

Catalyzing a Local Food System

4P FOODS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
MAY 2019 – JUNE 2022
FUNDED BY PATH FOUNDATION
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA

IMPACT EVALUATION REPORT

PREPARED BY
KAREN HINIKER SIMONS, CFA
APRIL 2024
Hudson Varick Resources, Ltd.

Executive Summary

Overview:

This evaluation report details the impact of the three-year, \$1.2 million expenditure responsibility grant the PATH Foundation (PATH) made to 4P Foods (4P), a for-profit mission-driven aggregator and distributor of local foods (a food hub) based in Warrenton, Virginia. The PATH Foundation is a health conversion foundation located in north-central Virginia dedicated to strengthening the health and vitality of Fauquier, Rappahannock, and Culpeper Counties. PATH's goals for the grant were to establish a year-round supply of healthy, local food for distribution to educational and charitable institutions and to catalyze a Good Food Movement¹ within the three counties. As part of the grant, 4P was required to undertake specific Charitable Activities including outreach to farmers (especially those from underrepresented demographics), subsidized food sales to charitable and/or educational institutions, food donations to food access organizations, and participation in a Demonstration Project. This report evaluates 4P's achievement of the Charitable Activities and the impact of 4P's activities on fostering a Good Food Movement in the PATH Foundation's geographic footprint (PFF).

4P was required to undertake specific Charitable Activities as 4P is a for-profit food hub. A foundation making a grant to a for-profit in the food sector is uncommon but not without precedent and can be made if certain conditions are met. Treasury Regulations permit foundations to make grants to organizations that are not 501(c)(3) public charities if the foundation undertakes specific activities such as pre-grant due diligence, meets IRS reporting requirements, and exercises expenditure responsibility over the grant in accordance with Section 53.4945-5(b)(3). According to the regulations, the primary purpose of an expenditure responsibility grant must be to accomplish one or more of the foundation's charitable purposes. PATH's Charitable Purpose is "to accomplish charitable and educational purposes in furtherance of PATH Foundation's mission of strengthening the health and vitality of our community by enhancing the local Good Food landscape of Fauquier, Rappahannock and Culpeper Counties, and fostering the human, environmental, economic and social health of our region." To ensure compliance with the regulations, PATH and 4P developed specific Charitable Activities for 4P to undertake that met PATH's Charitable Purpose and Charitable Objectives (Appendix 1).

The Demonstration Project required 4P to work with an impact evaluator (Hudson Varick Resources, Ltd. "HVR"), a business technical assistance provider (Citrin Cooperman, "Citrin"), and participate in quarterly calls with Demonstration Project participants. The inclusion of HVR from the start allowed them to develop baseline data, see the impact of 4P's activities on the PFF, and recognize the impact of the Demonstration Project design in real time. Citrin undertook a deep dive analysis of 4P's operations, helped integrate the financials after 4P acquired Local Food Hub's wholesale business, and developed a line-item operational budget. The inclusion of Citrin's technical assistance gave 4P much needed business support and was critical in developing 4P's financial and operational approach. The quarterly reporting and calls provided an opportunity to discuss 4P's financial health, operational issues, and impact. The project design positively impacted outcomes and created holistic support for 4P's work as described later in this evaluation.

The grant period began May 15, 2019 when PATH funded 4P's acquisition of Local Food Hub's wholesale business and the construction of a new warehouse. Over the next nine months, 4P constructed the new warehouse, worked to grow wholesale accounts, and expanded operations. In March 2020, the COVID crisis hit, significantly disrupting 4P's new wholesale business. The national closure of

¹ PATH Foundation defines the Good Food Movement as one which promotes the consumption of locally produced food, supports local farmers and businesses, protects the environment, and improves personal health.

nonessential businesses prompted 4P to significantly pivot to meet surging consumer demand. 4P's operations scaled astronomically in the final three months of the first year of the project (March to June 2020), with an astonishing 11,605% year-over-year revenue increase. In addition to meeting the overwhelming consumer demand, 4P initiated food access programs such as "Taco Tuesday" and "Community Cooks" that supported the local community, farmers, and food businesses. 4P also developed regional collaborations with the launch of the Eastern Food Hub Collaborative and the Mid-Atlantic Food Resilience & Access Coalition (MAFRAC) which strengthened regional food systems and ensured a steady supply of local, healthy food. In the second year, 4P's consumer sales continued to grow at a slower rate, and the wholesale business slowly restarted with a concentration on strategic partnerships focused on food access. In the final year of the Demonstration Project, 4P slowly increased institutional sales, negotiated support for BIPOC farmers, and applied for federal and state grants that supported regional food system development.

Evaluation Scope:

Two evaluation questions provided a framework for assessing evaluation outcomes: (1) Did 4P operations catalyze the Good Food Movement in the PFF? and (2) What effect did the Demonstration Project design have on the expected grant outcomes? The first question was divided into four sections: (A) Supporting charitable and educational institutions in the PFF that have missions aligned with the grant's Charitable Purpose in gaining access to local produce; (B) Improving access for poor, low-income, and underrepresented (including minority) farmers to markets that enable them to better support their families and expand the reach of their goods; (C) Strengthening the health and vitality of communities in the PFF through local aggregation; and (D) Enhancing the Good Food landscape in the PFF.

Evaluation Outcomes

(1) Did 4P Foods' operations catalyze the Good Food Movement in the PFF?

The original intent of the grant was to provide 4P with a wholesale line of business, in addition to its existing consumer business, as a means to catalyze healthy food into PFF institutions. However, due to the pandemic, 4P increased healthy food access through its consumer business and food security work. 4P's blended business model afforded them the flexibility to quickly pivot from a wholesale to consumer market, meet the extraordinary demand for food, and create community food system resiliency in the PFF. The pandemic validated the importance of a blended food hub business model in creating resilient community food systems. Importantly, 4P met or exceeded all of the Charitable Activities except for hiring a PFF intern in the second and third years (due to the pandemic) and supporting a nonprofit grower in the first year of the grant.

(A) Supporting charitable and educational institutions in the PFF that have missions aligned with the grant's Charitable Purpose in gaining access to local produce: PFF charitable and educational institutions were under great pressure for the duration of the grant period due to the pandemic. By the end of the grant period, PFF buyers were interested in buying locally if the pricing fit into their budgets, but most lacked the capacity to change procurement processes. 4P made significant contributions to PFF community food access through unanticipated community-based activities such as Taco Tuesday, Community Cooks, and Fresh Pharmacy. 4P also leveraged connections with regional partners, creating MAFRAC and the Eastern Food Hub Collaborative, which brought a healthy food supply to the PFF when other food supply chains were breaking down.

(B) Improving access for poor, low-income, and underrepresented (including minority) farmers to markets that enable them to better support their families and expand the reach of their goods: 4P strengthened the health and vitality of the PFF farming community from baseline but struggled to have

significant impact across the three counties due to farmers preferring the more lucrative direct-to-consumer market that emerged during the pandemic. Additionally, lack of wholesaling knowledge and infrastructure impeded 4P's sourcing. The hiring of a Grower Services Specialist may support increased PFF aggregation going forward.

(C) Strengthening the health and vitality of communities in the PFF through local aggregation: The PFF community economically benefited from 4P's presence through 4P's focus on local purchasing, regional sales, and place-based employment. At the end of the grant period, 4P had 40 full-time and part-time employees at Vint Hill, 14 of which were PFF residents. 4P estimated the direct regional economic impact of operations at \$5.6 million in 2020.²

(D) Enhancing the Good Food landscape in the PFF: 4P catalyzed the Good Food Movement through aggregation and distribution activities, food access activities, network development, and the creation of multi-stakeholder partnerships. The health and vitality of the PFF community was strengthened through 4P's activities during the Demonstration Project. Healthy food access was improved throughout the PFF because of 4P's activities. It is unlikely that the PFF would have had the same level of access to healthy food without 4P's contributions.

(2) What effect did the Demonstration Project design have on grant outcomes?

The Demonstration Project design ensured 4P had the tools to succeed and supported impact. The business technical assistance provided 4P with needed skills and support and the quarterly calls provided real time advice and feedback on activities and impact. This environment gave 4P the ability to shift tactics as needed, innovate, and explore new approaches to address food system barriers. The project design and grant funding provided 4P's management with the capacity to focus on catalyzing the PFF Good Food Movement despite the challenges encountered. Additionally, the collaborative relationship between PATH and 4P created impactful grassroots initiatives and enhanced grant outcomes.

PATH/4P Collaboration

Collaboration between PATH and 4P not only improved the grant's effectiveness but also played a pivotal role in catalyzing positive change in the PFF's food system. What started as a traditional funder/grantee relationship evolved into a transformative collaboration rooted in thought partnership and network building. 4P's pandemic response inspired confidence and strengthened collective efforts. This connection extended beyond the pandemic and continues to support and inform PATH's investment in food systems today. This evaluation details the power of collaboration in fostering positive change and could support a participatory grantmaking case study (Appendix 4).

² Using an economic multiplier of 1.49 for 4P's regional sales, the economic impact of 4P's purchasing was \$4.2 million and the economic impact of the 40 jobs (average wages of \$35,000) was \$1.4 million. Additionally, 110 indirect jobs were created in the region if an economic multiplier of 2.76 is used for calculating the impact of 4P's transportation and distribution operations.

Lessons Learned

- ***A values-aligned community of supportive networks and relationships brings about change:*** Through 4P's mission-driven work, a network of PFF food system stakeholders were connected, trusting relationships were developed, and innovative programs were designed. The PFF Good Food Movement was catalyzed in part because 4P facilitated network and relationship development.
- ***4P's blended business model created local food system resiliency:*** 4P's ability to shift operations from wholesale (Business-to-Business, or B2B) to consumer (Business-to-Consumer, or B2C) sales maintained local and regional access to healthy food and kept people employed when other food supply chains broke down. This blended business model allows for greater flexibility when market demand changes, creating food system resiliency.
- ***Strong mission-driven management is a significant contributor to success:*** 4P's leadership fostered an atmosphere of trust and respect for people and an environment of creativity and collaboration that kept the mission central to 4P's operations.
- ***Food systems work may need philanthropic funding:*** 4P undertook non-revenue generating activities such as farmer technical assistance and convening of public-private partnerships for regional grants. These activities were operational costs to 4P but essential to catalyzing progress. While a food hub is well-positioned to assemble food system actors with its values-based position in the middle of the supply chain, the time invested in this work is expensive. Philanthropic funding is key to supporting work on food systems development at a for-profit food hub like 4P.
- ***Impact reporting requires capacity and funding:*** Initially, 4P did not have the internal capacity nor technical expertise to meet the reporting requirements of PATH's grant. 4P's reporting improved dramatically after receiving a grant from another foundation to fund a consultant to work on impact reporting. This funding was critical in improving reports to PATH and later in reporting impact to existing and potential philanthropic funders and private investors.
- ***Holistic funding accelerates change:*** PATH's wider grantmaking had a significant impact on 4P grant outcomes. Seventeen agricultural entities, food access organizations, and public schools participating in the PFF food system received grants. Most of these organizations interacted with 4P in some capacity, from purchasing food to supporting the Good Food Movement building.
- ***Listen to community needs and fund in real-time:*** PATH worked directly with community stakeholders to develop needed programs during the pandemic. PATH continued this approach throughout the grant period by responding to community and food system needs with funding and other capacity supports.
- ***Rethink food hub donations to food access organizations:*** Food hubs are unable to donate food until close to the expiration date due to the cost of operations. If produce is close to spoiling, processing it into a shelf-stable food may be a better answer. Facilitating donations directly from farmers who grow for food access organizations could support access to fresher and culturally appropriate food.
- ***Regional work is needed in food systems to bring about local change:*** PATH looked to build the local food system by focusing 4P on the PFF. However, 4P's regional food system work demonstrated that a regional, system-wide approach was also needed to effect change in the PFF.

Conclusion

The PFF now has a growing Good Food Movement and a Good Food ecosystem to support its progress. 4P was critical to the development of the Good Food Movement through food access activities, network development, and the creation of multi-stakeholder partnerships. The farming community continues to benefit from 4P's work encouraging regional institutions to buy local. The Virginia Department of Education Centralized Local Procurement Pilot Program grant, which 4P was instrumental in securing, will bring more healthy food into PFF schools. 4P's activities will continue to transform the PFF food system and create economic opportunity in the community.

PATH supported 4P with business technical assistance, network connections, and funding. Business technical and networking assistance is often provided by business incubators, rather than foundations, making this aspect of the project unusual. This type of support contributed significantly to the success of the grant. PATH made grants to charitable and educational institutions to facilitate purchasing from 4P; additionally, their grants to farmer initiatives supported 4P's local sourcing. These efforts created opportunities for relationships to develop between supply chain participants, lowering barriers to future interactions.

The most unexpected outcome of the grant was the magnification of impact resulting from the collaboration between PATH and 4P. COVID was the catalyst for increased collaboration between PATH and 4P and, given the effectiveness of this partnership, it is clear that any food system development could benefit from more and stronger collaborative relationships. Working directly with the stakeholders and co-creating projects appears to move systems forward faster toward mutually defined goals.

1. INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report details the impact of the three-year, \$1.2 million expenditure responsibility grant from the PATH Foundation (PATH) to 4P Foods (4P), a for-profit mission-driven aggregator and distributor of local foods (a food hub) based in Warrenton, Virginia. The PATH Foundation is a health conversion foundation located in north-central Virginia dedicated to strengthening the health and vitality of Fauquier, Rappahannock, and Culpeper Counties. PATH's goals for the grant were to establish a year-round supply of healthy, local food for distribution to educational and charitable institutions and to catalyze a Good Food Movement within the three counties. As part of the grant, 4P was required to undertake specific Charitable Activities including outreach to farmers (especially those from underrepresented demographics), subsidized food sales to charitable and/or educational institutions, food donations to food access organizations, and participation in a Demonstration Project. This report evaluates 4P's achievement of the Charitable Activities and the impact of 4P's activities on fostering a Good Food Movement in the PATH Foundation's geographic footprint (PFF).

4P was required to undertake specific Charitable Activities as 4P is a for-profit food hub. A foundation making a grant to a for-profit in the food sector is uncommon but not without precedent and can be made if certain conditions are met. Treasury Regulations permit foundations to make grants to organizations that are not 501(c)(3) public charities if the foundation undertakes specific activities such as pre-grant due diligence, meets IRS reporting requirements, and exercises expenditure responsibility over the grant in accordance with Section 53.4945-5(b)(3). According to the regulations, the primary purpose of an expenditure responsibility grant must be to accomplish one or more of the foundation's charitable purposes. PATH's Charitable Purpose is "to accomplish charitable and educational purposes in furtherance of PATH Foundation's mission of strengthening the health and vitality of our community by enhancing the local Good Food landscape of Fauquier, Rappahannock and Culpeper Counties, and fostering the human, environmental, economic and social health of our region." To ensure compliance with the regulations, PATH and 4P developed specific Charitable Activities for 4P to undertake that met PATH's Charitable Purpose and Charitable Objectives (Appendix 1).

The Demonstration Project required 4P to work with an impact evaluator (Hudson Varick Resources, Ltd. "HVR"), a business technical assistance provider (Citrin Cooperman, "Citrin"), and participate in quarterly calls with Demonstration Project participants. The inclusion of HVR from the start allowed them to develop baseline data, see the impact of 4P's activities on the PFF, and recognize the impact of the Demonstration Project design in real time. Citrin undertook a deep dive analysis of 4P's operations, helped integrate the financials after 4P acquired Local Food Hub's wholesale business, and developed a line-item operational budget. The inclusion of Citrin's technical assistance gave 4P much needed business support and was critical in developing 4P's financial and operational approach. The quarterly reporting and calls provided an opportunity to discuss 4P's financial health, operational issues, and impact. The project design positively impacted outcomes and created holistic support for 4P's work, as described later in this evaluation.

4P Foods was founded by Tom McDougall in 2014 with a mission to build a regenerative and equitable food system. The four Ps stand for people, purpose, planet, and profit. 4P's business model used an online ordering platform to deliver CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) bags to consumers in Washington, D.C. and surrounding communities, thereby connecting buyers to healthy foods from local farmers and processors. Food security and equity are foundational to 4P's operations as evidenced by partnerships to deliver subsidized produce bags to residents of Wards 7 and 8 in D.C. and the Local Food Hub's Fresh Farmacy Program in Charlottesville, Virginia in 2016.

In 2018, Mr. McDougall approached the PATH Foundation about funding 4P's warehouse in Warrenton and acquisition of the Local Food Hub's wholesale distribution business. PATH, a health and wellness

foundation, was seeking a vehicle to bring healthier food into the PFF to advance the community's overall health. PATH had previously funded a Food Port Feasibility study that recommended development of a food enterprise in the community and 4P appeared to fit the requirements.³ An investment in food hub infrastructure would give the PFF end-to-end supply chain management and provide institutional access to local healthy food. PATH also anticipated that a food hub could be a conduit that would increase the amount of healthy, local, and sustainable foods in the community. 4P could serve both the wholesale (Business-to-Business, or B2B) and consumer (Business-to-Consumer, or B2C) markets. Discussions over the amount, purpose, and structure of a grant evolved over 18 months as PATH researched the effectiveness of food hubs, assessed the capabilities of 4P's management, and worked with their board to create comfort around an expenditure responsibility grant to a for-profit business.

The expenditure responsibility grant funded startup costs related to hard and soft infrastructure for 4P's new warehouse in Fauquier County. The funds were released in two tranches. In 2019, the first portion of grant funds supported 4P's planning and construction of the aggregation and distribution warehouse, warehouse equipment, technology and website upgrades, and operational capacity, as well as the acquisition of the wholesale business of Local Food Hub (LFH), a Charlottesville-based nonprofit. Prior to the acquisition, 4P's operations were focused mainly on the B2C market. With the acquisition of LFH, 4P entered the B2B market on a larger scale. The second tranche, released June 2020, supported additional operational capacity and technology upgrades.

2. 4P FOODS ACTIVITIES

Over the first year of the Demonstration Project (May 15, 2019 to June 2020), 4P worked to develop a new warehouse site in Warrenton, integrate the existing Charlottesville warehouse and wholesale accounts acquired from LFH, grow consumer operations, and build relationships within the PFF food system. As part of the Demonstration Project, 4P worked with Citrin on a deep dive analysis of 4P's operations and developed a line-item budget. On March 9, 2020, 4P moved into the new 15,000 square foot Vint Hill warehouse. Nine days later, on March 18, the state of Virginia mandated a stay-at-home order for all residents due to the COVID-19 virus. Institutions, businesses, and schools closed immediately, and the associated food services shuttered. 4P's institutional business instantly evaporated. 4P's largest wholesale customer, the University of Virginia (UVA), did not take delivery of its weekly order and left 4P with the produce. 4P immediately pivoted to address the dramatically different operating environment. The UVA order was donated to a local food bank, and 4P began work to address the overwhelming consumer demand for food.

4P's consumer business exploded as grocery store shelves grew empty and people could not – or would not – leave their homes to purchase food, especially seniors and other high-risk populations. In just three weeks, 4P outgrew its new warehouse space. Cooler capacity that was considered excess and had been available for farmers to rent was now insufficient. 4P leased several refrigerated trailers until a new cooler was installed in June and additional warehouse space was rented next door for bag quarantining and cleaning. 4P hired 50 people in four weeks to scale operations in order to meet surging demand.

4P sourced and distributed meals in an effort to support food insecure populations in the PFF. Taco Tuesdays were 4P's initial response to increase food access, offered weekly at no cost to consumers and later through a pay-what-you-can model. Several months later, PATH and 4P developed the Community Cooks initiative to deliver meals to the food insecure. The initiative paid local restaurants and carry-out operations to prepare meals using food sourced from local farmers through 4P and then distributed by 4P to food insecure households in Fauquier County. In total, 7,800 locally sourced meals were delivered

³ <https://docsend.com/view/yq4caww>

through Community Cooks. The initiative supported the farming community, kept the local food supply chain moving, people in the PFF employed, and addressed food insecurity at a critical time.

At the same time, 4P was instrumental in launching two regional initiatives: the [Eastern Food Hub Collaborative](#), a network of 16 food hubs with 600+ farmers spanning from Maine to Georgia linking food hubs across the region; and the Mid-Atlantic Food Resilience & Access Coalition ([MAFRAC](#)), a collective working to keep people fed, farmers growing, and food businesses operating and maintaining the mid-Atlantic regional food system. Both of these organizations supported the regional food system and kept healthy local food flowing to consumers.

What was originally intended to be a grant for a warehouse to support wholesale operations bringing healthy food into institutions was now supporting healthy food access for consumers at a time when food supply chains were failing across the nation. The timing of 4P's move into the warehouse was critical in creating access to local healthy food for the PFF. Their revenues increased 11,605% year-over-year, with almost all the growth occurring in one quarter. Staffing grew from 25 to 80 people as 4P added operations, warehouse/logistics, and sales team members to meet the demand. According to 4P, without the new facility, 4P would not have been able to address the overwhelming market demand.

Year 2 of the Demonstration Project began with 4P still operating in the uncertain environment created by COVID. In July 2020, food supply chains were just beginning to work through shortages and nonessential businesses were starting to reopen. Consumers became more comfortable going to grocery stores, farmers markets, and restaurants. The change in food purchasing behavior slowed the growth in 4P's consumer business, but only relative to the explosive growth in the first few months of the pandemic. 4P's wholesale business slowly restarted through partnerships with food access organizations and subscription-based businesses. 4P's wholesale business became food access-oriented outside of the PFF.

After the success of Community Cooks, PATH and 4P continued to work on other food access initiatives in the PFF and launched Fresh Pharmacy, a pilot fruit and vegetable prescription program. 4P also began building relationships with major food service providers in order to increase institutional purchasing from black, indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) producers and to support investment in infrastructure for BIPOC farmers. Regionally, 4P worked on food access with the [Washington Nationals Youth Baseball Academy](#) and expanded partnerships to include [Brighter Bites](#), a national organization that distributes fresh produce and educational materials to schools in underserved communities.

Year 3 of the Demonstration Project brought about a new normal to 4P operations. The continued unknowns of COVID and everything it touched – labor markets, school systems, vaccination mandates, government funding, and more – made it particularly difficult to project demand and plan operations. However, 4P made headway in institutional sales by adding two universities (both outside the PFF) and in securing a \$100,000 commitment from UVA to purchase from BIPOC farmers over the 2022-2023 school year. Outreach to local farmers improved with a newly hired and dedicated Sourcing Specialist who undertook production planning with 50+ farmers (some of whom were in the PFF). 4P also successfully collaborated with Foodshed Capital on a USDA Regional Food System Partnership grant application (with just under \$1 million awarded) that detailed a multi-stakeholder partnership plan to develop a regenerative meat value chain in the Mid-Atlantic region and centered in Virginia.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The impact evaluation was guided by two questions: (1) Did 4P operations catalyze the Good Food Movement in the PFF? and (2) What effect did the Demonstration Project design have on grant outcomes? The first question was divided into four sections: (A) Strengthening the health and vitality of

communities in the PFF through local aggregation; (B) Improving access for poor, low-income, and underrepresented (including minority) farmers to markets that enable them to better support their families and expand the reach of their goods; (C) Supporting charitable and educational institutions in the PFF that have missions aligned with the grant's Charitable Purpose in gaining access to local produce; and (D) Enhancing the Good Food landscape in the PFF.

For the impact evaluation, HVR developed Key Indicators in the following areas to evaluate the PFF's progress toward a Good Food landscape: distribution to wholesale buyers, aggregation from PFF farmers and underrepresented farmers, donations to food access organizations, and progress on workforce development. The Key Indicators were informed by PATH's Charitable Activities Tracker, information provided by PATH, Citrin, 4P, and annual PFF local food system stakeholder interviews. PFF food system stakeholders were surveyed each year of the grant to evaluate if 4P's infrastructure was catalyzing a Good Food Movement. The viewpoints expressed in the interviews are a small sampling of the sector chosen to represent a cross section of prospective or current organizations participating in 4P's local food supply chain. The data for the Key Indicators was gathered each year of the project with baseline data covering May 15, 2018 to May 14, 2019, Year 1 covering May 15, 2019 to June 30, 2020, Year 2 covering July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021, and Year 3 covering July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022. For a comprehensive description of the Evaluation Methodology, see Appendix 2. For additional detail on Key Indicators, see Appendix 3.

The Demonstration Project process and methodology were finalized in February 2020. As a result of the COVID pandemic, many interviews for baseline data collection were delayed until the fall of 2020. While it is unlikely that the delay significantly impacted project results, quantitative and qualitative information was more difficult to collect than anticipated. As the pandemic continued, it became clear that not all of 4P's activities were adequately captured in the predetermined data collection methods as the project's original focus was on the movement of local healthy food into PFF institutions. Qualitative information on these additional activities has been included to offer a comprehensive understanding of 4P activities.

4. EVALUATION ANALYSIS

The following answers the two evaluation questions. Additional information on how the PATH/4P relationship evolved, Lessons Learned from the three-year project, and Challenges in Developing the PFF Good Food Movement follow.

Evaluation Question 1: Did 4P Foods' operations catalyze the Good Food Movement in the PFF?

(A) Supporting charitable and educational institutions in the PFF that have missions aligned with the grant's Charitable Purpose in gaining access to local produce:

Charitable and Educational Institutions

To gauge if the grant had an impact on PFF charitable and educational institutions, nine charitable and educational institutions were interviewed annually over the three-year grant term. The charitable and educational institution buyers surveyed included schools, hospitals, and senior centers. A sampling of each was interviewed as each buyer type had different procurement processes and needs. The nine buyers surveyed had fresh food purchases that ranged from \$30,000 to \$180,000 annually.

Year 1 interviews largely reflected the impacts that COVID had on the food environment. Buyers had changed their approach to meal service by purchasing more shelf-stable foods and developing single serve wrapped meals rather than buffet style. Institutions had difficulty sourcing food and had to adjust menus

accordingly. As a result, the cost of providing meals increased significantly. Struggling with limited financial resources, demands on staff time, and COVID precautions, little room was left for buyers to focus on much else. COVID meant local and fresh took a back seat to safely feeding customers.

Year 2 interviews showed little change from Year 1 with buyers still under pressure from the pandemic. While they were no longer scrambling to find food and a safe way to feed people, paper/packaging products and staff to cook and serve meals were scarce. Buyers were also dealing with distributors substituting products or not delivering orders on time due to driver shortages. Buyers responded by reducing menu options and instituting quick-serve menus. One institution no longer put produce orders out to bid as it took too much time and vendors were not honoring contract prices. Schools reported that they were feeding significantly more meals at breakfast and lunch, reportedly a result of the federal government relaxing eligibility requirements for free school meals. All buyers were interested in buying from local producers but few had the capacity to shift procurement processes.

Year 3 interviews reflected a similar but slightly less stressful environment. All institutions had labor issues and experienced product shortages, but to a lesser degree. Menu adjustments were still taking place as pricing pressures were more intense due to rising food costs. The institutions reported that dining rooms and cafeterias were open and event catering had resumed with COVID guidelines or policies in place. Schools were back to in-person education but feeding fewer students than the previous year. When the federal government reverted to pre-COVID eligibility requirements for free school meals, fewer students ate breakfast and lunch.

More buyers in Year 3 were open to local purchasing than at the start of the grant, but they still had limited capacity to take on a new distributor and/or approach to food service. During the last round of interviews, all nine buyers indicated that they were interested or very interested in buying locally, up from five. Throughout the grant period, only two made buying local a priority. The buyers reported that their clients/students were very interested in locally sourced foods, but staff capacity and cost were the biggest barriers. They stated that more people knew and cared about local food than before the pandemic and found their administrations and government officials were more supportive. A few wanted to buy direct from farms but were hampered by regulations.

The majority of buyers interviewed purchased over 99% of their fresh food from regional and national wholesale distributors. The buyers felt that their distributors carried a comprehensive line of food offerings including local foods. The meaning of local varied, with definitions ranging from the county, the state, or within 150 miles. Buyers also reported that their distributors were now clearly identifying local farm products and increasing locally sourced options.

The most important considerations for buyers when purchasing local foods were the price and quality of the product. Reliable delivery service was also important. Meeting food safety standards was a mandatory requirement for purchasing from any distributor. No organizations had language in their contracts that supported local purchasing and none changed any food procurement policies over the grant term. Most buyers were open to adding another distributor but shared concerns about the complexity of adding one and whether a local distributor like 4P would be able to deliver in their remote area. Several institutions stated it was difficult for them to meet 4P's minimum order level. Two reported that 4P had waived the minimum for a small delivery fee or were given the option to pick up orders at the warehouse.

Wholesale (B2B) evaluation indicators demonstrate that COVID impacted 4P's wholesale sales in the PFF and the region (Appendix 3a). Year 1 indicators show an increase in regional and PFF wholesale activity from baseline, reflecting the addition of the wholesale line to 4P's business and the progress made prior to COVID shutdowns. Year 2 indicators show slight progress in wholesale sales to PFF customers, while sales to regional wholesale customers remained flat. The final year of the grant shows positive

movement in wholesale indicators, a result of the wider reopening of institutional food service in Year 3. Over the grant term, 4P's total PFF wholesale dollar volume increased over 8500% from baseline. The total number of PFF wholesale customers increased by 400% while total wholesale sales increased over 1,400% and total wholesale customers doubled.

During the grant period, 4P sold to three of the PFF charitable and educational organizations interviewed. Few charitable and educational institutions had the capacity to develop new purchasing habits during the pandemic. Even if the institutions had the capacity and inclination to purchase locally sourced food, price remained a significant barrier. The three charitable and educational institutions (primarily school systems) that purchased from 4P received grants from PATH to purchase local food and therefore had a subsidy to address price. Two of the three said 4P positively impacted operations by saving them time sourcing local food. The third was neutral. They also mentioned that they perceived 4P's produce as fresher than their main distributor's produce and were willing to pay the higher price. Notably, all institutions were interested in buying healthy local food if the price fit into their budgets.

4P increased sales to the PFF wholesale market and met or exceeded PATH's Charitable Activity goals for PFF charitable and educational institutions during the grant term. Importantly, 4P worked to break down barriers such as price. 4P assembled a public-private partnership that was awarded a Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) Centralized Local Procurement Pilot Program grant to supply over 45 school districts in the state with subsidized local healthy food. While only one PFF school district chose to participate in the application process, the existence of the initiative could motivate others to join. On the last quarterly call, 4P reported that they were working with the Rappahannock Rapidan Regional Commission's farm-to-school liaison to connect with PFF schools interested in increasing local purchasing.

4P was successful in initiating the development of networks and organizing local food supply chains for institutional buyers, actions that were key to cultivating a Good Food Movement. With 4P's activities and the awarding of the VDOE grant, the foundation is in place for a time when the PFF institutions have more capacity to focus on local healthy food.

Organizations Serving the Food Insecure

PATH hypothesized that a food hub in the PFF could increase the amount of excess food donated to food access organizations and the food hub's trucking or cold storage infrastructure could support food access organizations' operations. Four food access organizations were surveyed to understand if the infrastructure supported increased access to healthy food for their clients. Three of the organizations served clients directly and one was a food access distributor.

At the onset of the pandemic, food access organizations were overwhelmed, operating beyond capacity and scrambling to service clients in a way that kept everyone safe. COVID significantly disrupted food supply chains and created tremendous demand. To address food shortages, food access organizations worked directly with farmers and/or shifted to local suppliers when product was available. They reported that farmers and community members supported them with increased donations and volunteering. The food access distributor stated that COVID accelerated partnerships and that they received significantly more produce from the USDA to distribute to food pantries and food banks. All organizations felt there was an insufficient supply of fresh produce and proteins from local and national or international sources.

During Year 2 of the grant, pricing shifted and locally sourced food became more expensive. Food access organizations reverted to purchasing directly from grocery stores and other traditional suppliers. Demand for food was only slightly lower than the previous year. Farmers and community members continued to

significantly support these organizations. All organizations now felt there was sufficient supply of fresh produce available for their clients but all wanted more proteins and eggs.

Demand at food access organizations in Year 3 continued at increased levels. Inflationary pressures on food, gas, and household expenses took a toll on the organizations' clients with more new and previously financially secure families seeking help. All organizations reported an increase in new clients and expressed excitement about the Northern Virginia Food Rescue App by Food Rescue Hero, partially funded by PATH, that was now available. They felt that the app could significantly increase donations and support home delivery. Three organizations mentioned that MAFRAC had supported their operations through grants, new ideas for operations, and/or networking opportunities.

The four food access organizations interviewed cared a great deal about fresh food and believed their clients did as well. Organizations defined local as food grown in the county the organization operated in. They estimated that 99% of fresh food donations were used and that the remainder was donated to farmers for animal feed or composting. Three of the four organizations had invested in, or were in the process of investing in, infrastructure. Two organizations opened new facilities and one enlarged storage and purchased a refrigerated van. All four of the organizations had received grants from PATH.

When asked if there would be efficiencies in having 4P pick up and deliver fresh food donations, only one organization thought 4P's trucking infrastructure might help. Donations from farmers or the community were either delivered or picked up by volunteers who reportedly enjoyed the work. One of the three food access organizations felt that they were too rural or out of the way for 4P to deliver to them. The food access distributor felt their mission was to pick up and deliver rescued or donated food and suggested they might be better suited for that role than 4P. The distributor felt that they were funded for this purpose and had the flexibility to respond when the donated food became available.

4P donated 29,908 pounds of fresh produce, dairy, meat, and pantry items to food access organizations in the PFF over the grant period. In Year 1, 4P delivered to one organization and by the end of Year 3, delivered to three (Appendix 3b). In surveying the food access organizations, several mentioned that the quality of produce donated by farmers was significantly better than 4P's. The quality difference may be attributed to the fact that farmers generally bring produce to the organization the day of or the day after harvest. 4P donations tend to be excess inventory several days after harvest and closer to expiration. Food access organizations felt produce close to expiration may be better donated to a processing facility where it could be canned into a shelf-stable product and then donated. Food access organizations also reported that the volume of product 4P donated might not be enough to put out for all clients or the items may not be appropriate for their clientele.

4P effectively supported food access organizations throughout the grant's duration, surpassing the Charitable Activity goals. Despite this success, the anticipated enhancement in healthy food donations and trucking support did not materialize as envisioned. While 4P donated excess food, the donations were not always aligned with the specific preferences of the recipient organizations. Feedback on 4P's donations highlights the financial tension inherent in balancing charitable contributions with the demands of running a distribution business. Ideally, 4P would have minimal excess inventory with little available for donation. It is not surprising that produce was near the end of its useful life. Additionally, the organizations did not have a strong interest in 4P transporting food donations. The arrival of the Food Rescue App might change the need for transporting donations, but this also could be handled by the food access distributor. While 4P's support of PFF food access organizations was meaningful, 4P made a more significant impact on community food access through projects such as Taco Tuesdays and other direct community initiatives borne out of the pandemic.

(B) Improving access for poor, low-income, and underrepresented (including minority) farmers to markets that enable them to better support their families and expand the reach of their goods:

The expenditure responsibility grant assumed that 4P's infrastructure would support PFF farmers through aggregation, wholesale technical assistance, access to cold storage, and/or fee-for-service trucking. The grant also detailed specific Charitable Activities supporting access to markets for poor, low-income, and underrepresented farmers. PATH defined underrepresented farmers within the grant as: a family-owned and operated farm with at least one minority owner/operator, including women or individuals who are poor/low-income. To evaluate 4P's direct and indirect impact on the PFF farming community and underrepresented farmers, ten small and mid-sized farms in the PFF were interviewed annually over the course of the grant term. Farmers were surveyed to understand their views on selling wholesale and to determine if they benefited from 4P's infrastructure and operations.

Year 1 interviews revealed that COVID significantly impacted farmers' decision making. Farmers shifted sales channels and adjusted production. Six of the ten farmers interviewed increased their sales through Direct-to-Consumer (DTC) outlets. One farmer shifted from DTC to wholesale due to personal health concerns. The shift was so successful that the change was likely to become permanent as wholesale freed up weekends for family time. Four produce farmers scaled back production, three of whom reduced the acreage in production in March 2020 due to uncertain demand. During the fall interviews, these farmers were sanguine about having reduced production, given that sales were strong on other farms, but at the time had felt it was the right decision. Of the six farmers selling proteins, most had sold out of inventory over the season and would have increased production but could not because of processing bottlenecks. Every protein producer stated that new processing slots were difficult to find or nonexistent and that much more could have been sold if processing was available.

During Year 2, farmers continued to sell DTC while many tentatively sought to re-enter the B2B market. Several farmers sold directly to restaurants where they had not reported doing so before. Two stated they used an intermediary farmer who aggregated product for restaurants so they did not have to establish the relationship. Farmers were concerned about restaurants staying open and were hesitant to invest too much in this sales channel. One farmer sold direct to schools and stated that the price the schools paid was higher than 4P's.

In Year 3, farm DTC sales continued at similar levels with farmers still reluctant to sell wholesale. Four of the farmers reported selling excess product through wholesale channels, but wholesale was not a significant part of their business. The six farmers selling proteins were in a much better position by the end of Year 3 with respect to processing. Most had processing slots for existing production with slots scheduled well into 2024. However, a few mentioned that there needed to be flexibility in slot times as the point at which cattle are ready to be processed is difficult to predict. Others mentioned they would scale up if more slots became available.

Over the grant term, PFF farmer perspectives on wholesale either had not changed or wholesale had become less attractive. Farmers conveyed a willingness to sell wholesale, but price and volume were significant barriers. Nine of the ten farmers interviewed had heard of 4P, with several stating they had direct or indirect experience with them. All farmers were open to working with 4P if the right opportunity presented itself. Farmers agreed having 4P in the area was helpful as 4P provided a potential outlet to sell excess product, with four farmers having done so. At least six of the farmers interviewed had sold to 4P over the three years. Two of the farmers mentioned they would like 4P to be a more consistent buyer. Importantly, three of the farmers that sold to 4P stated that working with 4P had a positive impact on their business. This positive impact is especially significant as all three of these farmers identified as underrepresented.

While farmers were open to it conceptually, most stated some sort of assistance was needed to sell wholesale or to increase wholesale sales. Generally, the assistance requested was infrastructure related (wash and pack, cold storage, processing) rather than technical assistance related to wholesaling. Several farmers stated that if 4P would wash and pack for them, they could increase production and/or wholesale sales. One farmer mentioned the positive impact financial technical assistance had on understanding the farm business and thought this type of assistance should be made available to all.

Overall, farm viability increased over the three years. Eight of the ten farmers were expecting to cover costs or breakeven in Year 3, with five of the farmers reporting significantly higher on-farm income over baseline. Farmers reported that the increase in cash flow was due to higher DTC sales and/or reduced costs. In addition to investing in on-farm infrastructure, five farmers increased land in production through purchasing, leasing, or inheriting. Four of the five farmers were preparing the new land for livestock.

In the first year of the grant, all farmers were interested in how 4P's infrastructure could support them. By the end of the grant period, only one was interested. Initially, six farmers were very interested in renting cold storage or freezer space. When 4P's warehouse opened, one farmer rented freezer space. However, the farmer had to relinquish the freezer space after the onset of COVID. As the pandemic progressed and farmer income increased, eight of the ten farmers interviewed invested profits in on-farm infrastructure. As a result of these investments, five of the six farmers were no longer interested in renting space. In Year 1, five farmers were interested in 4P's ability to transport products as part of a fee-for-service trucking relationship. By the end of the grant term, only one remained interested.

4P met or exceeded the Charitable Activity objectives of broad outreach to farmers and provided them with wholesale technical assistance training in each year of the grant (Appendix 3c). 4P sourced over \$1.1 million in product from PFF farmers and at least 57% of these farmers could be identified as underrepresented. The exact number of farmers that fit PATH's definition is uncertain; therefore, the number of PFF poor, low-income or underrepresented farmers that 4P reached may be understated. However, 4P considers all farmers they work with in the PFF to be underrepresented as they are all small to medium sized independent farms. 4P conducted 11 technical assistance initiatives for PFF farmers and amplified farmer narratives on their website and weekly newsletter, in forums, and through earned media. With the Sourcing Specialist and 4P's more focused sourcing strategy that is working to deepen relationships, the groundwork has been laid for the potential to increase sourcing in the PFF. However, the price farmers get for their product will continue to be a significant barrier to increasing 4P's sourcing from PFF farmers.

(C) Strengthening the health and vitality of communities in the PFF through local aggregation:

COVID demonstrated the food system resiliency of 4P's B2B/B2C business model and how important that resiliency is to communities when global supply chains break down. Because of 4P's blended business model, the infrastructure for taking orders from consumers and delivering to their homes was already in place at the onset of the pandemic. The challenge came in scaling to meet consumer demand. While the number of active Year 1 total customers jumped 885% from Baseline (Appendix 3d), the increase in consumer bags sold over the last quarter of 2019 through the second quarter of 2020 illustrates the magnitude of operational scaling. In the last quarter of 2019, 4P sold 8,766 consumer bags. In the first quarter of 2020, 4P sold 13,065 consumer bags (which includes two weeks of the pandemic). In the second quarter during the height of the pandemic, 4P sold 75,231 consumer bags. This reflects an 850% increase in consumer bags delivered in six months. Without 4P, the PFF (and the region) is unlikely to have had as much access to healthy local food.

The Charitable Activities related to workforce development required 4P to prioritize PFF residents during employee recruitment and annually hire an intern from a disadvantaged rural background that attended a

PFF high school, community college, or vocational training program. Over the three years, 4P hired 14 full-time employees who lived in the PFF, exceeding expectations (Appendix 3e). In Year 1, 4P hired an intern who was eventually hired full-time, but did not hire an intern in the following two years due to the pandemic and operational circumstances. 4P promoted employees internally and provided living wage jobs with health insurance and other benefits.

The PFF economically benefited from 4P's presence through local purchasing, regional sales, and place-based employment. 4P estimated that the direct regional economic impact of operations was \$5.6 million in 2020. That year, 4P purchased \$2.8 million from regional farmers, producers, and processors and employed 40 people. Using an economic multiplier of 1.49 for 4P's regional sales, the economic impact of 4P's purchasing was \$4.2 million and the economic impact of 40 positions (with average wages of \$35,000) was \$1.4 million.⁴ Additionally, 110 indirect jobs were created in the region if an economic multiplier of 2.76 is used for calculating the impact of 4P's transportation and distribution operations.⁵

(D) Enhancing the Good Food landscape in the PFF:

4P's activities over the three years enhanced the Good Food landscape in the PFF. 4P scaled to feed the PFF and region, developed food access programs, created regional initiatives, met almost all grant Charitable Activities, and continued to work on institutional markets despite COVID-related challenges. Their network building and leadership in developing multi-stakeholder partnerships grew the Good Food Movement in the PFF.

When COVID hit, institutions closed, supply chains were significantly disrupted, and people struggled to get food. The economy has yet to completely recover at the time of this report. Food hubs generally begin as mission-driven organizations, but as the day-to-day realities of operating in a competitive industry become more apparent, they often shift their business model, become less mission-driven, and/or close their doors. By contrast, 4P scaled, supported food access locally and regionally, and worked on the grant's Charitable Activities. Their blended B2B/B2C business model allowed 4P to shift seamlessly from institutional to consumer markets and contributed significantly to food system resiliency within the PFF community and the region.

The grant envisioned 4P creating a Good Food Movement in the PFF through sales to institutions and sourcing from PFF farmers. However, the pandemic hampered progress on both. The PFF charitable and educational institutions did not have the capacity to change procurement practices during the grant period. Notwithstanding this, 4P worked toward increasing institutional purchasing by networking and building trust with those stakeholders. 4P worked with the PFF farming community by providing wholesale trainings and sourcing from underrepresented farmers. The groundwork laid in these activities created the basis for strong relationships and a stakeholder network.

Despite challenges resulting from the pandemic, 4P exceeded almost all of the required Charitable Activities, created significant Good Food access, and contributed meaningfully to the development of a Good Food Movement in the PFF. Healthy food access was improved throughout the PFF because of 4P's activities. It is unlikely that the PFF would have had the same level of access to healthy food without 4P's

⁴ Schmidt, T (2019) *The Economic Contributions of Agriculture to the New York State Economy: 2019*. Charles H. Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management SC. https://dyson.cornell.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2021/08/EB2021-04_TShmit.pdf.

⁵ Bivens, J. (2019). *Updated employment multipliers for the U.S. Economy*. Economic Policy Institute. <https://www.epi.org/publication/updated-employment-multipliers-for-the-u-s-economy/> Appendix Table A1, Transportation and Warehousing

contributions. 4P's response to creating food access for the food insecure over the life of the grant is highly commendable and 4P performed impactful activities in the PFF that were not required nor anticipated at the grant outset. As a result of 4P's activities across the supply chain, a food system network was built and the Good Food Movement in the PFF was enhanced and catalyzed.

Evaluation Question 2: What effect did the Demonstration Project design have on grant outcomes?

The terms of the expenditure responsibility grant required 4P to participate in a Demonstration Project. The Project's objective was to support 4P's advancement of PATH's Charitable Purpose and to evaluate 4P's model for catalyzing the Good Food Movement in the PFF. The project required 4P to work with a business technical assistance provider (Citrin), an impact evaluator (HVR), to provide regular financial and impact reporting, and to participate in quarterly phone calls.

In the first year of the project, Citrin undertook a deep dive analysis of 4P's operations, helped to integrate financials after 4P acquired LFH's wholesale business, and developed a line-item budget. The initial analysis, which encompassed a complete review of 4P's operations, management, finances, member experience, and related measures provided a high-level tactical plan on how to advance 4P's operations. This plan was used to determine which hires to prioritize and where to focus management attention. The line-item budgeting tool helped 4P understand operational and funding needs. The budgeting tool was delivered in early 2020 and was immediately put to use modeling how the massive scaling necessary due to COVID impacted operations and cash flow. 4P also shared the budgeting tool with potential investors. According to 4P, the information in the tool increased investor confidence and 4P was able to rapidly raise and close on a \$500,000 convertible bridge loan early in the pandemic.

Reporting and calls focused 4P's attention on financial health, operational issues, and impact. Quarterly, 4P submitted a management letter, financials, and impact information. On the calls, the reports were discussed in depth and PATH would update participants on area food-related activities. The financial analysis and impact evaluation gave 4P real-time feedback and operational support that helped to guide 4P's decision-making. PATH introduced 4P to PFF stakeholders, enhancing 4P's ability to deliver on the Charitable Activities.

The grant's reporting requirements led 4P to develop a process to capture and measure impact early on. Initially, reporting impact was difficult for 4P to do with few resources and little reporting knowledge. At the end of the first year, 4P hired a consultant to support grant reporting and, in the second year, hired a CFO who formalized 4P's financials and impact reporting. As time progressed, 4P refined the reporting metrics with support from the project participants and ultimately benefited from PATH's reporting requirements. The processes 4P developed for reporting grant impact led to detailed data that was used for more grant applications and investor pitches.

The Demonstration Project design ensured 4P had the tools needed to succeed. PATH took a risk in supporting an early stage, mission-driven for-profit food hub's efforts to build a Good Food Movement in the PFF. PATH supported 4P with business technical assistance, impact evaluation, quarterly check-ins, and networking because of the early stage of the organization and the importance of the expenditure responsibility grant's success. This environment gave 4P the ability to shift tactics as needed, innovate, and explore new approaches to address food system barriers. The project design and grant funding provided 4P's management with the capacity to focus on catalyzing the PFF Good Food Movement despite the challenges encountered.

5. PATH/4P COLLABORATION

Collaboration between PATH and 4P improved the grant's effectiveness and catalyzed positive change in the PFF's food system. What started as a traditional funder/grantee relationship evolved into a transformative collaboration rooted in thought partnership and network building (Appendix 4). This partnership was critical to seeding the PFF's Good Food Movement.

Goodwill and trust developed out of solutions-focused brainstorming brought on by a collapsing food system at the onset of the pandemic. Taco Tuesdays and Community Cooks evolved into longer-term, partner-driven solutions to regional and national supply chain interruptions. Regular reporting and quarterly phone calls required by the Demonstration Project allowed space for PATH and 4P to share ideas and connections that would enhance the impact of their goals beyond the grant. As fallout from the pandemic subsided, PATH and 4P continued to work together to address structural and systemic issues impacting the local food system.

Over time, PATH deepened their focus on food systems funding. PATH's grant to the Minority & Veteran Farmers of the Piedmont (MVFP) is one example. 4P initiated conversations with MVFP with the objective of increasing BIPOC sourcing. After joining early-stage discussions at the invitation of 4P, PATH granted \$10,000 to MVFP to support the sourcing initiative.

By the end of the grant period, PATH had more experience with the PFF food system and stakeholder groups. 4P grew more deeply rooted in the PFF food system and committed to building community. This partnership extended beyond the grant and continues to support and inform PATH's investment in food systems today.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

- ***A values-aligned community of supportive networks and relationships brings about change:*** Through 4P's mission-driven work, a network of PFF food system stakeholders were connected, trusting relationships were developed, and innovative programs were designed. The PFF Good Food Movement was catalyzed in part because 4P facilitated network and relationship development.
- ***4P's blended B2B/B2C business model created local food system resiliency:*** 4P's ability to shift operations from wholesale to consumer sales maintained local and regional access to healthy food and kept people employed when other food supply chains broke down. This blended business model allows for greater flexibility when market demand changes, creating food system resiliency.
- ***Strong mission-driven management is a significant contributor to success:*** 4P's leadership fostered an atmosphere of trust and respect for people and an environment of creativity and collaboration that kept the mission central to 4P's operations.
- ***Food systems work may need philanthropic funding:*** 4P undertook non-revenue generating activities such as farmer technical assistance and convening of public-private partnerships for regional grants. These activities were operational costs to 4P but essential to catalyzing progress. While a food hub is well-positioned to assemble food system actors with its values-based position in the middle of the supply chain, the time invested in this work is expensive. Philanthropic funding is key to supporting work on food systems development at a for-profit food hub like 4P.
- ***Impact reporting requires capacity and funding:*** Initially, 4P did not have the internal capacity nor technical expertise to meet the reporting requirements of PATH's grant. 4P's reporting improved dramatically after receiving a grant from another foundation to fund a consultant to work on impact reporting. This funding was critical in improving reports to PATH and later in reporting impact to existing and potential philanthropic funders and private investors.

- ***Holistic funding accelerates change:*** PATH’s wider grantmaking had a significant impact on 4P grant outcomes. Seventeen agricultural entities, food access organizations, and public schools participating in the PFF food system received grants. Most of these organizations interacted with 4P in some capacity, from purchasing food to supporting the Good Food Movement building.
- ***Listen to community needs and fund in real-time:*** PATH worked directly with community stakeholders to develop needed programs during the pandemic. PATH continued this approach throughout the grant period by responding to community and food system needs with funding and other capacity supports.
- ***Rethink food hub donations to food access organizations:*** Food hubs are unable to donate food until close to the expiration date due to the cost of operations. If produce is close to spoiling, processing it into a shelf-stable food may be a better answer. Facilitating donations directly from farmers who grow for food access organizations could support access to fresher and culturally appropriate food.
- ***Regional work is needed in food systems to bring about local change:*** PATH looked to build the local food system by focusing 4P on the PFF. However, 4P’s regional food system work demonstrated that a regional, system-wide approach was also needed to effect change in the PFF.

7. CHALLENGES IN DEVELOPING THE PFF GOOD FOOD MOVEMENT

- ***Farmer willingness to sell wholesale:*** Issues such as infrastructure, ability and willingness to scale, and pricing will continue to affect 4P’s ability to source from PFF farms. Interviews consistently revealed that the price farmers receive was the biggest hurdle in increasing farmer sales to 4P. For farmers who are accustomed to getting retail prices, shifting to wholesale can be a challenging adjustment. While many of the PFF farmers interviewed resolved their on-farm infrastructure issues, the ability to wash, pack, and have access to cold storage is critical for entering the wholesale business.
- ***Agricultural products:*** 4P’s ability to source from PFF farmers may continue given that the local agriculture industry is predominately focused on protein production and products that support the protein industry such as hay and grains. The PFF has minimal produce production. According to the 2017 USDA Census, the total market value of agricultural products from PFF farms was \$113.5 million with only 7% of that market value attributed to produce sales. 4P’s PFF sourcing is also constrained by the limited demand from its customers for the higher priced sustainable beef 4P sells.
- ***Protein processing:*** Capacity limitations at animal processing facilities may be an ongoing challenge. In Year 1, all protein producers felt limited by processing slots as they sought to grow operations. In Year 2, producers thought processing slots were still an issue although most had booked slots well into 2023. By Year 3, producers had slots reserved but wanted more flexibility as animals are not always ready for processing at the appointed time. Others mentioned they would scale up if more slots became available.
- ***Increasing sales to institutional buyers:*** The price that institutions were willing to pay was a significant barrier in selling local healthy food to institutions.
- ***Size of the PFF:*** The PFF is large and extends well beyond 4P’s regular distribution route. The extensive geographic footprint makes logistics challenging and expensive if an institution is not ordering regularly, meeting the minimum order, and/or if producers are not producing sufficient volume to justify the trip.

8. CONCLUSION

The PFF now has a growing Good Food Movement and a Good Food ecosystem to support its progress. 4P was critical to the development of the Good Food Movement through food access activities, network development, and the creation of multi-stakeholder partnerships. The farming community continues to benefit from 4P’s work encouraging regional institutions to buy local. The VDOE grant, which 4P was

instrumental in securing, will bring more healthy food into PFF schools. 4P's activities will continue to transform the PFF food system and create economic opportunity in the community.

PATH supported 4P with business technical assistance, network connections, and funding. Business technical and networking assistance is often provided by business incubators, rather than foundations, making this aspect of the project unusual. This type of support contributed significantly to the success of the grant. PATH made grants to charitable and educational institutions to facilitate purchasing from 4P; additionally, their grants to farmer initiatives supported 4P's local sourcing. These efforts created opportunities for relationships to develop between supply chain participants, lowering barriers to future interactions.

The most unexpected outcome of the grant was the magnification of impact resulting from the collaboration between PATH and 4P. COVID was the catalyst for increased collaboration between PATH and 4P and, given the effectiveness of this partnership, it is clear that any food system development could benefit from more and stronger collaborative relationships. Working directly with the stakeholders and co-creating projects appears to move systems forward faster toward mutually defined goals.

APPENDIX 1: CHARITABLE PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

PATH Foundation's Charitable Purpose is "to accomplish charitable and educational purposes in furtherance of PATH Foundation's mission of strengthening the health and vitality of our community by enhancing the local Good Food landscape of Fauquier, Rappahannock and Culpeper Counties, and fostering the human, environmental, economic and social health of our region."

The grant agreement between 4P Foods and PATH established the following Charitable Objectives to be accomplished in furtherance of the grant's Charitable Purpose.

Charitable Objectives:

- Create or strengthen aggregation, processing, and distribution capacity for local growers;
- Improve the quality of nutritional purchases available to local charitable and educational institutions that have missions aligned with the Charitable Purpose (i.e., expand infrastructure to support wholesale economies for institutional buyers of local produce such as hospitals, schools, and universities);
- Support nutrition improvement and access for local charities serving the food insecure;
- Strengthen and create new opportunities for the rural workforce;
- Expand physical and technical infrastructure supporting the local agricultural economy in Virginia;
- Enhance the Good Food landscape of Culpeper, Fauquier, and Rappahannock Counties in Virginia; and
- Engage in a Demonstration Project regarding the viability of the food port model in Culpeper, Fauquier, and Rappahannock Counties in Virginia.

During each year of the grant, 4P worked to conduct the following Charitable Activities in furtherance of the grant's Charitable Purpose.

Charitable Activities:

- Serve a minimum of one nonprofit grower, advancing charitable and educational purposes in Fauquier, Rappahannock, and Culpeper Counties (the "PATH Foundation's Footprint," or PFF).
- Ensure that at least 20% of the Grantee's annual sales in the PATH Foundation's Footprint are made at subsidized rates to charitable and educational institutions that have missions aligned with the Charitable Purpose.
- Ensure that at least 10% of the volume from the Grantee's consumer shares sold in the PATH Foundation's Footprint (i.e., the CSA program) is donated to Section 501(c)(3) charities focused on improving food access.
- Prioritize residents in the PATH Foundation's Footprint when making decisions about the employment of individuals to work for the Grantee.
- Hire at least one intern or apprentice through an arrangement with a high school, community college, or other vocational training program in the PATH Foundation's Footprint that equips an individual from a disadvantaged rural background with the training and skills necessary to obtain farming or food-related career opportunities.
- Increase the number of new purchasing agreements with local farmers in the PATH Foundation's Footprint by 50% by the end of the term of the Grant.
- Engage in broad outreach to poor, low-income, or under-represented (including minority) farmers located in the PATH Foundation's Footprint and provide educational information to such farmers that enables them to learn more about the Grantee, the benefits of aggregation, and the opportunities to obtain technical assistance to support them in their careers.

- Conduct at least two technical assistance initiatives aimed at providing training and information to poor, low-income, or underrepresented (including minority) farmers located in the PATH Foundation's Footprint on topics that will support these farmers in their careers, such as institutional procurement, food safety certification, new farmer training, and/or regenerative farming practices.
- Participate in a Demonstration Project that researches and evaluates the Grantee's model for (1) strengthening the health and vitality of communities in the PATH Foundation's Footprint through local aggregation; (2) enhancing the Good Food landscape in the PATH Foundation's Footprint; (3) improving access for poor, low-income, and underrepresented (including minority) farmers to markets that enable them to better support their families and expand the reach of their goods; and (4) supporting charitable and educational institutions in the PATH Foundation's Footprint that have missions aligned with the Charitable Purpose in gaining access to local produce. Such a Demonstration Project will include the hiring of an external evaluator and a consultant to provide technical assistance designed to help the Grantee advance the Charitable Purpose and achieve the goals of the Demonstration Project. The Grantee shall collaborate fully with such external evaluator and consultant.
- By no later than December 31, 2022, prepare a comprehensive written report regarding such research and evaluation efforts and broadly disseminate such report to stakeholders throughout the PATH Foundation's Footprint.

APPENDIX 2: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The PATH Foundation is a health conversion foundation in north-central Virginia that aims to improve the health and vitality of the communities in Fauquier, Rappahannock, and Culpeper Counties. In May 2019, the PATH Foundation made a \$1.2 million expenditure responsibility grant to 4P Foods, a for-profit benefit corporation, with the goal of improving access to healthy, locally grown food to the community. The grant aimed to benefit both farmers and consumers, including those with limited access to healthy, locally produced food. The expectations for the grant were rooted in six dimensions of anticipated charitable benefit:

1. Create or strengthen aggregation, processing, and distribution capacity for local growers.
2. Improve the quality of nutritional purchases available to local charitable and educational institutions that have missions aligned with the Charitable Purpose (i.e., expand infrastructure to support wholesale economies for institutional buyers of local produce such as hospitals, schools, and universities).
3. Support nutrition improvement and access for local charities serving the food insecure.
4. Strengthen and create new opportunities for the rural workforce.
5. Expand physical and technical infrastructure supporting the local agricultural economy in Virginia.
6. Enhance the Good Food landscape of Culpeper, Fauquier, and Rappahannock Counties.
7. Engage in a Demonstration Project regarding the viability of the food hub model in Culpeper, Fauquier, and Rappahannock Counties in Virginia.

The underlying reasoning for the PATH Foundation's grant to 4P Foods was that by increasing the capacity for key functions of a strong food system, such as aggregation, distribution, and cold storage, the infrastructure would promote access to locally grown, healthy foods for the community while supporting the sustainability of farmers as part of the larger Good Food Movement. In order to assess the charitable impact of the grant and understand its wider community impact, 4P Foods participated in a Demonstration Project led by Hudson Varick Resources, Ltd. (HVR) that evaluated the grant's effect on the local food system in the PATH Foundation Footprint. The evaluation period ran from May 2019 to June 2022.

Evaluation Research Questions

The Demonstration Project was an evaluation of the short-term and medium-term outcomes of 4P Foods' business activities over the period from May 2019 to June 2022. PATH Foundation and HVR developed the following evaluation questions to assess the local food system outcomes and progress in increasing access to locally grown, healthy foods while supporting the sustainability of farmers as part of the larger Good Food Movement in the PATH Foundation Footprint:

1. Did 4P Food catalyze the Good Food Movement in PATH Foundation footprint by:
 - a. Strengthening the health and vitality of communities in the PATH Foundation's Footprint through local aggregation?
 - b. Improving access for poor, low-income and underrepresented (including minority) farmers to markets that enable them to better support their families and expand the reach of their goods?
 - c. Supporting charitable and educational institutions in the PATH Foundation's Footprint that have missions aligned with the Charitable Purpose in gaining access to local produce?
 - d. Enhancing Good Food landscape in PATH Foundation footprint?
2. What effect did the Demonstration Project design have on grant outcomes?

Evaluation Development, Scope, and Process

To answer the evaluation questions, HVR developed a Demonstration Project Evaluation Framework to guide the development, scope, and process of the evaluation. The Framework was divided into three sections: 1) the Impact Pathway, which identified the essential activities of stakeholders needed to bring about desired change; 2) Key Indicators that signal whether change is occurring; and 3) data collection methods for the indicators.

Impact Pathway

The Impact Pathway outlined the key connections between 4P Foods' activities and the long-term desired charitable impact of the grant. It detailed the major activities that 4P could undertake over the grant period and linked the outputs of these activities to potential immediate and medium-term outcomes and the long-term desired impact of the grant. The potential immediate and medium-term outcomes were expected to show whether a Good Food system was being developed in the PATH Foundation Footprint. These potential outcomes were then distilled down to key desired outcomes by PATH and HVR for measurement and evaluation purposes. The key desired outcomes included the Charitable Activity objectives that were required as part of the grant to further its charitable purpose.

Key Indicators

Key Indicators were created to specifically test, measure, and evaluate progress towards the key desired outcomes and the desired long-term impact. The indicators assessed the development of a Good Food system through 4P's local food activities, including aggregation, distribution, workforce development, food access, and support for underrepresented farmers. The indicators were then divided into stakeholder categories: farmers, wholesale buyers, and food access organizations. Members of each stakeholder category were interviewed over the evaluation period to determine the impact of 4P's activities on the local food supply chain and verify the outcomes reported by 4P Foods. See Appendix 3 for Key Indicators.

Data Collection

Data for the indicators was obtained from the following sources: (1) reports from 4P Foods, (2) baseline and annual interviews with stakeholders in the PATH Foundation Footprint food system, and (3) PATH Foundation and Citrin reporting. Data was collected initially to establish a baseline and then annually. While the data collection instruments were comprehensive, they were limited in that they relied on self-reported measures.

- 1) *4P Foods Reports*: 4P Foods reported baseline indicators in May 2020 and annual indicators by August 2020, 2021, and 2022. The annual reporting dates coincided with the required financial and Charitable Activities reporting dates established by PATH and Citrin.
- 2) *Baseline and annual interviews with stakeholders in the PFF food sector*: Semi-structured interviews of farmers, charitable and educational institutions, and food access organizations in the PATH Foundation Footprint were conducted to assess stakeholder progress towards a Good Food system. The interviews were conducted over the phone or in person using a survey specifically designed to collect data for the relevant indicators and verify local food supply chain narratives provided by 4P. Stakeholders selected for interviews were a sampling of the sector, chosen to represent a cross section of organizations currently participating in the wholesale local food supply chain or with the potential to do so. The sampling approach was chosen as a statistically significant survey would have required more resources.
- 3) *PATH Foundation and Citrin reporting*: Citrin and PATH supplied information on 4P financials and PFF food system information when relevant.

Farmers: The farmers selected for interviews represented a cross section of small to mid-sized farms that were or had the potential to participate in wholesaling local food and could potentially be underrepresented farmers. The potential pool of farmers for interviews was gathered from 4P, Key Informants, the PATH Foundation, and publicly available farm databases such as the Buy Fresh Buy Local Piedmont Guide.

Over the course of the grant, ten PATH Foundation Footprint farmers participated in the interviews. These farmers were existing 4P vendors and potential 4P vendors located in Culpeper County (1), Fauquier County (6), and Rappahannock County (3). The interviews were structured as open-ended questions, and each farmer answered the same questions annually. The products produced and sold by the interviewed farmers included fresh vegetables (7), fresh fruit (2), and proteins (beef, pork, and/or poultry) (6). Additionally, two farmers produced and sold value-added products. Four farmers sold value-added products from other farms. Of the farmers interviewed, six self-identified as underrepresented. Baseline interviews for farmers were conducted in March/April 2020, and the annual interviews occurred in October 2020, 2021, and 2022.

Charitable and Educational Institutional Buyers: Charitable and Educational Institutional buyers are defined as institutions that are mission-driven and prepare and sell food as part of a meal service. Over the course of the grant, nine buyers were interviewed. The buyers were a mix of schools, hospitals, and senior centers. A sampling of each type of buyer was included as each type had different procurement processes and needs. The buyers were identified based on recommendations from 4P Foods, Key Informants, and the PATH Foundation, as well as research into mission-related food purveyors in each county. The geographic distribution of the nine organizations was as follows: four in Culpeper County, three in Fauquier County, and two in Rappahannock County. All were purchasing local food or had the potential to do so. Baseline interviews for buyers did not occur in the spring of 2020 due to the pandemic, and the annual interviews occurred in October 2020, 2021, and 2022.

Food Access Organizations: Food access organizations were organizations that primarily provided meals or food for free. The four food access organizations were chosen because they accepted fresh produce or had the ability to accept fresh produce and were recommended by PATH. Three organizations served clients directly, and one was a food access distributor. Due to the pandemic, only two baseline interviews took place, and the rest of the interviews occurred in the fall of 2020, 2021, and 2022.

Key Informant Interviews: Twelve individuals identified by PATH and HVR as key players in the PATH Foundation Footprint local food system were interviewed in February 2020 to gather information for the Demonstration Project.

PATH Foundation and Citrin: PATH and Citrin, as appropriate, provided HVR with information about their activities that impacted the local food system or 4P Foods. This data informed the qualitative assessment of the direct and indirect impact of participants on 4P's success.

APPENDIX 3: KEY INDICATORS

a. Wholesale Sales (B2B)

Wholesale sales increased significantly over Baseline due to the acquisition of LFH’s wholesale business but overall B2B sales are flat and reflect the stress of the pandemic. 4P’s wholesale business slowly restarted through partnerships with food access organizations and B2C subscription-based businesses, albeit outside of the PFF. Sales to PFF Charitable and Educational Institutions were hampered by the pandemic and barriers such as price. 4P exceeded the Charitable Activity objective for PFF Charitable and Educational Institutions.

Key Indicator*	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Total Number of Wholesale Customers	114	247	240	227
Number of PFF Wholesale Customers	2	9	7	10
Total Wholesale Sales	\$194,180	\$2,796,021	\$2,483,310	\$2,937,525
Total Sales to PFF Wholesale Customers	\$595	\$15,836	\$21,167	\$51,455
Number of Total Orders by All Wholesale Customers	335	3,955	3,997	5,431
Number of Total Orders by PFF Wholesale Customers	7	28	78	157
Percentage of Total PFF B2B Sales Made at Subsidized Rates to PFF Charitable and Educational Institutions**	-	93%	29%	23%

* Time periods are as follows: Baseline—July 1, 2018 to May 14, 2019; Year 1—May 15, 2019 to June 30, 2020; Year 2—July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021; Year 3—July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

** Charitable Activity

APPENDIX 3: KEY INDICATORS (CONTINUED)

b. *Organizations Serving the Food Insecure*

4P supported food access organizations over the life of the grant and exceeded the grant’s Charitable Activities objectives.

Key Indicator*	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Pounds of Food Donated to Food Access Organizations in PFF	15,852	21,649	10,150	3,040
Number of PFF Food Access Orgs 4P Is Delivering Food To	1	1	3	3
Percent Volume of 4P Consumer Shares Donated to PFF 501(c)3 Food Access Organizations**	-	212%	57%	25%

* Time periods are as follows: Baseline—July 1, 2018 to May 14, 2019; Year 1—May 15, 2019 to June 30, 2020; Year 2—July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021; Year 3—July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

** Charitable Activity

APPENDIX 3: KEY INDICATORS (CONTINUED)

c. *Farming Community*

4P strengthened the health and vitality of the PFF farming community from baseline but struggled to have significant impact. The hiring of a Grower Services Specialist may support increased PFF aggregation going forward. 4P supported PFF farmers with technical assistance, amplified farmer narratives on their website and weekly newsletter, in forums, and through earned media. 4P met two of the three farming-oriented Charitable Activity objectives.

Key Indicator*	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Total Number of Regional Farms	90	82	94	101
Total Number of PFF Farms	10	13	12	12
Total Amount Purchased from All Farms	\$792,980	\$2,028,123	\$3,452,656	\$2,453,435
Total Amount Purchased from PFF Farms	\$125,972	\$402,898	\$320,049	\$179,863
Total Number of PFF Value-Added Producers Purchased From	N/A	0	5	3
Total Number New PFF Farmer Purchase Agreements**	-	2	8	4
Number of Technical Assistance Initiatives Provided for Underrepresented PFF Farmers**	-	5	2	2
Total Number of Nonprofit Growers Supported**	-	0	1	1

* Time periods are as follows: Baseline—July 1, 2018 to May 14, 2019; Year 1—May 15, 2019 to June 30, 2020; Year 2—July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021; Year 3—July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

** Charitable Activity

APPENDIX 3: KEY INDICATORS (CONTINUED)

d. PFF Community (B2C)

B2C sales exploded at the start of the pandemic and leveled off in the third year of the grant. Without 4P, the PFF and the region is unlikely to have had as much access to healthy local food.

Key Indicator*	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Number of Active B2C Customers at Year End	472	4647	4646	2109
Number of Active PFF B2C Customers at Year End	14	88	55	54
Total B2C Sales	\$25,233	\$2,953,528	\$7,393,677	\$4,196,209
Total PFF B2C Sales	\$717	\$65,096	\$134,576	\$84,200
Number of PFF Community Share Drop-off Sites	2	2	2	2

* Time periods are as follows: Baseline—July 1, 2018 to May 14, 2019; Year 1—May 15, 2019 to June 30, 2020; Year 2—July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021; Year 3—July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

e. PFF Workforce Development and Economic Impact

4P exceeded the Charitable Activity objective for prioritizing the hiring of PFF residents and met the intern objective in only the first year of the grant.

Key Indicator*	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Number of Interns/Apprentices Hired from PFF**	N/A	1	0	0
Number of PFF Full-Time and Part-Time Jobs at 4P**	8	24	17	22

* Time periods are as follows: Baseline—July 1, 2018 to May 14, 2019; Year 1—May 15, 2019 to June 30, 2020; Year 2—July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021; Year 3—July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022

** Charitable Activity

APPENDIX 4: PATH FOUNDATION/4P FOODS COLLABORATION

The PATH/4P relationship began when 4P's founder and CEO, Tom McDougall, approached the PATH Foundation about funding 4P's warehouse in Warrenton, Virginia. PATH, a health and wellness foundation, was seeking a vehicle to bring healthier food into the PATH Foundation Footprint (PFF) to advance the community's overall health as the area, despite having a strong agricultural community, was a rural food desert. PATH had previously funded a Food Port Feasibility study that recommended development of a food enterprise in the community and 4P appeared to fit the requirements. An investment in food hub infrastructure could give the PFF community end-to-end supply chain management and provide institutions access to local healthy food. Discussions over the amount, purpose, and structure of a grant to fund the infrastructure evolved over 18 months as PATH researched the effectiveness of food hubs, assessed the capabilities of 4P's management, and worked with their board to create comfort around an expenditure responsibility grant.

The first portion of the grant was funded in May 2019. The initial stages of the grant relationship were challenging but productive. The last phase of the funding was delayed several times for a variety of reasons including inadequate impact reporting by 4P. When COVID hit, the nature of the relationship shifted. 4P's quick pivot to B2C, the ability to scale to meet demand, and 4P's organic creation of Taco Tuesdays instilled confidence at PATH that 4P was a strong partner. After a few weeks of Taco Tuesdays, PATH and 4P began to coordinate the weekly offerings and brainstormed on how to improve the local food supply chain.

A great deal of goodwill and trust developed out of the brainstorming process. 4P gained PATH's trust through the performance and execution of tasks, causing PATH to become more open to funding 4P's pandemic food access activities. The relationship continued to progress as 4P and PATH shared networks and remained in close communications. In time, the traditional funder/grantee relationship evolved into a collaboration.

PATH and 4P continued to collaborate beyond the height of the pandemic. During the Demonstration Project quarterly meetings and in between, PATH and 4P would share ideas and perspectives on the PFF food system. Over time, PATH became more knowledgeable on and comfortable with making food system grants that might not have been previously considered or might have taken longer to approve. PATH's grant to the Minority & Veteran Farmers of the Piedmont (MVFP) is one example. 4P initiated conversations with MVFP with the objective of increasing BIPOC sourcing. After joining early-stage discussions at the invitation of 4P, PATH granted \$10,000 to MVFP to support the sourcing initiative.

PATH now considers 4P a key player in developing the PFF food system. By the end of the grant period, PATH had more experience with the PFF food system and stakeholders, and subsequently, allocated additional funds for food systems grantmaking. As a result of the grant and PATH relationship, 4P became more rooted in the community and deeply committed to building the PFF food system. The collaboration not only improved the grant's effectiveness but also played a pivotal role in catalyzing positive change in the PFF's food system.