gone into effect, there has been increases in requests for food assistance. Charities or organizations in Boise had escalating calls and the fastest growing group seeking food was women and children. In Virginia, Michigan and Wisconsin, where welfare reform at state and federal levels has been enacted, food pantries have had increases. Hunger in 1998 was still evident and it was expected that during 1998 the requests for food assistance would continue to rise, (America, 1998).

After the 1995 study conducted in collaboration by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the Food and Nutrition Service and the interagency groups, data collection continued. The National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990, enables the research to continue. The Congress, recognized the need to assess the nutritional well-being of the U. S.

population by obtaining data on the prevalence of food insecurity or food insufficiency in America. The Act has a ten-year plan incorporated. The (CPS) Current Population Survey supplement was utilized in September 1996, April 1997, August 1998 and April 1999. The same content was on the questionnaire but it was redesigned in August 1998 to improve screener efficiency and respondent burden. When the questionnaire was redesigned, the USDA Economic Research Service (ERS) became responsible for the food-security data collection, (USDA, HFSUS, 1999).

Between the years of 1995 and 1998, the trend during that period shows that food security in U.S. households improved through 1997, but then declined between August 1997 and August 1998. Preliminary figures indicated that between August 1997 and August 1998, 89.8 percent of all households were food secure. There were 93 million U.S. households that had access at all times to enough food for an active healthy life without using emergency means or extraordinary measures. Those households consisted of 230 million individuals. During the same times period, there were 10.5 million households that were food insecure, which was 10.2 percent of all households in the U.S. This means 36 million people didn't have access to enough food to fully meet their needs without using emergency food sources or using exceptional means to fulfill their food needs. Children are 40 percent of the group that are food insecure which is 14.4 million individuals, (USDA, HFSUS, 1999)

As found, there are many families and person still struggling to meet basic food needs. Of the 10.5 million that were food insecure, 3.7 million households had one or more members that were hungry at least sometime during the time period due to lack of food resources. There were 6.6 million adults and 3.4 million children that experienced hunger at some time in the

household during 1998. The households that were food insecure were the high-risk groups. Households headed by a single woman with children was 31.9 percent, Hispanic households were 21.8 percent, and Black households 20.7 percent. Households with incomes below the official poverty line made up 35.4 percent of the households. Those households that had children present had twice the rate of those that had no children. Those with children was 15.2 percent versus without at 7.2 percent. Married couples with children also had a lower rate of food insecurity of 9.6 percent, (USDA, HFSUS, 1999).

The information was analyzed geographically. It was found that insecurity prevails 14.2 percent in central cities, 10.6 percent in rural areas, 7.6 percent in suburbs and other metropolitan areas. The rates of food insecurity were highest in the West 12.2 percent, then the South with 11.1 percent, and the Midwest had 7.7 percent food insecurity. In this report the Upper-Midwest, Northwest, East, Northeast were not mentioned, (USDA, HFSUS, 1999).

The prevalence of hunger in households was 3.6 percent of all households. Again of this group a single woman headed household made up 10.4 percent, men living alone 5.6 percent, black households 8.2 percent and Hispanic 6.7 percent of households experiencing hunger. The number of households below the poverty line was 13.5 percent. Hunger is experienced most in central cities with 5.6 percent, then the West with 4.2 percent and the South with 4.0 percent of the households experiencing hunger, (USDA, HFSUS, 1999).

Overall between 1995 and 1998 there was no change in the food security of the people of our nation. The food secure households in 1995 was 89.7 percent, in 1998 it was 89.8 percent. Those insecure households

were 10.3 percent in 1995 and 10.2 percent in 1998. The number of households with evidence of hunger has declined from 3.9 percent in 1995 to 3.6 percent in 1998. The last few years brought little change in food security to those that most need it, (USDA, HFSUS, 1999).

The United States Conference of Mayors met and released a report in December 1998. The report was on hunger and homelessness of 30 cities of the nation in 1998. There were increases for emergency food in 1998 in 78 percent of the cities surveyed. There was an 84 percent increased demand for emergency food among families with children. Increased demand for food among the elderly was 67 percent in the cities. Sixty-one percent of persons requesting emergency food were children or their parents. There was 37 percent of the emergency food given to employed people. The cities surveyed had 48 percent of them have an increase in the number of facilities. The level of resources, funds, foods and volunteers has increased by 24 percent. The mayors reported that 60 percent of cities had decreases in the quantity of food that they can provide/or numbers of times a family can receive food. There is a need that has not been fulfilled. There is 21 percent demand for food that goes unmet and 18 percent of the need is among families. In 47 percent of the cities, hungry people have been turned away because of lack of resources, (Foodchain, 1999).

In May of 1999, Under Secretary, Shirley Watkins of the USDA's Food and Nutrition Services, toured Tennessee, Mississippi and Arkansas. It was called the Delta Hunger Tour. This was one of three hunger tours that Ms. Watkins had made. She previously toured California, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island,(USDA, Delta, 1999).

She attended many Town Hall meetings where she met elected officials as well as participants of various social programs. Ms. Watkins

heard information about a volunteer gleaning net work, a welfare to work program, women's shelters providing food service training and placement and other volunteer programs. She visited WIC programs, community gardens, and cooking schools where seniors learn food safety. The seniors gave Ms. Watkins feedback about their difficulties in acquiring services in the food stamp program, medical and prescription cost and nutrition programming. In Memphis, Tennessee, welfare to work participants voiced that their key to success was their ability to have access to food stamps during the transition period,(USDA, Delta, 1999).

The secretary found in Arkansas, that the food banks serving the northeastern and eastern part of the state needed to have simpler paperwork. There also was the need for continued donations of primary food items such as meat and produce. Seniors reported that they struggle on a day to day basis to have enough food. Fresh fruits and vegetables were rare. Congregate meal programs, home delivered meals and food pantries make a difference. Forrest City, AK representatives cited, the major challenges with their anti-hunger campaign and meals on wheels programs is that transportation has been a barrier, (USDA, Delta 1999).

The Undersecretary found on her tour that hunger and poverty still exist in America. Nutrition education and access to nutritional rich foods is key to the maintenance of healthy individuals. Many individuals and families are utilizing existing programs but many more could be utilizing those programs if there were not the existing barriers, (USDA, Delta, 1999).

The hungry of the 1990s were and are today those of families, single-parents with children, elderly, couples and individuals. They need not be homeless, some are though. They may hold jobs and have a home but just can not meet the financial requirements to provide housing and food for their

families. The individuals or families may be employed part-time, which would/could disqualify them for any welfare or aid. They may hold a job that pays minimum wage and does not cover all basic living expenses. They may just have fallen into a hardship and are unemployed, among many other reasons. As documented, there is an ever increasing number of individuals and households seeking assistance. In any case, those seeking assistance to combat the pangs of hunger are relying and have relied on others' sentiment and generosity.

Human societies existed in earlier times on wild foods. They gathered nuts, berries, and plants and hunted wild game for meat. If the environment and weather conditions were adverse for growing conditions, plants and animals became scarce. Food supplies were limited and the people would starve. Humans had to change their habits to meet their needs. Societies experimented to make the earth produce more plants that were favorable for consumption or produced food that they could consume. The plants that were not food bearers were ignored. People developed farming which produced more food for humans than hunting and gathering foods. There was more food so the population grew. (Aaseng, 1991).

Through the centuries the populations of the earth have continued to climb. The demand for food has increased. Unfortunately the demands for food in some parts of the world can not be met. Some countries have accelerated in the development of their societies and others have not. The countries and regions of the world have become segregated in their abilities to provide for their populations. Some of the countries of the world have advanced technology, information and resources that allow them to provide for their citizens, other countries do not and can not supply even the basic human needs of their citizens. Those countries that cannot supply their own

country with food have had to rely on developed nations to provide for them. Developed nations, not only have the burden of providing for their own populations but several other countries as well. The United States is one of a few countries that is developed, a wealthy nation, with the technology and the resources to provide many countries with relief each year.

In the early 1900s, 1914, World War I began. After several years of war many countries were in need. France, Belgium, Britain, Italy, Serbia, Greece, Roumania and other neutrals of Europe had food problems.

President Woodrow Wilson appointed Herbert Hoover, to be Federal Food Administrator. In 1919, he wrote, "America is the only quickly accessible, reservoir available for the urgent needs of France, Belgium, Britain, Italy, Serbia, Greece, Roumania and the famine-pinched neutrals of Europe.

Peace or war the American people are their Allied brothers' keepers so far as food is concerned, for the next 12 months," (Hoover, 1918, p. 242). The Americans had to supply its army, the Allied armies, and the Allied civil populations with food to maintain strength, (Hoover, 1918).

The Allies met in Europe at conferences on food supply and shipping. It was determined at the meetings the amounts of goods needed. The United States was going to ship by July 1, 1919, 2,600,000 tons of meats and fats which consisted of beef, pork, dairy, poultry and vegetable-oil products. Breadstuffs of wheat and substitutes in terms of grain of 10,400,000 tons. From the U.S. and West Indies 1,850,000 tons of sugar. Feed grains of 2,700,000 tons were shipped which were mostly army oats. These amounts were increased from July 1, 1918 by 5,730,000 total tons of food. The Allies would have and did have less than the Americans, (Hoover, 1918).

Hoover wrote, "We must maintain the health and strength of every human being among them or they will be unable to put their full strength

alongside our own in the supreme effort. At the President's direction, I have assured them that "in this common cause, we eat at a common table," and upon entering these conferences in Europe, we promised them that whatever their war-food program called for from us we should fulfill," (Hoover, 1918, p. 243).

During the year of 1918, the United States wheat production had been better than the year before but other cereal grain production was less due to drought. The U.S. imports of sugar was sufficient to remain at the consumption level it was at and still provide for the Allies. There was not a problem with coffee either as long as everyone did not overbrew. However, the tropical fruit imports did decline because of the shipping distance, (Hoover, 1918).

The Allies had been promised tremendous amounts of food and more than the previous year. Where was it to come from? Mr. Hoover asked Americans to make "a reduction in consumption and waste in the two great groups of first breadstuffs, and second, meats and fats-that is in all breads and cereals, beef, pork, poultry, dairy and vegetable-oil products. A reduction in consumption of less than one-half pound per week per person in each of these two great groups of foods would accomplish our purpose," (Hoover, 1918, p. 244). The government knew that some of the homes could already not provide more than what was needed to keep their families healthy. They felt they could not ask those people to make reductions but the majority of the homes could. It was estimated 9,000,000 people ate at hotels, restaurants, boarding houses, clubs, dining cars and other public eating places. The food consumption was felt to be higher in these places. The proprietors and employees of these facilities were asked to enforce strict codes, (Hoover, 1918).

The reduction in consumption was not looked upon as rationing but as appeal to Americans to save food. Hoover believed that people would do this voluntarily and it was considered patriotic cooperation. He wrote, “The willingness to assume individual responsibility in this matter by the vast majority is one of the greatest proofs of the character and idealism of our people, and I feel it can be constantly relied upon,” (Hoover, 1918, p. 244). With cooperation in the reduction of consumption and waste, it was hoped that the government would not have to enforce wheatless and meatless days. The government wanted a reduction in the consumption of all foodstuffs, especially the staples to supply the Allies with as much surplus as the people could provide. “It is necessary for every family in the United States to study its food budget and food ways to see if it cannot buy less, serve less, return nothing to the kitchen, and practice the gospel of the clean plate,” (Hoover, 1918, p. 244).

In 1920, the United States was sending condensed milk to Europe only as part of relief programs, (Taylor, 1921).

The American commitment of wheat for the U.S.’s relief abroad was in danger in April 1946. There were 400,000,000 bushels of wheat needed to meet the commitment. The forecast was 96,000,000 bushels short until after the July harvests. The Department of Agriculture reported that the wheat reserves were at the lowest point in five years but were disappearing at the fastest rate in history, (Newsweek, 1946).

The world food supply would be adequate if it were distributed equally among the peoples of the world. The food is not though, some countries are able to produce enough for their countries, but for various reasons, others fail to produce. Those countries that have monetary resources can buy food. The countries with valuable resources can sell raw

products or manufactured goods to acquire money for food. The problem is that the exportation of goods may not generate enough money to buy food for all the people. Another dilemma may be that they use large percents of their budgets for food and do not have enough remaining funds to improve technology to grow food or manufacture it, (Leinwand, 1985).

The United States, because of the above problems developing or Third World nations having, created legislation to help. In 1954, Public Law 480, known as the Food for Peace Program was created. “The law provides long-term credit for 20 to 40 years at low rates of interest to enable countries to buy food from the U.S. The program is designed not only to provide food relief to countries that are friendly to the United States, but also to help them help themselves by improving their own agricultural systems and economic development,” (Leinwand, 1985, p. 76).

Since the 1970s there has been gallant efforts to raise awareness and funding for hunger by the music world. There was a concert that was organized to benefit the starving in Bangladesh. Britains organized the Britain’s Band Aid; the United States did USA for Africa in which many well-known artists performed and recorded, “We Are the World,” (Smith, 1987).

A global conference on hunger was held on Nov. 30 – Dec. 1, 1993 in Washington, D.C. The World Bank hosted it. The conference was Overcoming Global Hunger – A Conference on Actions to Reduce Hunger Worldwide. There were participants from anti-poverty groups and some 70 non-governmental organizations known as NGOs. The participants concluded that hunger was/is a poverty issue and not a food supply issue. The World Bank President Lewis Preston confirmed the bank was willing to join others to mobilize financing for activities to address extreme poverty.

The NGOs agreed to work on an essential anti-poverty program. Preston stated, “Hunger and malnutrition are the most devastating problems facing the world’s poor, the Bank is determined to work forcefully with others to help these people,” (World Bank, 1994).

Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter spoke, “We know that people suffering from starvation are more likely to erupt in civil war and in a war-torn society, starvation is almost invariably prevalent. The afflictions feed on each other. In fact, we have found that peace, freedom, democracy, human rights [including the right to food], and the alleviation of human suffering are inseparable,” (World Bank, 1994). Carter also stated that there were problems in solving the world’s hunger. One of the problems is that there was a defective relationship between research emphases and practical needs in the developing world. Much of the international agricultural research centers are concentrating on basic research and less on applied research so they have become less effective, (World Bank, 1994).

Ismail Serageldin, the Bank’s Vice-President for Environmentally Sustainable Development, emphasized that the elimination of hunger and poverty will come from effective research. The Bank would support small self help credit schemes to benefit the poorest of the poor. The Bank was to give the Grameen Trust a \$2 million grant, (World Bank, 1994).

In April of 1998, Dan Glickman, Secretary of Agriculture announced that Korea could receive additional credit for commodities. Korea received the credit under the Commodity Credit Corporation’s Export Credit Guarantee Program, (GSM-102) for 1998. It gave Korea a total of \$1.5 billion in credit. Korea was going to receive \$60 million for meat, wheat \$60 million, soybeans \$100 million, corn, barley, oats, rye, sorghum and soybean meal \$130 million in credit which was then to be used on U.S.

commodities, (USDA, No. 0188.98).

In July, there were similar credit extensions offered to Pakistan and India. There had been restrictions/sanctions against these countries under the Arms Export Control Act. The President had to sign a law to remove agricultural products out from under the sanctions. Mr. Glickman stated, “Our policy has long been that food should not be used as a foreign weapon in an attempt to coerce or influence the actions of other nations. The actions of India and Pakistan required a firm response, the cutting off of credit for food purchases only hurts their consumers and our farmers,” (USDA, No. 0285.98). India received \$20 million in credit. Pakistan was extended \$250 million in credit. Pakistan is the third largest export market for U.S. wheat and since the beginning of the fiscal year has purchased \$162 million in wheat, (USDA, No. 0285.98).

August of 1998, The agriculture Secretary and Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), J. Brain Atwood, announced eligible countries for U.S. food donations. The international food assistance program is under the Agricultural Act of 1949, Section 416 (b), which authorizes overseas donations of surplus U.S. commodities. The President introduced the Food Aid Initiative in July to help reduce wheat surpluses and meet humanitarian needs abroad. The countries were chosen based on a number of factors, which included, levels of hunger and poverty, recent harvests, existing international aid and the need to avoid disruption of normal commercial sales. The countries chosen for aid were: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia, Macedonia, Bangladesh, the Caucasus region, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Honduras, Indonesia, Moldova, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Peru, the Sahel region of Africa, southern Sudan, West Africa, and Yemen, (USDA, No. 0322.98).

There was a critical need for food assistance by these countries because of civil strife and disrupted agriculture production, which created many displaced people. The actual donations were going to be announced as the agreements were signed. The USDA and USAID were going to work with private voluntary organizations in food distribution, international organizations and the regional governments to disperse the food, (USDA, No. 0322.98).

The Dominican Republic was added to the relief list at the end of September 1998. "Hurricane George inflicted severe damage on the Dominican Republic destroying homes and infrastructure, decimating crops and disrupting food supplies for tens of thousands of people," Glickman said, (USDA, No. 0397.98). The USDA donated 100,000 metric tons of wheat to the relief efforts for the recovery. Andrew Cuomo and Atwood headed a survey team of the relief efforts in the region, (USDA, No. 0397.98).

The United States Department of Agriculture announced two U.S. wheat donations to Bangladesh totaling 350,000 metric tons which is approximately 13 million bushels. The donation is part of the Food Aid Initiative. Bangladesh suffered from early and severe flooding earlier in 1998. It destroyed crops and affected 30 million people. The USDA will donate 300,000 metric tons of wheat to Bangladesh to replenish the country's food stocks and assist families in the flooded areas. The shipments were to be made mid to late November. The United States donated the other 50,000 tons of wheat to the World Food Program (WFP) which is an emergency flood relief program in Bangladesh, (USDA, No. 0435.98).

In October 1998, the Food Aid Initiative goal of allocating 2.5 million tons of wheat was met. Glickman said, "I am pleased to report that we have now allocated the full amount announced by the President. This is good news for America's farmers and good news for countries in need," (USDA, No. 0447.98). It was also reported additional countries were added to the eligibility list for the Food Aid Initiative. The countries included China, through WFP for flood relief; Tajikistan, through private voluntary organizations; Ecuador, Jordan, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka have been added to the list through government-to-government agreements, (USDA, No. 0447.98).

Also in October of 1998, the preliminary allocations were released for the Food for Peace Program for 1999. There was \$201 million earmarked for different programs. There were fourteen countries eligible. There was \$166 million allotted for commodities. The USDA will use \$10 million for agreements with private entities in 1999, which they can do because of the 1996 Farm Bill. The Food for Progress Programs will fund Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kyrgyzstan, and Russia with \$35 million. The Food for Peace program is used to support countries that have made commitments to introduce or expand free enterprise in agriculture. This could include commodity pricing, marketing, input availability, distribution and private business participation, (USDA, No. 0446.98).

Each year on October 16th, several countries of the World commemorate World Food Day. The United Nation's World Food Programme sponsors it. This last year, 1998, celebrated the 18th World Food Day, which was observed in more than 150 countries. The World Food Programme is the U.N.'s front-line agency in the fight against hunger. In 1997, relief workers fed 53 million people most of them women and children

and which included most of the world's refugees. The WFP is headquartered in Rome Italy and has enterprises in 76 nations around the world making this the largest provider of food aid in the world, (WFP, 1998).

The 1998, World Food Day, observed women, the theme was "Women Feed the World." The WFP Executive Director, Catherine Bertini said, "WFP has a strong commitment to women because they are the key to feeding the more than 8 million people caught in the trap of lifelong poverty and hunger. This year's World Food Day draws international attention to the crucial role that women play" in fighting hunger around the world. "Providing food to women puts it in the hands of those who use it for the benefit of the entire household, especially children. Women are the people in each household who are committed to ensuring that every member has access to food," (WFP, 1998). WFP implements assistance programs with the objective of giving women control of the food. In one out of three households women are the sole breadwinners. They are also the major cultivators of food in developing parts of the world. Women and young children are 75 percent of the victims of war, drought and other disasters. Seven out of ten of the world's hungry are women and girls. Bertini states, "It is important that the international community understands that women are the key to making food aid work and that donors fund programmes that directly help women," (WFP, 1998). In the United States, there are 450 national organizations with more than 20,000 community organizers that work to increase the awareness and undertake action on hunger, (WFP, 1998).

In November 1998, the Russian Government finalized an agreement with the United States. The agreement was to provide Russia with 3.1

million metric tons of food to help Russians. The agreement was worked on by Vice President Gore and at that time Prime Minister Primakov. The Russians had to agree to give the assistance to those in need and the food aid would be exempt from taxes. The 3.1 million metric tons was thought to be a minimal amount needed by Russia and the U.S. Administration was prepared to provide additional assistance if it was needed. The reason for the assistance was that Russia's grain production was projected at 52 million metric tons. This was to be the worst harvest in 50 years. The agreement that was discussed had three components. There was to be 100,000 tons of commodities distributed through non-government voluntary organizations to the most vulnerable Russians and the poor; 1.5 million metric tons of wheat was provided as a grant for needy people; 1.5 million metric tons of different commodities were to be provided under the loan program of Public Law 480, Title I, (USDA, No. 0455.98).

The Americans have provided relief to many countries throughout the history of this country. Heads of States, Kings, and Ambassadors all have asked the American people to help them in times of disaster or need. The people of the United States have provided continually on a governmental level, and voluntarily good-will basis, support for those countries monetarily and materialistically.

Sometimes it is difficult to believe that the same conditions exist in our own country. The Congress has been able to formulate several programs to help those in this country that have fallen on misfortune. Unfortunately, the government has not been able provide a program to do everything and catch everyone that has fallen through the cracks. Citizens have had to help. Public and private organizations have had to volunteer their efforts in order for our country to help more of our citizens. Together the government and

private organizations are working to provide the basic human rights that all people should be guaranteed.

During the 1930s, agricultural products fell very low in price. The farmers were unable to support themselves and pay their mortgages. There were great surpluses of food products. In 1932, Congress gave the Red Cross 40 million bushels of wheat to distribute to the needy. In 1933 and the following years the same happened. Large distributions of surplus foods continued. In 1939 the first Food Stamp Act was designed, it was to help farmers sell surplus products, (Leinwand, 1985).

The Food Stamp Program began in 1939 with a goal of extinguishing hunger and malnutrition and also as a way farmers could remove surplus food. In 1964, there was reform in the food stamp act. It was amended several times. This act was an important part of the War on Poverty in President Johnson's package of legislation. The state and local welfare agencies were going to distribute stamps or coupons to those who met certain criteria. The poor would no longer have to wait for the distribution of surplus farm goods. They could purchase foods with greater nutritional value at the local stores as long as the foods fell within the federal nutritional guidelines,(Leinwand, 1985).

Those people that support the food stamp program believe that it has had a significant impact on reducing hunger in America. In 1997, the Food Stamp Program provided food for 9 million households and 22 million people daily. The program provides an account for individuals or households with an amount of money to use to acquire food. The 1997 program provided \$19 billion for those in need, (Cason, 1999).

The Food Stamp Program does have faults according to some. Food stamps are not used by as many people as could be because of limitations on

participation, lack of information about the program and inadequate funding. Another problem is that there is not sufficient amounts of benefits being received by some of the participants, so therefore they may be experiencing hunger. Some individuals or households who have received food stamps have been found to have inadequate diets, according to, the Third Report on Nutrition Monitoring in the United States, which was completed in 1995. Those receiving food stamps should have their diets improve, but because they have not, nutrition education may be needed. Nutrition Education funding has been available from USDA since 1986. There has been 21 states that have implemented nutrition education as part of their food stamp programs,(Cason, 1999).

In 1946, the National School Lunch Program was established. The reason for establishing this program was evidence of severe malnutrition. It was found in those young men that were drafted for World War II, which had signs of healed aspects of malnutrition. There were also several studies completed in different states showing children with very low-caloric intakes and inability's to function at school. Many children were malnourished to the point they were lethargic, and had hunger pangs so badly they had to be sent home from school, (Leinwand, 1985).

On one hand there were children malnourished and on the other hand the agriculture community had a problem; they had surplus food. The result was the National School Lunch Program, where the government bought the surplus. They then provided it to the schools for lunches to be provided to low income, needy children. "The law stated that it was a matter of "national security" to provide lunches so as "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods,"

(Leinwand, 1985, p. 51).

The program provided free or reduced-price lunches to students in public and nonprofit schools. The federal and state governments shared the cost. In 1968, and 1970 the Program was amended to provide every needy child with a free lunch and the very poor with free breakfasts. In 1982, there were 23 million children in the school lunch programs, but 30 percent were cut out of the programs because of new stringent qualifications. There also were middle class students receiving benefits and paying reduced rates. Over a million were dropped from the lunch program. Due to the costs of the program many schools cut the programs. The poor did not pay anything for the lunch and the middle class reduced lunches were subsidizing the program. There were 2,700 schools that discontinued the lunch program, (Leinwand, 1985). In 1997, the National School Lunch Program provided meals to more than 26 million children. There were 14.6 million children that received free or reduced price lunches daily, (Cason, 1999).

During one of Lyndon Johnson's speeches, he said, "We were so poor we didn't know there was such a thing as poverty," (Dict. Of Amer. Hist., 1976, p. 382) In every period of history Americans have been poor in things they owned and consumed. The 20th Century is when people became aware. Until then hardship was not a worry or surprise because it was taken for granted that it was a common experience. It was thought of as normal and generally a wholesome condition of life. Poverty did not exist as a social issue. It was only an issue when people could not be self supported and sought assistance, (Dict. Of Amer. Hist., 1976, 1996).

The poverty line is an amount of money calculated by multiplying the Department of Agriculture's Economy Food Plan by three (assuming that a family would spend one-third on food), (Dict. Of Amer. Hist., 1996). "The

minimum income was the amount deemed necessary for an individual or a family of specified size to obtain a subsistence level of food and other essential goods and services,” (Dict. Of Amer. Hist., 1976, p. 380). This calculated amount was originally intended only for research purposes and not for eligibility into any aid programs.

Because of the significant numbers of those in need, President Johnson, Congress and the administration formulated a collection of legislation that was known as the War on Poverty. The legislation increased federal spending for the poor and needy of this country. The War on Poverty was to help the poor out of the poverty and not make them secure in it, (Dict. Amer. Hist, 1996).

There were several programs implemented in the late 1960s as part of the War on Poverty. The School Breakfast Program was initiated in 1966. The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 introduced the School Breakfast Program as a temporary measure. There were several children that had long bus rides to school and there were many mothers in the workforce. In 1975 the program became permanent. It assisted schools in providing nutritious breakfasts for children, (Cason, 1999). In 1982, 400,000 children were dropped from the breakfast program because of new restrictions and objections of some middle class getting reduced breakfasts, (Leinwand, 1985). In 1997, 67,063 schools served more than 7 million children breakfast; 86 percent of the children were from low-income households, (Cason, 1999).

The Summer Food Service Program was formed in 1968. It was funding for organizations to serve nutritious meals to low-income children when school was not in session. In 1996, the program had 3,400 organizations serving meals at 28,000 sites to more than 2.2 million children, (Cason, 1999).

The CACFP or the Child and Adult Care Feeding was founded in 1968. It provided funds to licensed public and nonprofit child-care centers, family and group child-care homes for preschool children, after-school programs for school-age children and to adult day-care centers serving chronically impaired adults or those over 60. The funding was for meals and snacks. In 1996, the program served 2.6 million children daily providing 1.5 billion meals and snacks; it served more than 40,000 adults, (Cason, 1999).

Another program, that began in 1968, was the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program or EFNEP. The Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the state Cooperative Extension services administer the Program. It was funded in 1968 with a \$10 million budget from an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. In 1970 funding was received from the Smith-Lever Act, 1977 the Food and Agriculture Act and in 1981 the Agriculture and Food Act, (Cason, 1999).

This program is to educate those with limited resources and reduce food insecurity. Trained individuals teach families how to improve dietary practices and effectively manage resources. The people are taught nutrition education usually in non-formal settings such as homes, community centers, housing complexes, WIC offices, Extension offices, health departments and churches. The information is taught considering the needs, interests, age, learning ability, financial and ethnic background of the group or individuals, (Cason, 1999).

The 1970s were a continuation of introduction of programs that would help the low-income. WIC is the Special Supplemental Program for Women, Infants and Children. It was established by Congress in 1972 as an experimental pilot program and became a national program in 1975. WIC is

a program that provides low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants and children that are/or may be at a stage of nutritional risk with nutrition education, nutritious foods and access to health care. In 1997, \$3.7 billion was available for the program to serve an estimated 7.4 million people, (Cason, 1999).

Second Harvest is the single largest anti-hunger campaign in the United States. It is made up of 188 food banks that serve more than 50,000 local charitable organizations that operate 94,000 local food pantries, soup kitchens, shelters and other needy serving projects. Second Harvest serves all 50 states and Puerto Rico. It distributes more than one billion pounds of donated food and grocery product annually. They provide food assistance to more than 26 million Americans including 8 million children and 4 million seniors each year. Second Harvest sent more than 2 million pounds of food to the Midwest when the floods displaced families. Dan Glickman thanked the people for their efforts in July of 1997. “The mission of Second Harvest is to feed hungry people by soliciting and distributing food and grocery products through a nationwide network of certified affiliate food banks and to educate the public about the nature of and solutions to the problem of domestic hunger,” (Second Harvest, 1997).

The American Culinary Federation formed the Chef and Child Foundation in 1988 as a program to address the nutritional and dietary needs of children. The American Culinary Federation Chef and Child Foundation, Inc. is “The Voice of the American Culinary Federation in the fight against childhood hunger.” The CCF is a non-profit corporation of ACF. The group is comprised of professional chefs and cooks, apprentice chefs and chefs, (ACF, 1999).

The ACF Chef and Child Foundation, Inc. focuses on the nutritional

development of all children no matter their economic situation. This foundation believes that all children need to learn how to cook and choose healthy foods. Single parents or dual career parent homes many times leave children cooking for themselves, siblings and parents. The Foundation's purpose is to promote, encourage and stimulate an awareness of proper nutrition in preschool and elementary children. The professional chefs and cooks teach pre-school and early elementary school kids nutrition with hands on cooking classes. Apprentice chefs raise funds for local agencies that provide dietary assistance or nutrition education. Then there are chefs serving in their local communities in programs, (ACF, 1999).

The American Culinary Federation sponsors grants. There are local grants to feed hungry children and provide nutrition education through the "Chef in the Classroom" program. They sponsor educational grants to non-profit institutions for nutritional research and educational programs in the promotion of proper nutrition. The foundation fund programs which give instruction on nutrition and proper eating habits to school age children. The ACF also provides emergency food relief when there are disasters-natural or otherwise, (ACF, 1999).

The programs currently active are "Recipes for the Hungry." "Kids Cooking Team," which was a pilot program used with homeless fourth graders to teach them basic cooking skills. It is part of a curriculum development project for national distribution. "Chefs Day at Kids Café," is a nutrition education and cooking classes for latch-key community based programs. This program too is a pilot project development with research being conducted. Childhood Hunger Day Activities are accessible and ACF also has a School Breakfast Campaign, (ACF, 1999).

The ACF Chef and Child also has a partnership with USDA Food

Safety and Inspection Services. Through this partnership the FSIS will distribute copies of a safe food handling video to non-profit feeding programs and all state health departments. The two groups were also producing a coloring book for grades K-2 on safe food handling. The National Dairy Council-Chef Combo Partnership provides nutrition education curriculum and education materials for K-5 grades. The CCF offers Chefs Educational Series Seminars of Safe Food Handling, Menu Planning and Nutrition to all members of Foodchain which could reach over 6,000 agencies feeding the needy. CCF also provides community based culinary advisors to the programs wishing their assistance. The main goal and concern of the ACF and the Foundation is to eradicate hunger among children, (ACF, 1999).

Foodchain is another one of the largest hunger-relief organizations in the country. Foodchain, Inc. was formed in 1992, as a non-profit corporation. Foodchain is a network of charitable organization working on the local level to help feed hungry people and fight hunger at its roots. Foodchain rescues food that otherwise would go to waste and uses the food to support community-based programs working to support people and help them become more self-sufficient. As of last year 1998, there were 145 programs in the United States and Canada that distributed a total of 200 million pounds of food. For this year, Foodchain is striving to rescue more food to feed more people and expand efforts in training unemployed people for food service jobs, (Foodchain, 1998).

Foodchain Inc. was formed to advance and support the network of prepared and perishable food-rescue programs. The corporation itself does not collect or distribute food. The corporation provides services. It is an (1) information clearing house, which provides a source of information on

prepared and perishable food rescue programs for potential donors, programs and citizens interested in the fight against hunger. It is (2) a technical assistance center which shares expertise and experience that presents training on the latest news and better operational techniques. The Foodchain does (3) food donor, in-kind donor and trade association development. The staff forges relationships with food service industry representatives to increase sources of food and equipment for the food-rescue programs. The office is a national recruiter so the national food manufacturers and restaurant chains can support local programs. The 4th program is the Community Kitchens Initiative. The Foodchain office provides information and resources to local programs wishing to start job training for unemployed people. The training is in the food service industry, (Foodchain, 1998).

The national and regional food donors that have supported Foodchain include some of the largest and well-known companies in the industry. They consist of Pizza Hut, Sodexo Management Services, Southland (7-Eleven), Chrysler Foodservices, Morrisons Fresh Cooking, Hardee's, Boston Market, KFC, Marriott, Sheraton, Disneyland, Holiday Inn, Hilton, Hyatt, Stouffer, Mrs. Fields Cookies, The Four Seasons, The Peabody and Publix Super Markets, Inc. There are also thousands of restaurants, hotels grocery stores and other food related business' that donate products to the programs, (Foodchain, 1998).

Foodchain has a fund-raising program called Match-A-Meal. The program is to raise awareness of hunger and gain financial support. The idea is to donate as much money as one would have spent on a meal for a business, which is usually done for lunch. The program can be done at a business, place of employment, college campuses, high schools or any

institution. The funds raised are used in the donors' community. Eighty-five percent goes to the food rescue programs and the other 15 percent goes into Foodchain network to support programs across the country. They then can provide literature and information to groups to have a successful program, (Foodchain, 1998).

The Foodchain's Community Kitchens Initiative is/has been successful. The most famous is the D.C. Central Kitchen in Washington, D.C. and more kitchen programs like this one have been implemented. The program has a viable vocational training program. The donated food is prepared by unemployed people to gain skills in food service. As of 1997, more than 150 people had received the training and nearly 75 percent of the participants have retained their jobs. Philip Morris Companies Inc., the Presbyterian Hunger Program and Share Our Strength fund the Community Kitchens Initiative. Feeding the hungry is essential but training people to develop skills to become self-sufficient is even a greater contribution to the well-being of the individuals and America, (Foodchain, 1998).

In April 1993, the Congress became more aware of the hunger issues that threaten millions of people on a daily basis. U.S. Congressman, Tony Hall, from Ohio, did something others would never even consider. He went on a 23 day fast. He wanted to make people aware of hunger issues. Due to this fast, the United States House of Representatives established a Hunger Caucus, (World Bank, 1994).

The private sector involvement is a significant instrument to the elimination of hunger. In June through September of 1996, Blockbuster video and other large video retailers, which was more than 8,000 video stores, participated in the Fast Forward to End Hunger campaign. The program was to raise awareness about the plight of hungry children in our

country and also to raise money to help them. The money, 100 percent, raised by the video stores was donated to organizations within the community where the money was raised to help hungry children, (End Hunger, 1996).

A professional organization, The American Dietetic Association has established Dietetic Practice Groups to keep practitioners informed about various subjects. The groups are important in the dissemination of information through newsletters, brochures and contact with other professionals. The Association has formed a hunger and malnutrition group. The hunger and malnutrition group has worked with the USDA on domestic and international food security. It reviews legislation and educates others on the impact of legislation initiatives; works with federal agencies to develop food assistance policies and programs that will maximize access to food and nutrition services by all populations. The group educates the public on the status of food security. ADA also has a quarterly publication that highlights hunger actions, surveys, and educational materials called the ADA Hunger Line, (ADA, 1998).

Karen Wilson, chair of the Hunger & Malnutrition Practice Group, said, “The Hunger and Malnutrition DPG is pertinent to every dietetic practitioner regardless of practice specialty. Access to food is the cornerstone of all avenues of dietetic practices and therefore, should be a primary concern for all practitioners,” (ADA, 1998). The HMDPG’s mission is to strive for a world free from hunger; ensure access to nutrition services for all Americans; and promote the health and well-being of all people regardless of income levels, (ADA, 1998).

The U.S. Department of Agriculture made two beef purchases on July 16, 1998. The purchases totaled \$9.2 million dollars. The beef will be used

for distribution in the National School Lunch Program and other food assistance programs. The (AMS) Agricultural Marketing Service purchased 8 million pounds of frozen ground beef products at a cost of \$8.1 million. This purchase was the first for ground beef for the 1998-1999 National School Lunch Program. They also purchased 520,000 pounds of frozen beef roast, (USDA, No. 0289.98).

The USDA announced \$2.4 million in grants, in October 1998. The grants were to help communities across the U.S. be more self-sufficient in providing for their own food and nutritional needs. The goal was to improve access to nutritious affordable food by funding projects that meet needs of low-income and elderly. The USDA funded 18 projects in 12 states, to address local farm food, and nutrition issues, which incorporated small business development, markets and job training for youth. The grants were awarded through USDA's Cooperative State Research and Education Extension Service, (USDA, No. 0421.98).

During the 1995 census, information was gathered from the Food Security Supplement. It was found that there were 34.7 millions Americans which were at risk of hunger or food security. The USDA Economic Research Service also did a study in 1995 to examine and quantify food loss. The study was the first of its kind in 20 years. The USDA estimated that more than one-quarter of all food produced in the nation is lost. In 1995, there was 356 billion pounds of food available for human consumption. It is estimated that 96 billion pounds or 27 percent was lost at the retail, consumer and food service levels. The probable loss is greater because this study did not consider the losses at pre-harvest, on-the-farm, farm to retail and wholesale levels. It is given that there is significant loss at each of the levels. The expected amount of loss is greater than that of the 96 billion

pound figure, (USDA, No. 0314.97).

Most of the loss is highly perishable items such as fresh fruits and vegetables, milk, grain. There is 20 million pounds of fruit that rots in refrigerators or in grocery stores. There is a lot of loss due to cosmetic reasons such as bruised fruit, dented cans, and crushed packages. There is always new products, new flavors or brand and the old is discarded. Seasonality (items that are holiday related) also results in products being discarded. The products are still edible but they can not be sold or the companies can not sell them, (USDA, No. 0218.97).

Individual families do throw away food, but significant amounts are lost on farms, manufacturing plants, distribution centers, wholesale markets, farmers' markets, supermarkets, cafeterias, restaurants, as well as, schools, hospitals and any other large feeding institution, (USDA, No. 0314.97). There are food losses due to weather, disease and predation. During harvest the mechanization and production practices loose product. Storage problems such as mold, insects, spoilage, shrinkage, and deterioration occur. The processing stage of food has removal of inedible parts of the food such as bones, peels, pits or bruised portions that can't be eaten. Poor handling, package breakage, and transportation can all result in loss before it even arrives to a destination where consumers can purchase it. At the retail level in 1995, there was 5.4 billion pounds of food lost. The loss was two percent of the edible supply. Dairy products, fresh fruits and vegetables were half of the retail loss. The consumer and food service losses were 90+ billion pounds of food. These losses were 26 percent of the edible food supply. Fresh fruits and vegetables accounted for 20 percent at this level, (USDA, ERS, 1997).

On average, each American consumes about three pounds of food a day. It was estimated that if five percent of the amount of food being thrown away could be salvaged, it would be enough food to feed 4 million people for a day; if 10 percent was recovered, 8 million people would be fed; a 25 percent recovery would mean 20 million people would eat for the day, (USDA, No. 0314.97).

Secretary Glickman, in December of 1995, hosted a National Roundtable on Gleaning and Food Recovery to find solutions to barriers of food donation, (USDA, No. 0089.97). America had millions of hungry people and at the same time, we were wasting millions of pounds of food. To curb those losses, in April of 1996 the USDA established a toll free phone number (1-800-GLEAN-IT) to provide information on local gleaning and food recovery programs that producers could donate the food to, (USDA, No. 0089.97).

The USDA coordinated a project in the summer of 1996 called, “Summer of Gleaning.” The USDA utilized AmeriCorps members for the project. AmeriCorps is a service program, which has 25,000 Americans working to meet critical needs of a community. In return those individuals receive an award for college, job training or to pay back student loans. This project was part of a national initiative to coordinate and promote public and private gleaning and food recovery efforts. The “Summer of Gleaning” program was in 20 states for 12 weeks, (USDA, No. 0426.96). Eighty-eight AmeriCorps members recruited more than 1,600 community volunteers who in turn, recovered enough food to provide the equivalent of over 1.34 million meals for the hungry, (USDA, No. 0313.97)

AmeriCorps members from the USDA office and Congressional Hunger Center worked cooperatively in gleaning at the Summer Olympics.

They were able to recover 170 tons of perishable food. The amounts of food increased after the vendors and venues were closing after the closing ceremonies of the Olympics. The food collected according to estimates provided 226,000 meals according to the Atlanta Community Food Bank. Dan Glickman said, “It is clear that the USDA AmeriCorps effort to recover food from the Olympic Games has been an incredible success...all deserve gold medals in food recovery. Every year millions of pounds of nutritious uneaten food are thrown away. It is my highest personal priority to find ways to get this food to the hungry,” (USDA, No. 0426.96).

The President signed into law on October 1, 1996, the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act. This Act created the opportunity for food recovery to increase. The Act created a uniform national standard liability protection for non-profit groups, corporations and private citizens who donated excess food, (USDA, No. 0089.97). The law protects donors from civil and criminal liability, if for any reason any of the donated product would cause harm to recipients. There are exceptions made for gross negligence. Specifically the law protects in addition to non-profit groups, corporations, and citizens, partnerships, organizations, associations, governmental entities, wholesalers, retailers, restaurants, caterers, farmers and gleaners, (Foodchain, 1998).

The Emerson Act provides protection for food and grocery products that meet all quality and labeling standards imposed by federal, state, and local laws and regulations even though the food may not be marketable because of appearance, age, freshness, grade, size, surplus or other conditions that would make the products unsaleable, (Foodchain, 1998).

With the knowledge about the number of hungry people and knowing how many millions of pounds of food was being wasted, there were several

discussions on what could be done. Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman told President Clinton about USDA's donations. The USDA's cafeteria in Washington, D.C. donated its excess food to feed the hungry in the Washington, D.C. area. President Clinton was enthusiastic about this deed and wanted all federal agencies to do this and not just the headquarters, (USDA, No. 0218.97).

In November of 1996, President Clinton directed Glickman to lead a federal government wide initiative to boost food recovery. Each federal agency was directed to participated in an interagency working group on Food Recovery to Feed the Hungry. Mr. Glickman chaired the working group. Each agency had/has to identify ways to aid gleaning and food recovery efforts, particularly focusing on donating food from federal cafeterias and determining which programs can be better utilized to aid food recovery, (USDA, No. 0313.97).

During the fall of 1996, the USDA published "A Citizen's Guide to Food Recovery." It was/is a resource guide on food recovery programs for businesses, community-based non-profit organizations as well as private citizens and public officials. The guide has gleaning and food recovery activities within and suggestions on how to support the existing programs. It outlines legal issues, food safety considerations and key information on the steps to food recovery and distribution of the food. It has been updated and revised since its development. It is dedicated to the late Representative Bill Emerson who was the Former Vice Chair, of the Congressional Hunger Caucus. In his words, "Hunger is an issue that, in its solution, should know no partisan or ideological bounds," (USDA, Citizen's, 1999).

July 1, 1997 at the National Conference of Second Harvest in San Diego, California, Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman, spoke to the

people that fight hunger everyday. He spoke about the USDA's Economic Research Service study in which food waste was investigated. He told the audience about the 96 billion pounds of waste and the other amounts of waste that are hard to measure. He emphasized the 4 million people we could feed with a small amount of that food. The study by ERS also discussed hurdles of food recovery which include recruiting people with food, volunteers in the community, transportation, storage, and packaging. "There is an enormous potential for growth in the amount of food available for hungry families. Food recovery is one way everyone can lend a hand against hunger. The Good Samaritan law, which frees good-faith donors from liability clears the way for food donation and makes it as common as recycling throughout the commercial food chain," (USDA, No. 0218.97)

Mr. Glickman announced the organization of a National Summit on Food Recovery to be held September 17 & 18, 1997 in Washington, D.C. The Summit would be sponsored by Second Harvest, the Congressional Hunger Center, the Chef and the Child Foundation and Foodchain. The USDA wanted to push hunger and make people do more than just talk about the problem. Those involved in the summit were to be people from large corporation, small business, faith-based groups, labor union, elected people, professional organizations, people in agriculture, transportation, community service groups and the anti-hunger activists and anyone interested in finding ways to end hunger. "One goal will be to increase the amount of food recovered and distributed to the hungry families by 33 percent by the turn of the century. That's about a 500 million pound increase enough to feed some 340,000 Americans everyday," (USDA, No. 0218.97).

The National Summit on Gleaning and Food Recovery took place on September 15-16, 1997. The Summit's goal was to develop a national plan

to feed 450,000 more hungry Americans each day. One goal of the summit was to identify ways to increase the amount of food recovered by 33 percent by the year 2000 which meant capturing another 500 million pounds of food a year. The largest summit was in Washington, D.C. and local summits were through live satellite broadcasting. There were more than 50 locations across the nation that had the broadcasts then held discussion on summit goals, workshops sessions and held community service projects. The summit was to help people understand the three basic steps in food recovery and gleaning which are getting the food, preparing or sorting the food and distributing the food to programs that serve the hungry, (USDA, No. 0314.97).

The Vice President Al Gore and Glickman kicked off the Summit with the leading anti-hunger organizations. Vice President Gore spoke, “We are here today to try to ease some of that pain—to join together in the fight against hunger. For the first time, we will be fighting hunger with a fuller picture of the problem itself. The study tells us that in America, at the dawn of the 21st century—about 12 million households a year experience food insecurity. It is an appalling figure—and we as a nation must do more to end the human tragedy of hunger. We have enough food in America to feed all those who are hungry. Every citizen must do their part if we are to end hunger. In such a prosperous and powerful country, the mere existence of hunger destroys lives and it destroys hope. With this summit we are marking a new beginning. I know that as more and more Americans join us, we will reach the day when—amid our amber waves of grain and our fruited plains—the pain of hunger is only a memory,” (Summit, 1997).

As a result of the prior directives many programs had been formulated and implementation had begun. The announcements of these programs were

made at the Summit. To begin to meet the goal of increasing food recovery, the USDA created a staff position of National Coordinator of Food Recovery and Gleaning to oversee all of the programs.

The USDA's Farm Service Agency proposed a new Field Gleaning Program. The new program is a national volunteer program for field gleaning. The agency will form partnerships between farmers, local governments, anti-hunger organization, community action agencies and faith-based groups. There were to be 13 pilot state programs in the summer of 1998 and there were hopes of having one program in each state by 2000. The USDA research farms were going to increase donations. Produce, 3,870 pounds, in Texas, was donated to the Food Bank of the Rio Grande Valley; a East Lansing, Michigan research unit donated 100,000 eggs; in Fresno California a lab donated 1,500 pounds of almonds, 2,000 pounds of raisins and 2,000 pounds of walnuts in the past two years to food programs, (USDA, No. 0315.97).

The federal government cafeterias at the Department of Labor, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Federal Reserve Bank all agreed to donate the excess food to the hungry. The National Institute for Health of the Department of Health and Human Services was going to start food recovery in eight kitchens that were under contract with them. The USDA was going to announce a plan to recover food from the National School Lunch Program, the Breakfast Program and Summer Food Service Program. The National Ski Areas Association will cooperate with the Forest Service to find ways to recover food because they are on the National Forest System land, (USDA, No. 0315.97).

The Department of Defense and General Services Administration starting September 8, 1997, were going to provide \$10 million worth of excess rations to programs around the country for 18 months. The Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service would be in control of the project. The U.S. Coast Guard has issued a memorandum requesting all units to implement food recovery with local cafeterias, commissaries, food vendors, government contractors and other Coast Guard food facilities, (USDA, No. 0315.97).

There were new PSA's or public service announcements on food recovery and gleaning. The USDA will now automatically send information on how to donate excess food to sponsors of events attended by the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary and Under and Assistant Secretaries. The USDA, 4-H Program, the National Collaboration for Youth, Rock & Wrap It Up!, Inc., Foodchain, The National Student Campaign Against Hunger and Homelessness and other non-profit youth groups were going to work on a step-by-step guide to volunteering in food recovery service projects. The USDA has already developed a guide for citizens called "A Citizens Guide to Food Recovery," (USDA, No. 0315.97).

In Maryland the Southland Corporation donated funds to Maryland Food Bank to purchase a refrigerated truck for the bank's perishable food rescue program. A Rhode Island group announced funding for six new Americorps*VISTA Members to work for the Rhode Island Community Food Bank. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters Union is encouraging local unions to ask drivers to volunteer time driving trucks for local food recovery programs. The Department of HHS Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration with the Health Resources and Services Administration initiated a regular non-perishable food collection,

(USDA, No. 0315.97). In the two weeks prior to the Summit, in other words the first two weeks of September, the USDA employees and volunteers gleaned 380,000 pounds of fresh produce to donate to the cause. In a 10-day department-wide food drive the employees collected more than 128,000 pounds of food nation wide for community food programs across the country, (USDA, No. 0316.97).

The announcement was made at the National Summit on Gleaning and Food Recovery that the National Restaurant Association will work with the USDA. The two organizations will work together to create a handbook about how restaurants can donate excess food. The Restaurant Association will make the guide available to all its members and the American Hotel and Motel Association will also provide the information to the 45,000 members in the organization,(USDA, No. 0315.97).

The Restaurant Association worked quickly and in November news of the guide was released. There was a news conference at a Washington, D.C. area restaurant, Jaleo, where Dan Glickman and the chief executive officer, Herman Cain, of the National Restaurant Association unveiled a new comprehensive handbook that will encourage restaurants to recover and donate unused food. The handbook is called, "Food Donation: A Restaurateur's Guide." Those representatives from the Washington area restaurants attending the news conference also said they would increase their donations to the D.C. Central Kitchen. American Express has agreed to provide funds to publish and distribute the food recovery guide, (USDA, No. 0419.97). The National Restaurant Association's National Headquarters has estimated that approximately only six hundred of the food recovery guides had been disbursed as of November 1999.

Chapter 3

Sample Selection

The sample was taken from the membership of the Wisconsin Restaurant Association. The Wisconsin Restaurant Association is a not-for-profit trade association composed of foodservice businesses. The association represents every size and style of restaurant. Members include fine dining establishments, mom and pop restaurants, supper clubs, small cafes, fast food outlets, corporate chain restaurants, catering services, and hotel and motel food services. There are 3,000 members that represent 7,000 foodservice outlets, (WRA, 1999).

The sample of restaurant association members are those that utilize the electronic mail systems. The sample was generated by the Wisconsin Restaurant Association. The sample for the study is comprised of one hundred members of the Association from the entire state of Wisconsin. The members with electronic mail access were chosen to improve the response time of the study and utilize the technology aspect of the age.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to conduct this study was developed by the researcher. The contents of the instruments are questions that pertain to the food service manager's knowledge of the Good Samaritain Food Donation Act. Whether the food service managers know about the benefits of donating to a food recovery program that are directly related to the business. If the businesses are donating recoverable products; to which programs is that food being donated and the quantities that are donated. If food service managers are not donating, what are the reasons they are not donating.

Sanitation Certificate identification was surveyed due to the vital role it plays in the safe handling of food products, prevention of food borne illness, and the “flow of food,” through the food service. Do the food service managers need more information on the Good Samaritan Food Donation Act before donations to food recovery programs will increase and eradicate hunger.

Data Collection

The Wisconsin Restaurant Association was contacted and the association provided names and addresses of the membership that have access to electronic mail. A limited number of the membership utilize this technology at this time. The survey was sent to the individuals through the electronic mail systems, along with a letter of consent and explanation of survey and directions to follow to return the survey. One-hundred of the questionnaires were electronically mailed. The surveys were compiled and information analyzed for each of the questions. The analysis of the information was reported in the findings section of this paper and a summary, conclusions and recommendations reported.

Data Analysis

The raw data was accumulated and analyzed for each question. The first eight questions of the survey are positively or negatively answered. The first seven are knowledge based. Percentages for each of questions were calculated.

Chapter 4

The study was conducted by electronically transferring a questionnaire about the Food Donation Act to members of the Wisconsin Restaurant Association. The members electronically returned the questionnaire. The following results were found.

Questions

1. Did you know that between August 1997 and August 1998, that there were 36 million Americans that did not have access to enough food?

67 percent of the respondents did know that there were 36 million Americans in need between August 1997 and August 1998.

33 percent of the people did not know that there were 36 million hungry Americans during that same time period.

2. Did you know that the USDA Economic Research estimated that 96 billion pounds of food is lost at the retail, consumer and food service levels?

33 percent of the respondents did know that there was a loss of 96 billion pounds of food at the retail, consumer, and food service levels.

67 percent of the respondents did not know that there was 96 billion pounds of food lost at the retail, consumer and food service levels.

3. Did you know that if 5% of the food was recovered, 4 million people would be fed for a day and if 25% of the food was recovered, 20 million people could eat?

33 percent of the respondents knew that if 5% of the food thrown away was recovered that it could feed 4 million people per day and that if 25% of the food was recovered, 20 million people would eat for a day.

67 percent of the people did not know that if 5% of the food was recovered that it could feed 4 million people per day and that 25% of the food was recovered, 20 million would eat for a day.

4. Are you aware of the Bill Emerson Food Donation Act, formerly known as the Good Samaritain Food Donation Act?

33 percent of the respondents were aware of the Bill Emerson food Donation Act.

67 percent of the respondents were not aware of the Bill Emerson Food Donation Act.

5. Did you know that contributions to food recovery programs are tax deductible?

0 percent of the respondents did know that the donations to the food programs recovery were tax deductible.

100 percent of the respondents did not know that the donations to the food recovery programs were tax deductible.

6. Did you know that the Food Donation Act protects your business from any repercussions or lawsuits that might occur as a result of a donation?

67 percent of the respondents did know that they were protected by the Food Donation Act from repercussions or lawsuits of donating products.

33 percent of the respondents did not know that they were protected by the Food Donation Act against repercussions or lawsuits of donating products.

7. Do you know about any food recovery and gleaning programs in your local area?

33 percent of the respondents did know about food recovery programs in their local areas.

67 percent of the respondents did not know about food recovery programs in their local area.

8. Does your establishment donate to any food recovery programs?

33 percent of the establishments donate to the food recovery programs.

67 percent of the establishments do not donate to food recovery programs.

9. If, yes to what program(s) do you donate food?

The programs that the respondents identified that they donate food include:

Loaves and Fishes

Bethany House

Broken Bread

10. If no, why does your facility not participate in food recovery programs?

The respondents identified the following reasons why they do not participate in the food recovery programs.

There are not any programs in the local area that are known about to donate food.

Respondent hasn't been contacted by any food donation programs.

11. How many servings of food does the establishment discard at the end of the business day?

100 percent of the respondents discard 25 or less servings of food a day.

0 percent of the respondents discard 25-50 servings of food a day.

0 percent of the respondents discard 50-75 servings of food a day.

0 percent of the respondents discard 75-100 servings of food a day.

0 percent of the respondents discard 100 or more servings of food a day.

12. Is the food that is discarded useable if it was donated to a food recovery program?

0 percent of the respondents identified that the food that is discarded is useable.

33 percent of the respondents identified that the food that is discarded is not useable.

67 percent of the respondents did not answer the question.

13. How many pounds of food is discarded weekly?

The respondents identified that weekly, the following amounts are discarded.

33 percent of the respondents did not know how much food was discarded weekly.

50 lbs., 75lbs.

14. How many pounds of food is discarded monthly?

None of the respondents identified on a monthly basis, the amounts of food that is discarded.

15. How many employees are employed at your food service facility?

The respondents identified that they have the following number of employees employed in their food service facilities.

25 – 45

135

7

16. How many employees at your facility hold a state sanitation certificate?

The respondents identified they have the following number of employees with a state sanitation certificate.

One, two, six

17. How many employees at your facility have had the ServSafe Sanitation Program?

The respondents have identified that, the following number of employees have had ServSafe training.

One, two, six

18. What is your position or title at the facility?

33 percent of the respondents are managers at the facilities.

100 percent of the respondents are owners at the facilities.

0 percent of the people have other titles at the facilities.

19. Do you have a copy of the *National Restaurant Association & U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Donation, A Restaurateur's Guide*?

33 percent of the respondents do have a copy of the Guide.

67 percent of the respondents do not have a copy of the Guide.

20. Would you like to receive more information about food recovery and gleaning?

67 percent of the respondents would like to receive more information on food recovery and gleaning.

33 percent of the respondents would not like to receive more information about food recovery and gleaning.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

This study was conducted to determine if proprietors, owners and managers of food services and related businesses are adequately knowledgeable about the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act. The act, which is public law was created to encourage donations of food and grocery items to organizations for the distribution to the needy. The study was to determine if the Act is being utilized at a grass-roots level within the state and to identify the programs that have received donations.

The study was conducted through a survey, which was developed by the researcher. The survey was electronically mailed to members of the Wisconsin Restaurant Association. Directions, explanation, a letter of consent were sent to the members with the survey. Reminders, and the consent letter and survey were electronically mailed two additional times. Participants returned the survey through electronic mail.

The respondents to the survey know that there are hungry Americans in this country. They do not know, at least two-thirds do not know how much food is thrown away overall. In their own facilities they did not identify how much food that they threw away each month. On a weekly basis it was identified. Two-thirds of the respondents did not know about the Bill Emerson Food Donation Act, nor the benefits that a business can utilize through participation in food recovery programs. The establishments do have people or employees in their facilities that are knowledgeable about sanitation, which is a major component of food recovery. They could donate

recoverable food to programs. The majority of respondents did not know about food donation programs in their local areas or have not been contacted by programs which disburse food to the needy. Only a few organizations were named as to which donations have been made by those who do donate. They do want more information about the Bill Emerson Food Donation Act and most do not have a restaurateur's guide.

Conclusions

The survey of Wisconsin Restaurant Association members has identified that a majority of the respondents do not know about the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act. Since there is little knowledge of this act, there is only a small amount known about the organizations that are involved with food recovery. There is little donation to the food recovery programs. The managers of the facilities are just unaware of programs in their local area that work in food recovery or have not been asked to participate in the programs. They would like to receive more information about the Food Donation Act, gleaning and food recovery.

Recommendations

Recommendations for study in food recovery. The sample used in this survey was small, due to the limited use of technology used to communicate in the restaurant and related businesses. Some of those surveyed were also afraid of the technological problems that can arise when

working with electronic mail. Others of those surveyed also thought that they had not been in the business long enough to answer the survey honestly. A survey utilizing the entire membership of the Wisconsin Restaurant Association would give a better perception of the memberships' knowledge of food recovery. The survey could use surface mail or U.S. Postal Service which can reach all members. In the future, more of the members could utilize technology and not be fearful of the problems we now face.

Recommendations for further study of food recovery could consist of the following; educate the Wisconsin Restaurant Association Membership of the Bill Emerson Good Samaritain Food Donation Act through seminars, workshops, articles in a newsletter, public service announcements and direct mailings of information. Identification of food recovery programs near the members' facilities and making the members aware of those programs. This could be done with the National Restaurant Association or the United States Department of Agriculture. After an educational period resurvey the members to determine if information has reached them and if they are participating in food recovery programs. Restaurants and food services can be instrumental in the eradication of hunger in this country, if they choose to participate.

Bibliography

- Aaseng, N. (1991). Ending World Hunger, Franklin Watts Publisher, New York.
- ADA. (1998). American Dietetic Association Hunger and Malnutrition Dietetic Practice Group, June 1998, <http://www.eatright.org/dpg15.html> [March 18, 1999].
- America. (1996). Hungrier in America, May 18, 1996, 74, 3.
- America. (1998). Hunger on the rise, January 31, 1998, 178, 3.
- Amidei, N. (1987). Rethinking hunger in America: adapting the Sullivan Principles, The Christian Century, 104, 51.
- Cason, K. (1999). Hunger and food security, The Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 91, 49.
- Commonweal. (1988). The twenty million, 115, 5.
- Congressional Quarterly - Guide to the Presidency. (1996). Congressional Quarterly Inc., Washington, D.C.
- Current Biography Yearbook. (1982). The H. W. Wilson Company, New York.
- DeGraff, H. (1951). Can the World feed its population?, Journal of Home Economics, 43, 411.
- Dictionary of American History, (1976). Charles Scribers Sons, New York, USA.
- Dictionary of American History, (1996). Simon & Schuster and Prentice Hall International, New York, USA.
- End Hunger Network, (1996). What you can do, <http://www.cdc.net/~tvnow/hunger.htm> [March 18, 1999].
- Foodchain (1998). Foodchain: The National Food-rescue Network Annual Report 98, Rescue food @aol.com, www.Foodchain.org

Bibliography

- Hoover, H. (1918). Food for our Allies in 1919, The National Geographic Magazine, 34, 242.
- Leinwand, G. (1985). Hunger and Malnutrition in America, Franklin Watts Publisher, New York.
- Lochhead, C. (1988). Is there really hunger in America?, Readers Digest, 133, 116.
- New Jersey, (1997). New Jersey farmers against hunger, a hunger relief program of the New Jersey Agricultural Society, <http://www.state.nj.us/agriculture/njfah.htm> [March 18, 1999].
- Newsweek, (1940). Food by ticket, January 15, 1940, 15, 24.
- Newsweek, (1946). Food: scarcer and scarcer, April 22, 27, 29.
- Rivera, E., L. Everton Brice, R. Healy (1997). Hungry at the feast: in spite of prosperity and job growth, a new study warns of a festering crisis among the working poor, Time, 150, 38.
- Rode, P. and C. M. Avant, (1996). New study finds food shelf users likely to be employed, families with children, July 15, 1996, Urban Coalition, http://freenet.msp.mn.us/ip/resource/urb_coalition/hunger/hunger.html [March 18, 1999].
- Samuleson, R. J. (1996). The next food crisis?, Newsweek, August 26, 1996, 128, 45.
- Second Harvest (1997). Second Harvest http://www.secondharvest.org/websecha/a_abtsh.htm [August 13, 1999].
- Smith, A. (1987). Does more food mean less famine?, Esquire, 108, 55.

Bibliography

- Smith, E., L. Therrien, and E. Britton (1989). The World's cupboard is emptying out; lagging food production may bring disastrous shortages, Business Week, April 3, 1989, 107.
- Summit, (1997). Remarks as prepared for delivery by Vice President, Al Gore, September 15, 1997, <http://www.usda.gov/fcs/glean/vpgore.htm> [August 26, 1998].
- Taylor, A. (1921). After the War economic food problems, The Journal of Home Economics, 13, 1.
- Time, (1940). Who eats?, January 22, 1940, 35, 36.
- Time, (1945). Land of plenty, November 26, 46, 21.
- USDA, Delta (1999). Delta Hunger Tour, Food and Nutrition Services, May 1999, <http://www.fns.usda.gov/FNS/Menu/whatsnew/HungerTour/hungertour.htm> [August 5, 1999].
- USDA, ERS (1997). Estimating and addressing America's food losses, <http://usda.fns.gov/whatsnew/Feature/ARCHIVES/JULAUG97/INDEX.htm>, also found: Food Review, Vol. 20, No. 1, Jan-Apr, 1997, [July 14, 1999].
- USDA, HFSUS (1999). Household Food Security in the United States, Advance Report, Food and Nutrition Services, July 1999.
- USDA, No. 0089.97 (1997). Fact sheet Clinton Administration accomplishments, gleaning and food recovery, March 20, 1997, <http://www.fns.usda.gov/FNS/MENU/GLEANING/SUPPORT/0089.txt> [August 5, 1999].
- USDA, No. 0188.98 (1998). Glickman announces credit guarantee allocations to Korea, <http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/04/0188>

Bibliography

- USDA, No. 0218.97 (1997). Remarks of Secretary Dan Glickman at the Second Harvest National Conference, San Diego, CA, Jul 1 1997, <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fns/MENU/gleaning/SUPPORT/secharv.txt> [July 14, 1999].
- USDA, No. 0285.98 (1998). USDA reinstates credit guarantee programs for India and Pakistan, <http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/07/0285> [July 14, 1999].
- USDA, No. 0289.98 (1998). Glickman announces more than \$9 million in frozen beef purchases, <http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/07/0289>
- USDA, No. 0313.97 (1997). Fact sheet: USDA Food Recovering and Gleaning Initiative, <http://www.usda.gov/cgi-bin/waisga...07316697+6+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve> [October 13, 1997].
- USDA, No. 0314.97 (1997). Fact sheet: National Summit on Gleaning and Food Recovery A Call to Action September 15-16, 1997, Washington, D.C. <http://www.usda.gov/cgi-bin/waisga...07316697+2+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve> [October 13, 1997].
- USDA, No. 0316.97 (1997). Vice President Gore and Agriculture Secretary Glickman kick off first-ever National Food Recovery and Gleaning Summit; issue national call to action, <http://www.usda.gov/fcs/glean/0316.htm> [August 26, 1998].
- USDA, No. 0322.98 (1998). Glickman and Atwood announce countries eligible for U.S. Food Aid Initiative, <http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/08/0322> [July 14, 1999].
- USDA, No. 0397.98 (1998). USDA announces wheat donation to Dominican Republic, <http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/09/0397> [July 14, 1999].

Bibliography

- USDA, No. 0419.97 (1997). New handbook will help guide restaurants toward food recovery,
<http://www.usda.gov/fcs/library/0419.txt> [August 26, 1998].
- USDA, No. 0426.96 (1996). 170 tons of food recovered at Olympics by USDA AmeriCorps,
<http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1996/08/0426>.
- USDA, No. 0435.98 (1998). USDA announces wheat donations of 350,000 tons to Bangladesh,
<http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/10/0435> [July 14, 1999].
- USDA, No. 0446.98 (1998). USDA announces P.L. 480 country allocation for fiscal 1999,
<http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/10/0446.htm>
[July 14, 1999].
- USDA, No. 0447.98 (1998). Food Aid Initiative allocations reach 2.5 million-ton goal,
<http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/10/0447>
[July 14, 1999].
- USDA, No. 0455.98 (1998). Statement of Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman on Russian Food Aid Package, Nov. 4, 1998,
<http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1998/11/0455>.
- World Bank (1994). World Bank conference focuses on the eradication of hunger and poverty, February, 1994,
<http://www.worldbank.org/html/cgiar/newsletter/Feb94/v0106402.html> [March 18, 1999].
- WRA, Wisconsin Restaurant Association (1999). About the Wisconsin Restaurant Association,
<http://www.wiscrest.org/aboutwra.html>
November 11, 1999.

Bibliography

WFP, World Food Programme (1998). Women are the key to ending world hunger says WFP,
<http://www.wfp.org/press/981016.html>
October 16, 1998, Press Release, [March 18, 1999].

Appendix A

Letter of Consent

Dear Participant;

Below is the letter of consent for participating in this study.

By returning this questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner.

I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from the study without repercussions.

Questions or concerns about this research can be addressed to the researcher, research advisor or Ted Knos, Chair, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11HH, UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI, 54751, Telephone Number (715) 232-1126.

Thank you for the participation in this study.

12. Is the food that is discarded useable if it was donated to a food recovery program?
_____YES
_____NO_____

13. How many pounds of food is discarded weekly?_____

14. How many pounds of food is discarded monthly?_____

16. How many employees are employed at your food service facility?_____

17. How many employees at your facility hold a state sanitation certificate?_____

17. How many employees at your facility have had the ServSafe Sanitation Program?_____

18. What is your position or title at the facility?

_____manager _____owner _____ other-position
title:_____

19. Do you have a copy of the *National Restaurant Association & U.S. Department of Agriculture Food Donation, A Restaurateur's Guide*?
_____YES NO_____

20. Would you like to receive more information about food recovery and gleaning?
_____YES NO_____

Appendix C

Gregg Fitzpatrick
1100 Club
1100 South 1st Street
Milwaukee WI 53204
(414)647-9950

info@1100 club.net

Harold Hassell
41 Starlite Diner
4182W. Wisconsin Ave.
Appleton WI 54913-8632
(920) 734-5130

hlhaasell@aol.com

Steven Azarela
AmeriKing
9418 North Green Bay Road
Milwaukee WI 53209
(414)371-9115 (414)371-9716

#sazarela@ameriking.com

Steven Liebzeit
Appleton Daily Queen Stores
1813 N Richmond St
Appleton WI 54911~2730
(920) 739-6109 (920) 738-6111

lssahl@ix.netcom.com

Karen Caidwell
At Ease-Dining..Delectables..Dillman's
11119 PrellerAve.
Worth IL 60482-1814
(708) 448-5298

karen.l.caldwell@gte.net

Michele Fairchild
Aurora Health Care
8901 West Lincoln Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53227
(414)328-6823(414) 328-8536

michele_fairchild@Aurora.org

Al Graske
Bailiwicks An American Eatery
517 GrandCanyon Drive
Madison WI 53719
(608)833-0110 (603) 833-6543

fandb@radmad.com

Sally Miller
Betty's Eagle Cafe
904 N. Railroad Street
Eagle River WI 54521-1933
(715) 479-2766 (715) 479-1335
tmbd@newnorth.net

Mary Kessens
24 Carrot Cafe & Catering Service
1017 Hampshire Place
Madison WI 53711
(608) 274-7571 (608) 274-7255
kessens@gdine.com

Janet Didier
A Twins Inn
470 E. Green Bay Avenue
Saukville WI 53080-2010
(414) 284-3663
jld@nasp.net

Barbara Anderson
Anderson's
1474 E Friess Lake Dr
Hubertus WI 53033-9416
(414) 628-3718 (414) 628-9930
icatr@aol.com

Dee Olson
Arby's Of Chippewa Falls
2129 Brackett Avenue
Eau Claire WI 54701
(715) 726-8888 (715) 835-2584
mclllc@aol.com

Pat Schallock
Atlanta Bread Co.
751 N. High Point Road
Madison WI 53717-2237
(605) 8314300 (601) 131-4332
mpsch@terracom.net

Steve Jackson
Beach Club, The
73771 North Highland Shores
Hayward WI 54843-2037
(715) 634-3090
Lbeachc1b@aol.com

Allan Erwin
Big Moose Inn
N8796 Business HWY. 51 S
Tomahawk WI 54487
(715) 453-6667 (715)453-4624
ae896@yahoo.com

Bing Bing Li
Canton Garden Restaurant
121 East Main Street
Stoughton WI53589-1720
(608) 873-8901

jobl@students.wisc.edu

Nancy Vistain
Cedarwood Family Restaurant
5351 Glennville Road
Bancroft WI 54921
(715) 335-6677

rvnv@uniontel.net

Cyntyhia L McCullough
C.L. Java
29 South Main
Janesville WI 53545
(608) 758-1195

cljava@ticon.net

SabiAtteyih
Cabash Restaurant & Lounge
119 E Main Street
Madison WI 52702-3315
(608) 255-2272

sabi@chrous.net

Barbara Bargabos
Back Door Café
1223 Front Street
Cashton WI 54619-8029
(608) 654-5950 (608) 654-5709

bargie@centuryinter.net

Al Hanson
Chelsea's Supper Club
N10005 Highway 73
Greenwood WI 54437
(715) 267-6428

awhanson@tds.net

Raymond Olson
Clausing Barn Restaurant
S103 w37890 Hwy 67
Eagle WI 53119-9802
(414) 594-2141 (414)-594-6342

rolson@elknet.net

Micheal Fischer
Corner Place
Hwy 63 & Cty Hwy M
Cable WI 54821-0486
(715) 798-4900

corner@cheqnet.net

Kevin Scheuremann
Dairy Queen-Kewaskum
118 Highway H
Kewaskum WI 53040
(414) 626-4774 (414) 626- 8367

trueg@kmoraine.com

Neil Heinze
Domino's Pizza
1700 East Washington Avenue
West Bend WI 53095-2602
(414) 334-5577 (414) 334-5579

bunchaza@aol.com

Citlali Mendieta
El Rey Sol
2338 West Foresthme Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53215-2525
(414) 389-1760 (414) 389-1860

elreysol@aol.com

Mia K. Leaver
Evergreen, The
W4104 State Hwy 64
Bryant WI 54418
(715) 882-3663

dmleaver@newnorth.net

Sandy Fletcher
Fletch's Reel-Em Inn
N1410 County Hwy, MD
Sarona WI 54870-9292
(715) 354-3700 (715) 354-7565

reelemin@chibardun.net

Mike Forrest
George Webb Restaurant
1939 N Richmond Street
Appleton WI 54911
(920) 734-9962

forrest@athenet.net

Ricky Eiting
Greenville Station, The
N1865 Municipal Drive
Greenville WI 54942
(920) 757-6999 (920) 725-7545

unstation3@aol.com

Kirsten C. Van Horsen
Ciatt's Italian Restaurant
N5697 Sunset Drive
Onalaska WI 54650
(608) 781-8686 (608) 781-8644

dankay123@aol.com

Lise Conway
Conway's Pub & Brewing Co.
215 S. Boulevard
Baraboo WI 53913-2943
(608) 356-8986

conj@baraboo.com

Mike Busalacchi
Culver's
604 N 60th S
Wauwatosa WI 53212-4117
(262) 677-8313 (262) 677-8315

mbussie@aol.com

Kathy Samlow
De Jope Bingo
4002 Evans Acres Road
Madison WI 53718
(608) 224-1145 (608) 224-1110

smithlow@terra.com.net

Jeff Hyslop
Donna's Café
4356 East Wall St.
Eagle River WI 54521-9397
(715) 479-6697 (715) 477-0067

jah4wi@nnex.net

Mark J. Osredkar
Eurest-Datex/Ohmeda Cafeterias
3030 Ohmeda Drive
Madison WI 53718-6794
(608) 221-1551 (608) 222-9147

mosredkar@aol.com

Lois Ruediger
Fibber's Bar & Restaurant
8679 Big St, Germain Dr.
Saint Germain WI 54558-8931
(715) 542-3810 (715) 542-2894

relax@stgermainlodge.com

Pennyjo Joesph
Fontana Blvd Café Company
403 S. Lake Shore Drive
Lake Geneva WI 53147-2128
(414) 248-9731 (414) 248-3412

espu4u@genevaonline.com

Mary Rowley
Goose Blind, The
512 Gold St.
Green Lake WI 54941-0414
(920) 294-6363 (920) 294-6540

info@gooseblind.com

Manager
Grenadier's Restaurant
747 Broadway
Milwaukee WI 53202-4302
(414) 276-0747 (414) 276-1424

grenadiers@foodspot.com

Terry Freund
Headwaters
5675 County Highway M
Boulder Junction WI 54512
(715) 385-2601 (715) 385-2061

bigt@g2a.net

Vernon Doenges
Horseshoe Golf Club
5335 Horseshoe Bay Road
Egg Harbor WI 54209
(920) 868-9141 (920) 868-9041

hbaygolf@itl.com

Karen Meyer
Imperial Garden Chinese Restaurant
2039 Allen Blvd
Middleton WI 53562-3401
(608) 238-6445 (608) 238-6855

dine@imperialgarden.com

Terry Smith
Inn At Cedar Crossing
336 Louisiana St.
Sturgeon Bay WI 54235-2422
(920) 743-4200 (920) 743-4422

[innkeeper@innatcedarcrossing.](mailto:innkeeper@innatcedarcrossing)

Claus Weingaertner
JAWS inc.
N1997 Pine Beach Rd.
Oostburg WI 53070-1640
(920) 564-2967

cpcclaus@comusei.com

Gerald M. Grosenick
Jerry's Old Town
N116 W15841 Main St.
Germantown WI 53022
(414) 251-4455 (414) 250-2282

gr8rib@aol.com

Steven Johannes
Johann's Bar & Grill
N1257 County Road B
Coloma WI 54930
(715) 228-2500

johann@uniontel.net

Karl Hartkemeyer
Karl & Cindy's Embers America
6220 Texaco Drive
Eau Claire WI 54703-9603
(715) 874-6213

khartk@werewolf.net

David Krisopeit
Kewpee Lunch
520 Wisconsin Ave
Racine WI 53403-1051
(414) 634-9601

kewpee@wi.net

Marilyn Ford
Helen's Kitchen
P.O. Box 609
Waupun WI 53963-0609
(920) 324-3441

marilyn@powerweb.net

Jim Gruszynski
Hunter's Glen Golf Club
W7572 Old W
Crivitz WI 54114-8621
(715) 854-8008 (715) 854-8009

golfhuntersglen@yahoo.com

Scott A. Rockman
Indigo Grille
5110 Main St.
Stevens Point WI 54481
(715) 345-0070

srockman@coredes.com

Heidi Hutchinson
Jamieson House
407 North Franklin Street
Poynette WI 53955-9490
(608) 635-4100 (608) 635-2292

jamhouse@execpc

Robert Kenneth
Jeffer's Black Angus
Hwy 18 South
Prairie Du Chien WI 53821-0565
(608) 326-2222 (608) 326-7165

kenneth@mhtc.net

Toni Mitt
Jitterzz Coffee House
7606 W State Street
Milwaukee WI 53213
(414) 774-5952 (414) 277-0727

coffee@execpc.com

Silke Davis
Johnson Creek Travel Plaza
201 Village Walk Lane
Johnson Creek WI 53038-0266
(920) 699-4500 (414) 549-4499

loudavis@aol.com

Gary Chrisotpherson
Kentucky Fried Chicken
P.O. Box 363
Medford WI 54451-0363
(715) 748-2032 (715) 748-3162

gchris@midway.tds.net

Donna Lavore
Lavore's on the Hill
235 Church Lane
Coloma WI 54930-9638
(715) 228-2112

unite@lavore.net

Christopher Leffler
Leff's Lucky Town
7208 W. State Street
Milwaukee WI 53213-2732
(414) 258-9886 (414) 258-9860

leffs@execpc.com

Jean Moure
M & M Victorian Inn-La Grappe D'Or
1393 Main Street
Marinette WI 54143
(715) 732-9531

innkeeper@cybrzn.com

Nufri Asani
Merchants Walk Restaurant
213 Main Street
Poynette WI 53955
(608) 635-8181 (608) 635-7793

nufriasani@fourlakes.com

Randall L. Ray
Mill Run Golf
3905 Kane Road
Eau Claire WI 54703
(715) 834-1766 (715) 830 2123

rylar@.com

Arthur E. Lotz
Mr. D's Restaurant & Bakery
1146 State Street
La Crosse WI 54601-3520
(608) 784-6737 (608) 782-6798

mrdrest@pop.presenter.com

Ron Kuchmek
Mug N' Muffin
337 River Bluff Circle
Oconomowoc WI 53066-3480
(262) 567-9594

rkucjmek@execpc.com

Marta Bianchini
Osteria Del Mondo
1028 E Juneau Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-2850
(414) 291-3770 (414) 291-0840

osteria@osteria.com

Patrick Quinn
Oxford's Café & Pub
217 N. Washington St.
Green Bay WI 54301
(920) 435-2233 (920) 435-2409

dmanning@netnet.net

Jayne Germinaro
Papillon's Pizza, Ltd.
1041 Grand Ave
Rothschild WI 54474-1022
(715) 359-9417

gerinmaro@pcpros.net

James F. Glover
Pine Cone Restaurant
Box 399 (I-94 & Wisc. 26)
Johnson Creek WI 53038
(920) 699-2767

pci@execpc.com

Leif Offerdahl
Leif's Café
2700 Highway 45 N
Eagle River WI 54521-8620
(715) 547-3896

offinc@juno.com

Wayne A. Machut
Machut's Supper Club
3911 Lincoln Ave
Two Rivers WI 54241-1833
(920) 793-9432

machuts@lsol.net

Ruth Behnke
Mom's Restaurant
W3740 Hwy. 64
Marinette WI 54153-9657
(715) 732-5420

sudsy@cybrzn.com

Jeff Wickwire
Mr. Peepers Pizza
598 Red Bird Circle
De Pere WI 54115
(920) 339-7868

louwick@sprynet.com

Timothy J Biermeier
Northwestern Lounge
P.O. Box 479
Rhinelander WI 54501-0479
(715) 362-5080

northwestern@bfm.org

Mark McKean
Ovens of Brittany
3244 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
(608) 231-6858 (608) 231-1613

markonpath@aol.com

Gary Tierman
Papa's Place
630 W Pine
Baraboo WI 53913-1039
(608) 356-4869 (608) 356-0520

paparest@midplains.net

William Kowalski
Peshtigo River Resort
N9807 Deer Lake Road
Crivitz WI 54114
(715) 757-3741

bill@cybrzn.com

Mike Snyder
Pine Ridge
16618 W Sissababma Road
Stone Lake WI 54876
(715) 865-2796

pinerdg@win.bright.net

Michael Bertrand
Point Comfort Place
N52 W35002 Lake Dr.
Okauchee WI 53069
(414) 569-9700 (414) 569-9451

pep@execpc.com

Sandra L. Duemer
Quilted Bear Restaurant, The
N111 W18611 Mequon Rd.
Germantown WI 53022
(414) 255-1940 (414) 250-9009

quiltedbear@aol.com

Gary Rudy
Rudy's Drive-In
P.O. Box 1351
La Crosse WI 54602-1351
(608) 782-2200

rudysl@aol.com

Sara Biskup
Sara's A & W Drive In
10321 W. Montatna Avenue
West Allis WI 53227-3228
(414) 281-8630 (414) 281-5558

sarbisk@aol.com

Paul F. Cunningham
Schreiner's Restaurant Inc.
168 N Pioneer Rd.
Fond Du Lac WI 54935-9401
(920) 922-0590 (920) 922-1992

eat@fdlchowder.com

Jo Lynne C. Peterson
Soda Jo's Diner
106 S. Main Street
Viroqua WI 54665-1505
(608) 637-2226 (608) 637-6826

sadajos@frontiernet.net

Fred Ryser
Sportsman's Bar
514 1st St.
New Glarus WI 53574-0369
(608) 527-2225

pool-player@tds.net

Mike Kruger
Stevens Point Country Club
1628 Country Club Drive
Stevens Point WI 54481-7005
(715) 345-8900 (715) 345-8909

spcc@coredcs.com

Gary Scheuerman
Summer Kitchen
9922 Town Line Rd.
Sister Bay WI 54234-9239
(920) 854-2131

horsetrot@dcwis.com

Mark Schmitz
Pumphouse Pizza & Brewing Co.
19 West Monroe
Lake Delton WI 53940-0745
(608) 253-4687 (608) 254-5337

pumphouse@jvl.net

Arlene Roux
R Place Fine Dining & Cocktails
1508 North Highway F
Edgewater WI 54834-3208
(715) 354-3690 (715) 354-7033

rplace@chibardun.net

Jack B Harmeling
Richards Restaurant
501 Monroe St.
Sheboygan Falls WI 53085-1433
(920) 467-6401

richards@intella.net

Jim Votaw
Rustic Haven
8425 Hwy 38
Caledonia WI 53108-9608
(262) 835-1336

yogipark@aol.com

Ed Traux
Sky Club East
1229 Gillingham Rd.
Neenah WI 54956-3903
(920) 725-8152 (920) 925-5582

edaddressskyclubeast@juno.com

Jacquelyn Simerlein
Stagecoach Inn
W7780 Plank Road
Greenbush WI 53206
(920) 526-3110

jo32151@oknet.net

Tim Ward
Stone Bank Pub & Eatery
N67 W33395 Hwy K
Oconomowoc WI 53066
(262) 966-1975

pubboywis@aol.com

Hassan Lahrache
Taste of Italy
N7 W23825 Bluemound Rd.
Waukesha WI 53188
(414) 542-1721

hlahrache@hotmail.com

Dennis Hoffman
The Berlin Bread Co. & Deli
215 Ripon Road
Berlin WI 54923-2167
(920) 361-1363

dhomffman@wirural.net

Tanya Clausen
Thunderbird Club
936 Acker Parkway
De Forest WI 53532
(608) 846-5841

trae@it is.com

Larry Rosencrans
Traveler's Restaurant
319 E Walworth Avenue
Delavan WI 53115-1119
(414) 728-6919

larryro@execpc.com

Linda J. Alexander
Wells Street Café
429 E Wells St.
Milwaukee WI 53202-3706
(414) 273-1976

wellsstretcafe@hotmail.com

Henry Sinkus
the Pine Baron's
149 County W
Manitowish Water WI 54545
(715) 543-8464 (715) 543-2091

pinebarons@centuryinter.net

Dorothy Marten
Wild Life Bar & Grill
3315 Blackberry Road
Unity WI 54488
(715) 223-8215 (715) 223-2271

tddommer@pcpros.net

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

FOREWORD

A produce wholesaler in Santa Barbara donates 30 flats of slightly soft strawberries to a local food bank.

A restaurant owner in Florida brings four unsold pizzas to a lunch program at a community shelter.

A member of the AmeriCorps National Service Program in Iowa recruits community volunteers to pick corn from an already harvested field. What do these people have in common?

Whether you call it gleaning, food rescue, or food recovery, they are all part of a growing community of individuals who work from day to day to make sure good food goes to the dinner table instead of going to waste.

In the United States, we not only produce an abundance of food, we waste an enormous amount of it as well. Up to one-fifth of America's food goes to waste — in fields, commercial kitchens, markets, schools, and restaurants.

Even in a society where just about everything is disposable, good food going to waste is unacceptable. As long as any child or adult in this country is going hungry, food recovery will be one of my highest personal priorities as Secretary of Agriculture.

Since it was founded by Abraham Lincoln in 1862, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been known as the "People's Department" because it has a direct, positive impact on people's lives. I can think of no greater way to fulfill that legacy than by helping to feed families who would otherwise go hungry.

At USDA, we battle hunger every day. Our Food Stamp Program helps 27 million low-income Americans put food on the table. Our Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) makes sure young children, newborns, and pregnant women get the nutrition they need. Our School Lunch Program ensures that 25 million children don't have to learn on empty stomachs.

These strong Federal programs are essential, but government alone cannot solve the problem of hunger in America. We need your help.

As a catalyst for that help, USDA is working with groups such as Foodchain and Second Harvest to lead a national effort to coordinate public and private projects to rescue the millions of pounds of healthful, uneaten food in this country that would otherwise have been thrown away every year even as millions of Americans go hungry.

This handbook is about what you can do. It lists ways you can join this growing community of volunteers. In short, it tells you how to make a daily difference in the lives and futures of hungry families across our Nation.

Dan Glickman

Secretary of Agriculture

**This Citizen's Guide is
Dedicated to the late
Representative Bill Emerson**

**Former Vice Chair,
Congressional Hunger Caucus**

***"Hunger is an issue
that, in its solution,
should know no
partisan or
ideological bounds."***

---Representative Bill Emerson

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDE

This publication by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) is a resource guide on food recovery programs for businesses, community-based profit or nonprofit organizations, private citizens, and public officials.

It describes some of the prominent food recovery activities already taking place, and suggests how a community, a business, or an individual can support existing programs or begin new efforts. It also outlines key considerations relating to legal issues and food safety.

This guide uses the USDA AmeriCorps Summer of Gleaning as a case study of how various kinds of food recovery activities can work.

In addition, it includes an explanation of how to use the Internet to obtain more information on food recovery, a directory of selected public and private organizations active in food recovery and related issues, the text of the new Federal Good Samaritan law, and a summary of citations for State Good Samaritan laws.

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

I. An Introduction to Food Recovery

Food recovery is the collection of wholesome food for distribution to the poor and hungry. It follows a basic humanitarian ethic that has been part of societies for centuries. We know that "gleaning," or gathering after the harvest, goes back at least as far as biblical days. Today, however, the terms "gleaning" and "food recovery" cover a variety of different efforts. The four most common methods are:

1. *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.

2. *Perishable Food Rescue or Salvage* — The collection of perishable produce from wholesale and retail sources.
3. *Food Rescue* — The collection of prepared foods from the food service industry.
4. *Nonperishable Food Collection* — The collection of processed foods with long shelf lives.

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

II. Why Food Recovery Is Necessary

Fighting Hunger and Poverty

Despite the bounty of our agricultural production here in the United States, one of our most complex and serious health problems is hunger.

Eliminating hunger is a moral issue, driven by compassion for others, as well as a practical issue involving the long-term future of millions of our Nation's children. Chronic hunger and malnutrition take a heavy toll on children's lives. Days missed from school, inattention in class, stunted growth, and frequent illness jeopardize their education and their futures as productive citizens.

In fact, a study by the Community Childhood Hunger Identification Project reports that most low-income families must receive food assistance from several sources, relying on Federal food assistance programs as well as emergency food programs.

Other studies also confirm the need for both food recovery programs and Federal food assistance programs. For example, 90 percent of low-income households with at least one child under the age of 12 use food pantries and soup kitchens and also participate in the School Lunch Program.

Even with Federal assistance and the work of charities and nonprofit organizations, last year nearly 20 percent of the requests for emergency food assistance went unmet.

Ending Food Waste

Food recovery is one creative way to help reduce hunger in America. It supplements Federal food assistance programs by making better use of a food source that already exists.

Up to one-fifth of America's food goes to waste each year, with an estimated 130 pounds of food per person ending up in landfills. The annual value of this lost food is estimated at around \$31 billion. But the real story is that roughly 49 million people could have been fed by those lost resources.

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

III. Ongoing Food Recovery Activities

Currently, more than 10 percent of the U.S. population depends on nonprofit food distribution organizations for a significant part of their nutritional needs.

In the United States, it is estimated that there are 150,000 such private programs helping to feed the hungry. Virtually all these programs use recovered food. While their strategies and emphases may differ, they all operate under two common assumptions that:

5. From fields to markets to tables, the Nation wastes an abundance of edible food; and
6. This food can be collected and redirected to feed the hungry.

Each program is distinct in terms of its size, organization, management, and clientele. Some programs are run by a handful of dedicated volunteers in a barely serviceable facility. Other programs are larger organizations with paid staff and state-of-the-art facilities.

The following programs represent six of the most common approaches.

St. Mary's Food Bank

In the United States, organized food recovery initiatives first gained recognition in the late 1960s. In 1965, John Van Hengel volunteered to feed homeless people in the dining room of St. Mary's mission in Phoenix, Arizona. For two years, he spent much of his time trying to establish programs to simply find food for the hungry.

One day during his work at the mission, Van Hengel met a woman who fed her children with food discarded from grocery stores. She said it was like finding a "bank of food." Thus the term "food bank" came to describe facilities that made food available to the hungry.

In 1967, Van Hengel founded St. Mary's Food Bank. As word of its success spread, groups from all over the country visited the Arizona facility for insight, inspiration, and instruction.

Second Harvest

The sharing of knowledge and experience from the St. Mary's Food Bank led to the founding of Second Harvest in 1979 by John Van Hengel, who served as the first director of Second Harvest. At that time, Second Harvest was comprised of 13 food banks, distributing approximately 200 million pounds of donated food to local agencies serving needy families.

Today, Second Harvest has grown to the largest domestic charitable hunger relief organization in the United States, and the fifth largest charitable organization overall. In 1995, the Second Harvest network distributed 811.3 million pounds of food and grocery products, with a market value of more than \$1 billion. This was done through 181 food banks and more than 50,000 local charitable agencies operating in all 50 states and Puerto Rico.

Independent research has found that the Second Harvest network helps provide emergency food relief to 26 million people each year, of which approximately 11 million are children and 4 million are elderly. Second Harvest's mission is to feed hungry people by soliciting and judiciously distributing marketable but surplus food and grocery products to regional food banks and agencies; to develop, certify and support Second Harvest food banks that channel food to local nonprofit charities; to serve as a liaison between food banks and donors; and to educate the public about the nature of and

solutions to the problems of hunger.

Appendix B of this guide lists addresses and phone numbers of Second Harvest members.

From the Wholesaler to the Hungry

In 1987, Mickey Weiss, a retired produce wholesaler, was visiting his son at the Los Angeles Wholesale Market. He watched as a forklift hoisted 200 flats of ripe, red raspberries, raspberries that had not sold that day, and crushed them into a dumpster! Weiss' retirement didn't last long. Working out of donated office space at the market, he enlisted student volunteers to call community kitchens, while he persuaded friends in the produce business to "put good food to good use."

To make his dream a reality, he formed a team that included the Los Angeles Wholesale Produce Market and the Los Angeles County Department of Agriculture. Today, Mickey Weiss' Charitable Distribution Facility distributes more than 2 million pounds of produce a month throughout southern California.

In 1991, Susan Evans and Peter Clarke joined forces with Weiss. Wanting to replicate his concept nationwide, they designed a systematic consultation process to help cities begin their own fresh produce operations.

The project, From the Wholesaler to the Hungry (FWH), continues to help cities establish programs to channel large donations of fresh fruits and vegetables to community agencies. Adding fresh fruits and vegetables to the diets of low-income Americans improves their nutrition and their health, and helps prevent disease.

Appendix B lists contacts for FWH recovery and distribution programs.

Foodchain

Food rescue programs collect surplus prepared and perishable food from restaurants, corporate cafeterias, caterers, grocery stores, and other food service establishments. This food is distributed to social service agencies that help people in need.

By the late 1980s, pioneers of food rescue programs began to see themselves as members of a nationwide community of local programs working toward the same end and experiencing similar challenges and difficulties. Programs from all over the United States recognized the value of forming a national network and establishing a central resource center.

The network's goals were to actively promote the work of individual food rescue programs and to support their continued growth and development, without disturbing the original programs' diversity and grassroots nature.

The combination of these efforts is now called Foodchain. A network of prepared and perishable food rescue programs, Foodchain opened its doors in November 1992 with a staff of one.

Today, 116 member programs and 22 associate programs participate in Foodchain, distributing nearly 100 million pounds of food to some 7,000 social service agencies each year. Locations of these Foodchain programs are listed in Appendix B.

Society of St. Andrew

The Society of St. Andrew is a nonprofit organization dedicated to ending hunger by using surplus produce to feed the needy. Since 1979, the Society has gleaned 200 million

pounds of fresh fruits and vegetables that were distributed to feeding agencies throughout the United States. This produce is given to foodbanks, soup kitchens, and food pantries free of charge. The Society has offices in Virginia, North Carolina, Texas, and Florida.

National Hunger Clearinghouse—World Hunger Year

The National Hunger Clearinghouse is a program of World Hunger Year under contract with USDA. Its major emphases are gleaning and food recovery and answering the USDA Food Recovery Hotline: "1-800-GLEAN-IT"; however, the mission is much broader, providing information about numerous efforts to fight hunger across America. Included is information on hunger, nutrition, food security, sustainable agriculture, model poverty programs promoting self-reliance, and volunteer opportunities. The Clearinghouse database already has over 20,000 organizations listed, from soup kitchens to restaurants.

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

IV. USDA Food Recovery Activities

Under the leadership of Secretary Dan Glickman, USDA has made food recovery a top priority. Secretary Glickman continues to hold public forums, visit food recovery organizations throughout the Nation, and use many USDA resources to highlight the importance of food recovery.

The Department is not seeking to create a new Federal bureaucracy, but rather to encourage, energize, and provide technical assistance to existing and new private, nonprofit, and corporate food recovery efforts. Here are some examples of USDA activities:

The Cooperative Extension System

Across the country, USDA's Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) plays an active role in the quest to eliminate hunger. CSREES is a major link to the Cooperative Extension System (CES) programs at the land-grant universities in each State.

CES helps diverse agencies and community-based groups work together to establish local hunger programs, administer food recovery programs, and coordinate gleaning programs. Also, since the universities provide a national education network of practical science-based knowledge, an important CES contribution is informal education and training for recipients, staff, and volunteers working with food recovery. CES offers information on food preparation and handling, nutrition, food preservation and safety, dietary guidance, and balanced menu planning. Appendix B lists CES State contacts.

The AmeriCorps National Service Program

AmeriCorps is a domestic national service program created by President Clinton, with bipartisan support from Congress, to allow Americans of all backgrounds to provide community service in exchange for educational awards. Members may use the awards to

pay for college, job training, graduate school, or to pay back existing student loans. Since the inception of AmeriCorps, USDA has sponsored AmeriCorps projects that use a wide variety of tools, including gleaning and food recovery, to fight hunger.

USDA AmeriCorps anti-hunger programs in five different urban and rural locations have been involved in various types of food rescue and distribution activities:

- In Washington, D.C., USDA AmeriCorps members have joined with a local gleaning organization on a regular basis to pick and distribute fresh produce to local soup kitchens and shelters, and teach local children about the importance of gleaning.
- Thousands of loaves of day-old bread have been salvaged by USDA AmeriCorps members from grocery stores in Burlington, Vermont, and donated to local food pantries.
- The USDA AmeriCorps project in Milwaukee has helped allocate tons of food collected through massive food drives to Milwaukee area pantries. The project has also helped rebuild, repair, and repaint the physical plants of the City's food banks.
- In the poverty-stricken counties of the Mississippi Delta, USDA AmeriCorps members have worked with local affiliate groups to establish food banks in areas that have no emergency food assistance facilities.
- In Los Angeles, one entire team of AmeriCorps members is now dedicated to contacting hundreds of area restaurants and fast-food outlets to encourage them to participate in the Los Angeles Regional Food Bank's very successful Second Helpings program, a city-wide perishable food rescue effort.

In the summer of 1996, USDA sponsored a special AmeriCorps Summer of Gleaning program that implemented food recovery projects in 20 States. The AmeriCorps members in this summer program helped recover over 1,005 tons of food, which provided an estimated 1.34 million meals. Since the total Federal dollars spent on this summer program, including transportation and storage of food and stipends and educational awards for the AmeriCorps members, amounted to only \$430,000, the total Federal cost provided was approximately 32 cents per meal.

Other USDA Activities:

- Each Friday, in cooperation with USDA's food service contractor, the two cafeterias at USDA headquarters donate an average of 150 pounds of uneaten food to DC Central Kitchen, a nonprofit group that provides meals to shelters and soup kitchens all over Washington, D.C.
- USDA works in partnership with Burger King Corporation and its purchasing agent to donate food to nationwide food-rescue efforts and to create jobs in rural America.
- USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service worked with The Chef and The Child Foundation of the American Culinary Federation to create a training program on food safety for gleaned foods. Understanding Prepared Foods (including a videotape and workbook) is available to State health departments, shelters, soup kitchens, and nonprofit feeding programs.
- USDA established "1-800-GLEAN-IT," a toll-free hotline to provide an easy-to-reach source of information on how to become a volunteer, donate food, or get

involved in a local gleaning or food recovery program.

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

V. How Americans Can Help Recover Food

In today's world, where so many wake up in poverty and go to sleep hungry, each of us must ask: "How can I help?"

To get involved or to start implementing any of the ideas suggested below, citizens may contact the "1-800-GLEAN-IT" toll-free hotline.

Businesses and Corporations

Many businesses and corporations have already joined the fight against hunger. Corporations such as the Associated Food Dealers of Michigan, American Express, Boston Market, Kentucky Fried Chicken, Kraft Foods, Inc., Marriott International, Northwest Airlines, and Pizza Hut have formed coalitions with community-based food recovery programs to help their neighbors in need.

But the businesses do not have to be national ones. Nor do they have to be food-related. Food recovery programs need volunteers, office equipment, transportation, computer help, and organizational talent.

Participation in food recovery benefits the company, its customers, its employees, and its community. It increases the business' visibility, and the workplace volunteer spirit spills over into the larger society to help build a more cohesive local community.

To help in the fight against hunger and demonstrate commitment to the community, businesses and corporations can start or join a food recovery program, or:

- Encourage, recognize, and reward employees and other individuals for volunteer service to the community. Increase employee awareness of local hunger and provide training to make employees more useful volunteers.
- Sponsor radio and television air time for community organizations that address hunger.
- Donate excess prepared and processed food from the employee cafeteria or from special events to local food recovery programs.
- Donate transportation, maintenance work, or computer service.
- Prepare legal information on donor considerations such as "Good Samaritan" laws and food safety and quality.

Food Service Professionals

- Organize a food drive and donate food to a local food bank or pantry.
- Donate excess prepared food from restaurants or catered events.
- Assist organizations in training their volunteers in safe food-handling practices.

Nonprofit Organizations

- Work independently or with existing organizations to assist on-going food recovery efforts.
- Support or develop a community or regional coalition against hunger.
- Develop a community financial fund to fight hunger.

- Plan tours of food recovery facilities or arrange for knowledgeable speakers to increase community awareness of hunger and poverty problems, and what people are doing to address them.

Youth Service Groups and Volunteer Organizations

- Work on their own or with existing organizations to assist on-going food recovery efforts.
- Organize essay, oratorical or art contests for school children to focus on a child's view of hunger and its consequences.
- Sponsor a community garden that gives a portion of the harvest to food banks, soup kitchens, and other food recovery programs.
- Supply gardening tools and harvesting equipment for local gardening and gleaning efforts.

Individual Citizens

- Volunteer at the food recovery program closest to you.
- Attend food safety training sessions so you are better prepared to volunteer in a soup kitchen or shelter.
- Suggest that organizations you belong to or businesses you work for sponsor food recovery programs.
- Join or form a community walk/run to benefit a food recovery program.

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

VI. Food Safety Issues

A critical consideration in all food recovery projects is maintaining the safety and quality of the donated food while it is stored and transported. The following guidelines, prepared by the Chef and the Child Foundation, Inc. of the American Culinary Federation, Inc. in the workbook, *Understanding Prepared Foods*, may be helpful for entities receiving donated food.

Foodborne Illness

The most commonly reported foodborne illnesses are caused by bacteria. Ironically, these are also the easiest types of foodborne illness to prevent. Thousands of people contract some form of foodborne illness each year. Symptoms may include an upset stomach, nausea, diarrhea, fever, or cramps. Some people are more vulnerable than others to the effects of foodborne illness, particularly infants, the elderly, those with underlying health problems, and the malnourished.

The bacteria that cause foodborne illness don't necessarily make foods look, taste, or smell unusual. Bacteria tend to grow very quickly under certain conditions:

- In temperatures between 40 and 140 degrees Fahrenheit — the Danger Zone.
- In high-protein foods—milk and dairy products, meat, fish, and poultry.
- When moisture is present.
- When they have time to reproduce.

Additionally, bacteria can easily spread through inadvertent cross-contamination. To

avoid such cross-contamination, remember to:

- Avoid touching your face or hair when working with foods.
- Avoid using the same knife, spoon, or tongs on different foods.
- Be sure to clean and sanitize cutting boards and counter space between tasks when working with different foods.
- Avoid reuse of disposable containers. The aluminum pans food is delivered in should not be used again. Recycle them instead.
- Avoid storing washed and unwashed food together.
- Separate the raw and the cooked. Do not let juices from raw meat or poultry come in contact with other foods, surfaces, utensils, or serving plates.
- Wash hands thoroughly with soap and water before handling food or food utensils, and after handling raw meat or poultry.

Receiving and Storing Donated Food

Handling the receiving and storage of donated food properly can greatly help to reduce the potential for foodborne illness. Considerations may include the following:

- Whenever possible, plan with the donor for the receiving of the food.
- Make space in the refrigerator or freezer for the donated food.
- Consider using the FIFO method — First In, First Out; rotate the food to be sure the newest food is to the back.
- Clean all surfaces that you will be using when the food arrives.
- Evaluate the food:
 - Is the food discolored? Is it moldy? Does it have a sour odor?
 - Does frozen food look as if it has been thawed and refrozen?
 - Has anything leaked onto the food from another container?
 - Is the food at the correct temperature?
 - WHEN IN DOUBT, THROW IT OUT.

Additional Information:

"A Quick Consumer Guide to Food Handling," available from USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service, may be ordered from:

FSIS Publications
USDA
Room 1180 South Building
Washington, DC 20250

The Chef and the Child Foundation, American Culinary Federation's workbook and companion video, *Understanding Prepared Foods*, may be ordered from:

The Chef and the Child Foundation
American Culinary Federation
10 San Bartola Drive
St. Augustine, FL 32086
Phone: (904) 824-4468, Ext. 104

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

VII. Legal Issues

The Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act

When citizens volunteer their time and resources to help feed hungry people, they are rightfully concerned that they are putting themselves at legal risk.

Fortunately, recent legislation provides uniform national protection to citizens, businesses, and nonprofit organizations that act in good faith to donate, recover, and distribute excess food.

The Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act converts Title IV of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, known as the Model Good Samaritan Food Donation Act, into permanent law, within the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. Congress passed the legislation in late September, 1996 and President Clinton signed the bill into law on October 1, 1996. The Act is designed to encourage the donation of food and grocery products to nonprofit organizations such as homeless shelters, soup kitchens, and churches for distribution to needy individuals. (The full text of the Act as well as the portions of the National and Community Service Act that it amends are presented in Appendix C.)

The Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act promotes food recovery by limiting the liability of donors to instances of gross negligence or intentional misconduct. The Act further states that, absent gross negligence or intentional misconduct, persons, gleaners, and nonprofit organizations shall not be subject to civil or criminal liability arising from the nature, age, packaging, or condition of apparently wholesome food or apparently fit grocery products received as donations.

It also establishes basic nationwide uniform definitions pertaining to donation and distribution of nutritious foods and will help assure that donated foods meet all quality and labeling standards of Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

Although the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act takes precedence over the various State forms of Good Samaritan statutes, it may not entirely replace such statutes. As a Federal statute, The Emerson Act creates a uniform minimum level of protection from liability for donors and gleaners nationwide. But State Good Samaritan statutes still may provide protection for donors and gleaners above and beyond that guaranteed in the Federal statute. Therefore, local organizations should be familiar with such State statutes. (See Appendix D for a listing of citations for State statutes. Further details may also be obtained by contacting the office of the attorney general for the appropriate State.) In addition, the Emerson Act does not alter or interfere with State or local health regulations or workers' compensation laws. Local organizations in each State should also be familiar with the impact upon food recovery projects of State or local health regulations and workers' compensation laws.

A CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO FOOD RECOVERY

VIII. Lessons from USDA AmeriCorps Summer of Gleaning - A Case Study

How the USDA AmeriCorps Summer of Gleaning Worked

The Summer of Gleaning was based on the philosophy that government should provide energy, vision, and some limited funds to serve as a catalyst to increase citizen efforts. Summer of Gleaning projects worked in partnership with literally hundreds of locally based anti-hunger groups, youth service corps, churches, food banks, and food recovery organizations, that are currently recovering food in 20 States. (See Appendix E.)

These AmeriCorps partnerships created collaborative efforts that brought together farmers, agribusinesses, food distribution organizations, special event organizers, large institutions, and restaurants to recover food that would otherwise have been thrown away. Overall, Federal funding was minimal. The AmeriCorps members received a small living stipend that allowed them to meet basic living expenses as they provided full-time community service. If they successfully completed the program, the AmeriCorps members earned an educational voucher that may be used to partially pay for college, graduate school, job training, or to pay back already existing student loans.

The program was based on the "volunteer generator" model in which a handful of compensated AmeriCorps members recruit numerous noncompensated volunteers to help implement large-scale tasks. The 88 AmeriCorps members in the summer program recruited over 1600 noncompensated community volunteers who helped pick, sort, deliver, and prepare the recovered foods.

There were a total of 22 Summer of Gleaning projects operating 12-week, 480- hour programs that were administered by USDA agencies (Rural Development, the Farm Service Agency, and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service), with technical assistance and support provided by the USDA Food and Consumer Service and the USDA National Service staff.

The 88 AmeriCorps members in the program served in teams of two to six members each, organizing and implementing gleaning projects that rescued ripe fruits and vegetables from farmers' fields that would otherwise have gone unharvested and either been left to rot in the fields or plowed under. The fresh produce was then distributed to needy families and individuals in the local area, emphasizing the community-building aspect of the AmeriCorps program. In addition to gleaning produce directly from farmers, several of the summer projects focused on efforts to rescue prepared and perishable foods from local restaurants, resorts, bakeries, and other businesses involved with food service. Perhaps most importantly, the food recovery programs that were begun through the initiative of the USDA AmeriCorps members now continue to operate in every one of those communities, even though the AmeriCorps members are no longer there.

Key Issues Identified During the Program

The following issues have been identified by staff and project partners. They do not represent a comprehensive approach to food recovery issues, but do provide one case study about key challenges and solutions that can affect many food recovery projects:

Creating and Implementing Partnerships

No gleaning project can operate without effective local partnerships, and the AmeriCorps

USDA Summer of Gleaning projects were no exception.

In general, effective partnerships appear to have been easily established between the Federal agencies responsible for administering the gleaning projects and local nonprofit organizations.

USDA staff provided preliminary guidance and information to potential project managers and, wherever possible, tried to facilitate links among groups that sometimes were not even aware of each other's existence. Comprehensive lists of local groups, such as those in Appendix B of this guide, were provided to local project managers at a training program and through subsequent mailings in order to give them a starting point.

However, in many cases we found that this type of information was not needed, because the project managers were already familiar with the types of services available in their own communities. Most of the project proposals came in to USDA headquarters with letters of commitment from a wide variety of partners, saving a great deal of start-up time for the short summer projects that could be better used contacting farmers or other donors and getting right to work on the actual gleaning/food recovery activities.

In creating partnerships, it is essential to delineate the responsibilities of each participant in the project. Each partner needs to know exactly what it will be expected to contribute, and what it can expect the others to do. This must be done at the beginning of the project, to eliminate confusion and possible collapse as the project proceeds.

Formal written agreements are not always necessary, but letters of commitment are a very good idea. Administering agencies should also be prepared to replace partners in the event that some logistical problems arise; a contingency list is advisable.

Once a project develops to a level where there are several key partners involved, regular contact, either through meetings or conference calls, should be sustained to avoid confusion and to be sure that all of the necessary tasks are being completed and all commitments are being fulfilled.

Some of the summer projects were slightly less effective in implementing good partnerships because they did not always recognize an organization's real potential as a good partner. Every group, organization, and company that brings added value, however small, to the project should be treated as a valuable partner. USDA noted that thanks and recognition, even in small gestures, often generated increased support for the project, and played a critical part in the local communities' interest in continuing the gleaning projects beyond the summer.

General Donor Identification Issues

Obviously, finding donors for any sort of food recovery program, whether it involves farm and field gleaning, or is designed around a prepared and perishable food rescue operation, is absolutely critical. Without the donors, there is no food to be recovered. USDA learned through the AmeriCorps Summer of Gleaning projects that, because this is such a critical element, contacts with potential donors must be one of the first tasks accomplished if a program is going to succeed. Furthermore, if donors are carefully identified, solicited, and maintained during the gleaning project, they are much less likely to drop out of the program as it progresses, and their peers who declined to participate at the outset, for whatever reason, are more likely to offer their own contributions as well.

Two types of food recovery programs — farm gleaning and perishable food rescue programs — have a number of common concerns related to donors.

For example, both types of donors are going to be concerned about liability questions,

such as, "What if someone gets sick from the sandwiches I donate because they weren't refrigerated properly after they left my restaurant?" or, "What if someone trips and falls while gathering cucumbers in my field?"

To respond to these questions, the person who is soliciting donations should be familiar with the appropriate Good Samaritan laws, both the new Emerson Food Donation Act that establishes minimum standard Federal policy about liability and immunity in every State, and the particular State statutes that may provide additional protection for donors and gleaners involved in food recovery programs.

Another concern to keep in mind is that most people in the food production business, whether they are growing fresh food to be sold to commercial processors or preparing it to be consumed right away, are trying to make a profit. Solicitors should be very tactful and careful not to present their requests in a way that would threaten the donor; what is being offered instead is an opportunity to make good use of food that would not have been sold and would otherwise be thrown away.

The project manager and/or staff members should make every effort to speak with someone at the potential donor's place of business who is actually in a position to make the decision and the commitment to participate in the project.

All donors need to be pampered, to a certain degree. They need to know that a food recovery program manager is aware that if it weren't for the donors' contributions, there would be no program. Project managers must remember that donors are partners in this effort, who need to have a real stake in the project's outcome. They need to be approached carefully, and once engaged, they need to be treated as valuable members of the process from the beginning to the end of the project. Including donors on an advisory council that is set up to oversee and sustain a gleaning project is a good way to accomplish this, as it underscores the donors' relevance to the project. Finally, donors should always be thanked for their contributions as publicly as possible (or at least to the extent that they are comfortable with such expressions of appreciation).

Identifying Donors for Farm Gleaning Projects

The experience with the 22 summer gleaning projects in 1996 indicates that the State and county USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) offices can be essential partners in any successful gleaning project. (These local offices can be found in most phone books in the blue government pages under "Federal government — Agriculture Department.") FSA is the entity that knows, on a daily basis, what is being grown by farmers in a given area, how the crops are coming along, when they will be ready to be harvested, and what sort of prices are likely to be paid for various foods.

The FSA County Directors are also a valuable resource because the farmers generally know and trust them. This confers legitimacy and credibility to the gleaning project that might otherwise take months to establish. In general, the summer projects administered through FSA were able to identify their donors much more quickly, and rarely lost donors during the course of the project period. Therefore, it is a good idea for all non-FSA project managers to establish a working partnership with FSA first, thereby saving considerable time and effort that can be better devoted to other aspects of project management. FSA is a critical conduit to the farmers, especially when another agency is administering the gleaning project.

State departments of agriculture can also be extremely valuable resources in helping to identify donors for gleaning projects. These agencies are not only closely tied to the

individual growers — possibly even more than the FSA office — but are also usually the offices that approve and establish farmers' markets and organize the State and county fairs. Furthermore, the importance of involving the appropriate State and local agencies in a project such as this cannot be overstated, as such involvement helps to build a sense of community and cooperation at the local level.

Several summer project managers suggested that a database be set up that identifies and tracks the vital information that makes a gleaning project possible. Such a database would include information such as who is growing what food, who is likely to have excess crops, who might be willing to donate that excess to the gleaning project, when the different crops will be ready to be harvested, how long it would take to glean all or part of a field, the best method(s) for harvesting a given crop, and pick-up schedules for the harvested food being donated. The database can then be cross-referenced to a similar database that indicates the names, addresses, needs and preferences, and capacities of the recipients or recipient agencies, as well as names of volunteers who can be called on to gather the crops from the farmer's field.

Before going out to ask a farmer to donate, the project manager needs to anticipate questions that the farmer is likely to raise. Keep in mind that a farmer is going to have some unique concerns that will need to be addressed, and it is important not to make a commitment that will be impossible to keep, such as an absolute guarantee that no one can sue him if injured while on his land. (Anyone can file a lawsuit against anyone else. The "Good Samaritan" laws just set some guidelines for who would win such a lawsuit.)

Be prepared to discuss the liability provisions in detail; have a copy of the "Good Samaritan" law, or a well-written summary of its provisions, to give the farmer.

Initiate a discussion of who will be responsible for providing the containers for the gleaned produce: Will they be provided by the farmer, or will they have to be brought in? What are the farmer's concerns about having all these unknown people on the farm? Does the farmer have ground rules that need to be identified up front (such as no use of the restroom facilities or the telephone in the house, don't drive vehicles in certain areas)?

One final issue that will be very important to most farmers is how well-equipped the gleaning project is to handle produce on very short notice. If a project needs 3 or 4 days to make all the arrangements to get out to a certain farm, the farmer is not likely to want to participate, because he or she may not know how much there is to donate until it becomes necessary either to move the excess off the field or to plow it under so another crop can be planted.

It is important to remember that producers are professionals whose time and product are valuable. Neither should be wasted by promising to glean and then not showing up, or showing up at the wrong time or place, or showing up with the wrong type of gleaners (e.g., Boy Scouts, when the producer specifically said no children).

Identifying Donors for Food Rescue Projects

Most of the lessons that USDA learned about identifying and soliciting farmers as donors for field gleaning projects can be easily adapted and applied to commercial entities as potential donors for food rescue programs. In addition to knowing the applicable Good Samaritan laws, the project manager should also be conversant with State and local health department restrictions and requirements that would affect the donation of prepared foods, as well as basic food safety procedures for handling and storing of the donated items.

If the project is working in partnership with an established food bank, especially the larger ones with extensive recipient agencies, the manager should be very careful not to design a process that conflicts with, duplicates, or disrupts the food bank's regular donor list. One of the most frequent difficulties encountered during the summer projects was related to this issue, when the AmeriCorps project contacted a potential donor who was already a regular donor for an established food recovery system. As a general rule, new food recovery efforts should be extremely careful not to compete with pre-existing efforts.

The best way to convince potential donors to participate in a food rescue program, after reassuring them about the liability issues, is to offer them an arrangement that is as easy as possible. This means that once the donor has agreed to contribute allowable leftovers, the food rescue project would be prepared to do just about everything that the donor does not agree to do, such as arrange a pick-up schedule that is convenient for the donor, provide the transportation, and provide the resources needed to pick up the food and take it away.

Identifying Recipients

Obviously, recovering the food is only half the job; the second half consists of finding someone who can use the food once it has been recovered. In virtually every community in America today, there are families and individuals who lack the resources to obtain good quality, nutritious foods at prices they can afford.

Donated food recipients are not always homeless, or substance-abusers, or irresponsible, or even unemployed; they simply have to make some very hard choices about how to spend whatever funds they have. Unfortunately, food, particularly wholesome, healthy food, is not always one of the things they choose. Therefore, the task of identifying potential recipients who can benefit from a food recovery project is rarely difficult; the difficulty is in identifying those who will benefit most from such an effort.

Based on USDA's experiences with the AmeriCorps gleaning projects, it is much simpler and more efficient to establish a firm partnership with a local food bank or distributing agency that already has a regular clientele or recipients. This can be accomplished effectively at several levels. For example, a food bank, such as the Atlanta Community Food Bank or the Greater Chicago Food Depository, distributes recovered food to smaller, grass-roots types of organizations that then provide direct meal services or boxes/bags of food to needy families and individuals. When a project works through such an arrangement, it can devote more of its time, energy, and other resources to acquiring the food itself, because the food bank has a system in place to evaluate and allocate the recovered foods to those facilities that can use it best. This process works especially well in urban areas, by keeping the food recovery project managers from running the risk of competing with the larger organizations or of unnecessarily duplicating their efforts. On the other hand, in some of the smaller communities, and particularly in rural areas, gleaning projects work best by delivering their produce directly to a shelter or soup kitchen. Project staff seem to find this approach more gratifying because they maintain a degree of control over the process a little longer, and can see first-hand the results of their efforts. As with the system described above, however, the final recipients of the recovered foods have already been identified by the local facility.

The third option—by far the most time-consuming and labor-intensive—has individuals and families solicited and identified directly by the gleaning project itself. Project

managers work with local social service offices, and/or advertise the project to develop a pool of eligible recipients. Sometimes this is the only option available, in instances where relatively small amounts of food are expected to be recovered, or in the small rural communities that do not have facilities to provide emergency meal services or food assistance to those in need.

One additional benefit to this approach is that the project can establish its own criteria and requirements for eligibility, such as a requirement to attend a class on proper handling, storage, and preparation of the food that is received. But this option should be used only for projects that cannot find a local or regional food bank to work with as a partner.

Collecting the Food

Collection and transportation of recovered food were by far the most expensive aspects of the summer gleaning projects. Suitable containers to hold the produce as it was picked and delivered were absolutely essential. The farmers who donated the produce could not be expected to provide these containers because they represent a significant expense. Several projects were very successful in obtaining donations of boxes and bags for the gleaned food, but this is an area that needs to be budgeted carefully. Arrangements to obtain containers also need to be made early in the development of the gleaning project, because by the time the food is ready to be harvested, an adequate supply may not be available.

Transporting the Food

Although the purchase of containers for the gleaned food should be considered and budgeted as a significant expense, transportation is also a major expense. There are actually two separate issues: transportation of volunteers, and transportation of the food itself.

- 7. Transportation of Volunteers.** Although this issue did not arise consistently in all 22 projects, there were a few instances where it became a critical issue. USDA does not recommend that gleaning project managers commit to providing transportation for volunteers as a regular practice unless they already have the capacity to do so. With sufficient time allowed in the project development stage, contingency plans for transporting volunteers to and from the project site (farm, warehouse, soup kitchen, etc.) should be included in the initial project design.
- 8. Transportation of Food.** Because freshly harvested produce is perishable, it must be transported to the delivery point as quickly and as safely as possible. Refrigerated trucks are always preferable, but are often prohibitively expensive. Regular (nonrefrigerated) trucks can be used as long as appropriate precautions are taken to ensure that the safety of the harvested produce is not compromised. Most of the summer projects incurred major expenses in renting trucks to carry the food that was gleaned either to a food bank with a cold storage facility or directly to a soup kitchen that would be using the food immediately. However, some projects were able to transport the gleaned/rescued food at no cost whatsoever, because they had established partnerships that provided this service. For example, the project in the State of Washington was able to use the Emergency Food Network's (EFN's) 40-foot refrigerated truck because EFN was one of the primary partners there. Another example of creative partnership was in

Illinois. The Illinois National Guard provided trucks and drivers for the duration of the program.

Storing the Food

Storage of food recovered through the AmeriCorps gleaning projects was not a large problem. Those projects that did not deliver the food directly to its final destination, such as a homeless shelter where it was usually used immediately in that day's meal preparation, made sure that it was delivered to a food bank with an appropriate warehousing facility. Some concern was expressed by one of the project managers that when the latter procedure was used, the AmeriCorps project staff had no way to be sure that it was used promptly.

Communicating With the Public

Communicating the activities and successes of gleaning projects through the media helps generate support for food salvage efforts — and finding volunteers and new sources for food recovery. Media coverage also increases awareness and could lead to further use of food recovery efforts.

Salvaging excess food for distribution to the hungry has an innate high human interest factor, a key component in attracting media coverage. Initial project plans should incorporate a communications strategy outlining media goals and indicating specifically how they will be achieved. If time and staff resources are problems, a volunteer with media experience may be identified to spearhead media efforts, such as the developing of a list (with fax numbers) of news and assignment editors of print and broadcast media in the area. A partnering organization may also provide public relations assistance. Planning media events with the sole purpose of attracting coverage is essential. Some suggestions include planning a kickoff ceremony, designating a Day of Food Recovery, or inviting a well-known personality or official to visit the project site. Maybe there is a novel aspect to a project that would draw media attention, such as a grade school class—or some homeless veterans—volunteering to glean for a day.

A week before the event, a media advisory should be sent, indicating the who, what, and where of the activity, daily and weekly, with a contact and telephone number. The day before the event, someone should telephone the appropriate editor at the local newspaper(s) as well as assignment editors at local television or radio stations. The day of the event, a news release goes out emphasizing its success.

Here are some other recommendations for communicating with the public:

- Ignore no media—but remember television has the largest audience.
- Don't forget radio talk shows—they are always looking for people to interview on issues or specific programs.
- Consider whether the public affairs department of the local television or radio stations would be willing to run public service announcements.
- When following up with media, don't call during deadline times. Find out the deadline hour for daily reporters, the deadline day of the week for weeklies, and call broadcast assignment editors no later than an hour before a news broadcast.
- If the time and financial resources are available, develop your own video release or radio actuality (a 1- or 2-minute news story on cassette for distribution to radio stations).
- Include specialized media, such as national periodicals on hunger, an area general

- interest magazine, or religious publications on your list.
- Send out press updates, such as: "A month after kickoff, the local gleaning project has harvested 500 pounds of vegetables, the equivalent of 250 meals for needy families."
 - And always, always send out an end-of-project press release detailing the program's accomplishments and the people and partners who made it happen.

Recruiting and Managing Volunteers

Volunteers must be recruited, trained, supervised, thanked, motivated, and thanked again. Volunteers can be recruited from the membership of all project partners, as well as through the media. Recruitment efforts must be high-profile and persistent. One of the best ways to manage volunteers is to be organized, so that the volunteers' time is not wasted. Telling people to show up at a field at 9:00 and then not getting to work until 10:00 can significantly reduce the number of volunteers next time. In several projects, such as Baltimore, Maryland, and the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, the most reliable and satisfied volunteers were the people who were also the recipients of the food that was gleaned. Another extremely successful and innovative approach was to get volunteers from State correctional departments' alternate sentencing projects and minimum security inmates. The precautions and requirements for this approach were extensive, but project managers who tried it seemed to believe that the extra effort was worthwhile in light of both the quality and quantity of work accomplished. Finally, some of the projects relied almost exclusively on the AmeriCorps members to glean the produce or arrange to have it harvested and picked up at the farm, rather than to facilitate the process by recruiting volunteers to get the job done. This area will need special attention for future gleaning projects, but it can likely be resolved with a slightly longer planning/start-up period and more direct treatment of the issue during the preliminary training and technical assistance phase of the program.

Food Recovery on the Internet

Two possible approaches to finding gleaning and food recovery organizations and resources on the Internet are:

9. General search of the World Wide Web

A general search of the World Wide Web can be conducted using search tools such as YAHOO or LYCOS. When using these tools be aware that the terms "hunger" and "hunger resources" are more likely to identify the relevant organizations than the terms "gleaning" or "food recovery."

10. Beginning at specific sites

The following web sites are good starting points to search for gleaning and food recovery related web sites:

USDA Gleaning and Food Recovery Home Page:

<http://www.usda.gov/fcs/glean.htm>

World Hunger Year (see the site's "hunger and poverty" links) :

<http://www.iglou.com/why/glean/>

Second Harvest:

<http://www.secondharvest.org/>

The Contact Center Network:
<http://www.contact.org/ccn.htm>

United Way:
<http://www.efsp.unitedway.org/>

Food Recovery and Gleaning State Resource List

One way to find information about food recovery activities across the Nation is to call USDA's 1-800-GLEAN-IT toll-free hotline, which is managed by World Hunger Year. It is an easy-to-reach source of information on food recovery and how to volunteer or donate food. Perhaps the best way to get involved is to contact an organization nearest you already working on food recovery-related issues. Listed below is a State-by-State directory of such organizations, in alphabetical order by location of each organization's office, marked by the following affiliation codes:

CES = Cooperative Extension Service: comprises USDA-affiliated programs at the land-grant universities in each State. CES helps diverse agencies and community-based groups work together to establish local hunger programs, promote food safety and proper nutrition, and administer food recovery programs.

FC = Foodchain: Founded in 1992, Foodchain is a national network of prepared and perish-able food rescue programs. It includes 140 member programs in 40 States and the District of Columbia. Membership requires organizations to comply with the network's food safety and donation guidelines. In 1997, Foodchain programs distributed more than 150 million pounds of food to 12,000 agencies. The organization provides technical assistance and marketing support, and matches donors to member programs. National contact: (800) 845-3008.

FSA = The USDA Farm Service Agency: Each state office of the Farm Service Agency has appointed one staff member to coordinate field gleaning activities state-wide and to help food recovery groups connect with farmers, ranchers, and orchard owners. Note: when sending information to state offices, make sure "FSA" is in the first line of the address. National contact: Sue Rourk King, (816) 926-6189, fax (816) 823-2464.

SH = Second Harvest, which is a nationwide network of food banks. The largest charitable hunger relief organization in the country, it oversees the distribution of surplus food and grocery products through 188 network affiliate food banks and nearly 50,000 charitable agencies. These food pantries, soup kitchens, and homeless shelters serve nearly 26 million people each year. In 1997, Second Harvest distributed 860 million pounds of food to hungry people. Note that some of the food banks served entire states or large regions of states through other delivery sites, which are not listed; to find such sites, you can call any food bank listed in your State. National office: (312) 263-2303.

SOSA = Society of St. Andrew, which is the Nation's leading field gleaning organization, rescuing over 20 million pounds of fresh fruits and vegetables yearly which would normally be discarded. The produce is taken as a charitable donation at growers packing and grading sheds or gleaned directly from farmers' fields. Produce is delivered to food banks, soup kitchens, and food pantries free of charge through the national Potato Project program and local Gleaning Networks. National contact: (800) 333-4597.

WH = From the Wholesaler to the Hungry has helped launch many systematic produce recovery programs and get them on their way to continuous and large-scale distribution of nutritious fresh fruits and vegetables to low-income people.

National contacts: Susan H. Evans and Peter Clarke, (323) 442-2613.

Wisconsin

Feed My People (SH)
P.O. Box 1714
Eau Claire, WI 54702
(715) 835-9415

Second Harvest of
Southern Wisconsin (SH)
2802 Dairy Drive
Madison, WI 53704
(608) 223-9121
Fax: (608) 223-9840

USDA - Wisconsin State Office (FSA)
6515 Watts Road, Suite 100
Madison, WI 53719-2726
(608) 276-8732 Ext. 141
Fax: (608) 271-9425

Wisconsin Harvest
1717 N. Stoughton Road
Madison, WI 53704
(608) 246-4730 ext. 206
(608) 246-4760

Second Harvest Food Bank
of Wisconsin (SH)
1700 W. Fond Du Lac Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53205
(414) 931-7400
Fax: (414) 931-1996

Second Harvest of Fox Valley (SH)
1436 Progress Lane
Omro, WI 54962
(414) 865-6626
Fax: (414) 685-6639

Appendix E
World Wide Web Sites

Directory:End World Hunger

<http://members.aol.com/pforpeace/dirla.htm>

Hunger Prevention in Wisconsin - Hunger Task Force of Milwaukee

<http://www.dhfs.state.wi.us/children/hunger/food system.html>

Interfaith Voices Against Hunger

<http://web.pac.edu/~shaver/ivah.html>

New Jersey Farmers Against Hunger

<http://www.state.nj.us/agriculture/njfah.htm>

Second Harvest

<http://www.secondharvest.org/>

The Contact Center Network

<http://www.contact.org/ccn.htm>

The End Hunger Network

<http://www.cdc.net/~tvnow/hunger.htm>

The Hunger Project

<http://www.thp.org/>

The Hunger Web

<http://www.brown.edu/Departments/WorldHungerProgram/>

The National Food Rescue Network

www.foodchain.org

United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR)

<http://gbgm-umc.org/units/umcor/>

United Way

<http://www.efsp.unitedway.org/>

USDA Gleaning and Food Recovery Home Page

<http://www.usda.gov/fcs/glean.htm>

World Hunger Education Service

<http://www.healthfinder.gov/text/orgs/hr1202.htm>

World Hunger; Poverty; Ethics

http://ethics.acusd.edu/world_hunger.html

World Hunger Year

<http://www.iglou.com/why/glean/>