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INTRODUCTION
Introduction

The State Farm to School Policy Handbook: 2002–2020 is a tool for those working to advance farm to school, which is a movement for building just and equitable food systems through the ways kids eat, grow, and learn about food in school and early care and education settings. The Handbook summarizes and analyzes bills and resolutions introduced between January 1, 2002, and December 31, 2020, from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the US territories. It enables users to search bills by both jurisdiction and topic.

The Handbook provides:

- Analysis and infographics on state farm to school legislative trends;
- Summaries of proposed bills since 2002, whether enacted, defeated, or pending;
- Case studies on farm to school advocacy and implementation efforts including local procurement incentive programs, state farm to school support for Native communities, and COVID-19 impacts on farm to school; and
- Additional resources for advocates and policymakers to support state farm to school policies.

Farm to school advocates, policymakers, state agencies, and other stakeholders can use this guide to:

- Learn about existing state farm to school policies and programs as potential models for future efforts;
- Compare farm to school policies and programs across states;
- Access the full text of state farm to school legislation for inspiration and assistance in the legislative drafting process; and
- Advance new farm to school policies and programs.

Importantly, we acknowledge that policies change and often do so quickly. Thus, this report reflects a moment in time. The State Farm to School Policy Handbook: 2002–2020 is intended for use as a reference guide. To the best of our knowledge, the Handbook provides an accurate snapshot of state farm to school legislation through December 31, 2020. We welcome suggestions for additions or corrections at info@farmtoschool.org.
What’s New in this Edition

The State Farm to School Policy Handbook: 2002–2020 is a new and improved update to earlier versions of the State Farm to School Legislative Survey. The 2019 update included bills that directly advanced the core elements of farm to school—local procurement, school gardens, and food and agriculture education. In this edition, we broadened our scope to also include bills, regardless of whether they explicitly included the core elements of farm to school, that support universal meal expansion and implementation, support small farmers and producers of color, and support farmers or school food service in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The COVID-19 pandemic has radically shifted the ways that child nutrition programs operate, with school nutrition professionals working tirelessly to feed kids under emergency conditions and farmers pivoting their operations to feed their communities. One clear takeaway for school nutrition professionals is the need for universal meals, which allow them to focus more on nourishing kids than on filling out paperwork by eliminating means testing and making all school meals free for all students. The pandemic has also highlighted the urgency of moving towards a more resilient local food supply that builds racial and social equity. We believe that universal meals embedded with the core values of farm to school have the potential to radically transform our food system for the better.

Additionally, we recognize that farm to school exists within the broader agricultural economy and that policies addressing the historical and ongoing inequities between BIPOC farmers and their white counterparts are ultimately necessary for BIPOC producers to experience a level playing field on which to participate in farm to school.

Our Methodology

Authors of this edition and the 2019 edition of the Handbook developed a coding procedure to streamline the research process for farm to school bills introduced between 2017 and 2020. For this edition of the Handbook, authors identified relevant legislation using key search terms such as “farm to school,” “farm to early care and education,” “school gardens,” “local procurement,” and “food education” (see Appendix for full list). The search included bills introduced between 2019 and 2020 for each state, Washington, DC, and the US territories. Any legislation identified in this initial search process was then assessed against seven threshold questions.

The threshold questions were used to determine whether a policy would be included in the final dataset for analysis. Thus, each bill and resolution introduced in 2019 or 2020 included in this Handbook answers “yes” to at least one of the threshold questions below:

Does the bill/resolution...

- explicitly include local food procurement or a local food preference within a farm to school context?
- explicitly include school gardens within a farm to school context?
- explicitly include food and/or agriculture (i.e., garden, farm) and/or nutrition education within a farm to school context?
- establish a universal meals program or include funding for universal meals?
- expand the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)?
- explicitly give procurement preference to small producers or producers of color?
- include support measures for farmers and/or school food service in response to the COVID-19 pandemic?

BIPOC—which stands for Black, Indigenous, and people of color, and is pronounced “bye-pock”—is an umbrella term intended to center the specific experiences of Black and Indigenous people. This term is more descriptive than “people of color” (POC) as it acknowledges that not all people of color experience the same types of discrimination, prejudice and injustices. BIPOC specifically emphasizes that systemic racism continues to oppress and invalidate the lives of Black and Indigenous people in ways that other people of color may not experience. BIPOC does not replace specifically naming Black and Indigenous people when able to do so, and should not be used when referring to individuals or an issue that affects specific people. Doing so can be a form of erasure.

To learn more, read YWCA’s blog post about why they use the term BIPOC:

https://www.ywcaworks.org/blogs/ywca/fri-01152021-1332/why-we-use-bipoc
Any bill that passed any of the seven threshold questions was then coded and added to the dataset. For example, once a bill passed at least one of the threshold questions, we identified any additional farm to school-related components contained in the bill such as task forces, grant programs, state databases, or coordinator positions. Our coding process focused on identifying bills and resolutions introduced by state legislatures during their respective legislative cycles. Thus, our research did not include farm to school funding or programming that was approved or passed solely through a state’s budget process.

The laws of Native Nations are not included within the scope of the legislative review for the 2020 State Policy Handbook. As independent self-governing (i.e., sovereign) nations, Tribes do not operate under the federal government as states do, and have their own constitutions and codes. They have a unique government-to-government relationship with the federal government. Although we were unable to include Tribal policies in this resource, we recognize the influence of state and Tribal policies on one another and the impact on citizens of Tribes in supporting farm to school initiatives, which we explore through interviews with members of Tribal communities in the Farm to School State Policy Strategies to Support Native Food and Tribal Sovereignty case study.

For more details on the coding process, see the Appendix.

How to Use this Handbook

SEARCH BILLS BY JURISDICTION
Click here to view a map of states with proposed or enacted farm to school legislation. Select any state or territory to review its farm to school bills. For each jurisdiction, bills are presented in reverse chronological order beginning with the most recent. Each bill summary includes the bill’s number, subject matter, a hyperlink to bill text, a summary, and procedural information indicating the bill’s status.

SEARCH BILLS BY TOPIC
Click here to view tables categorizing farm to school bills by topic.

REVIEW CASE STUDIES
Review case studies on successful state farm to school advocacy. Click here to view case studies highlighting farm to school policy advocacy and implementation efforts including local procurement incentive programs, state farm to school support for Native communities, and COVID-19 impacts on farm to school. Click here to view case studies from the previous edition.

LEARN MORE
Learn more on the Additional Resources page. Click here to view a list of suggested farm to school informational and advocacy tools.
What is Farm to School?
Farm to school implementation differs by location but always includes one or more of the following:

**CORE ELEMENTS OF FARM to SCHOOL**

- **Education**
  Students participate in educational activities related to food, agriculture, and nutrition.

- **Local Procurement**
  Schools purchase, serve, and promote local foods in their cafeterias.

- **Gardens**
  Students learn about food, agriculture, and nutrition through gardening.

Why Farm to School?
A triple win: Farm to school benefits everyone involved—children, farmers, and communities.

**KIDS WIN.**
Farm to school is a win for kids when they eat nourishing food in meals and snacks, participate in hands-on activities, and learn about the importance of where our food comes from.

**FARMERS WIN.**
Farm to school is a win for farmers when school market opportunities provide reliable and consistent sales and fair pay.

**COMMUNITIES WIN.**
Farm to school is a win for communities when food is grown, distributed, prepared, and consumed for the benefit of every community member.

For more information, review the [Benefits of Farm to School](#) fact sheet.
Why State Farm to School Legislation Matters

Various federal policies and funding sources support local procurement, school gardens, and food and agriculture education. This support is limited and thus it is important to know about opportunities for states to create additional policies, programs, and funding streams to strengthen farm to school efforts. These initiatives will, in turn, support children, farmers, and communities within the jurisdiction.

Lawmakers recognize the myriad benefits of farm to school. Since 2002, legislators continue to propose a high number of bills to foster farm to school activities, including bills that enable schools to serve local foods, provide space and resources to garden, and educate students about food systems and agriculture.

The overall increase in state farm to school legislation mirrors the expansion of farm to school activity across the country. According to the US Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) January 2015 Trends in US Local and Regional Food Systems, the number of farm to school programs in the US increased 430 percent between 2006 and 2012. And, the most recent USDA Farm to School Census in 2019 shows significant increases in farm to school participation and reach since data was last collected in 2015. In the 2018-2019 school year, 67,369 schools with 42.8 million students reported participating in farm to school, an increase of 58 and 81 percent compared to 2015, respectively. Additionally, school food authorities (SFAs)—the entity or person responsible for managing school food service operations—are spending $1.26 billion, a 60 percent increase from 2015, on food from local farmers. In the most recent National Survey of Early Care and Education Providers in 2018, 49 percent respondents in 46 states reported that they carried out some type of farm to early care and education activity within the last year. And in 2021, a Farm to School Census and Comprehensive Review by the USDA’s Food and Nutrition Service found a continued increase in nationwide participation in farm to school, encompassing many types of activities including local food procurement, school gardening, farm visits, and culinary classes as well as food-related education integrated into classroom curricula.

In 2018, a study published in the Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development concluded that the multiplier impacts for the farm to school farm sector are more significant than those found in more traditional fruit and vegetable farm sectors, resulting in positive local economic impacts. In 2012, a study published in the Journal of School Health concluded that there is a causal relationship between the rise in state laws requiring or encouraging farm to school and the rise in state farm to school programs. Simply put, strong laws facilitate strong programs.

Ultimately, the goal of every state and territory should be to pass comprehensive legislation that supports all three core elements of farm to school: local procurement, school gardens, and food and agriculture education. However, gaps remain in access to farm to school, with only 65.4 percent of SFAs across the country reporting that they participated in farm to school activities according to the 2019 USDA Farm to School Census. Advocates must continue to work with legislators to propose and pass new farm to school laws at both state and federal levels.
Key Strategies for Advancing Farm to School through Policy

Since 2002, state legislatures passed laws creating the following strategies, among others, to explore, establish, and fund farm to school:

STATE FARM TO SCHOOL COORDINATORS
Housed within state agencies to develop and implement state farm to school activities

PERMANENT FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAMS
To promote local procurement, school gardens, and food and agriculture education

FUNDING MECHANISMS
To offset school costs through appropriations, grant programs, or reimbursement structures

LOCAL PREFERENCE LAWS
To encourage or require state agencies, including schools, to purchase food locally

ONLINE, STATEWIDE FARM TO SCHOOL DATABASES OR DIRECTORIES
To connect schools with agricultural producers to facilitate local procurement

FARM TO SCHOOL PILOT PROGRAMS
To launch local procurement, school gardens, and food and agriculture education activities

TASK FORCES, COUNCILS, & WORKING GROUPS
To research, assess, and implement farm to school programs

BROADER POLICY INITIATIVES THAT INCLUDE FARM TO SCHOOL
To strengthen public health, food security, economic equality, and food infrastructure
TRENDS IN FARM TO SCHOOL POLICY
Trends in Farm to School Policy

The farm to school movement’s increased momentum and success have resulted in the introduction of an increasing number of farm to school-specific bills, generating more data with which to compare and contrast farm to school approaches and trends, and providing a basis for a more nuanced policy resource for advocates. Consequently, this report takes a broader approach than our previous surveys of state farm to school legislation to include bills, regardless of whether they explicitly included the core elements of farm to school, that
• support universal meal expansion and implementation,
• support small farmers and BIPOC producers, and
• support farmers or school food service in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

For clarity and consistency, however, we only included bills that directly support farm to school in the trend analysis below (Figure 1). For example, California’s universal meals bill (S.B. 499), which outlines a procurement incentive for California-grown fruits or vegetables, is included in the trend analysis due to its direct connection to local procurement efforts, one of the core farm to school elements. On the other hand, a universal meals bill that does not include any direct connection to farm to school will not be included in the trend analysis below (Figure 1).

However, both farm to school bills and bills that support universal meals, small farmers and BIPOC producers and farmers, or school food service in response to the COVID-19 pandemic introduced between 2019 and 2020 are included in the bill summaries section. Additionally, to learn more about policies that support universal meals and small farmers and producers of color, visit the Emerging Opportunities section and read more about COVID-19 response efforts in the State Policy Responses to COVID-19 Impacting Farm to School case study.

For resources documenting broader food system bills such as local food policy or food policy council databases, see the Additional Resources section.
Figure 1 shows an increase in the total number of farm to school bills introduced from 2002 to 2020. The bar charts show the breakdown between the numbers of farm to school bills proposed (but not passed) each year and the number of bills proposed that passed. The line graphs show the cumulative (total) number of bills proposed and passed over time. Of the cumulative proposed farm to school bills (dotted line), about half passed (solid line) from 2002 to 2020.

A Note about Legislative Cycles and COVID-19

Most legislatures meet annually, though four state legislatures meet once in a two-year period during odd-numbered years. Moreover, even jurisdictions with legislatures that meet annually may see a difference in total bills introduced from year to year depending on how frequently a new legislature convenes. While not all states see a new legislature convene every two years (a “biennium”), most do. This could, in part, explain why during each odd year (when the new legislature first convenes) there is generally a higher number of farm to school bills introduced than during the even year (in the second year of the biennium). As you can see from the graph above, the numbers of bills introduced in 2011, 2013, 2015, and 2017 are all higher than the numbers of bills introduced in each subsequent year. We expected to see this trend for bills introduced during 2019–2020 as well; however, we think the increase in number of bills introduced in 2020 (but decrease in number of bills passed) relative to 2019 is due to state efforts to respond to COVID-19 and related budget shortfalls.
Overall Look at State Policy Efforts

As of December 2020, 46 states, the District of Columbia (DC), and one US territory introduced a combined total of 546 bills and resolutions supporting farm to school activities. Of those, 43 states, DC and the US Virgin Islands successfully passed farm to school legislation including 170 bills enacted and 70 resolutions adopted. During this period, only four states and four US territories did not pass farm to school legislation.

Since 2002, the most common bill type has been one that provides funding for farm to school; overall, 164 such bills have been introduced. These bills include annual appropriations, permanent funds, and other revenue streams. Other popular bill types include bills supporting food and agriculture education and school gardens. For example, between 2015 and 2020, state legislatures introduced 125 food and agriculture education bills and 74 school gardens bills, with 36 and 22 passing, respectively.

To date, 14 states—Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawai’i, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Vermont, and Wisconsin—have passed comprehensive farm to school legislation, which means the legislation includes funded grant programs, coordinator positions, or local procurement incentives. Collectively, these three types of farm to school legislation require a high level of political support and advocacy (see Advocacy Strategies section).

Where political support for comprehensive state legislation is lacking, there are many other policy options from which to choose. Jurisdictions just beginning to explore farm to school opportunities can create pilot programs like those in Connecticut, Hawai’i, Michigan, North Carolina, and Wyoming, whose pilot projects establish farm to school programs, fund purchases and reimbursements for schools serving meals that include local produce, fund design of outdoor classrooms, and establish composting projects in schools.

Many school districts cite a lack of knowledge about producers in their area as a significant barrier to local food procurement. An effective legislative option to counter this barrier is one that facilitates the creation of a farmer database, supplying schools with the information and contacts they need to purchase local products. Connecticut, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia have passed such bills.

Finally, legislators can consider passing bills or resolutions to raise awareness about farm to school opportunities and benefits to improve the chances of passing farm to school legislation in subsequent years. Alabama, Hawai’i, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Vermont, and Virginia have passed these types of bills.
**2019–2020 Legislative Trends**

Between January 1, 2019, and December 31, 2020, 26 states proposed 91 farm to school bills and resolutions. Of the 91 farm to school bills and resolutions introduced, 30 passed. Each of these bills related to at least one of the core elements of farm to school, with some relating to two core elements or all three: 66 included components related to local food procurement, 48 included food and agriculture education, and 23 included school gardens. In each of these categories, well over half of the bills that passed included funding. In total, 33 percent of the 91 bills and resolutions passed and 64 percent of those that passed contained funding (See Figure 2).

Some of the legislation that passed includes:

- **ALABAMA S.B. 157**, which provides funding for an incentive program offering 25 cents per meal that features locally grown products.
- **ARKANSAS H.B. 1615**, which establishes a farm to school and early childhood education program dedicated to, among other things, accelerating school garden and farm-based education for students.
- **COLORADO H.B. 1132**, which establishes a program designed to reimburse participating providers—school districts, charter schools, or childcare centers—for the purchase of products grown, raised, or processed locally.
- **MICHIGAN S.B. 927**, which appropriates $3,800,000 to expand a per-meal program statewide and to both school and childcare settings to purchase locally grown produce for the 2020–2021 school year.
- **NEVADA S.B. 458**, which appropriates $205,000 for fiscal year 2020–2021 in the state general fund for nonprofits creating and maintaining school garden programs.
- **NEW MEXICO S.M. 18**, which designates a New Mexico Food and Farms and School Nutrition Day in the State Senate.
Popular Types of Farm to School Bills

In addition to addressing the three core elements of farm to school, the following categories of bills were quite popular. The most common types of bills introduced were appropriations bills with 55 proposed and 16 passed; grant programs with 33 proposed and 8 passed; food service worker and farmer training with 27 proposed and 6 passed; promotional bills and resolutions with 23 proposed and 8 passed; and reimbursement bills with 22 proposed and 5 passed (See Figure 3).

![Figure 3: 2019-2020 Popular Bills Types](image)

Farm to Early Care and Education Policies

Since 2011, farm to early care and education has been a programmatic priority for National Farm to School Network because the early years of life are formative years for developing healthy eating habits. However, connecting young children in early care settings to local foods and engaging them in food and agriculture education early on through legislative efforts remains an emerging area for farm to school advocates. In 2019 and 2020, 10 bills were proposed and 5 passed to allow for early care and education providers to participate in farm to school programs. The 5 bills that passed include AR H.B. 1615, CO H.B. 1132, MI S.B. 927, MN H.F. 4490 and OR H.B. 2579.
Resolutions that Encourage Local Food Procurement

A number of states introduced resolutions focused on encouraging and increasing local food procurement by governments and schools. The resolutions below offer ways to experiment with different approaches to increasing local food procurement as well as effective stepping-stones to passing more robust procurement bills:

- **Nebraska** passed a resolution (L.R. 337) directing the state legislature’s Agriculture Committee to conduct a study examining which locally grown food products can feasibly be used for school meals and snacks. The task force was convened and produced a report on farm to school, providing recommendations to the legislature. This report was followed by the introduction of L.B. 396 in 2021 aimed at establishing a farm to school program that supports the purchase of locally and regionally produced or processed food. The status of L.B. 396 is pending.

- **Hawai‘i** introduced a resolution (S.R. 181/ S.C.R. 214, dead) urging Hawai‘i’s Department of Education Food Services Branch to require procurement of goods and services from local food hubs as part of its ‘Aina Pono Programs which include Farm to School and Harvest of the Month. The goal of this resolution is to help local farmers be more economically sustainable by providing access to larger agricultural markets while increasing school access to fresh, locally grown food and value-added products.

- **Iowa** proposed a resolution (H.R. 112, dead) that encourages state and local governments as well as public schools to increase the direct purchase of food from local and regional producers. The resolution encourages the establishment of procurement goals for local, nutritious food and encourages state and local governments to become active participants in regional food system working groups.

Based on our research, resolutions focused on celebrating farm to school or designating Food and Farms Day like New Mexico’s H.M. 15 typically have a 75 percent passage rate. The resolutions highlighted above from Hawai‘i, Iowa, and Nebraska show the growing variety of resolutions that can be used to encourage and advocate for farm to school activities and local food procurement beyond establishing celebratory food and nutrition days at state capitols.

Grant Program Funding and Appropriations Bills

Recognizing that funding is critical to ensuring the implementation of farm to school initiatives, states continue to introduce appropriations bills funding farm to school activities, including:

- **Alabama S.B. 157**, which funds their new per-meal reimbursement incentive for purchasing locally grown food.

- **Michigan S.B. 927**, which funds the expansion of their per-meal incentive program statewide to both school and childcare settings for purchasing locally grown produce as well as their grant program.

- **Minnesota H.F. 4490**, which appropriates funds to reimburse schools and childcare settings for purchasing from local farmers.

- **Nevada S.B. 458**, which funds an account to support the creation and maintenance of school gardens in the state.


Ultimately, these diverse policies enable schools to serve local products, educators to incorporate food and agriculture into learning, and students to learn through gardening.
Emerging Farm to School Opportunities

Local Procurement: Universal Meals Policies

Farm to school advocates increasingly view universal meals as a strategy for advancing farm to school goals that expands the reach of school meal programs and increases resources available to school food service authorities to serve healthier meals. Universal meals means that all students enrolled in public and participating private schools in a given state receive free meals, regardless of income-based eligibility in the federal meal program. Over the last two years, 15 bills were introduced in 7 states to address school meal debt. This growing activity illustrates that states are recognizing the short- and long-term negative impacts on both school food budgets and students and families who rely on school meals when students and families are unable to regularly afford them.

By allowing all students to access child nutrition programs and school meals, schools can maximize the funding available for all school meal programs and minimize the administrative burden of administering separate meal programs, thereby allowing more resources for incorporating increased local foods into the menu. In the 2019 and 2020 legislative cycles, nine universal meals bills were introduced, including two with a local procurement component (California’s S.B. 499 (2019) and A.B. 958 (2020)). Additionally, bills in two states—North Carolina’s H.B. 948 (2019) and Mississippi’s H.B. 314 (2019) and H.B. 168 (2020)—have aimed at establishing universal preschool programs, complementing universal meal policies and programs.

School nutrition professionals and advocates have also called on federal child nutrition programs to implement universal meals as a strategy to feed all kids while reducing administrative burdens and increasing menu and procurement flexibility, during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. Responding to these calls, the USDA will continue to reimburse schools and childcare centers for free meals provided to all students regardless of family income through the 2021–2022 school year. Building on this momentum, the Universal School Meals Program Act was announced as part of the federal 2021 Child Nutrition Act Reauthorization aimed at providing free breakfast, lunch, dinner, and snacks to all school children regardless of income and includes a local food procurement incentive.

And, in the summer of 2021, California (S.B. 129) and Maine (L.D. 221) became the first states to adopt universal school meals, providing free breakfast and lunch to all K-12 public school students.

Producer Support Policies

More farm to school advocates recognize the importance of policies that support small agricultural producers and farmers in their states and regions selling to schools. In some cases, farm to school producer support policies may include a procurement preference for “socially disadvantaged, small or midsized producers,” such as California’s A.B. 958 and S.B. 499 or Minnesota’s H.F. 811. In others, policies may include funding for infrastructure investment such as DC’s Urban Agriculture Infrastructure Grant program, established through the mayor’s budget.

USDA uses the term “socially disadvantaged” to refer to someone who is a member of a group that has been subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice, without regard to their individual identity. This term was defined in the 1990 Farm Bill and expanded to include gender prejudice under the Agricultural Credit Improvement Act of 1992. Many states utilize this USDA definition or similar language defined by federal agencies such as the Small Business Administration. While the authors of this report generally do not promote the use of deficit-based language and know that the term is outdated and insufficient at describing the full experiences of the producers it seeks to identify, we recognize that incorporating this term in policy to target support for BIPOC producers is effective due to the established definition within federal legislation.

In the past two years, states have proposed and passed other bills broadly supporting farmers, including ones that prioritize environmental incentives (CA S.B. 253 and NM H.B. 204) and land access (CA A.B. 986 and A.B. 2955) for “socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers,” as well as establish implementation and regulatory policies and programs within the hemp industry in collaboration with “minority and socially disadvantaged farmers” (MS S.B. 2738). Legislation that embeds racial equity in school food procurement preferences as well as land, capital, and infrastructure access measures, environmentally sound growing practice incentives, and decision-making power for BIPOC farmers ensures there are economically viable small and local farms for schools to support.
POLICY IN ACTION
Promising Practices

When considering how to structure legislation to build strong farm to school programs, several promising practices emerge. These practices include securing sustained funding, identifying the motivation behind the bill, and establishing an evaluation process. Regardless of the type of bill—whether it establishes a farm to school program, coordinator, or grants program; provides funds to incentivize local purchasing; or creates a council, task force, or working group—the key is to develop legislation in a way that integrates these best practices. Doing so will support the longevity and sustained impact of the initiative.

1 Secure Permanent Funding

Funding for state farm to school initiatives usually originates from annual appropriations, the bills that fund state government operations from year to year. These appropriations are critical to ensure implementation of farm to school. Appropriations include funding local food procurement, establishing school gardens, supporting food and agriculture education, establishing farm to school coordinator positions, funding pilot farm to school projects, expanding existing farm to school programs, and providing technical support for farmers and schools.

While annual appropriations are a key element both for building support and a baseline of funding for farm to school, they are not as reliable as permanent funding. Permanent funding ensures critical resources for farm to school are sustained year after year, rather than being subject to the whims of the annual budget and appropriations process, as is illustrated in the 2018 New Mexico case study. This is particularly important for farm to school coordinator positions, which integrate farm to school initiatives within and across government agencies and seek to develop relationships with external stakeholders like school districts, nonprofits, and farmers and producers. If there is no job security for such a position, or if there is a lapse in funding, the position may be difficult to fill or the relationships the coordinator cultivates could be lost, which would undermine the effectiveness of the program.

Once a funded farm to school program has been established in your state, continuing to advocate for its growth is critical for its sustainability and resilience. For example, Oregon has consistently increased the amount of funding allocated to the state’s farm to school and school garden program. In 2011, H.B. 2800 appropriated $200,000 for grants to schools purchasing fresh Oregon food products and providing food-based, agriculture-based, and garden-based educational activities. After that, appropriations continued to increase each year: $500,000 in 2013 (H.B. 2649), $3.3 million in 2015 (S.B. 5507), $4.5 million in 2017 (H.B. 2038), and $10.4 million in 2019 (H.B. 2579). This increasing capacity has allowed Oregon to expand the reach of its farm to school and school garden efforts across the state.

2 Identify the Motivation Behind the Policy

Legislative text can play an important role in explaining the reasoning or motivation for establishing a farm to school initiative. Statements of motivation or purpose included in the legislation can help communicate the many benefits of farm to school—including public health, economic development, education, and the environment. These statements not only explain to the public the need for the policy, but also provide valuable guidance for those tasked with interpreting and implementing the law to understand what it is intended to achieve.

Of the 91 bills introduced in 2019 and 2020, 40 (44 percent) explicitly included a motivator such as health and wellness, economic development, food security, racial equity, health equity, or economic equity—a nearly five percent increase in the use of motivators compared to the 2017–2018 legislative cycles. Of those 40 bills, 33 were explicitly motivated by health and wellness, 32 by economic development, and 18 by food security. Additionally, 19 bills (21 percent) identified equity as a motivating factor, with 6 identifying economic equity, 10 identifying health equity and 3 identifying racial equity. Three of the 91 bills identified climate change as a motivating factor. Of the 40 bills with explicit motivators, 29 passed (73 percent).

As a best practice, farm to school advocates should consider explicitly acknowledging these motivations and priorities when advocating for and introducing future farm to school legislation. And, while articulating the equity motivations are important, we encourage advocates to first assess the potential equity impacts of farm to school legislation.
Evaluation is essential to assessing the impact and effectiveness of farm to school, and to sharing those impacts with stakeholders and the broader community. Moreover, regular assessment and evaluation can provide documentation and a base of evidence to inform future farm to school efforts, whether legislative or otherwise. For more information about best practices for farm to school evaluation, explore the National Farm to School Network’s Evaluation for Transformation: A Cross-Sectoral Evaluation Framework for Farm to School resource.

Importantly, evaluation should include data collection and analysis on the racial equity impacts of farm to school policies and programs to identify potential gaps in demographic reach, degree of cultural competency, and impact on producers of color, as well as promising practices for future implementation.

Integrating evaluation mechanisms into farm to school legislation can help identify what success looks like and how to determine when it has been achieved. That information can, in turn, be used to advocate for changes to improve a program’s effectiveness, or for additional funding to increase impact.

An evaluation mechanism could take the form of a required annual report to the legislature showing the benefits and barriers of the farm to school program implemented, such as MA H. 4395 (2018) or CA A.B. 958 (2020), or direct the implementing agency to collect data about expected outcomes and children’s readiness to learn at participating sites, such as MI S.B. 927 (2020). Or, an evaluation mechanism may require reports on the number of agricultural products purchased by schools in the state, such as AR H.B. 1853 (2019) and FL S.B. 1384 (2020), or the economic impact on participating buyers, producers, and economies, such as CO H.B. 1132 (2019). Of the 91 bills proposed in 2019-2020, 17 contained some form of program evaluation; of those proposed, 6 passed.

Centering farm to school programs and policies in racial equity is required to achieve a just, equitable food system that promotes the health of all school children and benefits producers, educators, and their communities. There are a few states leading the way in efforts to better center their farm to school programs in racial equity. In 2019, California introduced a bill establishing the California-Grown for Healthy Kids Program (S.B. 499) aimed at increasing universally free school meals made with fresh, California-grown fruits and vegetables. The bill intended to increase the number of schools purchasing local produce and serving culturally appropriate meals while encouraging school food authorities to purchase from “socially disadvantaged” farmers or local producers when possible. Minnesota proposed establishing a Farm to School Grant Program (H.F. 811, 2019) with goals to reimburse schools up to 4 cents per meal that serve a high percentage of free and reduced-price meals and purchase from “socially disadvantaged” small or midsized Minnesota producers.

For support in assessing and planning for equitable outcomes in farm to school policies in your state, review the National Farm to School Network’s Racial and Social Equity Assessment Tool for Farm to School Programs and Policy.
Advocacy Strategies

Seeding, Growing, and Sustaining Farm to School in Your State

Over the last 18 years, states have continued to grow, expand, and sustain farm to school activities and programs with persistent and evolving policy advocacy efforts. Farm to school legislation requires varying levels of political support and advocacy to pass successfully depending on what the legislation seeks to do (for example, generate farm to school awareness or reimburse schools for purchasing local food) and the existing social, fiscal, and political factors in the state. Whether your state is aiming to raise awareness and build farm to school capacity, grow and expand farm to school programming, or identify ways to better sustain farm to school, there are different types of bills—requiring different levels of political support and advocacy—that can support your efforts.

Bills that do not authorize funding of any kind typically require the lowest amount of political support and advocacy and can be great stepping-stones to seed farm to school capacity and pass more robust farm to school policies in the future. Legislation that establishes working groups, councils, or task forces typically require low political support and advocacy because they do not establish new policies, but rather direct the council to develop recommendations for future action. Proclamations also generally require low political and grassroots support because they do not create new law. Rather, they are statements of support or encouragement typically in the form of resolutions that can be adopted by one or both chambers of the legislature without the governor’s signature. However, these types of bills can be critical for building and maintaining support for farm to school. Bills and proclamations that do not establish new policies or authorize funding are a great place to start to generate interest in farm to school, while establishing working groups or task forces may help provide the data and analysis needed to get legislator buy-in for funded farm to school policies like pilot programs or farm to school coordinator positions.

Laws that make it easier to purchase local products (such as local preference laws) help grow farm to school in your state and tend to take a moderate amount of political support and advocacy to pass because they do not require new funding, but do require a change to existing law and purchasing regulations and guidelines. However, this type of bill is a tool for local economic development, which can give it broader, bipartisan appeal. Additionally, local preference laws can demonstrate need and feasibility for a funded procurement incentive program. Bills that establish pilot farm to school programs also generally require a moderate level of political support and advocacy because the outlay of funding tends to be limited by the pilot’s scope and duration and is therefore more politically palatable. Similarly, pilot farm to school programs can be effective pathways to establishing funded permanent farm to school programs.

Lastly, bills that authorize an expenditure of funds generally require more political support (and therefore greater advocacy efforts) to pass but are a critical part to achieving farm to school sustainability. Within funding bills, those that appropriate funding annually may be easier to generate support for than those that authorize permanent funding year after year. These permanently funded programs and positions are the gold standard for farm to school policy.

---

**FIGURE 4**

Seeding, Growing, and Sustaining Farm to School in Your State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seeding</th>
<th>Growing</th>
<th>Sustaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proclamations</td>
<td>Local Preference Laws</td>
<td>Funded Farm to School Programs (including grant programs and coordinators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Forces, Councils &amp; Working Groups</td>
<td>Pilot Farm to School Programs</td>
<td>Funded Local Procurement Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases &amp; Directories</td>
<td>Unfunded Farm to School Programs (including grant programs and coordinators)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Advocacy Strategies Continued

It is worth noting that the following analysis considers only the level of support (both political and advocacy) needed to propose and pass a bill, not the effort required to implement the bill once it becomes law.

Seeding Farm to School Capacity

Farm to School Proclamations

Farm to school proclamations (for example, designating a certain month as farm to school month in the state) recognize the significance of farm to school in advancing its many benefits. Such legislation is popular and sees high rates of introduction and passage because of the low political advocacy and resources needed. Many proclamations are in the form of a resolution, which can pass one or both bodies of a legislature and be adopted without the governor’s signature. Proclamations generally do not establish any new infrastructure or involve any allocation of resources, which helps them gain broad support and pass relatively easily. Between 2015 and 2020, 57 of 76 bills in this category (75 percent, Figure 4) passed. Proclamations can be effective stepping-stones to introducing and passing more robust farm to school legislation in the future. For example, New Mexico has adopted 19 resolutions celebrating farm to school since 2001, which has encouraged additional legislation appropriating $850,000 to reimburse schools for purchasing local food since 2007.

Farm to School Task Forces, Councils, and Working Groups

Task forces, councils, and working groups help to coordinate farm to school initiatives in the state collaboratively with farm to school stakeholders, including at state agencies. They may also be tasked with developing recommendations for actions, for example, to increase local purchasing by schools or to integrate food and agriculture into the educational curriculum. Bills to establish these entities are a great place to start in generating interest and buy-in supported by data about farm to school in your state because task forces, councils, and working groups are typically designed to explore or make recommendations about possible future action. Since 2015, 33 bills have been introduced establishing farm to school task forces or encouraging schools and coordinators to work with food councils and working groups, and 7 passed (21 percent, Figure 4). For example, Massachusetts tasked its Food Policy Council (H. 4568) in 2010 with increasing production, consumption, and institutional purchases of Massachusetts-grown foods. Then, in 2014, Massachusetts appropriated $120,000 (H. 4001) to incentivize purchasing local food for the state’s farm to school program. The program was funded again in 2017 (H. 3800) for the fiscal year 2018 for the same amount.

Farm to School Databases and Directories

Farm to school databases are essential for connecting farmers with schools and thereby advancing local procurement. These programs do not make major changes to existing purchasing processes or regulations and can be justified as an economic driver. Overall, 14 bills providing for state farm to school databases and directories were introduced between 2015 and 2020 and 4 passed (29 percent, Figure 4).

Growing Farm to School

Local Preference Laws

Local preference laws encourage or require state agencies, including schools, to purchase food locally. Local preference laws are an excellent next step in supporting farm to school efforts in your state. The level of advocacy needed for such bills is generally moderate because passing local preference laws has proven to contribute to the growth of local economies. Also, implementing local preference laws does not require substantial state funding but instead enacts or amends procurement requirements to favor local producers. In 2012, Alabama passed the Farm to School Procurement Act, which included, among other things,
establishment of a small purchase threshold of $100,000, creation of a farm to school coordinator position, and the development of a local foods directory. Building from this success, Alabama appropriated $120,000 (S.B. 157) for a 25 cents per meal incentive program for schools purchasing and serving Alabama-grown food. From 2015 to 2020, such bills have proved to be among the most popular with 121 bills introduced and 45 passed (37 percent, Figure 4). Between 2018 and 2020, this trend accelerated, with 55 proposed and 21 passed in those two years alone—an 83 percent and 88 percent increase, respectively, from the previous legislative cycles.

Pilot Farm to School Programs

Pilot farm to school programs help launch local procurement, school garden, and food and agriculture education activities in the state or territory. Pilot programs can be easier to pass because of their limited scope and duration. Such programs enable advocates to demonstrate the benefits of farm to school, and may be used to advocate for permanent farm to school programs in the jurisdiction. Several pilot programs have gone on to become statewide farm to school programs. For example, Michigan—after piloting a regional farm to school local procurement incentive program in 2016—expanded their 10 cents per meal program statewide to both school and childcare settings in 2020. From 2015 to 2020, 30 pilot farm to school program bills were introduced and 8 passed (27 percent, Figure 4).

Sustaining Farm to School

Funded Permanent Farm to School Programs

Permanent farm to school programs require a high level of advocacy because funding is critical to the success of the program. Any funding bill is likely to be a heavier lift, particularly those that establish permanently funded programs, including grant programs. From 2015 to 2020, a total of 30 bills establishing permanent farm to school programs have been introduced, and of those, 10 passed (33 percent, Figure 4). States that experienced success in getting a funded permanent farm to school program in place often successfully passed farm to school proclamations, bills that established working groups, local farmer/school databases or pilot programs first, like in Connecticut, Hawai‘i, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Oregon.

Funded Local Procurement Incentives

As previously mentioned, funding bills tend to require greater support for passage given the budget constraints many jurisdictions are operating within. In addition to the funding for statewide programs, incentive bills can be critical to increasing local procurement in schools and often rely on the momentum built through advocacy work on procurement-supportive policies such as databases, pilot programs, or local preference laws. For example, after Colorado established the Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Pilot Program (S.B. 06-127) in 2006 to incentivize schools in serving more local fruits and vegetables, they eventually passed a statewide local procurement incentive program (H.B. 1132) in 2019. Between 2015 and 2020, 21 bills with funded incentives were introduced and 10 passed (48 percent, Figure 4).

Funded State Farm to School Coordinator Positions

Farm to school coordinators play varied roles, such as reporting to legislatures on the value and specific outcomes associated with a farm to school program and providing recommendations for improving the program. Between 2015 and 2020, 17 bills providing for farm to school coordinator positions were introduced, and of those, 4 passed (24 percent, Figure 4). These bills require higher effort particularly if they include attached funding to ensure the long-term sustainability of the role and, in turn, the sustainability of farm to school programs.
Note: Except for proclamations, most bill types have a less than 40 percent passage rate, regardless of where they fall on the Seeding, Growing and Sustaining Farm to School Spectrum (Figure 4). While certain types of bills typically require more political support and advocacy (such as funded farm to school programs) than others (such as task forces), the degree of support needed does not necessarily translate into higher or lower passage rates. This is likely due to a number of historical, social, fiscal, and political factors in any given state.
Successful State Farm to School Legislation 2002–2020

The following map provides a comparison of state farm to school legislation introduced and passed from 2002 to 2020 and characterizes bills by the degree of farm to school development, growth, or sustainability typically associated with the bill. It does not include bills that were not passed, nor does it reflect district community or federal farm to school policy, or account for federally funded farm to school programs. Regarding farm to school coordinator positions, it only includes legislatively mandated farm to school coordinator positions. It does not distinguish between annual and permanent funding. States with bills in multiple categories are categorized by the bills in that state with the greatest level of farm to school sustainability. This map does not consider the level of effort required to implement the policy once passed.

Specific Advocacy Strategies

As discussed in more detail in the case studies below, legislatures and advocates are using multiple and diverse strategies to advance farm to school policy in their states.

**INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS ARE:**
- Consulting the National Farm to School Network for assistance in advocacy efforts;
- Participating in farm to school bill drafting;
- Identifying key legislative champions;
- Leveraging media and messaging to reach lawmakers regarding the benefits of farm to school;
- Engaging in regulatory processes and continued advocacy around budget and support for farm to school policies and programs;
- Coordinating educational events at statehouses and training individuals in how to be effective advocates;
- Monitoring and evaluating the triple-win benefits of farm to school and developing promotional and educational resources to share with legislators; and
- Hosting conferences, and leveraging federal grant funds to do so, to facilitate discussions and collaboration among stakeholders around advancing farm to school.

**STATE LEGISLATURES ARE:**
- Establishing and funding state farm to school coordinators who facilitate and promote farm to school;
- Collaborating with diverse stakeholders (from anti-hunger and nutrition advocates to supporters of agriculture and economic development) to develop and draft legislation;
- Using existing farm to school legislation, including from other states, as models in the legislative drafting process; and
- Extending existing state farm to school programs to early care and education sites.

**STATE FARM TO SCHOOL COORDINATORS AND PRACTITIONERS ARE:**
- Coordinating farm to school efforts across multiple state agencies;
- Facilitating farm tours for school personnel and school tours for farmers, and inviting state policymakers to these events; and
- Establishing grant programs specific to regional and community needs.

Learn more about farm to school advocacy and how you can get involved in informing and advocating for policy that supports farm to school.
Next Steps for Advocates

PASS LAWS

If your state has not yet passed farm to school legislation, put yourself on the map. Consider ideas to explore, promote, enable, or fund farm to school. Additionally, consider the various levels of support needed to pass different types of laws as highlighted in the preceding section on advocacy strategies.

ADVOCATE

If your state has passed legislation that encourages or explores farm to school programming, advocate for more permanent and comprehensive farm to school legislation considering the promising practices discussed above. For example, advocate for laws that provide:

- A permanently funded statewide farm to school coordinator;
- Permanently funded farm to school programs, including farm to early care and education and school garden programs, with a process for periodically evaluating program success;
- Funding for local procurement through appropriations, grants, or reimbursement programs; and
- The motivation behind farm to school efforts to guide implementation and further advocacy (e.g., racial, social, economic, and health equity).

CONNECT

Connect farm to school with broader food system policy initiatives (for example, local economic development) that can include farm to school.

LEARN

Learn about how you can promote farm to school in your state by contacting partners in your state through National Farm to School Network.
More Ideas for Advocates

NEED TO COORDINATE STATEWIDE ACTIVITIES? CONSIDER A BILL TO...

- Create a farm to school position in state government, such as Arkansas H.B. 1615 and Minnesota H.F. 811.
- Establish a farm to school coordination task force, such as Colorado S.B. 10-81 and New York S. 7925.
- Communicate with nearby Tribal governments about your farm to school efforts, such as Montana H.B. 667.
- Assess the state of agricultural education in public schools, such as Louisiana S.C.R. 64.
- Integrate agricultural education in the school system, such as Pennsylvania H.B. 178.

WANT TO SUPPORT LOCAL FARMERS? CONSIDER A BILL TO...

- Prioritize purchase of local foods from “socially disadvantaged” farmers or farmers who offer educational opportunities, such as California A.B. 958.
- Provide technical assistance to state agencies and farmers interested in local procurement, such as Washington H.B. 1508.
- Reimburse schools for meals that include local produce, such as Michigan H.B. 5579, Oregon H.B. 2038, and New York A. 09506B/S. 07506-B.
- Offer outreach and support to beginning, specialty crop, small and midsized farmers, and other farmers with demonstrated need around food procurement standards and requirements, such as Minnesota H.F. 811.
- Amend contract bid procedures to give local producers a competitive advantage, such as Massachusetts H. 4429 and Alabama H.B. 53.
- Create a farmer database so that schools can identify sources for local foods, such as Florida S.B. 1384.
- Encourage state and local governments to increase the direct purchase of food from local and regional producers, such as Iowa H.R. 22 and New York A.B. 6910B/S. 5251-B.

NEED TO RAISE AWARENESS? CONSIDER A BILL TO...

- Declare a Food and Farms and School Nutrition Day, such as New Mexico H.M. 15.
- Designate a Farm to School Month, such as Hawai'i S.B. 882.
- Designate a Farm to School Awareness Day, such as Vermont H.C.R. 35.
- Designate a School Garden Week, such as New Jersey S.J.R. 30.
- Designate an Agriculture Day, such as California H.R. 20.
- Establish an Agriculture Literacy Week, such as New Jersey A. 4387.

LOOKING FOR OTHER INNOVATIVE IDEAS? CONSIDER A BILL TO...

- Establish composting projects in schools, such as Hawai'i H.B. 2025.
- Fund kitchen renovations to help schools better prepare and store fresh food, such as Massachusetts H. 4395.
- Spend select sales tax revenue on school gardens, such as Missouri H.B. 542 and Maine L.D. 1548.
- Establish a universal meals program that prioritizes purchasing and serving local produce, such as California S.B. 499.
- Create incentives for schools to purchase local produce, such as California A.B. 129 and New York A. 09506B/S. 07506-B.
- Allow schools to serve school-grown produce to students, such as Illinois H.B. 2993.
- Design and build outdoor food and agriculture classrooms, such as Maryland S.B. 998.
- Create a farm to school cookbook, such as New Jersey A. 3639.
CASE STUDIES
Local procurement incentives provide an important resource to improve the utilization of fresh products and spur economic development in the local food system. As states have passed, implemented, and expanded their local procurement incentive policies, the different funding models have generated useful information about each approach. This case study presents an overview of policy design and advocacy considerations learned from farm to school practitioners and advocates working on implementing local procurement incentive policies in Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, and Washington, DC. For in-depth information on the evolution and structure of incentive programs in Michigan and New Mexico, see the Appendix.

Most procurement incentives fall under one of several main funding mechanisms:

- A matching reimbursement up to a certain amount per student per meal for those that win competitive grants, as in Michigan
- An additional reimbursement issued during each claim period, as in Washington, DC
- A noncompetitive reimbursement grant up to an amount determined by available funding and number of applications, as in Oregon
- Increased reimbursement when schools reach a threshold percent of purchases, such as New York’s incentive to provide a state contribution of 25 cents per lunch for schools spending 30 percent of their lunch budget on New York food products
- Lump-sum reimbursement upon application, as implemented in New Mexico

Each of these models presents different advantages and challenges that emerged as the policies were implemented and expanded. These lessons can help advocates and policymakers refine existing programs and offer strategies for states considering establishing their own incentive program.

Policy Design Considerations

Implementation Capacity

- Consider launching geographically limited pilots. Gradually expanding pilot programs geographically may allow for greater understanding of the specific needs of stakeholders (such as food service directors), connecting them with peer support, and building capacity in the region. For example, piloting Michigan’s program in less densely populated regions based on capacity for purchasing from producers and providing nutrition education opportunities helped to test and prove the model at a lower cost to the state before expanding it statewide, including to early care and education sites. In addition, before expanding the program statewide, program advocates had the chance to build targeted, purposeful relationships with key stakeholders in communities across the state to ensure success when funding became available to them.

- Consider unique differences between ECE/CACFP and K-12 school purchasing capacity and needs. Tailoring technical assistance and other supports to the distinct needs of different child nutrition providers will help identify common themes across sectors. In Washington, DC, the wide variety in scale of child nutrition providers eligible for the incentive program (due to the mix of public schools, charter schools, and ECE providers) makes it difficult to reliably match producers and buyers, particularly for the small scale of ECE sites. Similarly, summer meal programs have not usually been included in incentive policies, but present an ideal opportunity for local procurement due to many states’ growing seasons. However, the scale of purchasing and capacity to prepare unprocessed produce of many summer feeding sites presents different needs from those of K-12 schools.

A note on buyers: Local procurement incentive policies vary with respect to the entities that are eligible to participate as buyers. Because some policies include only K-12 schools, only early care and education (ECE) sites (typically those participating in the Child and Adult Care Food Program, CACFP), or both, in this case study we default to using “entities,” “buyers,” or “child nutrition providers” when speaking generally, and specifying school food authorities (SFAs) or ECE providers when necessary.
Incentive Size and Eligible Products

- **Include smaller incentives or matching incentives that allow entities to claim less than the full matching amount.**
  This flexible approach may be more feasible for smaller organizations or school districts in areas without existing robust local and regional food networks. In DC, SFAs and ECE providers are able to claim a five-cent reimbursement on any number of meals served. The reimbursement occurs through their existing claims process and so the number of meals with a local component (and thus eligible for reimbursement) may change from month to month depending on readiness, need, and seasonality.

- **Allow a wider range of eligible products, including those that cost more.**
  This approach increases opportunities for purchasing entities to claim the full incentive while contributing to market growth. New York’s incentive covers unprocessed products grown or raised in the state as well as processed products composed of at least 51 percent or more raw agricultural ingredients that are New York-grown or -raised by weight or volume. After year one of their program, three percent of schools reported buying New York-processed products and by year three, 42 percent of schools reported purchasing them. This approach facilitates more transparent supply chains by creating a powerful incentive for both SFAs and vendors to track and disclose local purchases and composition of products where they might not have before. Additionally, New York has seen both new and established companies creating products and buying products from New York farmers specifically for schools.

- **Include language in the legislation that promotes new local purchases without replacing existing ones.**
  Policies that are written without including or excluding specific sectors of products allow child nutrition providers to increase their local procurement without drawing backlash from the state’s agricultural industries. Oregon legislation includes language stating that incentive funding “shall not supplant” existing purchases. For instance, fluid milk is likely to be a significant budget item that Oregon schools are already purchasing from within the region due to its perishability. Local procurement advocates want to avoid risking that the incentive funding will replace federal or local money without actually changing purchasing behavior to spur a return on investment for state funding.

- **Target specific types of products in the incentive.**
  Limiting the incentive to specific products (for example, only fresh fruits and vegetables) makes it easier for purchasing entities to track and may assist in sidestepping debates on the relative health benefits of animal products, grains, or processed items. Michigan’s 10 Cents a Meal for Michigan’s Kids and Farms initiative, which covers Michigan-grown fruits, vegetables, and legumes, provides a more limited scope of products for participants to track and understand what qualifies.

Sustainability and Equity

- **Shift competitive grants to an opt-in process.**
  Allowing participants to opt-in increases overall participation in the program, local food purchases, and opportunities for producers. In 2015, Oregon’s legislature changed the procurement funding for the state’s Farm to School Grant Program from a competitive grant to an opt-in process. Subsequent program impact evaluation found that reimbursing eligible purchases for all interested districts, rather than those chosen through a competitive process, resulted in more low-income school districts participating in the program and purchasing locally than they did without funding. Evaluation also found this approach increased opportunity for producers to access a wider variety of markets. Due to increased site participation, opting-in means that the implementing agencies must provide technical assistance to a much wider audience and, if implementing the incentive for the first time, do so without baseline data on applicants’ needs or a track record of program cost.

- **Pair incentives to leverage other funding.**
  Pairing incentives that increase reimbursement, access, and local purchases provides greater child nutrition program sustainability. Washington, DC, utilized this approach for its Healthy Tots Act, which expanded the District’s Healthy Schools Act local procurement incentive to early care and education (ECE) settings. ECE sites participating in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) are eligible for an additional five cents for each lunch or supper served that contains at least one component that meets the definition of a locally grown, unprocessed food.
• Prioritize adequate, targeted technical assistance and capacity building.
  While it presents the most consistent challenge for implementation and expansion of local procurement incentive policies, providing consistent and targeted technical assistance to participating sites is critical for a program’s success. After the first year of the incentive implementation, New York recognized the importance of 15–20 existing farm to school coordinators in the state—funded through a mix of federal, state and private sources—in supporting farm to school growth and helping schools reach the 30 percent threshold. Evaluation showed that schools meeting the local food threshold in the first or second year had access to a farm to school coordinator and direct technical assistance—offering technical expertise for documentation, sourcing and tracking—while other schools needed this support to grow their purchase and reach the threshold. As a result, New York is working to provide this type of support to all schools across the state, and a state-funded Regional Farm to School Coordinator pilot program is launching in 2021.

• Build relationships with state agencies early in the policymaking process.
  Time to plan, build relationships, and gradually expand incentive programs builds support and expertise within the implementing state agencies as they formulate regulations and program guidelines, determine what verification is needed, and understand the technical assistance needed by grantees.
  • In New Mexico, the local procurement reimbursement is incorporated into larger state budget legislation with relatively little statutory direction, relying on the state agencies to determine programmatic structure. New Mexico recognized early on that necessary agency expertise, relationships, and stakeholder outreach were not yet in place when their incentive policy was first passed, and has since invested the time and resources to build expertise and relationships.
  • In New York, the New York Food for New York Kids statewide coalition works in close partnership with the state’s farm to school committee, coordinated by the Department of Agriculture and Markets, to support growth of the state’s local procurement program. While the farm to school committee brings together farm to school advocates across the state on an annual basis to share about current farm to school activities, the coalition engages in developing policy and advocacy strategy and directly advocating to the agency at key points in the legislative cycle.
  • Several states shared that agencies can also provide critical information about what baseline data is already available to identify existing resources and understand what is needed to implement the policy.

• Invest in continued policy design and programmatic improvement.
  Once local procurement incentive programs are in place, continuing to improve them based on reach, overall impact, and lessons learned is critical for program expansion and sustainability. In 2018, the Healthy Students Amendment to the Healthy Schools Act in Washington, DC, created accountability for goals originally outlined in the Healthy Schools Act that had not yet been fully implemented. Additionally, the amendment required DC Public Schools to conduct a baseline assessment with the goal of increasing purchases in line with Good Food Purchasing Program standards. Oregon is incentivizing further improvements with a new competitive grant for schools to go above and beyond the noncompetitive procurement grant amount. This new grant will prioritize plans to purchase from minority- or women-owned companies, serve culturally relevant foods, and develop new buying relationships.

• Gather data on the racial equity impacts of incentive programs.
  While local procurement incentives commonly track and report on economic and nutrition impacts of their programs, racial equity is usually not a consideration in the original program design, including evaluation. Incentive programs can increase resources to districts run and managed by BIPOC individuals, but without further targeting of resources or reparations, such programs increase equal opportunity but do not fully promote equity. Demographic information about students in participating schools may be available, but with little to no data or recommended practices for understanding the racial equity impact of incentive programs on producers. Advocates in multiple states cite the need for data and analysis to understand how incentives can make tangible progress on direct purchases, and purchases from BIPOC producers, that will truly lead to greater economic and racial justice.
• Balance the need for adequate producer and agricultural practices verification and impact data with the administrative burden on child nutrition providers.

Requiring School Food Authorities (SFAs) to track, document, and prove they met program criteria, as in New York’s incentive program, increases the program’s impact but also requires support to ensure tracking and documentation are done properly. Verifying the integrity of values-aligned purchases presents similar difficulties; official certifications of “minority-owned” or “women-owned” businesses for producers, fair labor certifications, or animal welfare certifications may be prohibitively burdensome and expensive for producers who must apply for those certifications, which may counteract the intent of prioritizing those values. Oregon has worked to address this by allowing producers to self-certify through subjective measures such as describing their labor practices that they believe meet qualifications. In Michigan, including funding in the policy for technical support and staff time for schools to collect and report back data whenever possible has allowed for robust impact evaluation while minimizing burdens on buyers. And in New Mexico, information on both the existing impact (number of kids served) and economic potential—demonstrated by what schools wanted to buy and producers wanted to sell—helped build broader support for their reimbursement program.

**Advocacy Considerations**

• Ensure grassroots community and nonprofit groups can adequately engage in the policymaking process.

All of these states described the necessity of ensuring nongovernmental partners remain funded, particularly during the annual state budget process, as they can do crucial legislator education on programmatic impact and importance of procurement incentives. For example, state and local food policy councils’ holistic food system and participatory democratic approach across sectors complement state agency work and play a key and ongoing role as procurement incentive program champions.

• Build statewide and community-based partnerships.

Many policies heavily depend on nongovernment partners for promotional and educational materials, and on academic partners (such as Extension specialists) for technical assistance and evaluation. States and communities with existing strong networks of institutional resources and partnerships have been better positioned to implement local procurement policies and access ongoing funding.

• Prepare to engage in the regulatory process.

Once an incentive program is enacted, implementing agencies determine program guidelines, technical assistance, and requirements for purchasing entities. Drafting clear guidance on eligible products and required tracking, for instance, increases the likelihood that SFAs are reimbursed for all the products expected. The regulatory process can also provide an opportunity to weigh in on equity in program design, such as ensuring opportunities for BIPOC producers, fair labor practices, and equitable access to schools, regardless of whether the legislation specified or prioritized such measures.
Overview

Tribal government policies are not included within the scope of legislation reviewed in this edition of the Farm to School Policy Handbook. As independent self-governing (i.e., sovereign) nations, Tribes do not operate under the federal government as states do, and have their own constitutions and codes. Although we were unable to include Tribal policies in this resource, Native American communities do play a vital role in, and are impacted by, the state governments they interact with. As we urge farm to school and farm to early care and education (ECE) advocates to replicate and build on the policies in this Handbook, advocates must address the impact of these strategies on Native American food sovereignty for the communities in their region. We want to ensure that these policies respect Tribal sovereignty and promote racial equity and governmental equity, both in impact and in their formulation, to achieve the long-term goal of shifting power in our food system. Farm to school and farm to ECE policy advocates at the local, state, and federal levels have much to learn from Tribal governments and Native American policies and perspectives that are far ahead in innovating and addressing the central issues of farm to school.

Stakeholders involved in state policy implementation that work in Native American communities were interviewed for this case study to gather recommendations from multiple policy areas about the key strategies that state advocates should promote through farm to school policy, as well as promising practices for working with Tribal governments and Native communities.

Government-to-Government Relationships

First and foremost, policy advocates must respect Tribal sovereignty and the formal government-to-government relationship that exists between each Tribe, or Native Nation, and the United States government. This means that while Tribal lands may fall within the boundaries of a state, each federally recognized Tribe maintains their sovereign authority based on treaties, statutes, and court decisions. The unique government-to-government relationship of each Tribe is with the federal government. Different Native Nations, even within the same region, may have different Tribal governmental structures and policies, as well as a unique history and relationship with the federal and state governments.

Further, Tribes vary widely in size, resources, and government structure. Depending on size, Tribal governments may each have their own process and approach regarding how policies are developed, passed, or implemented based on their specific needs and concerns.

This also means that each Tribe may have its own procedures for school food purchasing or vendor approval for Tribally controlled schools. In some cases, this means that Tribes have prioritized using their own funds for school food purchases so that they have the flexibility to support Tribal farmers and fishers without being restricted to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) vendor process when purchasing foods for Tribally controlled schools. However, in cases where a Tribe is purchasing food that goes into a federally funded school or program, the Tribe is held to the USDA’s vendor process and procurement standards. The variations in Tribal governmental structures also mean that Tribal leaders and program directors often fill multiple roles within their community’s agencies, while covering meetings and interacting with their Tribal government, federal government, state agency, and community organization counterparts.

Fostering adequate communication between Tribal government leaders, Tribal program directors or agencies, and state agencies is an ongoing challenge. Even in states with good communication between state agencies and Tribal government leaders, these leaders—such as Tribal council chairs—must deal with the full range of policy issues between the state and their respective nation (such as fisheries, gaming, health, and federal affairs) in government-to-government forums if that state acknowledges a government-to-government duty to consult or work with Tribes. Thus, state agency personnel and community organizations must ensure engagement and communication with individual Tribal agencies or program directors about farm to school grant opportunities or policy formulation.
Takeaways for Advocates

• Honor the sovereignty of Tribal governments and their goals.
  True partnership and outreach must reflect deference to what the Tribe needs or wants. One respondent framed the need as not fitting Native American communities into farm to school, but rather supporting nations in a way that takes into consideration Tribal sovereignty, a value-based system and culture that may be different from how the farm to school system was developed in the state.

• Respect past harms.
  Each Tribal government has its own unique history and engagement with federal and state governments. Inconsistent, ill-intentioned, and often genocidal government policies intentionally severed the relationships between Native peoples and the land that they relied upon for sustenance. Advocates must understand and respect this need for healing.

• Reach out, and keep reaching out.
  Advocates and practitioners should initiate and continue proactive communication with Tribal community contacts. Tribal officials and program directors filling multiple roles cannot devote all their time to one program. It is also important when reaching out to truly listen and support the concerns and solutions that have been identified by the nation itself.

• Build authentic relationships with Tribes and put relationships first.
  One representative from one Tribe cannot speak for all Tribes. To ensure policies benefit Tribes throughout the state, state farm to school and ECE advocates need to build relationships and gather multiple perspectives from members of multiple Tribal governments. Every respondent who contributed to this case study emphasized the importance and difficulty of building authentic relationships between state governments and Tribal and Native American communities. Building trust “can be particularly challenging when there is a high turnover at state agencies and relationships have to be rebuilt each time someone leaves a position,” said one state official. Respondents also emphasized the important role of opportunities for healing and reconciliation before moving forward on any kind of shared policy goals. “It’s about demonstrating that you don’t leave, that you’re in it for the long term, that you accept people for where they are and see them how they see themselves. And so that takes a long time to do all of that work, and I think that those are the things, kind of the underpinnings if you will, of really getting on board with this journey to equity,” said one respondent.

• Proactively communicate through multiple channels.
  Ensure that Tribal agencies, program directors, and community members are effectively consulted during policy creation, implementation, and funding opportunities. The varying sizes of Tribal governments’ resources and the multiple roles filled by program staff mean that the responsibility to communicate must be placed on states in order to shift power. Communicating solely through an intertribal coordinating body or consulting one Tribe is not sufficient to create authentic engagement opportunities.

• Formalize communication and consultation.
  Native American community advocates recommend processes to institutionalize meetings and communication, including written documents and protocols to guide interaction in state-Tribal government-to-government relationships. The state of Washington’s Centennial Accord, signed in 1989, which became state law R.C.W. 43.376 in 2012, provides an example of how a written agreement of commitments between the state and each of the federally recognized signatory Tribes provided a foundation for respect of that government-to-government relationship to build on in future policymaking interactions.

Takeaways for Policy Development

• Proactively consider obstacles and barriers.
  Direct community input from program participants is the best and only way to identify needs and necessary policy changes. Engage Tribes early before policies are established and ensure participation in the rulemaking process, either through written protocols between the state and Tribal governments, or in the specific law. Structuring Tribal government engagement to ensure listening for Tribal and community-based solutions is a key to more equitable policies, rather than using a stakeholder management approach once policy is formulated.

• Invest in Tribal producers.
  Always consider sourcing and ownership when formulating policies around purchasing. Respondents note that it is important to have access to traditional or culturally appropriate foods, but true Tribal food sovereignty hinges on the ability of a community to source food and own the process for themselves without structural barriers. Consider prioritizing purchases from Tribes and Native American producers, particularly of culturally relevant foods, in state policy grants and incentives.
• **Invest in Tribal educators.**  
Since 2015, Washington state public schools must incorporate Since Time Immemorial: Tribal Sovereignty in Washington State, a curriculum resource endorsed by all 29 federally recognized tribes in Washington, or an alternate Tribally developed curriculum. In addition to ensuring that every student learns about Native American culture and Tribal sovereignty, Tribal educator involvement in implementation creates a current, ongoing relationship between schools and Tribes, rather than portraying Native American communities as part of the state’s past. However, the landmark legislation that required this curriculum does not include funding to pay Tribal educators, which places a burden on them to teach their own history and culture to publicly funded schools if they want to build that relationship.

• **Invest in complementary activities.**  
To fully support Tribal food sovereignty, policies should consider funding for complementary activities, such as education on cultural context to support nutrition programs with traditional foods, or resources for Tribal educators to develop and fully implement science, technology, engineering, and mathematics-focused (or STEM) curriculum that complements school garden funding.

• **Utilize federal sources.**  
Because many programs, such as school meals, are governed by both state and federal funding mechanisms, advocates should consider how state interaction with federal money, such as Farm to School Grant Program proposals, can be specifically written to prioritize Native American producers, and especially promote direct Tribal access to funding. Additionally, when writing state policies that would normally require private or local (not federal) matching funds, consider exemptions that allow Tribal governments to use program funds that originate from federal sources.

**Takeaways for the Movement: Overcoming a Reductive View of Food System Policy**

Many state policies and agency structures are based on a siloed and colonial view of the food system. For instance, a state agency of agriculture may be totally separate from its counterpart that governs fisheries and other natural resources. For example, in Washington State, fisheries are considered a separate, but extremely important, sector of food policy from the type of agricultural production supported by state and federal agencies. For the Native American communities of that region, however, fisheries are an integral, inseparable component of their food landscape. Similarly, although foraging traditional foods might be guaranteed to Native nations by treaty agreement with the federal government, that right is not always understood and honored by state fish and game or national park law enforcement.

State policies and agencies also often separate early childhood care, K-12, and higher education, and elder care nutrition policies, and must undertake special efforts to coordinate between agencies to gain a full lifespan view of educational, nutritional, and overall health status and impacts, while most Tribal agencies and Native American community organizations may already be experienced in a multigenerational approach to engaging elders and youth.

In Tribes and Native American communities, it is understood that natural resources and environmental management impact human health and long-term sustainability. State advocates external to Native American communities have much to learn from this perspective that would improve farm to school and farm to ECE policies. One respondent noted the importance of considering accountability to future generations in decision- and policymaking, which is a perspective that is only just starting to permeate US state and federal policymaking in areas such as climate activism.
Case Study

State Policy Responses to COVID-19 Impacting Farm to School

Perhaps the largest challenge for farm to school and farm to early care and education (ECE) practitioners, advocates, and policymakers during 2019-2020 was the COVID-19 pandemic. Farm to school and ECE providers and advocates faced dual struggles of adapting services to rapidly changing circumstances as information emerged about the disease, and navigating local, state, and federal emergency policies passed in response to the pandemic. This public health and economic emergency illuminated valuable lessons regarding the resilience of our food system and farm to school and ECE work, as well as the need for future advocacy to ensure communities are better supported in recovery efforts and in future emergency situations.

Challenges

Interpretations of Federal Response

Federal child nutrition programs depend on state agencies and school food authorities (SFAs) to administer school lunches to 29.6 million students every day. As schools and ECE sites closed due to pandemic safety measures, the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) rolled out a series of waivers to offer flexibility to providers and attempt to prevent interruption of nutrition program delivery.

The USDA waiver system, however, initially depended on states to apply for each specific waiver. Even as some waivers were granted nationwide, they still depended on state agencies to interpret and implement the waiver for all the service providers in their communities. In a rapidly changing emergency situation, it was difficult to get a clear, timely understanding of new flexibilities, or to urge individual states to apply to the federal government for a waiver. Moreover, emergency waivers had to be renewed throughout the year, often coming down to the wire on whether they would expire.

In non-emergency times, SFAs may need to plan menus or inventory up to a year ahead of time; operating under the uncertainty of imminently expiring waivers further exacerbated an uncertain emergency situation and made it harder for school food and ECE nutrition programs to operate within budget.

Varied Responses Within Each State

A major challenge for farm to school and ECE partners was the varied and intermittent nature of school and ECE re-openings since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Between states, and even in different municipalities of each state, guidance differed on when schools and ECE sites could return to in-person operations. Where this happened, it created uncertainty for school meal and Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) providers, which made it more difficult for them to participate in farm to school procurement and educational activities. ECE site closures directly interrupted CACFP meal service and negatively impacted not only the availability of child care providers, but the solvency of the child care sector as a whole.

Budget Response

States faced with the cost of emergency measures and potential shortfalls in tax revenue contemplated budget cuts affecting farm to school and farm to ECE. Colorado delayed the launch of its local procurement incentive for K-12 and ECE food programs after an emergency legislative session in spring 2020 resulted in cuts to the overall state budget, including appropriations for the local food reimbursement. States, local municipalities, and SFAs facing uncertain tax revenue in 2020 and beyond means that advocates must make the case that farm to school and farm to ECE programs are vital investments in children and producers, rather than merely a “nice to have” activity.

Speed of Response

The changing nature of the COVID-19 pandemic, combined with the rapid dissemination of federal funding and policies passed in response, created specific difficulties for farm to school, farm to ECE, and local food systems. In an effort to ensure that federal aid was quickly making it out to communities, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding had an incredibly quick turnaround from award to fulfillment.
Programs operating to cope with this yearlong emergency had to be created or retrofitted as providers and state agencies figured out the necessary response. For example, the administering state agency personnel of Iowa’s Local Produce and Protein Program (LPPP) grants had to determine program guidelines, award funds, and ensure they were spent between August and December of 2020. This short timeline made it harder for state authorities to do effective, clear outreach about the program, and also created logistical difficulties given Iowa’s growing season and participating schools’ and ECE sites’ abilities to plan for local purchases to spend the reimbursement.

Existing nutrition policies for farm to school and farm to ECE have also not often been written to account for the months-long emergency disruptions that COVID-19 created. New York’s local procurement incentive was nearly disrupted by the fact that the budget legislation enabling the program specifies that only National School Lunch Program (NSLP) meals with local purchases qualified for the reimbursement. As schools shifted to emergency feeding programs (such as Summer Food Service Program, SFSP) during pandemic-related closures, their New York purchases made through SFSP risked not qualifying. This endangered school food budgets of early champions who have long been committed to farm to school. New York farm to school stakeholders and legislative champions recognized this administrative glitch and successfully advocated for the state Departments of Education and Agriculture and Markets to issue guidance and emergency funding that would fill these gaps, fulfill the incentive program’s intent, and maintain faith and interest in the program.

Innovations

Directing Federal Emergency Funding for Local Food Systems Work

States played an important intermediary role in administering federal COVID-19 relief funding in 2020. The CARES Act, passed in March 2020, granted a significant amount of flexibility to state governments in how they allocated the emergency response and recovery funds included in the bill. Iowa’s governor utilized $100 million in CARES Act funding for a range of agriculture programs, including the new $500,000 LPP Program granting funds to producers, schools and ECE sites, and food hubs for equipment and local food purchases. By specifically including food hubs in this emergency grant program, Iowa was able to continue progress towards its previous goal of growing food hubs’ capacity to support producers, aggregate products, and effectively serve farm to school and farm to ECE customers—including introducing new customers previously unfamiliar with food hub and farm to school purchasing.

Strategies for Future Resilience

Investment in Supply Chain and Provider Relationships

Almost overnight, many SFAs and CACFP providers radically re-envisioned their programs to keep students engaged, and in many cases became ad hoc emergency food providers for their students, families, and communities. While innovations looked different in every community, a major commonality was the existence of strong relationships between producers, intermediaries (such as food hubs or locally connected distributors), and K-12 and ECE customers. Creative solutions included using school infrastructure, such as school bus routes, to facilitate ‘last-mile’ delivery of meals or food supplies to families. In Iowa, a robust farm to ECE coalition in place before the pandemic helped ensure relationships existed to understand the needs of students and providers, and include ECE stakeholders in the funding that the governor allocated to local food support. States such as Iowa that implemented farm to school- and farm to ECE-specific policies now have a network of grantees that agencies can include in future opportunities for funding and technical assistance.

Investment in Policymaker Relationships and Advocacy Capacity

Successful policies and lessons learned also emerged from strong relationships between state officials and stakeholders; often, these relationships are the product of years of network building and advocacy capacity building in states’ farm to school movements. As state governors and executive agencies made decisions about the allocation of emergency pandemic funding from federal sources, they often did so quickly and with minimal time for public input. In those instances, a previous foundation of proactive, consistent communication with state officials about the benefits and importance of farm to school and ECE increased the likelihood that it would be top-of-mind during that decision process. Similarly, governmental relationships and nongovernmental coalitions supporting New York’s procurement incentive helped ensure that the state-issued guidance adapted the reimbursement program to function during the emergency feeding response for the 2020–2021 school year.
BILL SUMMARIES
State Farm to School Legislation

A State-by-State Listing

Between January 1, 2002 and December 31, 2020, 46 states, the District of Columbia (DC), and one US territory have introduced farm to school legislation, and 43 states, DC and the US Virgin Islands have enacted it. Below, this legislation is (1) categorized by topic and state, (2) summarized, and (3) hyperlinked to its full public text. All entries also include an indication of the current status of the bill. Bills that have passed are noted as enacted (codified or waiting to be codified), adopted (in the case of a resolution), or included in annual state budget documents (in the case of annual appropriations bills). Bills may also be labeled as pending if they were proposed but have not yet passed, according to public, online state records, or dead if they had not passed at the expiration of the legislative term. Please note that state rules vary regarding when pending bills are considered dead. This document is current as of December 31, 2020. For corrections or additions, please contact info@farmtoschool.org
SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:
The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the "State Summaries" section.

**Key:**
* indicates bills that became law
/ indicates companion bills
& indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

### Farm to School Coordinator
Establishes or modifies a statewide farm to school program coordinator position

| AL H.B. 670 | HI S.B. 1179 | MO S.B. 672, amended by S.B. 701* |
| AR H.B. 1615* | HI S.B. 2387/ H.B. 2156 | NC H.B. 1832/S.B. 1284 |
| AR H.B. 1839* | HI S.B. 2928 | NC S.B. 897* |
| AZ H.B. 2822 | IA H.F. 2458* | OK H.B. 2655* |
| HI H.B. 1102/S.B. 762 & H.B. 2215 & H.B. 2682 | IA H.F. 486/S.F. 441 | VT H. 287* |
| HI H.B. 1936 | IA H.F. 697* | VT H. 828/S. 169 |
| HI H.B. 1988/S.B. 2564 | IA S.F. 551* | VT S. 33* |
| HI H.B. 2497 | ME S.P. 460 | WI A.B. 746* |
| HI H.B. 255/S.B. 807 | MI H.B. 6368* | |
| HI H.B. 627/S.B. 376* | MO H.B. 2088, S.B. 854, S.B. 824 | |

### Appropriations & Other Revenue Streams
Allocates money or creates a fund for farm to school activities

| AK S.B. 119* | DC L.B. 750, L.B. 849, & L.B. 956* | IA S.F. 551* |
| AK S.B. 160* | FL H.B. 521/S.B. 1526 | IL H.B. 2667 |
| AK S.B. 18* | HI H.B. 1102/S.B. 762 & H.B. 2215 & H.B. 2682 | IL H.B. 3418* |
| AL S.B. 157* | HI H.B. 1494 | IL H.B. 5690/S.B. 3524 |
| AR S.B. 436 | HI H.B. 1536 | IL H.B. 78* |
| CA A.B. 129* | HI H.B. 1936 | KY H.B. 626* |
| CA A.B. 1634* | HI H.B. 322 | MA H. 3800* |
| CA A.B. 1917/S.B. 808 | HI H.B. 486 | MA H. 4001* |
| CA A.B. 2413* | HI H.B. 617/S.B. 524 | MA H. 4395 |
| CA A.B. 2466 | HI H.B. 627/S.B. 376* | MD S.B. 998 |
| CA A.B. 2782 | HI S.B. 1313 | ME H.P. 1066 |
| CA A.B. 38 | HI S.B. 564 | ME H.P. 1068 |
| CA S.B. 281* | IA H.F. 151 | ME H.P. 948 |
| CA S.B. 74* | IA H.F. 2426 | ME L.D. 454 |
| CO H.B. 1132* | IA H.F. 2458* | ME S.P. 155 |
| CO H.B. 15-1088 | IA H.F. 2491* | ME S.P. 517 |
| CO S.B. 06-127* | IA H.F. 427 | MI H.B. 4242 & S.B. 146 |
| CO S.B. 10-106* | IA H.F. 486/S.F. 441 | MI H.B. 4347* & S.B. 373 |
| CT S.B. 410* | IA H.F. 697* | MI H.B. 5314, H.B. 5372, & S.B. 838* |
| DC L.B. 407 | IA S.F. 609 | MI H.B. 5555 / S.B. 801 |
| DC L.B. 564* | IA S.F. 510* | Continued on next page |
SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:

The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the “State Summaries” section.

KEY:
* indicates bills that became law
/ indicates companion bills
& indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATIONS &amp; OTHER REVENUE STREAMS (continued)</th>
<th>Allocates money or creates a fund for farm to school activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI H.B. 5579*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI S.B. 0133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI S.B. 0218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI S.B. 801*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI S.B. 927*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 1630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 1874 /S.F. 1899*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 2049/S.F. 1657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 2200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 4490*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 4538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN S.F. 1305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN S.F. 1317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO H.B. 1526, S.B. 506, &amp; S.B. 850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO H.B. 146 &amp; S.B. 12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO H.B. 1660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO H.B. 2113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO H.B. 542*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT H.B. 4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT H.B. 667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 1099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 1832/S.B. 1284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC S.B. 897*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH H.B. 688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ A. 2641/S.1903*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 09505D/S.07503-D*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 10479/S. 7706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 1081/S. 2768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 1209/S. 3804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 1569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 2003D/S. 1503D*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 5322 /S. 2374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A. 9503C/S. 7503C*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A.09504D/S.07504-D*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY A.095068/S.07506-B*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 2038*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 2174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 2579*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 2649*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 2800 (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 2800* (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 3046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 3307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR H.B. 3476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI H. 5641/S. 0416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX H.B. 3290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT H. 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Bill No. 31-0186*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Bill No. 31-0359*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT H. 313*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT H. 485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT H. 537*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT H.13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA H.B. 1109*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA H.B. 1552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA H.B. 1710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA H.B. 2325/S.B. 6168*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA H.B. 2798/S.B. 6483*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA A.B. 304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA A.B. 56/S.B. 59*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA A.B. 64/S.B. 30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA A.B. 746*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA A.B. 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI S.B. 567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY S.B. 663*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY H.B. 194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the "State Summaries" section.

**KEY:**
- * indicates bills that became law
- / indicates companion bills
- & indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

### GRANT PROGRAMS
Authorizes grants to support farm to school activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 1357</td>
<td>IL H.B. 3418*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 1535*</td>
<td>IL H.B. 5690/S.B. 3524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 1592</td>
<td>IL H.B. 78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 1917/S.B. 808</td>
<td>KY H.B. 626*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 2602</td>
<td>MA H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 2782</td>
<td>MA H. 3549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 826</td>
<td>MA H. 556/S. 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA A.B. 958</td>
<td>MA H.4395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA S.B. 281*</td>
<td>ME S.P. 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA S.B. 499</td>
<td>ME S.P. 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA S.B. 74*</td>
<td>MI H.B. 4242 &amp; S.B. 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA S.B. 782*</td>
<td>MI H.B. 4347* &amp; S.B. 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO H.B. 10-1335*</td>
<td>MI H.B. 5506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO H.B. 15-1088</td>
<td>MI H.B. 5555/S.B. 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC L.B. 407</td>
<td>MI S.B. 801*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC L.B. 564*</td>
<td>MI S.B. 927*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC L.B. 750, L.B. 849, &amp; L.B. 956*</td>
<td>MN H.F. 1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL H.B. 1247</td>
<td>MN H.F. 2049/S.F. 1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI H.B. 1936</td>
<td>MN H.F. 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI H.B. 2025*</td>
<td>MN S.F. 1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI H.B. 2497</td>
<td>MO H.B. 1326, S.B. 506, &amp; S.B. 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI H.B. 255/S.B. 807</td>
<td>MO H.B. 146 &amp; S.B. 12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI S.B. 1313</td>
<td>MO H.B. 1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI S.B. 2928</td>
<td>MO H.B. 2088, S.B. 824, S.B. 854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL H.B. 2667</td>
<td>MO H.B. 542*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 1514*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MT H.B. 471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MT H.B. 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC H.B. 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC H.B. 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC H.B. 3290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC H.B. 199*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC H.B. 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NH H.B. 688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NV S.B. 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NV S.B. 458*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NV A. 10479/S. 7706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NY A. 1081/ S. 2768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NY A. 1209/S. 3804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VT H. 91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NY A. 1389A/S. 614*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NY A. 1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NY A. 6997/S. 3144A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 2038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 2174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 2579*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 2648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 2649*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 2800 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 2800* (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 3046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR H.B. 3185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR S.B. 501*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reimbursement & Incentive Programs
Provides schools additional money for including local foods in school meals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>S.B. 119*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>S.B. 160*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>S.B. 18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>S.B. 157*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 281*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H.B. 1132*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 144*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 564*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 750, L.B. 849, &amp; L.B. 956*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 521/S.B. 1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 1056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Farm to School Programs
Establishes a farm to school program within a state agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.B. 70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.B. 53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.B. 670*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1615*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H.B. 1132*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>H.B. 5847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>S.B. 589*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 564*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 7015 &amp; S.B. 1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 7087*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>S.B. 140*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>S.F. 601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.B. 78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>H.B. 1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.B. 404*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 3549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 556/S. 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>H.B. 696 /S.B. 158*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>S.P. 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>S.P. 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.B. 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>H.F. 2049/S.F. 1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 2088, S.B. 824, S.B. 854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>S.B. 1010, S.B. 878, &amp; S.B. 958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>S.B. 665*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>S.B. 672; amended by S.B. 701*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>S.B. 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>H.B. 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 1832/S.B. 1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 10320/S. 7847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>S.B. 663*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 95068/S. 07506-B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 9503D/S. 07503-D* and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A.09504D/S.07504-D*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800* (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800* (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>H.B. 3290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** * indicates bills that became law / indicates companion bills & indicates bills that are similar, but not identical
SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:
The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the "State Summaries" section.

**KEY:** * indicates bills that became law / indicates companion bills & indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

### FARM TO EARLY CARE AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS
Establishes a statewide farm to early care and education program within a state agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1615*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H.B. 1132*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 750, L.B. 849, &amp; L.B. 956*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHOOL GARDENS
Establishes or supports school garden programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.B. 70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.C.R. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1615*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>H.B. 2518*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1535*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1634*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1917/S.B. 808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1990*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2367*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>B. 22-0313 / A22-0566*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 564*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 750, L.B. 849, &amp; L.B. 956*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1571/S.B. 2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1990/S.B. 2565 &amp; H.B. 2462/S.B. 2762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 927*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>H.F. 4490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7049A/S. 2244B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2579*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>A. 337*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A. 3056*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A.J.R. 56 / S.J.R. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>S.J.R. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.J.M. 3 / S.J.M 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 16 / S.M. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 25 / S.M. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 57 / S.M. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 10101/S. 7114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 10479/S. 7006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 1081/S. 2768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 1209/S. 3804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 6628/S. 2438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7003/S. 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7007/S. 1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7479A/S. 4906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 981/S. 3242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>S. 3035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>H.B. 2833*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2649*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800* (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 3046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A. 2641/S.1903*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A. 2843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:
The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the "State Summaries" section.

**KEY:**
* indicates bills that became law
/ indicates companion bills
& indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

### SCHOOL GARDENS (continued)
Establishes or supports school garden programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 3185</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 31-0186*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 3601*</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 31-0359*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>S.B. 501*</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>18 L.P.R.A. 548*</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>22 L.P.R.A. 116*</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 828/S. 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>H.B. 1652</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>S. 33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>H.B. 2669</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1109*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 29-0160*</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1508*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1781/S.B. 5571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2325/S.B. 6168*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2798/S.B. 6483*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>A.B. 56*/S.B. 59</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>A.B. 746*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>H.B. 1109*</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>S.B. 663*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>H.B. 194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOCAL PREFERENCE
Directs schools to purchase foods locally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.B. 225*</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>S.B. 589*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.B. 46</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>S.B. 76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.B. 46</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>S.B. 804*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.B. 53*</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>B. 22-0313 / A22-0566*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.B. 670*</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>S.B. 157*</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 564*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1615*</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 750, L.B. 849, &amp; L.B. 956*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1839*</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 521/S.B. 1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1853*</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 708*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1917/S.B. 808</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2466</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 958</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>H.R. 20*</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>S.B. 44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>H.R. 26/S.R. 28*</td>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Bill No. 22 (LS)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 281*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 499</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 74*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 782*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H.B. 05-1307*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H.B. 10-1335*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 617/S.B. 524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H.B. 1132*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>S.B. 06-127*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 326*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>S.B. 12-48*</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.R. 181/S.C.R. 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>H.B. 5379</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.R. 98/S.C.R. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>S.B. 410*</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>H.A. 2426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
**SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:**

The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the "State Summaries" section.

**KEY:**
- * indicates bills that became law
- / indicates companion bills
- & indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

### LOCAL PREFERENCE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI H.B. 6368*</td>
<td>MI S.B. 927*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 2200 &amp; H.F. 4538</td>
<td>MN H.F. 4490*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN H.F. 811</td>
<td>MN H.B. 1184/S.B. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO S.B. 665*</td>
<td>MO S.B. 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT H.B. 667</td>
<td>MT S.B. 328*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 609</td>
<td>NC H.B. 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC H.B. 840</td>
<td>NC S.B. 770*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE L.R. 337*</td>
<td>NE L.R. 337*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ A. 3060</td>
<td>NJ A. 3060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM H.B. 328/S.B. 115</td>
<td>NM H.B. 328/S.B. 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM H.B. 2*</td>
<td>NM H.B. 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM H.B. 62</td>
<td>NM H.B. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM H.M 15/S.M 14*</td>
<td>NY S. 3224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM H.M. 24/ S.M. 59*</td>
<td>NY S. 7925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM S.B. 611*</td>
<td>OR H.B. 2579*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM S.B. 75</td>
<td>OR H.B. 2648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM S.M. 18*</td>
<td>PA H.B. 1514*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FOOD & AGRICULTURE EDUCATION

Supports food-, agriculture-, and garden-related educational activities for students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.B. 70*</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.B. 2667</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.C.R. 1</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.B. 5690/S.B. 3524</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 16/S.M. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1615*</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>H.B. 1283</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 25/S.M. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>S.B. 436</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>S.B. 154*</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 57/S.M. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>H.B. 2822</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.B. 404*</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S.B. 611*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1357</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 41</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S.M. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1634*</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>S.M. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1917/S.B. 808</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 3549</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>S.B. 458*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2413*</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 556/S. 301</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 10479/S. 7706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2466</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 621</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 1081/S. 2768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2602</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>H.B. 1297/S.B. 770*</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 1209/3804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2782</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>H.B. 870</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 2899/S. 3290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 38</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>H.P. 460*</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 3951/S. 5920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 147</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.B. 4242 &amp; S.B. 146</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 760/S. 5476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 31</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.B. 4347* &amp; S.B. 373</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 877/S. 4853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 281*</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.B. 5555/S.B. 801</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>S. 1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 499</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 0218</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>S.B. 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 717</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 801*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>H.B. 1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 74*</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 927*</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H.B. 1132*</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 99</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>S.B. 12-48*</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>H.F 811</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2579*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 144*</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>H.F. 1874/S.F. 1899*</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 564*</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>H.F. 2049/S.F. 1657</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2649*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Bill No. 164 (EC)*</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 1010</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800 (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Bill No. 22 (LS)*</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 1326, S.B. 506, &amp; S.B. 850</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 2800* (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1102/S.B 762 &amp; H.B. 2215 &amp; H.B. 2682</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 146 &amp; S.B. 12*</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 3185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1494</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 2113</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 3601*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1662</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 344*</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>S.B. 501*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1936</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>H.B. 471</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>H.B. 1514*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1968/S.B. 2564</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>H.B. 667</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>H.B. 178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2646</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 609</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>H.R. 1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 486</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 803</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>S.B. 1209*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 627/S.B. 376*</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 837</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S. B. 1736*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 214/S.C.R. 130</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>H.B. 688</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>H.B. 3290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 882*</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A. 3639</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>S.B. 1027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.R. 181/S.C.R. 214</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A. 4387</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>S.B. 1204*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>H.J.M. 1</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.J.M. 3/S.J.M. 4</td>
<td>Continued on next page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- * indicates bills that became law
- / indicates companion bills
- & indicates bills that are similar, but not identical
SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:

The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the "State Summaries" section.

**KEY:**
* indicates bills that became law
/ indicates companion bills
& indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

### FOOD & AGRICULTURE EDUCATION (continued)
Supports food-, agriculture-, and garden-related educational activities for students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>H. 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>V.I.C. 16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 28-0189*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 29-0160*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 31-0186*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 31-0359*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 456*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 537*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 828/S.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 91*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>S. 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1109*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1508*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1781/S.B. 5571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1863/S.B. 5804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2185/S.B. 6002*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2325/S.B. 6168*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2798/S.B. 6483*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>A.B. 215*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>A.B. 56*/S.B. 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>A.B. 746*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>S.B. 159 / A.B. 215*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE DATABASES OR DIRECTORIES
Directs state agencies to track and publish the names of parties interested in participating in farm to school activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.B. 670*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>H.B. 1839*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>H.B. 5847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 973/S.B. 1384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 1179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>S.B. 615*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>H.B. 730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.B. 404*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A. 156/S. 1902*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 4919*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>A. 2644/S.B.1964*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 1446/S. 1239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7049A/S. 2244B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7058/S. 3374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7090/S. 03625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7684/S. 4866*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A.095068/S.07506-B*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>H.B. 2655*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>H.B. 1514*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>S.B. 1209*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>S.B. 1027*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>S.B. 797*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Bill No. 28-0189*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 287*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 287*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 287*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>S.B. 1027*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2093/S.B. 3005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2093/S.B. 3005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 214/S.C.R. 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 83 &amp; H.R. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 1313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 2928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 147 &amp; S.R. 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 2928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 147 &amp; S.R. 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 2497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 4395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 4409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 5579*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 0133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 0133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>A. 3549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>A. 3549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S.F. 1317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 1010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>H.B. 667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 603/S.B. 637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 603/S.B. 637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>H.B. 1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PILOT PROGRAMS
Creates a temporary farm to school program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>S.B. 160*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 281*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>S.B. 06-127*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>S.B. 10-81*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>H.B. 5482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2025*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 147 &amp; S.R. 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 0133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 0133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 2497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 2646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 214/S.C.R. 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 83 &amp; H.R. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 1313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 2928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 147 &amp; S.R. 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 4395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 4409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 5579*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 0133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>P.A. 0133*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 2497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 2646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 214/S.C.R. 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 83 &amp; H.R. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 1313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.B. 2928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 147 &amp; S.R. 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>H. 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:
The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the "State Summaries" section.

**KEY:**
* indicates bills that became law
/ indicates companion bills
& indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

---

**PILOT PROGRAMS** *(continued)*
Creates a temporary farm to school program

| NY S. 4980 | TX H.B. 3290 | WA H.B. 1276 | WI S.B. 567 |
| NY S. 6288 | VT H. 192* | WA H.B. 1542 | WY S.F. 123* |

---

**TASK FORCES, COUNCILS, & WORKING GROUPS**
Creates a task force, council, or working group to recommend, assess, or implement policies and programs that support farm to school activities.

| AZ H.B. 2822 | IA H.F. 486/S.F. 441 | MO H.B. 344* | NV S.B. 458* |
| CA A.B. 1535* | IA S.F. 396 | MO S.B. 665* | NY A. 7058/S. 3374 |
| CA A.B. 2602 | IA S.F. 601 | MO S.B. 672; S.B. 701 | NY A. 7090/S. 03625 |
| CO H.B. 17-1192 | IL H.B. 2667 | MO S.B. 703. | NY A. 7479A/S. 4906 |
| CO S.B. 10-106* | IL H.B. 5690/S.B. 3524 | MS H.B. 1411 | NY A. 981/S. 3242 |
| CO S.B. 10-81* | LA H.B. 840* | MS H.B. 718* | NY S. 7925 |
| CO S.B. 13-153* | LA S.C.R. 64 | MS H.B. 828 | OH H.B. 240 |
| DC L.B. 564* | LA S.C.R. 94 | MT H.J.R. 8 | OK H.B. 2833* |
| DC L.B. 821* | MA H. 2782* | NC H.B. 609 | OK S.B. 1357* |
| HI H.B. 1936 | MA H. 3549 | NC H.B. 840 | TX S.B. 1027* |
| HI H.B. 2025* | MA H. 4395 | NC S.B. 491* | VA S.J.R. 347 |
| HI H.B. 2644 | MA H. 4459 | NE L.B. 175* | VI Bill No. 29-0160* |
| HI H.B. 2646 | MA H. 4568* | NE L.B. 544 | WA H.B. 1562 |
| HI H.B. 490 | ME H.P. 784 | NE L.R. 545 | WA H.B. 1685 |
| HI H.C.R. 167 & H.R. 145 | ME H.P. 948 | NH H.B. 1422* | WI A.B. 746* |
| HI S.B. 564 | MO H.B. 2088, S.B. 824, S.B. 854 | NJ A. 3058/S. 2366* |

---

**FOOD HUBS**
Supports infrastructure development for local food aggregation, processing, and distribution with an explicit connection to farm to school efforts

| HI S.R. 181/S.C.R. 214 | IL H.B. 2667 | ME H.P. 1066 | ME S.P. 517 |
| IA H.F. 151 | IL H.B. 5690/S.B. 3524 | ME L.D. 454* | Continued on next page |
**FOOD HUBS** (continued)
Supports infrastructure development for local food aggregation, processing, and distribution with an explicit connection to farm to school efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S.F. 1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 16/S.M. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>S. 4980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H.C.R. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 25/S.M. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>S. 6288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1437/S.B. 5327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 57/S.M. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>H.B. 851/S.B. 1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 7049A/S. 2244B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, FOOD SECURITY, AND HEALTH POLICIES**
Encourages farm to school activities as part of a broader state policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>H.C.R. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 144*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 564*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>L.B. 750, L.B. 849, &amp; L.B. 956*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>S.B. 140*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 2644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 617/S.B. 524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.B. 2667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.B. 5690/S.B. 3524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>H.J.R. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>H.B. 1422*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 10101/S. 7114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 6628/S. 2438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>H.B. 2833*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 3185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.B. 3476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>H.B. 3158/S.B. 3341*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>H.B. 851/S.B. 1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>H. 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1508*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2185/S.B. 6002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2798/S.B. 6483*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>S.B. 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>S.B. 663*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC, HEALTH AND RACIAL EQUITY**
Lists economic, health, or racial disparities as factors motivating farm to school activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.B. 2667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 146 &amp; S.B. 12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2185/S.B. 6002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.B. 5690/S.B. 3524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2798/S.B. 6483*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2413*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.R. 1093/S.R. 1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>H.B. 542*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>S.B. 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.B. 2782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 3504, H. 168, S. 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>S.B. 663*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.B. 717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S.F. 1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1508*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2185/S.B. 6002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2798/S.B. 6483*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROMOTIONAL PROGRAMS OR EVENTS**
Creates a statewide program or event that celebrates farm to school activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>H.B. 5847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>H.B. 7015 &amp; S.B. 1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>H.R. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>S.B. 589*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.C.R 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>H.B. 203*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Continued on next page
**SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:**

The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the “State Summaries” section.

### KEY:
- * indicates bills that became law
- / indicates companion bills
- & indicates bills that are similar, but not identical

### PROMOTIONAL PROGRAMS OR EVENTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Bill Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.B. 843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1016, H.B. 1341, &amp; S.B. 882*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.B. 1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 229 &amp; H.R. 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 95 /S.C.R. 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.B. 882*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 131 &amp; S.R. 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>H.B. 626*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>H.B. 825*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 2782*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>H. 3221 &amp; H. 4409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>H.B. 252/S.B. 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>H.B. 696 /S.B. 158*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>H.B. 751*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>S.P. 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>S.F. 1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>H.C.R. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>H.B. 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 111/S.C.R. 6; H.R. 82/S.R. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 95/S.C.R. 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 131/S.R. 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.R. 199 / H.C.R 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.R. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.R. 20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.R. 26 / S.R. 28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>H.R 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 558/S.R. 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 111/S.C.R. 6; H.R. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 167 &amp; H.R. 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 2643/S. 1907*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 2738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 3060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>A. 4238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A. 2041/S. 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>A. 2314/S. 907*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.M. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.M. 16/S.M. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.M. 25/S.M. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.M. 50/S.M. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.M. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.M. 57/S.M. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.M. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>S.M. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>S.M. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>H.J.R. 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 95/S.C.R. 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.R. 199 / H.C.R 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 147/S.R. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.C.R. 191 &amp; S.R. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.R. 181/S.C.R. 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>S.R. 98/S.C.R. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>H.R. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>H.R. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>H.J.M. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.R. 0376*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>H.R. 1093/S.R. 1257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Bill No. 28-0189*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>H.J.R. 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 1551/S.B. 5708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 2410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>H.B. 3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>S.R. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>S.R. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>S.R. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>S.R. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>H.R. 1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>H.R. 1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>H.J. 692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESOLUTIONS

Celebrates or encourages farm to school activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Resolution Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.C.R. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>H.C.R. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A.C.R. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>H.R. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>H.R. 20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>H.R. 26 / S.R. 28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>S.C.R. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>H.R 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 558/S.R. 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>H.R. 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 111/S.C.R. 6; H.R. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>H.C.R. 167 &amp; H.R. 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>H.R. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 15/S.M. 14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 16/S.M. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 25/S.M. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 29 /S.M. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 30/S.M. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 57/ S.M 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 53/ S.M 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>H.J.M. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>H.R. 1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>H.R. 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>H.R. 8109/S.R. 2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>H.R. 1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>H.R. 1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>H.M. 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
SEARCH BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS BY TOPIC:
The following tables organize farm to school legislation by topic. Additional information about these bills, including summary, status and a link to full bill text, can be found in the “State Summaries” section.

| KEY: | * indicates bills that became law |
| KEY: | / indicates companion bills |
| KEY: | & indicates bills that are similar, but not identical |

**RESOLUTIONS (continued)**
Celebrates or encourages farm to school activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WV S.R. 21</td>
<td>WV S.R. 33</td>
<td>WV H.J. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Summaries

KEY: / indicates companion bills
& indicates bills that are similar, but not identical
Unsuccessful bills that legislators reintroduced in a subsequent session are listed under the most recent session year

STATUS DEFINITIONS:

- **Adopted**—the legislature approved the resolution.
- **Codified at**—the legislature enacted the bill and included it in the state code.
- **Dead**—the legislature did not vote on the bill before the session ended, the legislature did not pass the bill, or the Governor vetoed the bill.
- **Enacted, yet to be codified**—at the time this handbook went to press, the legislature had passed the bill, but not yet included the provisions in the state code.
- **Included in annual state budget documents**—the legislature appropriated money for a bill. Appropriations and budget bills are not typically made part of the state code but are included in the public laws published annually.
- **Pending**—at the time this handbook went to press, the full legislature had not yet voted on the bill.

Alabama

### 2020

**S.B. 157**

**Funding for Sweet Grown Alabama Program**

S.B. 157 appropriates $120,000 for Alabama’s Farm to School Program. The funds are intended to be used as part of a 25-cent reimbursement incentive for every meal that features an Alabama-grown food product.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**

### 2017

**H.B. 53**

**Increasing the Small Purchase Threshold**

H.B. 53 allows school districts to use simplified contract procedures to purchase unprocessed agricultural products costing less than $150,000, the federal small purchase threshold. The state had previously allowed schools to use informal procedures to purchase unprocessed agricultural goods that cost less than $100,000. By allowing schools to use informal contract procedures for goods costing less than $150,000, the small purchase threshold makes it easier for schools to purchase from local farmers.

**CODIFIED AT ALA. CODE § 16-1-46 (2017)**
2012

H.B. 670

Encouraging Farm to School Procurement

This bill establishes the Farm to School Procurement Act. The purposes of the Act include (1) developing and coordinating state agency farm to school procurement processes, (2) helping local farmers access school-related food programs, and (3) disseminating information to schools and farm product producers. To help achieve these goals, H.B. 670 creates a farm to school coordinator position within the state Department of Agriculture and Industries. This coordinator is responsible for working with the Departments of Education and Public Health and developing a local foods directory. H.B. 670 also allows school districts to use simplified contract procedures to purchase unprocessed agricultural products that cost less than $100,000. By establishing a small purchase threshold of $100,000, this bill makes it easier for school districts to buy food for school meals from local farmers.


Alaska

2017

H.B. 46

Establishing a Local Foods Price Preference

State law requires government agents to purchase competitively priced products. H.B. 46 allows government entities to purchase agricultural products and fish harvested in state when the price falls within a certain range of the lowest responsible bid. School districts may purchase these products when the price costs no more than 115 percent of the lowest responsible bid. This price preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

DEAD

2016

H.C.R. 18

Encouraging Schools and Businesses to Reduce, Recover, and Recycle Food Waste

H.C.R. 18 encourages schools and businesses to reduce food waste and feed hungry Alaskans. This resolution promotes food waste reduction strategies such as composting in school gardens.

DEAD

2014

S.B. 119

Appropriating Money to the Nutritional Alaskan Foods for Schools Program

This bill appropriates $3 million to the Nutritional Alaskan Foods for Schools Program for fiscal year 2015. The Program’s purpose is to encourage every Alaskan school district to purchase nutritious Alaska-grown, caught, or harvested foods. The state Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development distributes funds to individual school districts. S.B. 119 is similar to S.B. 18 (2013) and S.B. 160 (2012) which also appropriated $3 million to the Program.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS
2013

**H.C.R. 1**

**Establishing a State Food Resource Development Working Group**

This resolution establishes a food resource development working group to collaborate with state agencies and the Alaska Food Policy Council. The goal of the working group is to identify resources and set policies that support a sustainable, healthy state food system. Specifically, the working group is responsible for (1) enhancing access, availability, affordability, and quality of food; (2) increasing economic opportunity for food production, processing, and distribution businesses; (3) recommending improvements to existing programs, policies, and regulations that affect the state’s food system; and (4) enhancing the health, safety, welfare, economic, and social well-being of the state’s residents. H.C.R. 1 also encourages the state Department of Education and Early Development to include locally produced food in school meals, establish education programs that highlight state food sources, and collaborate with farming groups to foster future generations of farmers.

**ADOPTED**

**S.B. 18**

**Appropriating Money to the Nutritional Alaskan Foods for Schools Program**

This bill appropriates $3 million to the Nutritional Alaskan Foods for Schools Program for fiscal year 2014. The Program’s purpose is to encourage every Alaskan school district to purchase nutritious Alaska-grown, caught, or harvested foods. The state Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development distributes funds to individual school districts. S.B. 18 is similar to S.B. 119 (2014) and S.B. 160 (2012) which also appropriated $3 million to the Program.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**

2012

**S.B. 160**

**Appropriating Money to the Nutritional Alaskan Foods for Schools Program**

This bill appropriates $3 million to the Nutritional Alaskan Foods for Schools Program for fiscal year 2013. The Program’s purpose is to encourage every Alaskan school district to purchase nutritious Alaska-grown, caught, or harvested foods. The state Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development distributes funds to individual school districts. S.B. 160 is similar to S.B. 119 (2014) and S.B. 18 (2013) which also appropriated $3 million to the Program.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**

2010

**H.B. 70**

**Establishing a Farm to School Program**

This bill establishes a farm to school program within the state Department of Natural Resources. The purposes of the program include strengthening the relationship between agriculture and school food procurement, expanding local markets, and improving the nutritional quality of school meals. The program also requires support for school educational activities including school gardens, school farms, and farm visits. To achieve these goals, H.B. 70 directs the Department of Natural Resources to work with the University of Alaska Cooperative Extension Service, Department of Health and Social Services, Department of Education and Early Development, and Department of Administration. H.B. 70 specifies that program operation is subject to appropriations and sunsets July 1, 2013.

**CODIFIED AT ALASKA STAT. § 36.15.050**

**H.B. 225**

**Establishing a Procurement Preference for In-State Agricultural Products**

This bill amends state procurement law to encourage government entities to purchase Alaskan agricultural products. The Procurement Code requires government entities to purchase competitively priced products. H.B. 225 allows state agencies to purchase local foods that cost up to 107 percent of the lowest responsible bid. This price preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

**DEAD**
Arizona

2016

H.B. 2518
Exempting School Garden Produce from Certain Food Safety Regulations
H.B. 2518 allows students to eat produce grown in their school garden. Food safety regulations previously prevented schools from serving their garden produce.

CODIFIED AT ARIZ. REV. STAT. § 36-136

2012

H.B. 2822
Establishing a Study Committee for Farm to School Programs
This bill creates a temporary ten member joint-legislative committee to study farm to school programs. H.B. 2822 encourages the committee to consider best practices for procurement and food education. It also recommends the Department of Agriculture establish a full-time farm to school position. The bill dissolves the study committee September 30, 2014.

DEAD

Arkansas

2019

H.B. 1615
Establishing a Farm to School and Early Childhood Education Program
H.B. 1615 establishes a farm to school and early childhood education program and creates a farm to school and early childhood education program coordinator position within the Arkansas Department of Agriculture. The coordinator is expected to address the issues of supply, demand, procurement, and consumption of farm or food products that are grown or packaged and processed in Arkansas in the farm to school and early childhood education program. The coordinator shall also prepare an annual report documenting the state’s farm to school activities.

CODIFIED AT A.C.A. § 6-18-2101

H.B. 1853
Amending the Local Food, Farms and Jobs Act
H.B. 1853 amends The Local Food, Farms and Jobs Act passed in 2017 to include data collection on the procurement of local farm or food products prepared and consumed within agencies. The bill also removes the contract preference for providers of local farm or food products.

CODIFIED AT A.C.A. § 15-4-3802
2017

**H.B. 1839**

Creating the Local Food, Farms, and Jobs Act

H.B. 1839 seeks to strengthen local food economies. The bill requires the state Department of Agriculture to create a local foods coordinator position and encourages the Department to develop a database of local farmers. H.B. 1839 sets specific procurement goals, encouraging state agencies to purchase 10 percent of foods locally in fiscal year 2018, and 20 percent in the years following. The bill requires agencies to track and report these purchases. And because local foods may not always be the lowest cost option, H.B. 1839 allows state agencies to purchase local foods that cost up to 110 percent of the lowest responsible bid. This price preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

*Codified at Ark. Code § 15-4-3800 et seq.*

**AR S.B. 436**

Funding After-School Nutrition and Literacy Programs

S.B. 436 appropriates $1,000,000 to the Arkansas Department of Education for after-school literacy and nutrition programs in the 2017–2018 fiscal year.

*DEAD*

---

**California**

2020

**A.B. 2466**

A.B. 2466 (2016)

A.B. 1357 (2015)

Establishing the Community Health Fund

A.B. 2466 taxes companies 2 cents per fluid ounce of sugar-sweetened beverage they produce and distribute. The bill authorizes the state to create the California Community Health Fund with the tax proceeds to be allocated to specified entities promoting health equity and reducing health disparities such as implementing educational, environmental, and policy strategies to improve nutrition, as well as state farm to school programs.

*DEAD*

**A.B. 1917/S.B. 808**

Appropriating Funds for the Farm to School Program

The Budget Act of 2020 appropriates nearly $8.5 million for grants for the Farm to School Program.

*DEAD*

**A.B. 958**

Creating the California Organic-to-School Pilot Program

A.B. 958 aims to create the California Organic-to-School Pilot Program to be administered by the state Secretary of Food and Agriculture, through the Office of Farm to Fork. The program is designed to provide at least five grants to school food authorities to purchase California organic food products. School food authorities are encouraged to purchase organic products from socially disadvantaged farmers, producers who offer educational opportunities, and local producers, and are encouraged to purchase in season based on the local growing season.

*DEAD*
2019

H.R. 20
Designating California Agriculture Day
H.R. 20 recognizes Thursday March 14, 2019 as National Agriculture Day and designates Wednesday, March 20, 2019 as California Agriculture Day in honor of all those who work in California agriculture.
ADOPTED

S.B. 74
Appropriating Funds for the Farm to School Program
The Budget Act of 2019 appropriates nearly $8.5 million for grants for the Farm to School Program.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

S.B. 499
Establishing the California-Grown for Healthy Kids Program
S.B. 499 establishes the California-Grown for Healthy Kids Program within the Office of Farm to Fork in the state Department of Food and Agriculture to increase universally free school meals made with fresh, California-grown fruits and vegetables. The bill intends to increase the number of schools purchasing local produce and encourages school food authorities to purchase products from socially disadvantaged farmers or local producers when possible. In addition to their procurement practices, participating schools are asked to incorporate educational opportunities and culturally appropriate meals.
DEAD

2017

H.R. 26/ S.R. 28
Establishing California Agriculture Day
H.R. 26 recognizes March 22 as California Agriculture Day to celebrate the significant role that agriculture plays in the lives of Californians. The resolution emphasizes the importance of purchasing food grown in California and the increasing support for farm to school programs throughout the state.
ADOPTED

A.B. 129
Funding the California-Grown Fresh School Meals Grant Program
A.B. 129 relates to California’s educational budget and establishes the California-Grown Fresh Meals Grant Program that places a priority on California-grown ingredients for school meals. The bill appropriates a one-time amount of $1,500,000 from the General Fund for the 2017-2018 fiscal year to fund the program.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

A.B. 1592
Revising the School Gardens Grant Reporting Requirements
A.B. 1592 amends the Instructional School Gardens Program law. This program provides three-year grants to create, support, or promote instructional school gardens. A.B. 1592 allows grant recipients to submit grant reports seven month, rather than six, after the grant period has ended.
DEAD
S.B. 717  
**Establishing a State Food Policy**  
S.B. 717 announces the legislature’s intent to develop a comprehensive food policy that expands access to healthy, equitable, and sustainable food. The bill highlights several strategies to promote healthy and sustainable foods. Examples include farm to fork initiatives, school gardens, and culinary training for children.  
**DEAD**

S.B. 730  
**Enforcing the Buy American Provision**  
S.B. 730 requires the state Department of Education to monitor and enforce the Buy American provision of the National School Lunch Act. The Buy American provision requires school districts to purchase domestic products to the maximum extent possible. S.B. 730 also requires school districts purchasing foreign products to submit a waiver to the state and communicate information about these foreign purchases with the public.  
**CODIFIED AT CAL. EDUC. CODE § 49563**

S.B. 782  
**Establishing the California-Grown Fresh School Meals Grant Program**  
S.B. 782 establishes a California-Grown Fresh School Meals Fund and appropriates $1.5 million to increase the use of California-grown food in freshly prepared school meals.  
**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**

2016  
**A.C.R. 147**  
**Designating California Agriculture Day**  
This resolution designates March 16, 2016 as California Agriculture Day. A.C.R. 147 emphasizes the importance of farm to school programs and agricultural education.  
**ADOPTED**

2015  
**A.B. 234**  
**Relating to Local Food Producers**  
A.B. 1990 (2014) gave local governments the power to impose certain restrictions on community food producers. A.B. 234 loosens these restrictions, authorizing local food producers who meet other food safety requirements to sell uncut produce and shell eggs without first registering with their local government. The bill includes school cafeterias as potential community food producers.  
**CODIFIED AT CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 114376**

**A.C.R. 31**  
**Designating California Agriculture Day**  
This resolution designates March 18, 2015 as California Agriculture Day. A.C.R. 31 emphasizes the importance of farm to school programs and agricultural education.  
**ADOPTED**
H.R. 15
Creating California Thursday
This resolution establishes April 23, 2015 as California Thursday. H.R. 15 aims to celebrate California produce and encourage schools districts to serve fresh, California produce.

ADOPTED

2014
A.B. 1990
Concerning Community Food Production
This bill authorizes community food producers—including school gardens and cafeterias—to sell or provide whole uncut produce or unrefrigerated eggs directly to the public, permitted restaurants, or other operations, provided the producer meets specified requirements. It also gives local governments the power to require community food producers to first register their operations.

CODIFIED AT CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 114376 (2014)

A.B. 2413
A.B. 38 (2013)
Establishing the Office of Farm to Fork
This bill establishes the Office of Farm to Fork within the state Department of Food and Agriculture. The bill requires the Office to (1) collaborate with the agricultural industry, agencies, and other organizations to increase the availability of agricultural products in underserved communities and schools, (2) promote food access programs in underserved urban and rural communities, (3) create the Farm to Fork Account, and (4) distribute funds from the Farm to Fork Account. A.B. 2413 also requires the Office to help build relationships between local producers and procurement personnel, incorporate best purchasing practices, enhance the nutritional quality of school foods, and increase access to nutrition education programs.

CODIFIED AT CAL. FOOD & AGRIC. CODE § 49000 ET SEQ.

A.B. 2602
Establishing the Farm to School Program
A.B. 2602 establishes the state Farm to School Program to provide grants and technical assistance to school districts and county offices of education. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Food and Agriculture to distribute grants of up to $5,000 per school to support food literacy education, renovate kitchen equipment, install salad bars, and train kitchen staff on preparing fresh food. A.B. 2602 also directs the Secretary of Food and Agriculture to develop an interagency working group to encourage schools to develop a farm to school program and to establish a farm to school program. The bill specifies that funding for the Farm to School Program is contingent upon appropriations.

DEAD

A.C.R. 128
Designating a Living Schoolyard Month
This resolution designates May as Living Schoolyard Month. A.C.R. 128 urges the state Department of Education, schools, and county offices of education to prioritize construction and design of green school spaces, as well as to integrate these spaces into standards-based curricula. The resolution also recognizes that the Living Schoolyard Month, in conjunction with the Instructional School Gardens Program, encourages schools to increase on-campus green spaces, such as school gardens, to improve the overall quality of student life.

ADOPTED
S.C.R 92
Celebrating National Agriculture Week and California Agriculture Day
This resolution recognizes the week of March 23, 2014 as National Agriculture Week and designates March 19, 2014 as California Agriculture Day. The resolution celebrates California's agricultural heritage and the vital role agriculture plays in daily life. Specifically, the resolution acknowledges that California consumers prefer to purchase foods grown in California and to support farmer's markets, consumer supported agriculture programs, and farm to school programs.
ADOPTED

2013
A.C.R. 29
Celebrating National Agriculture Week and California Agriculture Day
This resolution recognizes the week of March 17, 2013 as National Agriculture Week and designates March 20, 2013 as California Agriculture Day. The resolution celebrates California's agricultural heritage and the vital role agriculture plays in daily life. Specifically, the resolution acknowledges that California consumers prefer to purchase foods grown in California and to support farmer's markets, consumer supported agriculture programs, and farm to school programs.
ADOPTED

2012
A.B. 2367
Selling Produce from School Gardens
A.B. 2367 authorizes schools to sell produce grown in their school gardens. A school need not participate in the state's Instructional School Gardens Program. Instead, the school must comply with applicable federal, state, and local health and safety requirements for producing, processing, and distributing produce.
CODIFIED AT CAL. EDUC. CODE § 51798

2011
A.B. 909
Establishing a Farm to School Program
This bill establishes a farm to school program to provide schools that meet certain requirements with an additional 5 cents per meal. To receive this additional reimbursement, the district must purchase 80 percent of its fresh produce from California. Additional money makes it easier for school meal providers to purchase local foods.
DEAD

2006
A.B. 1535
Creating the Instructional School Gardens Program
A.B. 1535 establishes the Instructional School Gardens Program to include a grant program, advisory group, interagency working group, and appropriations. The Program provides grants and technical assistance to charter schools, school districts, and county offices of education to develop and maintain instructional school garden programs. The bill directs the state Superintendent of Public Instruction to convene an interagency working group to determine effective and efficient means to establish and maintain instructional school gardens. It also authorizes an advisory group to work with the Superintendent and appropriates money for the Program.
CODIFIED AT CAL. EDUC. CODE § 51795 ET SEQ.
2005

S.B. 281
Establishing the California Fresh Start Pilot Program
S.B. 281 establishes the California Fresh Start Pilot Program to provide additional fresh fruit and vegetables through the School Breakfast Program. The bill reimburses schools 10 cents for every breakfast that includes an additional fruit or vegetable serving. It also encourages schools to buy California products and requires that they offer local produce samples as a part of nutrition education. The legislation gives the state Department of Education $400,000 to provide competitive grants, $100,000 of which may fund an online seminar for school-site staff who will handle, serve, and promote fresh produce.

CODIFIED AT CAL. EDUC. CODE § 49565 ET SEQ.

A.B. 826
Establishing the California Farm to School Child Nutrition Improvement Program
A.B. 826 creates the California Farm to School Child Nutrition Improvement Program. The bill requires the State Department of Education to collaborate with the Departments of Food and Agriculture and Health Services. The Departments are responsible for providing outreach and training for school food service personnel and the agricultural industry. The goal of such training is to help schools serve fresh fruits and vegetables.

DEAD

2002

A.B. 1634
Establishing a School Gardens Program
This bill establishes a school gardens program to expand the number of educational gardens and salad bars in California public schools. The purpose of the bill is to encourage nutrition education activities that (1) emphasize the appealing aspects of healthy eating; (2) are participatory, developmentally appropriate, and enjoyable; and (3) engage families. A.B. 1634 requires the state Department of Education to develop, research, and coordinate the best practices for K—12 garden programs. It also appropriates money for the program.

CODIFIED AT CAL. EDUC. CODE § 51795 ET SEQ.

2001

S.B. 19
Concerning Nutrition in Schools
This bill increases the amount of money the state reimburses schools for free and reduced-price meals. It permits school districts to convene a Child Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Committee to increase organic produce in school meals, support school gardens, and collaborate with local farmers markets. Additionally, S.B. 19 prohibits the sale of sugar-sweetened beverages and establishes new standards for foods sold on site.

CODIFIED AT CAL. EDUC. CODE § 49433 ET SEQ.
Colorado

2020

H.B. 1300
Amending the Local School Food Purchasing Program

H.B. 1300 makes technical changes to the Local School Food Purchasing Program, such as when a local education provider may apply to the Program and when the Department of Education selects providers. The bill requires the department to ensure geographic and district pupil size diversity among providers. It also changes the limit on the number of lunches that all local education providers served in the prior year to 10 million; changes the reimbursement formula to $0.05 for every meal that the local education provider served in the previous year; and specifies that the department does not spend the full appropriation for the Local School Food Purchasing Program up to five percent of the appropriation that is available to the department in the following year.

CODIFIED AT COLO. REV. STAT. § 22-100 ET SEQ

2019

H.B. 1132
Establishing the Local School Food Purchasing Program and Technical Assistance and Education Grant Program

H.B. 1132 establishes the Local School Food Purchasing Program and the Local School Food Purchasing Technical Assistance and Education Grant Program. The Purchasing Program is designed to reimburse participating providers—school districts, charter schools, boards of cooperatives services that operate a public school, or residential childcare centers—for the purchase of Colorado-grown, -raised, or -processed products. The Technical Assistance and Education Grant Program provides a grant to a statewide nonprofit organization to develop and manage the program designed to promote Colorado food products to participating providers. The nonprofit would be able to award mini-grants for training, technical assistance and infrastructure to participating providers, grower associations, or other organizations that aggregate products from producers.

CODIFIED AT COLO. REV. STAT. § 22-100 ET SEQ

2017

H.B. 17-1192
Concerning the Colorado Food Systems Advisory Council

H.B. 17-1192 restructures the state food systems advisory council. The bill adds council seats for a state Department of Education representative and three farmers who sell foods to public schools. The bill repeals the interagency farm to school task force and instead, makes the council responsible for developing farm to school policy.

DEAD

2015

H.B. 15-1088
Creating an Interagency Farm to School Grant Program

H.B. 15-1088 appropriates $500,000 for an interagency farm to school grant program. The purpose of the program is to provide capital and technical assistance to farmers, ranchers, and food hubs selling to schools. The bill establishes two kinds of grants: one to defray the costs of complying with food safety regulations and the other to reduce the costs of aggregating and distributing foods to schools.

DEAD
2013

S.B. 13-153
Continuing the Interagency Farm to School Coordination Task Force
This bill extends the life of the interagency farm to school coordination task force indefinitely.

CODIFIED AT COLO. REV. STAT. § 22-82.6-104 ET SEQ. (2013)

2012

S.B. 12-48
Creating the Colorado Cottage Foods Act
S.B. 12-48 encourages state entities that regulate local food production to consider revising zoning ordinances, building and health codes, and other legal barriers that affect small producers. The goal is to encourage local food economies to grow. S.B. 12-48 also encourages agencies to support farm to school activities—to serve produce on-site and educate students about locally produced foods. S.B. 12-48 also exempts school and nonprofit community kitchens processing goods for sale from civil liability.

CODIFIED AT COLO. REV. STAT. §§ 13-21-113.5 & 25-4-1614 (2012)

2010

H.B. 10-1335
Creating a Healthy Food Grant Program
This bill creates the Boards of Cooperative Services (BOCES) Healthy Food Grant program to purchase food for school meals. BOCES who maintain food equipment and operate food-service facilities may use the funds to distribute food and beverages that meet school nutritional standards. The bill encourages BOCES to purchase food and beverages that are locally grown or produced.

CODIFIED AT COLO. REV. STAT. § 22-5-121 (2010), BUT REPEALED JULY 1, 2015

S.B. 10-81
Creating a Farm to School Coordination Task Force
S.B. 10-81 creates a thirteen member interagency farm to school coordination task force. School food service directors, agricultural representatives, and staff from the state Departments of Public Health, Education, Higher Education and Agriculture comprise the task force. They are responsible for recommending policies to encourage school districts to use local agricultural products. When developing recommendations, the task force must consider farm to school pilot programs, as well as funding sources that help to cover the cost of locally grown products. S.B. 10-81 also directs the task force to consider training farmers and school food service staff to integrate fresh local products into school meals.

CODIFIED AT COLO. REV. STAT. § 22-82.6-104 (2010)

S.B. 10-106
Establishing a Food Systems Advisory Council
This bill establishes a food systems advisory council to the state Department of Agriculture and appropriates money to administer the council. The council’s purposes include fostering a healthy food supply for all residents, enhancing Colorado’s agricultural and natural resources, encouraging economic growth, and expanding the viability of agriculture. The council’s duties include (1) developing local food recommendations to promote local food economies, (2) considering ways to improve the nutritional quality of foods available to children, and (3) increasing children’s access to locally grown foods.

CODIFIED AT COLO. REV. STAT. § 24-37.3-100 ET SEQ. (2010), BUT REPEAL EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2018
2006

**S.B. 06-127**

**Establishing the Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Pilot Program**

This bill establishes the Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Pilot Program for the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school years. The purpose of the program is to provide public school students with free fruits and vegetables. Participating schools are required to use Colorado-produced fruits and vegetables to the maximum extent possible. S.B. 06-127 appropriates $500,000 for school food: $350,000 for converting reduced price meals to free meals and $150,000 to the Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Pilot Program.

*Codified at Colo. Rev. Stat. § 22-82.5-101 et seq. (2010), but repealed January 1, 2009*

2005

**H.B. 05-1307**

**Establishing a Local Purchasing Preference**

This bill requires state agencies to choose Colorado agricultural products over out-of-state products when the price reasonably exceeds the lowest contract bid, but the quality is equal. By requiring state agencies to give local vendors a competitive advantage in bidding processes, H.B. 05-1307 makes it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

*Codified at Colo. Rev. Stat. § 8-18-103*

**Connecticut**

2019

**H.B. 5379**

**Concerning the Use of Locally Grown Food in School Food Programs**

H.B. 5379 encourages local and regional school boards to procure locally grown foods for their school food programs.

*Dead*

2018

**S.B. 106**

**H.B. 5847 (2006)**

**Concerning the Farm to School Program**

S.B 106 amends existing state law regarding the farm to school program within the state Department of Agriculture to include a requirement of proof from farmers and businesses that farm product supplied to schools and educational institutions are Connecticut grown. The goal of the program is to promote the sale of Connecticut-grown farm products to schools. The Department of Agriculture is responsible for (1) soliciting Connecticut farmers to sell products to schools, (2) developing a farm to school database, (3) facilitating farm to school purchases, and (4) providing technical assistance to farmers. The Department of Education coordinates the Connecticut Grown For Connecticut Kids week to promote Connecticut agriculture and foods to children at schools, farms, farmers’ markets, and other community locations.

*Codified at Conn. Gen. Stat. § 22-38D*

2017

**H.B. 5601**

**Concerning the Use of Locally Grown Food in School Food Programs**

H.B. 5601 encourages school districts to use locally grown foods in school meals.

*Dead*
2016

**S.B. 76**  
**Concerning Connecticut’s Farm to School Program**  
S.B. 76 requires the state Department of Education to develop regulations that encourage school districts to purchase local foods. Food vendors submitting a bid to a school district must detail the ways in which the bid supports the state’s farm to school program. H.B. 76 also specifies that when choosing among equal bids for food contracts, school districts must choose bids for foods from local farmers.

*CODIFIED AT CONN. GEN. STAT. § 10-215D*

---

2013

**H.B. 5482**  
**Increasing Connecticut-Grown Products in School Food Programs**  
H.B. 5482 establishes a pilot program to process local food for school meals. The bill would expand the reach of the Connecticut Grown and farm to school programs.

*DEAD*

**S.B. 804**  
**Establishing a Preference for Connecticut-Grown Protein**  
This bill requires the state Commissioner of Administrative Services to prefer Connecticut-grown and raised products when purchasing fresh foods. The Connecticut-grown products must be comparable in cost to out-of-state products. This preference for Connecticut products gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, enabling schools to purchase local foods.

*CODIFIED AT CONN. GEN. STAT. § 14A-51*

---

2005

**S.B. 410**  
**Allocating Funds to Encourage the Sale of Connecticut-Grown Food to Schools**  
This bill allocates $100,000 annually to encourage the sale of Connecticut-grown food to schools, restaurants, retailers, and other institutions in the state.

*CODIFIED AT CONN. GEN. STAT. § 4-66AA, BUT THE SCHOOL MEAL PROVISIONS WERE REPEALED SEPTEMBER 30, 2007*

---

2004

**S.B. 589**  
**Promoting Connecticut Farm Fresh Schools**  
This bill requires the state Commissioner of Agriculture to administer a program celebrating schools that serve Connecticut farm products. Educational institutions that serve at least 20 percent of state-grown foods may use the Connecticut Farm Fresh School label. The legislation also requires state entities choose vendors who use Connecticut agricultural products when purchasing food. By creating a preference for Connecticut foods, S.B. 589 gives local farmers a competitive advantage in the bidding process, enabling schools to purchase local foods.

*CODIFIED AT CONN. GEN. STAT. § 22-38B*
Delaware

2010

H.B. 203
Designating Strawberry Week
This bill designates strawberries as the official state fruit. It declares the week of May 17, 2010 as Strawberry Week, a statewide farm to school event.

CODIFIED AT DEL. CODE TIT. 29 § 322

2004

H.R. 74
Urging Congress to Pass the Farm to Cafeteria Projects Act
This resolution urges Congress to pass the Farm to Cafeteria Projects Act and any other legislation promoting farm to school partnerships. The goals of this bill are to help schools purchase locally grown food; provide more healthy, fresh food to school children; educate students and their families about food grown in their communities; and to expand market opportunities for local farms.

ADOPTED

District of Columbia

2017

DC B. 22–0313 / A. 22–0566
Amending the Healthy Schools Act of 2010
This bill amends existing law and requires the Office of Planning to develop recommendations for the mayor on best practices for schools to post sourcing information for school meals on their websites. It also directs the District of Columbia Public Schools to conduct a baseline assessment to determine how to better meet the core values of the Good Food Purchasing Program (GFPP), increase food procurement consistent with GFPP core values, and complete an annual follow-up assessment to demonstrate progress toward GFPP core values. It also requires the Office of the State Superintendent of Education to submit a biennial report to the mayor, the Council, and the Healthy Youth and Schools Commission, which includes an update on farm to school initiatives and recommendations for improving those initiatives.

CODIFIED AT § 38–821

2014

L.B. 750, L.B. 849, & L.B. 956
L.B. 407 (2013)
Authorizing the Healthy Tots Act of 2014
Together, these bills comprise the Healthy Tots Act of 2014. They direct the state Superintendent of Education to administer the Healthy Tots Fund to finance various programs that promote children’s health. For example, the Fund provides competitive grants to childcare facilities to support physical activity, nutrition, gardens, natural play areas, and farm to preschool programs. The Healthy Tots Fund provides additional money for schools meals and reimburses childcare facilities an additional 5 cents per meal served when at least one component of a meal is comprised entirely of locally-grown, unprocessed foods. The bills also encourage schools to adopt local wellness policies. L.B. 407 (2013) is similar, though not exactly the same as the bills that ultimately passed in 2014.

CODIFIED AT D.C. CODE § 38–282
**L.B. 821**

**Creating a Food Policy Council and Director Position**

This bill establishes a food policy council to determine food policies that promote access, sustainability, and local procurement. The council’s responsibilities include identifying regulatory barriers, analyzing data, and advising organizations on local food sales. Specifically, the bill directs the council to encourage institutional buyers to purchase locally grown foods. The bill also creates a food policy director position to promote policies that increase food access and build a local food economy.

*CODIFIED AT D.C. CODE § 48-311 ET SEQ.*

**2011**

**L.B. 144**

**Amending the Healthy Schools Act**

L.B. 144 amends the Healthy Schools Act to clarify the definition of unprocessed foods, penalties for noncompliance, food service requirements, nutrition requirements, health education assessment, and the Environmental Literacy Plan. This bill removes local milk from the list of products eligible for the additional farm to school reimbursement and makes breakfast meals eligible for the reimbursement. L.B. 144 develops a plan for certifying physical education and health teachers. It also provides support for School Wellness Advisory Councils.

*CODIFIED AT D.C. CODE §§ 38-821—828*

**2010**

**L.B. 564**

**Authorizing the Healthy Schools Act of 2010**

The Healthy Schools Act of 2010 serves to ‘green’ public schools and improve the health, nutrition, and wellness of students. L.B. 564 creates a Health Youth and Schools Commission to provide advice on health and wellness efforts. It requires the District Department of Education to hold schools accountable for their local wellness policies, which have a farm to school component, and establishes a school garden grant program within the Department. The bill also requires schools to meet USDA’s Healthier US Gold nutrition standards and to serve minimally processed foods from sustainable, local growers whenever possible. The bill reimburses schools an additional 5 cents for meals with locally grown, unprocessed foods and 10 cents for meals that meet the nutrition requirements. It also requires schools to educate students and staff about local, sustainable food and provides grants to help schools alleviate logistical farm to school issues.

*CODIFIED AT D.C. CODE §§ 38-821—828*

**Florida**

**2020**

**H.B. 973/S.B. 1384**

**Amending the Florida Farm to School Program**

H.B. 973 / S.B. 1384 aims to amend the Florida Farm to School Program such that vendors selling or delivering agricultural commodities to school districts are required to provide the school districts with an invoice that includes certain information such as the facility that produced the commodity, the type of commodity delivered, the total weight and volume, and the total value delivered. These bills require each participating district school board to then submit the information monthly to the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. With this information, the department is expected to create and manage a sortable database for the information and must submit an annual report to the Legislature.

*DEAD*
**H.B. 521/S.B. 1526**  
Establishing a Reimbursement Program for Schools Serving Florida-Grown Agricultural Commodities

H.B. 521/S.B. 1526 establishes an annual allocation of funds to participating school districts as an additional reimbursement for each meal served if at least one component of the meal is comprised of a Florida-grown agricultural commodity. These bills also remove an exemption from the requirement to implement universal, free school breakfast meals in certain schools.

*DEAD*

**2017**

**H.B. 1247**  
Supporting School Garden Programs

H.B. 1247 requires the state Departments of Education and Agriculture to provide school districts with information about establishing a school garden program, available grants, and other available resources. The bill allows schools to distribute school garden produce to students who qualify for free and reduced lunch and specifically exempts participating schools from specified food distribution regulations.

*DEAD*

**2015**

**H.B. 7015 & S.B. 1050**  
Relating to the Florida Farm to School Program

H.B. 7015 amends existing state law to change the name of the Florida Farm Fresh Schools Program to the Florida Farm to School Program. The goal of the farm to school program is to increase purchases of fresh foods grown in state. This bill also authorizes the Department of Agriculture to recognize districts that purchases more than 10 percent of food from local farmers.

*DEAD*

**2013**

**H.B. 7087**  
Establishing the Florida School Food and Nutrition Act

H.B. 7087 requires the state Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services to develop food service policies to implement the Florida Farm Fresh Schools Program. These policies must encourage program participants to buy fresh and high-quality food grown in Florida when feasible, prefer competitively priced organic food products when awarding contracts, and choose local foods. The bill requires the Department to provide outreach, guidance, and training about the benefit of fresh farm products from farms to parent/teacher organizations, schools, and students.

*Codified at Fla. Stat. § 595.400 et seq.*

**2010**

**S.B. 140**  
Establishing the Florida Farm Fresh Schools Program

S.B. 140 establishes the Florida Farm Fresh Schools Program within the state Department of Education. It recognizes that school children need nutritious food to develop physically and intellectually and to combat diseases related to poor nutrition. The bill directs the Department of Education to work with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services to develop policies that encourage school districts to buy fresh, local, and nutrient-dense food. S.B. 140 also requires the two Departments to provide outreach services regarding the benefits of Florida fresh food products.

*Codified at Fla. Stat. § 595.406*
Georgia

2017

H.R. 57
Creating the School Nutrition Programs Study Committee
This resolution creates the School Nutrition Programs Study Committee. The Committee is responsible for producing a comprehensive report on school food initiatives. Two initiatives the bill mentions are the Feed My School for a Week and the Georgia-Grown Test Kitchen—both introduce students to locally grown food. The report must recommend ways to further improve school nutrition programs.

ADOPTED

2013

H.B. 17
H.B. 843 (2011)
Establishing a Farm to School Program
This bill creates multiple initiatives to help students learn about and consume Georgia food products. H.B. 17 creates a farm to school program to promote the sale of Georgia-grown farm products and directs the Department of Agriculture to develop a local farmers database. H.B. 17 establishes a week long, annual event to promote Georgia agriculture to students at schools, farms, farmers’ markets, and other locations. The bill also encourages student-farmer interactions, including field trips and in-school presentations.

DEAD

H.R. 558/S.R. 430
Commending Farm to School Efforts
These resolutions recognize farm to school activities as viable strategies to combat Georgia’s obesity crisis. They encourage more schools to adopt farm to school programs and recognize farm to school’s potential to support Georgia farmers.

ADOPTED

2011

H.B. 367
Establishing a Farm to School Program
This bill promotes the production, purchase, and consumption of Georgia-grown farm products. It requires the Department of Agriculture to develop food procurement procedures and resources to help state agencies purchase Georgia-grown food, permits local school districts to operate school gardens or farms, and establishes a farm to school program within the Department of Education to promote the sale of Georgia-grown farm products to school districts.

DEAD

H.R. 589
Commending Farm to School Efforts
The resolution declares March 30, 2011 as Farm to School Day at the state capitol. It recognizes farm to school activities as viable strategies to combat Georgia’s obesity crisis and encourages more schools to adopt farm to school programs. H.R. 589 also recognizes farm to school’s potential to support Georgia farmers.

ADOPTED
2009

**S.B. 44**  
**Establishing a Local Purchasing Preference**  
This bill authorizes the Board of Education to promulgate rules to create a local purchasing preference. This purchasing preference makes local supplies, including agricultural products, more competitive in the contract award process. By giving local producers a competitive advantage in public contracts, S.B. 44 enables schools to purchase more local foods.  
*CODIFIED AT GA. CODE ANN. § 36-84-1*

---

Guam

2005

**Bill No. 164 (EC)**  
**Concerning the Local Wellness Policy**  
This bill directs the Guam Department of Education to establish and implement a Local Wellness Policy. This policy may include rules, regulations, and training to achieve optimal nutrition through the School Breakfast, Lunch, and After-School Snack Programs for student growth, development, and academic achievement. The policy may also include nutrition education and physical fitness in the school curriculum.  
*CODIFIED AT 17 G.C.A. § 3207*

1995

**Bill No. 22 (LS)**  
**Procuring Local Produce and Fish**  
This bill provides for government agencies to give preference to local farmers and fishermen in the procurement of produce and fish. It also directs the Guam Department of Agriculture to develop a list of qualified farmers and fishermen and to assist those eligible local farmers and fishermen in establishing pricing, variety, quantity, quality, availability, and other related logistics to facilitate the acquisition of local produce and fish.  
*CODIFIED AT 5 G.C.A. § 68101*

---

Hawai‘i

2020

**S.R. 181 & S.C.R. 214**  
**Urging the Hawai‘i State Department of Education to Require Procurement of Goods from Food Hubs**  
S.R. 181 / S.C.R. 214 urges Hawai‘i’s Department of Education Food Services Branch to adopt an addendum to its agreements for ‘Aina Pono programs—including Farm to School and Harvest of the Month—to require the procurement of goods or services from food hubs. The resolution explains that procuring from food hubs helps local farmers be more economically sustainable by providing access to larger agricultural markets while increasing consumers’ (such as schools) access to fresh, locally grown food and value-added products.  
*DEAD*
**H.B. 1936**

**Establishing a Farm to School Grant Pilot Program**

H.B. 1936 establishes a two-year farm to school grant pilot program within the Department of Agriculture. Eligible entities may apply to the Department of Agriculture for a grant to support the procurement of foods produced or processed in the State; food-, education-, farm- and school garden-based educational activities; initiatives to sustain or expand existing farm to school programs; or food safety and good agricultural practices training and implementation. The bill also establishes an agriculture education coordinator position within University of Hawai‘i at Manoa College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources to coordinate preschool through post-secondary agriculture education, oversee ongoing communication and collaboration of the agriculture education working group, and lead implementation of the coordinated framework of support for agriculture education in Hawai‘i. H.B. 1936 appropriates funds for both the pilot program and the coordinator position.

*DEAD*

**H.B. 637/S.B. 303**

**Relating to School Gardens**

H.B. 637 / S.B. 303 authorizes the Department of Education to develop programs to encourage the development of gardens on school property with the recognition that school gardens foster a better understanding and appreciation of where food comes from, how food travels from the farm to the table, and the important role of agriculture in the state and global economy.

*DEAD*

**H.B. 1494**

**Building a Well-Being Center at Manoa Elementary School**

H.B. 1494 appropriates funds for the construction of a “well-being center” at Manoa elementary school to provide a facility to house a school garden and sustainability program where students will develop a meaningful connection to real food, healthier eating habits, and practical and real-world project-based learning opportunities.

*DEAD*

**H.B. 1102/S.B. 762, H.B. 2215 & H.B. 2682**

**Relating to Agriculture Education**

H.B. 1102/S.B. 762 establishes and appropriates funds for an Agriculture Education Coordinator position within the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources to support the work of increasing the number of students exposed to agriculture education at all levels in public, charter, and independent schools; increasing the number of public school students entering and completing the career and technical education natural resources career pathway in agriculture; increasing the number of students entering and completing higher education programs in agriculture and food systems; increasing the number of teachers trained in agriculture education; increasing the number of local farms and farmers; and increasing the local food supply and food security.

*DEAD*

**2018**

**S.R. 98/S.C.R. 180**

**Reexamining School Menus to Integrate More Locally Grown Produce**

This resolution requests the Hawai‘i Department of Education to reexamine the menu schedules for school meals in order to give local produce suppliers the ability to provide locally grown produce to schools. The resolution encourages flexibility in school meals to meet USDA nutrition guidelines while providing more local produce in schools.

*ADOPTED*
H.R.199 / H.C.R 229
Conducting a Study on Subsistence Farming in Hawai‘i
H.R. 199/ H.C.R. 299 request the Hawai‘i Department of Agriculture to conduct a study to evaluate the percentage of subsistence farming agriculture in the state. The resolution includes that supporting farm to school gardens is a valuable educational experience and that gardens support subsistence farming and encourage healthy eating in children.

DEAD

H.B. 2025
H.B. 1577 (2017)
Creating a School Composting Pilot Program
H.B. 2025 establishes a composting grant pilot project for public schools to help students understand the relationship between food waste and local food production. The compost program is an extension of the legislature’s commitment to increase garden and farm-based opportunities, which is one of five pillars of the state’s farm to school program.

ENACTED; YET TO BE CODIFIED

H.B. 2497/S.B. 2928
Establishing a Farm to School Grant Pilot Program
H.B. 2497 establishes a three-year farm to school grant pilot program within the Hawai‘i Department of Agriculture to provide grants for local procurement, farm- and garden-based educational activities, initiatives to sustain or expand existing farm to school programs, and food safety and good agricultural practices training and implementation. The bill appropriates funding for this grant program and in continuation of the Hawai‘i farm to school program and coordinator position. It also directs the coordinator to report to the legislature on the value and outcome of the farm to school grant pilot program.

DEAD

S.B. 2387/ H.B. 2156
Establishing a Farm to School Program
S.B.2387/H.B. 2156 authorizes the Hawai‘i Department of Education (HIDOE) to establish a farm to school program; requires coordination between the farm to school coordinators within HIDOE and the Hawai‘i Department of Agriculture (HDOA); and appropriates funds for two full-time equivalent staff positions to serve as farm to school coordinators within HIDOE. The purpose of HIDOE’s farm to school program is to expand student opportunities for farm-based and school garden education; increase the procurement of locally-grown foods for the school meal program; and support coordination between HIDOE and HDOA on farm to school activities and initiatives.

DEAD

2017

H.B. 255/S.B. 807
Supporting Farm to School Activities
H.B. 255/S.B. 807 establish a farm to school grant program to provide training and technical assistance to farmers selling to schools. The amended version of H.B. 255 creates two full-time farm to school positions: a farm to school grant program coordinator and special fund manager.

DEAD

H.B. 490
Creating a Task Force for Local Food Production
H.B. 490 creates a task force to define Hawaii’s food production goals. The bill requires that one goal be to increase local foods procurement in schools. H.B. 490 reserves one spot on the task force for the state farm to school coordinator. In return, H.B. 490 requires that the farm to school program provide administrative support for the body.

DEAD
**H.B. 1016, H.B. 1341, & S.B. 882**  
**Designating Farm to School Month in Hawai‘i**  
These bills designate October as Farm to School Month in Hawai‘i. The goal of the annual celebration is to raise public awareness of farm to school efforts.  
*CODIFIED AT 8 HAW. REV. STAT. 8-29*

**H.B. 1544**  
**Supporting Local Food Production**  
The Department of Agriculture administers an agricultural planning and development program. H.B. 1544 expands the scope of this program to include a new goal: increasing production of food grown and sold in Hawaii. Making local foods more available can enable schools to purchase products grown in Hawaii.  
*DEAD*

**H.C.R. 83 & H.R. 45**  
**Urging the Farm to School Coordinator to Implement a School Mentorship Pilot Program**  
H.C.R. 83/H.R. 45 recommend that the Farm to School Coordinator develop a two-year mentorship pilot program. Through the pilot program, farmers advise students interested in becoming farmers or ranchers.  
*ADOPTED*

**S.B. 1313**  
**Developing a State Strategy for Food Resiliency**  
S.B. 1313 requires the state Department of Agriculture to develop a statewide strategy for agricultural development and food resiliency. The bill lists numerous goals, such as increasing the demand for and production of locally grown foods. S.B. 1313 requires the Department to submit a report detailing the statewide plan to the legislature. The bill also appropriates money to various agricultural initiatives, including school gardens and a farm to school pilot program in charter schools.  
*DEAD*

**2016**  
**S.C.R. 131 & S.R. 96**  
**Designating October as Farm To School Month**  
These resolutions highlight the benefits of Hawaii’s farm to school program and designate October of every year as Farm to School Month.  
*S.R. 96 WAS ADOPTED; S.C.R. 131 DIED*

**2015**  
**H.B. 627 & S.B. 376**  
**Relating to a Farm to School Program**  
Companion bills H.B. 627 and S.B. 376 establish a statewide farm to school program. The goals of the program are to improve student health, develop the agricultural workforce, expand farm- and garden-based education, and increase local food procurement for public schools. S.B. 376 authorizes one farm to school coordinator position, and appropriates $75,000 to the state Department of Agriculture to fund the position. In contrast, H.B. 627 creates a Farm to School program with two coordinator positions, one within the Department of Agriculture and the other within the Department of Education.  
*S.B. 376 WAS CODIFIED AT HAW. REV. STAT. § 141-11; H.B. 627 DIED*
**H.B. 1028/S.B. 1282**

Creating a Special, Innovative Procurement Process

H.B. 1028/S.B. 1282 create an alternative process for government entities to purchase goods. These bills authorize the state’s chief procurement officer, with the state attorney general’s approval, to initiate a special procurement process outside of the formal and informal bidding processes. H.B. 1028/S.B. 1282 could allow the state to increase farm to school purchases through these special processes.

*DEAD*

**H.C.R. 95 / S.C.R. 109**

Designating October as Farm To School Month

These resolutions highlight the benefits of Hawaii’s farm to school programs and designate October of every year as Farm to School Month.

*S.C.R. 96 WAS ADOPTED; H.C.R. 95 DIED*

**S.B. 378**

Encouraging Local Food Procurement

S.B. 378 allows government entities to purchase local meats and produce outside of the competitive bidding process. The bill’s purpose is to enable schools, hospitals, and other public institutions to purchase local food products. This bill notes that local foods can enhance children’s educational experience and health habits.

*DEAD*

**S.B. 593**

Supporting Local Food Production

S.B. 593 amends the primary mission of Hawaii’s agribusiness development corporation to include several new priorities, one of which is local food production. The bill also requires that the state development corporation and Department of Agriculture lease at least 50 percent of their managed lands for local food production. By increasing support for local agriculture, S.B. 593 increases schools’ potential to purchase local foods.

*DEAD*

**S.B. 1292**

Encouraging Schools to Purchase Foods from Local Foods

S.B. 1292 establishes a voluntary program to encourage well-funded school districts to initiate farm to school efforts by purchasing local foods. S.B. 1292 requires participating farmers to demonstrate they have adequate supplies to meet the district’s annual needs and that their farm has completed food safety certification.

*DEAD*

**S.C.R. 191 & S.R. 126**

Encouraging the Department of Education to Establish a Voluntary Farm to School Program

S.C.R. 191 and S.R. 126 encourage the state Department of Education to establish a farm to school program to improve student access to healthy foods. These resolutions suggest that the program require farmers to demonstrate they have adequate supplies to meet the district’s annual needs and that their farm has completed food safety certification.

*DEAD*
2014

H.B. 1990/S.B. 2565 & H.B. 2462/S.B. 2762
H.B. 322 (2013)
**Establishing the Good Agricultural Practices Program**

These bills establish the Good Agricultural Practices Program for farms growing local food products. The program will promote practices that reduce the potential for food contamination on farms, including school gardens. Specifically, the program will set standards for field management, hygiene, water quality, chemical use, and animal manure use. The bills note that the growth of small, diversified farms and a renewed interest in school gardens has encouraged the state to develop standards to reduce food contamination. These bills appropriate money for the program.

**DEAD**

H.B. 1536
H.B. 617/S.B. 524 (2013)
**Agricultural Development and Food Security Program**

These bills establish an agricultural development and food security program, as well as state planning objectives to increase demand for, access to, and production of locally grown foods. One of the objectives of the program is to encourage schools to purchase locally grown foods. These bills appropriate money for the program.

**DEAD**

H.B. 1571/S.B. 2226
**Establishing School and Community Gardens**

These bills authorize the Department of Education and Community Development Authority to develop programs that encourage school and community gardens creation. These bills require the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources of the University of Hawaii at Manoa to advise on best gardening practices.

**DEAD**

H.B. 1662
**Establishing Farm to School Month**

This bill designates October as Farm to School Month in Hawaii. The purpose of Farm to School Month is to promote public awareness of initiatives that (1) connect schools to local farms; (2) improve student nutrition; (3) provide agriculture, health, and nutrition education opportunities; and (4) support local farmers.

**DEAD**

H.B. 1988/S.B. 2564
**Establishing a Farm to School Program**

These bills establish a statewide farm to school program and a farm to school coordinator position within the Department of Agriculture. The farm to school program is designed to (1) increase state agency purchase of local foods and (2) coordinate agricultural education from preschool through the university level. These bills stipulate that the farm to school coordinator be a full-time position paid through appropriations from the general revenue.

**DEAD**

H.B. 2644
**Establishing the Farm to Table Task Force**

This bill establishes the Farm to Table Task Force to help the state achieve agricultural self-sustainability and to encourage healthy eating for all ages. The bill directs the Task Force to recommend strategies to (1) help local agricultural producers deliver their products to local consumers and (2) increase public awareness of the role local agriculture plays in building a healthy community.

**DEAD**
H.B. 2646
Establishing a School Farm Complex Task Force
This bill establishes a task force to decide whether to implement a teaching farm pilot project at the University of Hawaii-West Oahu campus. The purpose of the pilot is to encourage agricultural self-sustainability and build student interest in agriculture. At the farm complex, community partners are responsible for daily operations, and students from area schools take advantage of the complex’s classrooms and learning opportunities on a rotational basis.

DEAD

Declaring March as Localicious Hawaii Month
These resolutions declare the month of March as Localicious Hawaii Month. These resolutions encourage the Localicious Hawaii program to allow restaurants to adopt a fourth grade class as participants in Ag in the Classroom’s Veggie U Program.

H.C.R. 92 WAS ADOPTED

Providing Locally Grown Produce to Public School Salad Bars
These resolutions request that the state Department of Education collaborate with other agencies and agricultural stakeholders to develop a farm to school program. Specifically, the farm to school program is responsible for providing locally grown produce to salad bars at all public schools in the state.

ADOPTED

H.C.R. 214/S.C.R. 130
Establishing a School Farm Complex Task Force
These resolutions request that the University of Hawaii establish a task force to determine the feasibility of implementing a teaching farm pilot project located at the University of Hawaii-West Oahu campus.

DEAD

2013

H.B. 478
Serving Produce from School Gardens
This bill authorizes schools to use food from their gardens in school meals. To do so, the state Department of Agriculture must inspect and certify school gardens. The bill also encourages school to work with nonprofit organizations that administer fresh food distribution services.

DEAD

H.B. 486
Appropriating Funds to Encourage Agricultural Careers
This bill appropriates funds to enhance existing programs that educate youth about agricultural careers, including the Future Farmers of America and 4-H programs.

DEAD

H.B. 507
Establishing a Buy Local Policy
This bill amends the state planning act to encourage individuals and institutions to purchase Hawaii-grown foods.

DEAD
H.B. 1243
School Gardens Task Force
This bill establishes a task force to determine the feasibility of growing food in school gardens for a school’s lunch program. 
DEAD

H.B. 1351
Supporting Local Farms
This bill authorizes the state Department of Education to purchase agricultural products for school meals programs from farms within the region. It also requires the Department to arrange opportunities for students to work, volunteer, or study on farms.
DEAD

H.C.R. 229 & H.R. 184
Declaring Farm to School Month
This resolution declares October as Farm to School Month in Hawaii. It requests that the state Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Department of Education, create and implement a Farm to School program in Hawaii’s public schools.
ADOPTED

S.B. 327
Supporting the Purchase and Consumption of Locally Grown Products
This bill amends the Hawaii State Planning Act to encourage the purchase and consumption of locally grown products. The policy includes sixteen new objectives, most importantly including (1) engaging stakeholders to establish a state agricultural strategy; (2) developing a promotion, marketing, and distribution system for Hawaii’s producers and consumers; (3) providing public incentives and encouraging private initiatives to support agricultural growth; and (4) promoting activities that increase agricultural self-sufficiency.
CODIFIED AT HAW. REV. STAT. § 226-103

S.B. 564
Establishing the Hawaii-Grown Produce Working Group
This bill establishes a working group to study methods to increase consumption of Hawaii-grown produce. The group is also responsible for implementing a demonstration model in which a state facility, such as a school, serves Hawaii-grown produce. In a report to the legislature, the working group will evaluate the demonstration model and determine the feasibility of implementing the model at other state facilities. The bill also appropriates money for the working group.
DEAD

2012
H.B. 2093/S.B. 3005
Exploring School Farm Food Safety
These bills require the University of Hawaii to establish a Center for Agricultural Leadership. They also create a two-year pilot project at high schools in each county to determine how school farms can attain food safety certification.
DEAD
2011

**H.C.R. 167 & H.R. 145**

**Requesting a Working Group to Study Child Nutrition and Farm to School Programs**

These resolutions request the legislature establish a working group to study the 2008 Farm Bill and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act. The purpose of the study is to help Hawaii growers and producers competitively bid on Child Nutrition Program contracts. The working group is responsible for determining how schools may use the federally-approved geographic preference option to purchase more Hawaiian-grown produce for the school lunch program.

*ADOPTED*

---

2010

**S.C.R. 147 & S.R. 67**

**Convening a Working Group to Examine Farm to School Models**

These resolutions request the legislature establish a working group to examine the 2008 Farm Bill and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act. The purpose of the resolutions is to help Hawaii growers and producers to bid competitively on Child Nutrition Program contracts. The resolutions encourage the working group to propose a farm to school pilot. The working group determines how schools may use the federally-approved geographic preference option to purchase more Hawaiian-grown produce for the school lunch program.

*ADOPTED*

---

2009

**S.B. 1179**

**Establishing a Farm to School Program**

This bill establishes a farm to school program along with a state policy to support farm to school program in the state’s public schools. S.B. 1179 directs the Department of Agriculture to conduct a variety of activities, including (1) creating a coordinator position, (2) determining best practices for schools to purchase local products, (3) providing training to food service staff and farmers, and (4) developing a database to connect farmers and schools.

*DEAD*

---

Idaho

2017

**H.J.M. 1**

**Protecting Idaho Agriculture**

This resolution stresses the importance of protecting Idaho agriculture. H.J.M. argues for stricter standards for foreign companies selling in Idaho. This bill also encourages agricultural education in middle and secondary school as a means to preserve and strengthen state and national agriculture.

*DEAD*
2016

**H.B. 402**

**Preferring Idaho-Grown Items**

In a competitive bidding process where the products are of equal quality, H.B. 402 allows public entities to pay up to 105 percent of the lowest responsible bid for Idaho agricultural products. This 5 percent price preference applies to contracts worth less than $5 million. Such a price preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

*DEAD*

---

**Illinois**

2017

**H.B. 2993**

**Serving School-Grown Produce in Schools**

Illinois H.B. 2993 amends existing law to allow public schools to serve school-grown produce to students. The amendment allows students to grow and harvest fruits and vegetables from school gardens and for schools to serve school-grown produce as long as it meets state food safety standards.

*CODIFIED AT 105 ILCS 5/10-20.66*

**H.R. 0376**

**Declaring Illinois Great Apple Crunch Day**

H.R. 0376 is a resolution that promotes the purchase and use of local produce in public schools. The resolution encourages Illinois students to try healthy and local produce and encourages a partnership between the Illinois Farm to School Network and the Illinois Agriculture in the Classroom Program. Both the Illinois Farm to School Network and the Illinois Agriculture in the Classroom Program help schools participate in the Great Apple Crunch Day.

*ADOPTED*

**H.B. 3418**

**Concerning Urban Agriculture Zones**

H.B. 3418 authorizes local governments to designate urban agriculture zones for growing, processing, and selling local foods. The bill exempts property in the urban agriculture zone from tax increases for the next twenty-five years. It also allows a local board to reduce water rates and connection charges for growers, processors, and vendors. H.B. 3418 deposits the tax from the sales of local food within an urban agriculture zone into a fund, 10 percent of which is reserved for schools. School districts may apply to the Urban Agriculture Zone Fund for competitive grants that support farm to school activities.

*CODIFIED AT 20 ILCS 205/205-65*

2014

**H.R. 1093/S.R. 1257**

**Coordinating Government Food Initiatives**

These resolutions urge the governor to encourage the development of community-based food, nutrition, and agricultural initiatives that help to combat hunger and reduce poverty. They direct the governor to coordinate with six state entities to create such community programs. The resolutions also recognize the role schools play, providing subsidized meals to children who come from families in need.

*ADOPTED*
2010

**S.B. 615**

Creating a Farm-School Purchase Database

This bill directs the state Department of Agriculture to establish a farm to school database to facilitate school purchases of fresh food products. The database must contain contact information for agricultural producers and schools. The bill also authorizes the Department to solicit federal and state funds to support the farm to school database.

*CODIFIED AT 30 ILL. COMP. STAT. § 595/30*

2009

**H.B. 78**

Creating a Farm Fresh Schools Program

H.B. 78 creates the Farm Fresh Schools Program within the state Department of Agriculture and in cooperation with the Board of Education and Department of Public Health. The bill establishes a competitive grant program to implement farm to school programs and creates the Farm Fresh School Fund within the State Treasury. The bill recognizes that farm to school programs help to improve child health and strengthen local economies.

*CODIFIED AT 105 ILL. COMP. STAT. §§ 124/1—25*

Indiana

2017

**H.B. 1283**

Concerning Agricultural Education

H.B. 1283 alters the state’s school performance ranking system. To be eligible for the highest ranking, a high school must offer agricultural education each semester. The bill specifies that agricultural education includes information about producing, financing, processing, marketing, and distributing agricultural products. The bill also allows students up to five excused absences for helping parents plant and harvest crops, as well as for attending 4-H and Future Farmers of America events.

*DEAD*

2012

**H.B. 1089**

Developing a Farm to School Plan

This bill requires the state Department of Education to develop a farm to school plan to provide students with locally produced foods through school meal programs.

*DEAD*
**Iowa**

**2019**

**S.F. 609**

**Funding the Local Food and Farm Program Fund**

S.F. 609 appropriates funding for the Local Food and Farm Program, a collaboration between the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship and Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service. The Local Food and Farm Program is integral to Iowa’s farm to school efforts and houses the Iowa FoodCorps program.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**

**H.R. 112**

**Encouraging State and Local Governments to Increase Direct Purchase of Local Food**

H.R. 112 encourages state and local governments as well as public schools to increase the direct purchase of nutritious and healthy food from local and regional producers, including through food hubs created by the Local Food and Farm Program. The resolution encourages the establishment of procurement goals for local, nutritious food, and encourages state and local governments to become active participants in regional food system working groups.

**DEAD**

**2018**

**H.R. 22**

**Encouraging Local Procurement**

This resolution encourages state and local governments to increase the direct purchase of nutritious and healthy food from local and regional producers, including through food hubs created by the Local Food and Farm Program. The resolution encourages the establishment of procurement goals for local, nutritious food, and encourages state and local governments to become active participants in regional food system working groups.

**DEAD**

**H.F. 2491**

**Funding the Local Food and Farm Program**

H.F. 2491 is an appropriations bill that funds the state agriculture, natural resources, and environmental protection agencies and includes funding for the Local Food and Farm Program, a collaboration between the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship and Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service. The Local Food and Farm Program is integral to Iowa’s farm to school efforts and houses the Iowa FoodCorps program.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**

**2017**

**S.F. 510**

**Funding the Local Food and Farm Program**

S.F. 510 is an appropriations bill that funds the state agriculture, natural resources, and environmental protection agencies and includes funding for the Local Food and Farm Program, a collaboration between the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship and Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service. The Local Food and Farm Program is integral to Iowa’s farm to school efforts and houses the Iowa FoodCorps program.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**
**H.F. 151**

**Appropriating Money to the Local Food and Farm Innovation Fund**

H.F. 151 appropriates $300,000 to support food hub and farm innovation projects. Food hub projects must facilitate storing, processing, and distributing locally produced food products, while farm innovation funds must support research, development, and education. Food hub facilities can potentially partner with local schools to further farm to school programming. The bill also changes the name of the Local Food and Farm Program Fund to the Local Food and Farm Innovation Fund.

*DEAD*

---

**2015**

**H.F. 427**  
**H.F. 2426 (2014)**

**Supporting Small Farm Operations**

H.F. 427 creates multiple supports for small farms. For example, the bill establishes two tax benefits. One benefit allows farmers to subtract from the amount of taxes owed the lesser of $10,000 or 50 percent of food sales to schools. The other exempts small farm operations from property taxes. In addition to tax benefits, H.F. 427 creates a local food fund, a financial assistance program, and a processing and marketing program. The bill directs cooperative extension services to develop assistance materials for small farmers and requires government entities to prefer food products from Iowa small farms. By requiring government entities to prefer Iowa products, H.F. 427 gives local farmers a competitive advantage bidding on contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

*DEAD*

---

**2014**

**H.F. 2458**

**Appropriating Money for a Food and Farm Program**

H.F. 2458 appropriates $75,000 to support the Local Food and Farm Program. This bill directs the state Department of Agriculture to share the cost of a Local Food and Farm Program coordinator with Iowa State University as a part of agriculture and home economics cooperative extension services.

*INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS*

---

**2013**

**S.F. 396**

**Replacing the Farm to School Council**

S.F. 396 reassigns the farm to school council’s responsibilities to the Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship and the Department of Education. The Departments’ responsibilities are to facilitate communication between farmers and schools and to garner contributions to support the program.

*S.F. 396 WAS CODIFIED, BUT THE CODIFIED VERSION DID NOT INCLUDE THE FARM TO SCHOOL COUNCIL PROVISIONS*

---

**2011**

**H.F. 486/S.F. 441**

**Providing for a Local Food and Farm Program Initiative**

This bill establishes an initiative to support local food production, processing, and marketing. The purposes of the initiative are to improve communication and cooperation between interested parties. The bill appropriates money to the Local Food and Farm Fund, which supports the farm to school program.

*DEAD*
H.F. 697
Appropriating Money for a Food and Farm Program Coordinator
H.F. 697 appropriates $75,000 to support the local food and farm program. This bill directs the state Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship to share the cost of a local food and farm program coordinator with Iowa State University as a part of agriculture and home economics cooperative extension services.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2007
S.F. 551
Appropriating Money for the Farm to School Program
This bill appropriates $80,000 for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 for the state farm to school program. The appropriated money funds salaries, support, maintenance, and other miscellaneous program needs.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

S.F. 601
Establishing a Farm to School Program
S.F. 601 establishes the Iowa Farm to School Program. The bill directs the state Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship to coordinate with the Department of Education and Farm to School Council to promote locally produced food. It also creates the seven member Farm to School Council to improve child nutrition and strengthen local farm economies. S.F. 601 encourages activities that provide students with hands-on learning opportunities, such as school gardening, composting programs, farm visits, and cooking demonstrations.

S.F. 601 WAS CODIFIED, BUT THE CODIFIED VERSION DID NOT INCLUDE THE FARM TO SCHOOL PROVISIONS

Kansas

2005
S.B. 154
Nutrition Guidelines for Kansas’s Public Schools
This bill directs the Kansas State Board of Education to develop nutrition guidelines for school meals. The nutrition guidelines must focus on providing healthy foods and beverages, physical activity, and wellness education to reduce childhood obesity. Food education is a core tenet of farm to school programming.

CODIFIED AT K.S.A. §72-5128

Kentucky

2016
H.R. 56
Encouraging Government Entities to Support Kentucky’s Agricultural Economy
H.R. 56 encourages government entities to purchase Kentucky-grown agricultural products.

ADOPTED
2009

H.B. 626
Establishing the Kentucky Proud Program
H.B. 626 establishes the Kentucky Proud brand as the marketing program for the state Department of Agriculture. The bill creates the Kentucky Proud Advisory Council to help the Department administer the program and the Kentucky Proud Promotion Fund to provide grants to promote state-grown products. These councils typically encourage state institutions, including schools, to purchase local foods. They may also promote other farm to school activities.

CODIFIED AT KY. REV. STAT. § 260.019

H.B. 669
Requiring State Agencies to Purchase Kentucky Agricultural Products
This bill requires state agencies to purchase Kentucky-grown agriculture products when available and competitively priced. Prospective vendors must participate in the Kentucky-grown labeling program and may apply for marketing assistance from the state. In turn, participating state agencies must report their local food purchases.

CODIFIED AT KY. REV. STAT. § 45A.645

Louisiana

2016

S.B. 404
Establishing a Farm to School Program
S.B. 404 requires the state Board of Education to establish a statewide farm to school program. The purpose of the program is to help schools increase the use of locally grown and raised agricultural products. S.B. 404 directs the Board to work with the Department of Agriculture to develop school procurement guidelines and a local farm directory. The bill also requires the state to develop a plan to incorporate agriculture, food, health, and nutrition into curricula.

CODIFIED AT LA STAT. § 17:195.1

2015

H.B. 730
Supporting Farm to School Purchases
H.B. 730 requires the state Department of Agriculture to develop a database to connect farms and schools interested in participating in farm to school activities. The bill also allows public nutrition program providers to use simplified contract procedures for purchases up to $150,000; the federal government requires formal bid procedures for meals purchases that exceed $150,000, the small purchase threshold. By allowing schools to use informal contract procedures for goods under the small purchase threshold, H.B. 730 makes it easier for schools to purchase from local farmers.

DEAD

S.B. 184
S.B. 458 (2014)
Relating to the Small Purchase Threshold
S.R. 184 allows public nutrition program providers to use simplified contract procedures for purchases up to $150,000; the federal government requires formal bid procedures for school meal purchases that exceed $150,000, the small purchase threshold. By allowing schools to use informal contract procedures for goods that cost less than $150,000, S.R. 184 makes it easier for schools to purchase from local farmers.

CODIFIED AT LA STAT. § 17:194
2014

**H.B. 825**

**Establishing the Louisiana Master Garden Program License Plate**

This bill creates the Louisiana Master Gardener Program license plate. The royalty fees will support community programs related to horticulture, including community and school garden programs.

*Codified at La Stat. § 463.174*

**S.C.R. 41**

**Requesting Tastier Food Options for the National School Lunch Program**

S.C.R. 41 requests the United States Department of Agriculture to develop tastier food options for the National School Lunch Program. It notes the decline in students enrolled in the program since nutritional standards changed and the challenges schools face when preparing healthier menu options. In part, this resolution acknowledges that farm visits and school gardens are fun ways to educate students about eating healthier foods.

*Adopted*

**S.C.R. 94**

**Requesting a Farm to School Program**

S.C.R. 94 directs the state Department of Agriculture and Forestry and the Department of Education to implement a farm to school program. The program must help schools procure fresh fruits, vegetables, meats, and seafood locally. This resolution encourages the Departments to create a study group to identify barriers and existing resources for a statewide farm to school program.

*Adopted*

2013

**S.C.R. 64**

**Studying Agriculture Education in Elementary and Secondary Schools**

This resolution requests that the Department of Education establish a group to study the current state of agricultural education in elementary and secondary schools. The resolution requires the group to report its findings and recommendations by February 1, 2014.

*Adopted*

2010

**H.B. 840**

**Sustainable Local Food Policy Council**

H.B. 840 establishes the Sustainable Local Food Policy Council within the Department of Agriculture and Forestry. The purpose of the Council is to help build a local food economy that creates jobs; increases consumer access to fresh, nutritious local foods; preserves farmlands and water resources; stimulates statewide economic development; and provides greater food security for all Louisianans. The bill also details the responsibilities, membership, compensation, and term limits for the Council. H.B 840 suggests that the Council may consider increasing the amount of sustainable, local food served to public school students.

*Codified at La Stat. § 3:299, but repealed August 1, 2013*
Maine

2019

L.D. 454
Funding the Purchase of Local Produce for Public Schools
L.D. 454 establishes a Local Produce Fund to be used to match $1 for every $3 a school pays for produce or minimally processed foods purchased directly from a farmer, farmers’ cooperative, or local food hub in Maine. Maximum state contributions per school increase if the school sends food service employees to local foods training.

CODIFIED AT 20-A M.R.S.A. §6602

2018

S.P 557/L.D. 1584
Promoting Local Food Procurement
This bill establishes a statewide local foods procurement program with the goal that no later than 2025, 20 percent of all food and food products procured by state institutions be local food or food products. It directs the Commissioner of Agriculture to establish guidelines to assist state institutions in assessing their ability to procure local foods while minimizing procurement costs, as well as provide education and outreach in order to support local foods providers.

CODIFIED AT 7 M.R.S.A. § 220; REPEALED 2019

2017

L.D. 1548
H.P. 1066
Establishing the Let’s Grow Maine Program
This bill establishes the Let’s Grow Maine Program to relieve hunger in Maine by procuring fresh fruits and vegetables directly from farms for schools, senior citizens, and low-income individuals. To fund the Let’s Grow Maine program, the bill diverts a portion of taxes from non-cigarette tobacco products to a special Food and Farm Fund. It also directs the Food Security Council to develop a strategy for allocating resources through this program and to submit a report to the legislature annually with recommendations.

DEAD

H.P. 1068
Taxing Sugar-Sweetened Beverages to Fund Programs
H.P. 1068 taxes distributors and retailers one cent per fluid ounce sugar-sweetened beverage they distribute. The bill reserves 7.5 percent of revenues for the Healthy Food Access Fund. The goal of this fund is to support production and distribution of healthy, local foods to consumers and public entities such as schools. H.P. 1068 also reserves another 7.5 percent of the tax proceeds for the Obesity and Chronic Disease Fund.

DEAD

2016

H.P. 583
Honoring the Multifaceted Agriculture of Maine
This joint resolution celebrates the importance of Maine agriculture and pledges to support Maine youth interested in agricultural careers.

ADOPTED
S.P. 155
Encouraging the Use of Local Farm Products in Public Schools
S.P. 155 authorizes the state to issue $6 million in bonds to increase the availability of local foods in school meals. The bill allots $5 million to the Agricultural Marketing Loan Fund for farmers and $1 million to the Local Produce Fund for public schools.

DEAD

S.P. 460
Supporting School Nutrition
S.P. 460 creates multiple incentives to increase the use of local foods in school meals and to support food hubs. First, the bill establishes a competitive grants program to teach food service providers how best to procure and prepare fresh, Maine produce. For schools that participate in a local food service training program, the state may match $1 for every $3 a school spends up to $2,000. S.P. 460 creates an annual food service recognition program, as well as a food service position within the Department of Education to oversee the various initiatives.

DEAD

S.P. 587
Encouraging the Purchase of Products Made in Maine
S.P. 587 requires government entities to prefer Maine products when awarding contracts. The bill allows government entities to purchase Maine products when the cost of is no more than 105 percent of the lowest responsible bid. This 5 percent price preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

DEAD

2013
H.P. 460
Encouraging Schools to Teach Agricultural Studies
This bill encourages schools to include agricultural studies in their curricula. Curricula should stress (1) agriculture’s relevance in the state’s history, development, and economy; (2) connections between the farm and daily life; (3) food sources; and (4) the importance of eating healthy food to combat childhood obesity.

CODIFIED AT 20-A M.R.S.A. § 4710-A

H.P. 829
Enhancing Efforts to Use Locally Produced Food in Schools
H.P. 829 requires school districts to maintain a database and report their use of local foods in school meals. The bill requires the Department of Education to publish a list of schools that meet local food benchmarks.

DEAD

S.P. 517
Supporting School Nutrition and Expanding the Local Foods Economy
S.P. 517 requires the state Department of Education to administer a program to expand the use of local foods in school food programs. The program is responsible for providing competitive grants to train local school food providers in six regions across the state. The training programs (1) include creative, practical strategies for using and procuring local, fresh foods; (2) foster collaboration among school food service personnel; (3) encourage the use of local food hubs; and (4) establish an annual food service competition that emphasizes the creative, effective use of local food products. S.P. 517 advises schools on how to maximize student knowledge of nutrition and local foods, and how to get students to accept local foods. The bill also amends laws regarding the local produce fund, establishes an agricultural development fund, and appropriates money for the initiatives.

DEAD
2011

H.P. 948
Studying the Use of Locally Grown Food in Schools
H.P. 948 establishes a study group to examine the procedures school administrative units use to obtain and prepare locally grown foods in school meals. The study group is responsible for recommending methods to promote and use locally grown foods in a cost-effective manner. The bill also directs the study group to develop implementing legislation.

DEAD

H.P. 1060
Creating a Farm and Fish to School Pilot Program
H.P. 1060 creates a farm and fish to school pilot program under the Departments Education, Marine Resources, and Agriculture, Food, and Rural Resources. The two-school pilot program examines the benefits of purchasing food and fish grown, raised or caught in Maine for school meal programs. The pilot reimburses participating schools 6 cents per meal served using Maine food products. The Departments are responsible for submitting a report that details the economic impacts, benefits to producers, and changes to student eating habits.

DEAD

2009

H.P. 784
Creating a Working Group to Report on Farm to School Efforts
This resolution directs the Departments Education, Marine Resources, and Agriculture, Food, and Rural Resources to establish a working group. The purpose of the working group is to publish a report that recommends how Maine can strengthen Farm to School efforts within the state.

ADOPTED

Maryland

2018

S.B. 998
Establishing a REAL School Gardens Pilot Program
S.B. 998 establishes the REAL School Gardens Pilot Program within the Maryland State Department of Education to design and build custom outdoor classrooms. The bill allocates $200,000 for the program in fiscal year 2020 and requires a third party to analyze the success of the program’s first year. The bill authorizes the pilot for five years, from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2023.

DEAD

H.B. 870
Encouraging Each County Board of Education to Implement an Agricultural Education Program in Public Schools
MD H.B. 870 encourages each county board of education to implement an agricultural education program that prepares students for successful careers and opportunities in agriculture-related employment and higher education.

DEAD
2016

**H.B. 1297/S.B. 770**

**Concerning Agricultural Education**

These bills amend current education law to encourage, but no longer require, county school districts to offer agricultural science education in at least one school.

*CODIFIED AT MD. CODE, EDUC. § 4-111.3*

---

2015

**H.B. 252/S.B. 284**

**Concerning the Maryland Homegrown School Lunch Week**

H.B. 252/S.B. 284 amend existing farm to school legislation to require promotional events occur in both the fall and spring.

*DEAD*

---

2012

**H.B. 1225**

**Guidelines for Using State Produce in Schools**

This bill requires the state Department of Education to develop school purchasing guidelines. These guidelines should encourage schools to purchase produce for public school meals from Maryland farms or community gardens. The bill provides guidelines for serving produce.

*DEAD*

---

2011

**H.B. 528 / S.B. 791**

**Utilizing Public School Property for Gardens**

These bills require county boards of education to encourage schools to use open space to plant and maintain gardens. A county board of education must authorize school gardens.

*DEAD*

**H.B. 751**

**Reporting Farm to School Program Activities**

H.B. 751 requires school districts participating in the Jane Lawton Farm to School Program to report the types and amounts of products they purchase from Maryland farms. It creates a local foods database. The bill also establishes events to promote farm products to children through school meal and classroom programs.

*CODIFIED AT MD. CODE, AGRIC. § 10-1601*

---

2008

**H.B. 696 / S.B. 158**

**Establishing the Jane Lawton Farm to School Program**

These bills establish the Jane Lawton Farm to School Program in the state Department of Agriculture, in coordination with the Department of Education and the Board of Public Works. The program promotes the sale of Maryland-grown farm products to schools and encourages school meal and classroom programs. The bills direct the Department of Agriculture to develop a database of farmers interested in selling their products to schools and to provide technical assistance to farmers. These bills also establish the Maryland Homegrown School Lunch Week to promote local foods.

*CODIFIED AT MD. CODE, AGRIC. § 10-1601*
2006

H.B. 883
Establishing a Price Preference for Locally Grown Foods

This bill requires the state Board of Works to adopt regulations that allow agencies to purchase local foods that cost up to 105 percent of the lowest responsible bid. State schools and facilities are required to use the 5 percent price preference to purchase local products whenever possible. This price preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

CODIFIED AT MD. CODE, FIN. & PROC. § 14-407

Massachusetts

2020

H. 556/S. 301
Establishing Farm to School Grants

H.B. 556/S. 301 establishes the Massachusetts Farm to School Grant Program with the purpose of strengthening the state’s food economy and improving student health and nutrition. Subject to appropriation, the program shall provide funding for adequate kitchen equipment, training for school kitchen staff in preparing fresh meals using local ingredients, training for educators and other school staff in adding or integrating food system lessons to their curriculum, and infrastructure and programming for curricular and extracurricular activities for students to learn about agriculture and the food system.

DEAD

2018

H.4395
Healthy Eating in School Cafeterias

H. 4395 establishes multiple initiatives to improve the school food environment including an interagency farm to school task force and two pilot grant programs. The task force oversees the farm to school pilot that aims to educate students about healthier food choices and to increase fresh, locally grown foods in school meals. The second pilot project funds kitchen renovations to help schools better prepare and store fresh foods. Grant awards cover up to 70 percent of a school’s costs. For both pilots, participating schools must submit an annual report to help policymakers develop evidence-based standards for the future farm to school efforts. H. 3549 (2017) included appropriations of over $200,000 for one public school per year to update kitchen facilities for fresh preparation and storage. H. 3221 and H. 4409 (2015) included a community challenge event and competitive foods waiver for public schools promoting healthier foods.

DEAD

2017

H.3800
Funding the Farm to School Program

This appropriations bill includes $120,000 for the Massachusetts Farm to School Project for fiscal year 2018. The bill authorizes $300,000 to continue “buy local” efforts in western, central, northeastern, and southeastern Massachusetts and requires that any buy local effort include locally harvested seafood.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS
H. 3321
Providing Farm Training to Students
H. 3321 directs the Department of Food and Agriculture to create a certification program for agricultural internships. The purpose of the program is to provide farm training for students. To qualify, students must be enrolled in an agricultural school or program in Massachusetts and be paid as an intern. H. 3321 allows farmers who employ qualified student interns to deduct $500 per month from their taxes for each intern working at least twenty hours a week.

DEAD

H. 3549
H. 3221 & H. 4409 (2015)
Eating Healthy in School Cafeterias
H. 3549 includes multiple initiatives to improve the school food environment: an interagency farm to school task force and two pilot grant programs. The task force is responsible for overseeing a farm to school pilot. The farm to school pilot aims to educate students about healthier food choices and to increase fresh, locally grown foods in school meals. The second pilot project funds kitchen renovations to help schools better prepare and store fresh foods. Grant awards cover up to 70 percent of a school’s costs. For both pilots, participating schools must submit an annual report to help policymakers develop evidence-based standards for future farm to school efforts. The bill appropriates $200,000 for one public school per year to update kitchen facilities for fresh food preparation and storage. Earlier versions of the bill—H. 3221 and H. 4409 (2015)—also included a community challenge event and competitive foods waiver for public schools promoting healthier foods.

DEAD

2015
H. 2782
Establishing the Massachusetts Farm to School Month
H. 2782 requires the governor to declare October as Farm to School Month. The annual proclamation must highlight the cultural and economic roles agriculture plays and celebrate farm to school programs. The bill also encourages the state Departments of Education, Agriculture, and Health to collaborate with the state Farm to School Project to create a task force. The purpose of this task force is to expand farm to school programs across the state.

CODIFIED AT MASS. GEN. LAWS CH. 6 § 15BBBBBB (2016)

2014
H. 4001
Appropriating Money for Farm to School and Buy Local Efforts
This bill appropriates $120,000 to the Massachusetts Farm to School Project for fiscal year 2015. This bill also authorizes $300,000 to establish a “buy local” effort in central Massachusetts and to strengthen the “buy local” efforts in western, northeastern, and southern Massachusetts.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2011
H. 1056
H. 448 (2009)
Promoting Healthy School Meals
This bill establishes a pilot program within the state Department of Education to reimburse schools for meals that use Massachusetts-grown food. The goal of the pilot program is to increase the proportion of fresh, locally grown food in and nutritional quality of school meals.

DEAD
2010

H. 4459
Promoting School Purchases of Local Agricultural Products
H.B. 4459 requires the state Department of Agricultural Resources to collaborate with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to collect a variety of data on local foods. The bill directs the Departments to work with partner organizations such as the Massachusetts Farm to School Project to help schools procure local agricultural products. The Departments are also responsible for developing a process and resources such as a local farmers database to help schools purchase agricultural products from farmers.

DEAD

H. 4568
Establishing the Massachusetts Food Policy Council
H. 4568 creates the Massachusetts Food Policy Council to develop food system goals for the state. These goals include increasing production, consumption, and institutional purchases of Massachusetts-grown foods. The bill specifies that child nutrition programs should be a focus of the Council. H. 4568 also specifies the makeup of the Council—representatives from the Department of Education, school nutrition, and community or youth agricultural education organizations must be present.

CODIFIED AT MASS. GEN. LAWS CH. 20 § 6C (2010)

H. 4919
Promoting State Purchasing of Local Agricultural Products
H. 4919 amends existing state preference law (described below) to require the Departments of Agriculture and Education to collect and publish data from schools and food producers. The bill directs the Departments to work with programs that help public schools purchase local foods.

CODIFIED AT MASS. GEN. LAWS CH. 30B § 4 (2010)

2006

H. 4429
Promoting the State Purchase of Massachusetts-Grown Products
This legislation allows state agencies to purchase fresh, Massachusetts products that cost up to 110 percent of the lowest responsible bid. H.B. 4429 also allows state procurement officers to award contracts under $25,000 without first seeking other bids, usually required in the bidding process. H. 4429 gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

CODIFIED AT MASS. GEN. LAWS CH. 30B § 20 (2006)
Michigan

2020

S.B. 927
H.B. 4242/S.B. 146 (2019; dead)
H.B. 5579 (2018; dead)

Expanding the 10 Cents a Meal Program
This bill appropriates funding to expand the 10 Cents a Meal program statewide and to both school and childcare settings to purchase locally grown produce for the 2020–2021 school year. The goals of the grant program are to improve student nutrition while investing in Michigan’s agriculture and food business economy. The bill authorizes the state Department of Education to reimburse schools an additional 10 cents per meal that includes local fruit, vegetables, or legumes. It also directs the department to give a competitive advantage in the grant process to projects that educate students about healthy eating, involve the community, and include farm to school procurement activities.

CODIFIED AT MICH. COMP. LAWS §388.1631J (2020)

S.B. 373

Retroactively Funding the 10 Cents a Meal Pilot Project
This bill appropriates funding for the 10 Cents a Meal pilot project to reimburse schools for purchases of locally grown produce in the previous 2019–2020 school year. The goals of the grant program are to improve student nutrition and support Michigan agriculture. The bill authorizes the state Department of Education to reimburse schools an additional 10 cents per meal that includes local fruit, vegetables, or legumes. It also directs the department to give a competitive advantage in the grant process to projects that educate students about healthy eating, involve the community, and include farm to school procurement activities.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

H.B. 5555/S.B. 801
H.B. 4347 (2019)
S.B. 0133 (2017)
S.B. 801 (2016)

Funding the 10 Cents a Meal Program
This bill appropriates funding for the 10 cents a meal pilot project to help schools purchase locally grown produce. The goals of the grant program are to improve student nutrition while investing in Michigan’s agricultural and related food business economy. The bill authorizes the state Department of Education to reimburse schools an additional 10 cents per meal that includes local fruit, vegetables, or legumes. It also directs the department to give a competitive advantage in the grant process to projects that educate students about healthy eating, involve the community, and include farm to school procurement activities.

DEAD

2017

S.B. 0218

Funding a Healthy Kids Exercise Program
S.B. 0218 is an appropriations bill that funds several state agencies, including $1,000,000 for the Michigan Department of Education to establish a Healthy Kids Exercise Program, which would provide nutrition education for children and a safe place for children to play and exercise.

DEAD
**S.B. 99**

**Developing a Model Field Trip for Food Education**

S.B. 99 directs the state Department of Education to develop a model field trip program to provide students with hands-on learning experiences at local farms. The bill requires the program to include information on food transportation.

DEAD

---

**2014**

**H.B. 5314, H.B. 5372, & S.B. 838**

**Creating a Local Preference for School Food Procurement**

These appropriations bills require schools that participate in the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs to purchase Michigan-grown or produced foods when possible. Michigan-grown foods must be competitively priced and of comparable quality. These bills make it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

---

**2012**

**H.B. 5506**

**Helping Schools Purchase Local Farm Products**

H.B. 5506 establishes a grant program to help schools purchase local farm products. It outlines the criteria for awarding grants and prescribes the powers and duties of associated government actors.

DEAD

---

**2008**

**H.B. 6365 & H.B. 6366**

**Encouraging Schools to Serve Local Foods**

H.B. 6365/H.B. 6366 require school districts to adopt written policies governing procurement. They allow school districts to use simplified contract procedures for food purchases up to $100,000. By allowing schools to use informal contract procedures for goods that cost less than $100,000, the small purchase threshold makes it easier for schools to purchase from local farmers.

CODIFIED AT MICH. COMP. LAWS § 388.1618

---

**H.B. 6368**

**Establishing a Farm to School Program**

The bill directs the state Departments of Agriculture and Education to develop farm to school procurement procedures, provide food service training, and educate food service directors interested in serving local foods how to use the small purchase threshold to their advantage. The bill creates a farm to school coordinator position within the Department of Agriculture and encourages the Department to develop a farm directory. The bill also encourages school construction projects to include kitchen facilities capable of providing fresh school meals and opportunities for hands-on learning.

CODIFIED AT MICH. COMP. LAWS § 388.841 ET SEQ.
Minnesota

2020

H.F. 4490
H.F. 4538 (2020; dead)
H.F. 2200 (2019; dead)

Appropriating Money for Enhancing School Markets for Farmers

H.F. 4490 authorizes up to $400,000 each year over two years to develop and enhance farm to school markets for Minnesota farmers by providing more fruits, vegetables, meat, grains, and dairy for Minnesota children in school and childcare settings, including reimbursement of schools for purchases from local farmers.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2019

H.F. 811

Establishing and Funding a Farm to School Program

H.F. 811 establishes a Farm to School Grant Program aimed at providing administrative support and technical assistance to schools and farmers to facilitate and increase procurement of Minnesota-grown unprocessed and minimally processed food by schools. The grant program’s goals include increasing children’s access to healthy, fresh, and locally produced food and to support Minnesota farmers and processors. The state will reimburse up to 4 cents per meal to eligible applicants and will give preference to applicants that (1) serve a high percentage of free and reduced-price meals, (2) demonstrate capacity to purchase from socially disadvantaged small or midsized producers, and (3) collectively represent a diversity of sizes and geographic locations throughout the state. The bill also establishes a farm to school coordinator position.

DEAD

2017

H.F. 2049/S.F. 1657

Establishing a Farm to School Program

H.F. 2049/S.F. 1657 establish a farm to school program to support Minnesota farmers and to increase schools procuring fresh, minimally-processed local foods. The bills direct the state Department of Agriculture to administer the program and to coordinate with the University of Minnesota Extension Services. They authorize $300,000 in both 2018 and 2019 to fund three new extension positions to provide technical assistance to farmers selling directly to schools. The bills also authorize $4.5 million in the same years for a schools grant program. Participating schools must use the awards to purchase Minnesota produce and may spend up to 20 percent of funds on educational activities such as gardening or cooking projects.

DEAD

S.F. 1317

Establishing an Urban Agriculture Development Pilot Grant Program

S.F. 1317 establishes an urban agriculture development grant program and appropriates $10 million in 2018 and in 2019. The goals of the pilot are numerous: examples include creating food hubs; enhancing community education; providing fresh, culturally appropriate foods; promoting racial equity; and developing farm to school channels. The bill requires the state Department of Agriculture to issue an annual report detailing the jobs created, wages generated, number of people trained, organizational capacity created, and agricultural products produced.

DEAD
2015
S.F. 1305
Appropriating Money for Agriculture, the Environment, and Natural Resources
S.F. 1305 authorizes $10.235 million in 2016 and in 2017 to the Agricultural, Growth, Research, and Innovation Program to support a number of initiatives. One goal of the act is to create new markets for farmers by providing Minnesota schools with fruits, vegetables, meat, grain, and dairy products. The bill also authorizes $3.873 million for the Minnesota Grown program to promote local foods.
DEAD

2014
H.F. 1874 / S.F. 1899
Appropriating Money for Greenhouse Expansion
These bills appropriate $176,000 from the Environmental and Natural Resources Trust Fund to expand and enhance a city-owned greenhouse. The goals of the appropriation are to increase greenhouse production year-round and to reduce water usage. The greenhouse provides locally grown produce to local communities, schools, and restaurants. Local high schools may also use the greenhouse for educational purposes.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2013
H.F. 1630
Appropriating Money for the Agricultural Growth, Research, and Innovation Program
H.F. 1630 requires the Commissioner of Agriculture to reserve 5 percent of the money appropriated to the Agricultural Growth, Research, and Innovation Program for farm to school food grants.
DEAD

Mississippi

2015
H.B. 1411
Extending the Farm to School Date of Repeal
H.B. 1411 amends existing farm to school legislation. Rather than repeal the interagency farm to school council in 2015 as the existing law prescribes, H.B. 1411 authorizes the council through June 2018.
DEAD

2013
H.B. 718
H.B. 828 (2012)
Creating an Interagency Farm to School Council
This bill creates an interagency farm to school council to improve the quality of school meals and generate new income for Mississippi farmers. The council helps schools procure and use local agricultural products. For example, the council is responsible for developing a database of parties interested in farm to school efforts.
CODIFIED AT MISS. CODE ANN. § 69-1-351 ET SEQ., BUT REPEALED JULY 1, 2015
2012

H.C.R. 112
Designating the First Week of October as Mississippi Farm to School Week

H.C.R. 112 designates the first full week of October as Mississippi Farm to School Week. The resolution encourages schools to serve locally grown and raised agricultural products in meals and celebrates the substantial benefits of farm to school programs.

ADOPTED

2010

H.B. 1079
Requiring the Office of Healthy Schools to Provide Food Service Training

This bill requires the state Department of Education to provide comprehensive training for specified food service practices. Trainings topics include making healthy food and beverage choices, preparing healthy foods, marketing healthy food to students, and increasing National School Lunch and Breakfast Program participation.

CODIFIED AT MISS. CODE ANN.§ 37-13-137

Missouri

2020

H.B. 2113
Modifying STEM Education to Include Entrepreneurship, Art and Agriculture (E-STEAM)

H.B. 2113 modifies provisions relating to STEM education to include entrepreneurship, the arts, and agriculture. The bill creates the E-STEAM (entrepreneurship, science, technology, engineering, arts, agriculture, and mathematics) Initiative and E-STEAM Fund. The E-STEAM Fund should be used to grant awards to Missouri public two- and four-year institutions of higher education and school districts that have agreed to offer information technology certification and support the above-mentioned programs.

DEAD

2019

H.B. 1010
Establishing a Pilot Program for Agricultural Education Programs in Elementary Schools

H.B. 1010 establishes a pilot program for agricultural education programs in elementary schools. The bill instructs the Department of Education to collaborate with local school districts to establish the curriculum for each elementary agricultural education program which may include classroom, lab- and site-based learning activities, and opportunities for personal, leadership, and career development.

DEAD
2016

S.B. 665
H.B. 2121 (combining H.B. 1747 & H.B. 2244), S.B. 703, S.B. 1010

Modifying Provisions Related to Agriculture

S.B. 665 changes the Farm to School Act to the Farm to Table Act and repeals the legislation’s expiration date, previously set for December 31, 2015. The new act’s purpose is to connect Missouri farmers to public institutions. The bill instructs the state Department of Agriculture to develop voluntary guidelines for farm to table participation, and encourages, but does not require, public institutions such as schools to purchase 10 percent of foods locally. S.B. 665 also changes the structure of the existing farm to school task force, adding members from other state agencies and reducing the number of seats the Departments of Agriculture and Education hold. The other bills listed—H.B.s 1184, 1747, 2121, 2244 and S.B.s 38, 703, 878, 958, 1010—contain the same Farm to Table provisions described above, but these bills did not pass.

CODIFIED AT MO. REV. STAT. § 262.960.1

2015

S.B. 12 & H.B. 146

Reducing the Funding Available to Schools through the Urban Agriculture Zone Fund

S.B. 12 reduces the percent of funding available to schools through the Urban Agriculture Zone Fund. Previously, schools were the only entities eligible for funding to support curriculum development, an agricultural instruction position, or urban farming.

S.B. 12 reserves 50 percent of the Fund for municipalities that have urban agricultural zones. H.B. 146, though not a companion bill, includes the same Urban Agriculture Zone Fund provisions as S.B. 12. It also provides a scholarship fund for 80 students enrolled in agriculture-related degree programs—each student receives $5,000 toward college tuition costs. H.B. 146, H.B. 1326, S.B. 506, and S.B. 850 contained the same provisions concerning the urban agriculture zone but died in 2014.

CODIFIED AT MO. REV. STAT. § 262.900

2014

S.B. 672 amended by S.B. 701; H.B. 2088, S.B. 824, & S.B. 854

Establishing a Farm to School Program

S.B. 672 and S.B. 701 establish a farm to school program to strengthen local farming economies and help schools serve meals that use locally grown agricultural products. These bills direct the Department of Agriculture to designate an employee to administer the program and to create a Farm to School Task Force. The Farm to School Task Force recommends strategies that allow schools to more easily incorporate locally grown agricultural products in meals, salad bars, and vending machines. For example, the Task Force is responsible for developing standardized language for food service contracts. This language will help food service providers purchase more locally grown agricultural products. These bills also direct the Missouri Agricultural and Small Business Development Authority to make grants, loans, or loan guarantees to procure and process locally grown food for school meals. S.B. 672 passed; shortly after, S.B. 701 amended S.B. 672. H.B. 2088, S.B. 824, and S.B. 854 all died.

CODIFIED AT MO. REV. STAT. § 262.960 (2014)
2013

**H.B. 542**
**H.B. 1660 (2012)**

Establishing the Urban Agricultural Zones Fund and Supporting School Gardens

This bill requires the state treasurer to deposit the sales tax revenue from agricultural products sold in an Urban Agricultural Zone into the Urban Agricultural Zone Fund. School districts may apply to use money from the Fund to develop school gardens.

*CODIFIED AT MO. REV. STAT. § 262.900 (2013); S.B. 12 (2015) MODIFIED THIS STATUTE*

2011

**H.B. 344**

Establishing the Farm to Table Advisory Board

H.B. 344 establishes the Farm to Table Advisory Board. The Board recommends strategies to help public institutions incorporate locally grown agricultural products into meals, salad bars, and vending machines. The Board must also determine funding availability for institutional procurement and increase market opportunities for locally grown products. The bill requires the Board to support campaigns that teach the general public about food production and consumption; obesity and health; and the relationships between nutrition and accessible locally grown food.

*CODIFIED AT MO. REV. STAT. § 262.950, BUT REPEALED AUG. 28, 2014*

### Montana

2019

**H.B. 667**

Creating a Pilot Farm to School Grant Program

H.B. 667 establishes a pilot Farm to School Grant Program to provide funding to applicants providing farm to school activities including the purchase of Montana-grown food and the implementation of food-based, agriculture-based, and garden-based educational projects in schools. Grant preference must be provided to applicants who enroll a high percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price school meals and propose farm to school activities that are well designed, incorporate positive change in local food purchasing, promote healthy food activities, have clear educational objectives, involve parents or members of the community, and have high potential for job creation and economic development.

*DEAD*

2017

**H.B. 352**

Helping Small Poultry Producers Sell Products Directly

H.B. 352 supports local food economies by encouraging direct sales by ranches, farms, and home-based food producers. One of the bill’s provisions exempts poultry producers who slaughter fewer than 1,000 birds per year from meeting specified food safety requirements. By reducing the requirements with which small poultry producers have to comply, H.B. 352 enables more small farms to provide poultry to schools.

*DEAD*
2013

H.B. 4
Appropriating Money for Rural Farm to School Programs
This bill authorizes the state Department of Agriculture to use any remaining 2013 federal fiscal year funds for the farm to school program the following fiscal year.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

H.B. 471
Creating the Farm to School Grant Program
H.B. 471 creates a farm to school grant program for the state Office of Public Instruction and Department of Agriculture to administer. The grant program reimburses school districts for costs incurred purchasing and processing Montana food products. It also helps to fund school districts’ food-based, agriculture-based, and garden-based educational activities.

DEAD

2011

H.J.R. 8
Reducing Childhood Hunger in Montana
This joint resolution calls for a committee to study child hunger. The committee is responsible for determining the degree to which Montana children lack access to adequate, nutritious food and for recommending methods to alleviate child hunger. Recommendations may focus on reducing barriers for existing programs, identifying gaps in current services, facilitating partnerships, expanding successful programs, and encouraging schools to use of Montana farm products.

ADOPTED

S.J.R. 19
Encouraging Farm to School Programs
This joint resolution celebrates farm to school programs. It encourages Montanans to recognize the first week of October as Montana Farm to School Week.

DEAD

2007

S.B. 328
Allowing Direct Purchases of Montana-Produced Foods
This bill allows state entities to purchase Montana food products directly or through standard procurement procedures. State entities may purchase Montana-produced food directly when the quality and quantity are sufficient and the cost does not reasonably exceed the lowest bid for out-of-state products.

CODIFIED AT MONT. CODE ANN. § 18-4-132
Nebraska

2020
L.R. 337
Study to Reexamine Feasibility of Nebraska-Grown Food Products Used for School Meals and Snacks
L.R. 337 directs the Agriculture Committee of the Legislature to conduct an interim study reexamining which Nebraska-grown food products can feasibly be used for school meals and snacks including identifying appropriate preservation methods of local foods, assembling a catalog of farm to school activities in the state, and volume and cost totals for locally sourced foods.
ADOPTED

2015
L.B. 175 & L.B. 544
Creating a Community Gardens Task Force
L.B. 175 authorizes the Community Gardens Act. The bill highlights the important health, educational, and social benefits that gardens provide. L.B. 175 requires the Department of Agriculture to create a community gardens task force to expand community gardening, and specifies that a representative from a school district may sit on the task force. L.B. 544 contained many similar provisions, but unlike L.B. 175, it died.
CODIFIED AT NEB. REV. STAT. § 2-300 ET SEQ.

2014
L.R. 545
Examining Local Food Supply and Distribution Networks
L.R. 545 calls for an interim study to determine how the state could improve local food access and distribution networks. The resolution mentions researching funding sources for schools to purchase local food.
DEAD

2011
L.R. 507
Studying Farm to School Initiatives
L.R. 507 calls for an interim study to determine the feasibility of a statewide Farm to School initiative. The resolution recommends the study consider the Oklahoma Farm to School Program enacted in 2006. It also encourages partnerships between Nebraska farmers and school districts. Such partnerships increase fresh, local foods in schools and to provide students with hands-on agricultural learning opportunities.
DEAD
Nevada

2019

S.B. 458
Appropriating Money for School Gardens in Eligible Title I Schools
S.B. 458 appropriates $410,000 for the 2019-2020 school year and $205,000 for the 2020-2021 school year for the cost of nonprofits creating and maintaining programs for school gardens. To receive funding, a program must use a curriculum that includes a comprehensive science, technology, engineering, and mathematics approach, must be tailored to Nevada’s climate, and must be grade-level appropriate. The funds can be used to support professional development for teachers and provides students with the opportunity to connect with community members and local farmers and sell their produce at a school garden farmers market.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2017

S.B. 167
Appropriating Money for School Gardens in Eligible Title I Schools
S.B. 167 appropriates $410,000 for 2017 and $205,000 for 2018 to create and maintain school gardens. To receive funding, a program must use a curriculum that is tailored to Nevada and is grade level appropriate. Programs connect the school to community members such as local farmers, allow students to operate a farmers market for their produce, and include chef demonstrations.
DEAD

2013

A.B. 337
Encouraging Schools to Participate in Farm to School Activities
A.B. 337 encourages schools to participate in programs that promote fresh fruit and vegetable consumption. Specifically, the bill suggests that schools participate in the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, establish a farm to school program, or implement a school garden program to promote fresh produce.
INCLUDED ANNUAL PUBLIC LAW DOCUMENTS; SEE CHAPTER 170, LAWS OF 2013

New Hampshire

2016

H.B. 688
Establishing an Agricultural Education Number Plate
H.B. 688 authorizes the state to issue special agriculture number plates. The bill allows the state Department of Resources and Economic Development to use the first $50,000 collected to promote the license plate. Any additional money will create the Agricultural Education Number Plate Fund. This fund supports the New Hampshire Farm to School Program, Agriculture in the Classroom Committee, Future Farmers of America Foundation, and a new agricultural education grants program. H. 688 also establishes an advisory committee to oversee the fund.
DEAD
2014

**S.B. 141**

*Establishing the Granite State Farm to Plate Program*

S.B. 141 establishes the Granite State Farm to Plate Food Policy and Principles. The Policy encourages state agencies to cooperate with public and private entities to support local, state, and regional food systems. This bill notes that growing consumer demand from individuals and institutions, including public schools, necessitated such a policy.


2008

**H.B. 1422**

*Establishing a Commission to Prevent Childhood Obesity*

H.B. 1422 establishes the multi-disciplinary Commission on the Prevention of Childhood Obesity. The bill requires the Commission to identify legislative and policy strategies to prevent childhood obesity and to recommend strategies to implement school nutrition standards. In December of 2009, the Commission published a report that recommended increasing the number of schools participating in the New Hampshire Farm to School program.

*Included Annual Public Law Documents; See Chapter 219, Laws of 2008*

---

**New Jersey**

2018

**S.R.J. 30**

*Designating School Garden Week*

This joint resolution designates the school week immediately following the second Sunday in May each year as School Garden Week to recognize and promote the benefits of gardening in schools and further encourage students to eat fresh fruits and vegetables regularly. The joint resolution also directs the governor to annually issue a proclamation calling upon school districts to observe School Garden Week with appropriate activities and programs and to coordinate their activities and programs with those planned for Jersey Fresh Farm to School Week in September each year.

*Dead*

**A. 3639**

*Creating a Farm to School Cookbook*

This bill directs the New Jersey Department of Agriculture to create an electronic Farm to School Cookbook on its website. Any public or non-public school that participates in the New Jersey Farm to School program can submit recipes.

*Dead*

**A. 4387**

*Establishing New Jersey Agricultural Literacy Week*

This bill designates the third week of March as New Jersey Agricultural Literacy Week. The bill requires the New Jersey Department of Agriculture and Department of Education to collaboratively establish a New Jersey Ag Literacy Program and to designate annually a children’s book to highlight the importance of agriculture. New Jersey Agricultural Literacy Week would also encourage and promote the value and importance of New Jersey agriculture through additional classroom activities and through personal stories from volunteers, which may include farmers. The bill would allow the secretary of agriculture to solicit and accept contributions from private and public sources to provide support to help fund this New Jersey Agricultural Literacy Program.

*Dead*
A. 3640
Designating New Jersey Farm Fresh School Brand
This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to allow a school to use the words “New Jersey Farm Fresh School” in any promotional materials or description of the school upon receiving proof that at least 20 percent of the food served by the school consists of farm products grown and produced in New Jersey.
DEAD

2017
A. 3058/S. 2366
Establishing a Farm to School Coordinating Council
A.B. 3058/S.B. 2366 create a farm to school coordinating council within the state Department of Agriculture. The five members of the council include the Secretaries of Agriculture and Education and three experienced individuals whom the Governor appoints. The council must submit a report recommending ways to increase fresh farm foods in schools and to encourage more farmers and schools to participate in the program.
ENACTED YET TO BE CODIFIED

A. 3060
Allowing a Qualified School to be Called a New Jersey Farm Fresh School
A.B. 3060 authorizes schools to use the New Jersey Farm Fresh School designation in promotional materials. To use the phrase, schools must provide the state Department of Agriculture with proof that 20 percent of the food the school serves is grown or produced in New Jersey.
DEAD

2016
A. 3056
Concerning Food Waste in Schools
Requires the Department of Environmental Protection, in consultation with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Education, the Department of Health, and the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education, to establish, or work with appropriate nonprofit organizations to establish, voluntary guidelines to encourage and facilitate the ability of K-12 schools and institutions of higher education to reduce, recover, and recycle food waste.
CODIFIED AT N.J.S.A. 13:1E-99.115

2014
A. 156/S. 1902
Publishing Information Related to the New Jersey Farm to School Program
These bills require the Department of Agriculture to post a hyperlink to the state farm to school website on the Department’s website. They also require the Department to post a copy of successfully implemented public contracts for fresh foods for school meals on the farm to school website.
CODIFIED AT N.J. REV. STAT. § 4:10-25.2

A. 2641/S.1903
Establishing the New Jersey Farm to School and School Garden Fund
These bills permit the state Secretary of Agriculture to solicit contributions from private and public sources to support the New Jersey Farm to School Program.
CODIFIED AT N.J. REV. STAT. § 54A:9-25.36
A. 2642/S. 1908
Allowing Contributions to the New Jersey Farm to School Program
These bills permit the state Secretary of Agriculture to solicit and accept contributions from private and public sources in order to financially support the New Jersey Farm to School Program.

CODIFIED AT N.J. REV. STAT. § 4:10-25.2A

A. 2643/S. 1907
Establishing the Best in New Jersey Farm to School Awards Program
These bills establish the Best in New Jersey Farm to School Awards Program. The Program recognizes exemplary schools or districts for incorporating farm to school principles into meal and snack programs. The Departments of Agriculture and Education oversee the awards program.

CODIFIED AT N.J. REV. STAT. § 4:10-25.2B

A. 2644/S.1964
Establishing a Clearinghouse Website to Connect Farmers to Local Schools and Food Banks
A. 2644/S. 1964 establish a website for farmers to offer produce and dairy products to school meal programs and food banks. These bills direct the Department of Agriculture to collaborate with the Departments of Education and Health or with nonprofit organizations to maintain the website. The website includes a list and hyperlinks organized by county, to all schools, schools districts, and food banks that need produce or dairy products.

CODIFIED AT N.J. REV. STAT. § 4:10-25.2C

A. 2738
Clarifying the Jersey Fresh Law
This bill allows the Secretary of Agriculture to solicit funds from interested parties for the Jersey Fresh Program. The Jersey Fresh Program promotes state farm products. The state Department of Agriculture supports the Jersey Fresh Program, working with entities throughout the state, including schools.

DEAD

A.J.R. 56 / S.J.R. 49
Designating School Garden Week
A.J.R. 56/S.J.R. 49 designate the week immediately following Mother’s Day as School Garden Week. The annual School Garden Week is intended to complement Jersey Fresh Farm to School Week. Jersey Fresh Farm to School Week promotes the benefits of school gardens and encourages students to eat fresh produce regularly.

DEAD

S. 450
S. 2561 (2013)
A. 3019 (2012)
Serving Produce Grown in Community Gardens
S. 450 directs school districts to serve fresh produce from community gardens in school meals. The bill requires that (1) the state Department of Agriculture has certified that community garden soil and water is safe for growing food; (2) produce has been stored, transported, and prepared safely; and (3) any other criteria the Secretary of Agriculture requires has been fulfilled. A. 3019 passed in 2013 and became effective 2014. Legislators introduced identical bills, S. 450 (2014) and S. 2561 (2013), before A. 3019 went into effect.

CODIFIED AT N.J. REV. STAT. § 18A:33-20
**2012**

**A. 2041/S. 936**  
**Establishing the Agricultural Tourism Directional Sign Program**

These bills establish the Agricultural Tourism Directional Sign Program for the state Departments of Transportation and Agriculture to administer. The Program helps motorists locate agricultural tourism establishments. These establishments provide affordable recreational activities, educate the public about food production and farming heritage, and encourage the preservation of agricultural lands. Examples of agricultural tourism include hayrides, corn mazes, pick-your-own operations, farm markets, school tours, agricultural fairs, and horseback riding.

*DEAD*

**A. 2843**  
**Providing a Farmland Assessment Incentive to Lease Land for Community Gardens**

A. 2843 encourages property owners to lease under-utilized agricultural lands to municipalities, school districts, and nonprofit organizations for community garden purposes. The bill exempts property owners from specified taxation assessments and assigns liability to the lessee. By creating incentives for landowners to allow community gardeners to use their land, A. 2834 expands the potential sites for students to learn how to grow, prepare, and consume local foods.

*DEAD*

**2010**

**A. 2854/ S. 2125**  
**Establishing the Jersey Fresh Farm to School Week**

A. 2854/S. 2125 establish the Jersey Fresh Farm to School Week to occur the last week of every September. The promotional event highlights the importance of New Jersey agriculture, as well as the value of fresh farm foods to children’s general health and success in school.

*CODIFIED AT N.J. REV. STAT. § 4:10-25.1*

**New Mexico**

**2020**

**S.M. 18**  
**Recognizing New Mexico Food and Farms & School Nutrition Day**

S.M. 18 establishes February 6, 2020 as New Mexico Food and Farms and School Nutrition Day in the Senate. This memorial promotes economic growth and health equity in the state of New Mexico. The legislature’s goal with this initiative is to lower childhood obesity rates and to promote how farm to school programs support the agricultural economy and farm communities.

*ADOPTED*

**2019**

**H.B. 328/S.B. 115**  
**Appropriating Money for Procurement of New Mexico-Grown Produce for School Meals**

H.B. 328/S.B. 115 appropriates $350,000 to the public education department for fiscal year 2019 for the purchase and distribution of New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and fresh vegetables to school districts, charter schools, and juvenile detention centers through the department’s school meal programs.

*DEAD*
Recognizing New Mexico Food and Farms & School Nutrition Day

H.M. 15/S.M. 14 establishes January 24, 2019, as New Mexico Food and Farms and School Nutrition Day in the House of Representatives and the Senate. This memorial promotes economic growth and health equity in the state of New Mexico. The legislature’s goal with this initiative is to lower childhood obesity rates and to promote how farm to school programs support the agricultural economy and farm communities.

ADOPTED

2018

Recognizing New Mexico Food and Farms Day

H.M. 24 / S.M. 59 establishes January 23 as New Mexico Food and Farms Day. This memorial promotes economic growth and health equity in the state of New Mexico. The legislature’s goal with this initiative is to lower childhood obesity rates and to promote how farm to school programs support the agricultural economy and farm communities. The memorial acknowledges that state funds allow schools to purchase New Mexico-grown produce and notes that gardens help students learn about nutrition.

ADOPTED

Declaring January 23, 2018 “School Nutrition Day” in the House of Representatives

S.M. 19 recognizes the need for funding for school nutrition programs to promote healthier lifestyles and academic achievement and declares January 23, 2018, School Nutrition Day in the House of Representatives.

ADOPTED

Funding New Mexico Grown Fresh Fruits and Vegetables for School Meals

H.B. 2 appropriates $425,000 for New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and vegetables for school meal program.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

Making an Appropriation to Provide New Mexico-Grown Fresh Fruits and Fresh Vegetables for School Meals

H.B. 62 appropriates $400,000 from the general fund to the New Mexico Public Education Department for expenditure in fiscal year 2019 and subsequent fiscal years for the purchase and distribution of New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and fresh vegetables to school districts, charter schools, and juvenile detention centers through the Public Education Department’s school meal programs.

DEAD

2017

Appropriating Funds to Provide New Mexico-Grown Produce in School Meals

H.B. 208/S.B. 379 appropriate $1.44 million for schools to purchase and distribute New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and vegetables.

DEAD
H.M. 54
Establishing a School Nutrition Day
H.M. 54 establishes February 20, 2017 as School Nutrition Day at the House of Representatives. The resolution notes that the state's fresh fruit and vegetable program helps to promote a healthy diet and combat obesity by bringing farm-grown food to children across the state.

ADOPTED

H.M. 57/S.M. 59
Declaring New Mexico Food and Farms Day
H.M. 57/S.M. 59 establish February 20, 2017, as New Mexico Food and Farms Day at the Capitol. The memorials acknowledge that state funds allow schools to purchase New Mexico-grown produce and note that gardens help students learn about nutrition. In addition, H.M. 57/S.M. 59 celebrate the role food hubs play supporting farmers.

ADOPTED

2016

H.B. 115/S.B. 82
Expanding the Use of New Mexico-Grown Produce in School Lunches
H.B. 115 appropriates $90,000 to increase the amount of New Mexico-grown produce in school lunches.

DEAD

H.J.M. 3/S.J.M 4
Affirming the Importance of Environmental Education
H.J.M. 3/S.J.M 4 acknowledge that environmental education fosters academic achievement, health, and responsibility in students. The memorials note that school gardens serve as laboratories for science education. They also note that growing food at school promotes healthy eating behaviors. H.J.M. 3/S.J.M 4 request that the governor create an environmental education week in April and direct the state determine whether developing an environmental education grant program is feasible.

H.J.M 3 WAS ADOPTED; S.J.M. 4 DIED

H.M. 16/S.M. 19
Declaring New Mexico Food and Farms Day
H.M. 16/S.M. 19 establish February 3, 2016 as New Mexico Food and Farms Day at the Capitol. The memorials acknowledge that state funds allows schools to purchase New Mexico-grown produce and note that gardens help students learn about nutrition. In addition, H.M. 16/S.M. 19 celebrate the role food hubs play in supporting farmers.

ADOPTED

2015

H.B. 231/S.B. 237
Increasing New Mexico Fresh Fruits and Vegetables in School Lunches
H.B. 115/S.B. 237 appropriate $160,000 to increase the amount of New Mexico-grown produce in school lunches.

DEAD

H.M. 25/S.M. 22
Declaring New Mexico Food and Farms Day
H.M. 25/S.M. 22 establish January 25, 2015 as New Mexico Food and Farms Day at the capitol. These memorials acknowledge that state funds allows schools to purchase New Mexico-grown produce and note that gardens help students learn about nutrition. In addition, H.M. 25/S.M. 22 celebrate the role food hubs play in supporting farmers.

ADOPTED
2014

**H.B. 81/S.B. 143**  
Appropriating Money for New Mexico-Grown Fresh Produce for School Meals  
H.B. 81/S.B. 143 appropriate $1.44 million for fiscal year 2015. The appropriation enables schools to purchase New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and vegetables for school meals.  
DEAD

**H.B. 220**  
Appropriating Money for New Mexico-Grown Fresh Produce for School Meals  
H.B. 220 appropriates $100,000 for fiscal year 2015. The appropriation enables the Gadsden, Las Cruces, and Deming school districts to purchase New Mexico fresh fruits and vegetables.  
DEAD

**H.M. 29/S.M. 25**  
Declaring New Mexico Food and Farms Day  
H.M. 29/S.M. 25 declare January 29, 2014, as New Mexico Food and Farms Day. The memorials acknowledge the importance of supporting farmers, farmers markets, and food entrepreneurs. They encourage public schools to continue purchasing New Mexico-grown fruits and vegetables. H.M. 29/S.M. 25 also acknowledge that increased state investment enables schools to feature New Mexico-grown produce. Using New Mexico produce in school meals helps meet federal nutrition requirements, promotes healthier lifestyles, enhances students’ diets, and increases academic achievement.  
ADOPTED

**H.M. 50/S.M. 48**  
Declaring School Nutrition Day  
H.M. 50/S.M. 48 declare February 2, 2014, as School Nutrition Day. The memorials state that funding for school nutrition programs supports healthy lifestyles and academic achievement. H.M. 50/S.M. 48 recognize more than fifty farmers selling fruits and vegetables grown and sixty school districts serving fresh produce to 146,848 schoolchildren.  
ADOPTED

**S.B. 313**  
Appropriating Money for New Mexico-Grown Fresh Fruits and Vegetables  
This bill appropriates $240,000 for fiscal year 2015 to purchase New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and vegetables for school meals.  
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2013

**H.B. 2**  
Appropriating Money for New Mexico-Grown Fresh Fruits and Vegetables  
This bill appropriates $100,000 for fiscal year 2014 to purchase New Mexico-grown fresh fruits and vegetables for school meals.  
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

**H.B. 338/S.B. 80 & S.B. 76**  
Appropriating Money for New Mexico-Grown Fresh Fruits and Vegetables  
These bills appropriate $1.44 million to purchase and distribute New Mexico-grown fruits and vegetables for school meals.  
DEAD
H.M. 13
Declaring New Mexico Food and Farms Day
H.M. 13 celebrates New Mexico’s food and farming culture and declares January 25, 2013 as New Mexico Food and Farms Day. The memorial recognizes that school gardens are an important way for children to grow food, learn about nutrition, and understand life sciences.
ADOPTED

S.B. 75
Concerning Local Foods in School Meals
S.B. 75 requires the state Department of Education to promulgate regulations that (1) set minimum nutritional standards for school lunches, (2) include New Mexico-grown produce in all meals, and (3) source from New Mexico vendors whenever feasible.
DEAD

2012
S.M. 9
Declaring FoodCorps and AmeriCorps Day at the Senate
S.M. 9 declares January 24, 2012 FoodCorps and AmeriCorps Day at the Senate. The memorial urges residents to thank FoodCorps and AmeriCorps members for their service and to increase food access to improve children’s health.
ADOPTED

2008
S.M. 54
Declaring FoodCorps and AmeriCorps Day at the Senate
S.M. 54 declares FoodCorps and AmeriCorps Day at the Senate. The memorial urges residents to thank FoodCorps and AmeriCorps members for their service and to increase food access to improve children’s health.
ADOPTED

2007
S.B. 611
Appropriating Money to Provide New Mexico-Grown Produce to Albuquerque Public Schools
S.B. 611 appropriates $85,000 to provide New Mexico-grown produce to the Valley High School Cluster. The bill also appropriates other funds to expand farmers markets and sustainable agriculture education.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2001
H.J.M. 34
Using New Mexico Agricultural Products in School Meals
This joint memorial requests that the state Departments of Agriculture and Education collaborate to evaluate opportunities to increase the use of New Mexico agricultural products in school meals.
ADOPTED
New York

2020

A. 7049A/S. 2244B
A. 7058/S. 3374 (2017)
A. 7090/S. 3625 (2015)

Enacting the Local Food, Farms and Jobs Act

A. 7049A/S. 2244B establishes a New York state council on food policy responsible for, among other things, supporting and encouraging that by 2021, 25 percent of food and food products purchased by entities such as public schools, child care facilities, after-school programs, and hospitals, shall be local farm or food products. The council is also tasked with creating a geo-coded database to facilitate the purchase of fresh produce and food products by schools.

DEAD

A. 1209/S. 3804
A. 1081/S. 2768 (2017)
A. 10479/S. 7706 (2016)

Creating the New York Farm to School and School Garden Fund

A. 1209/S. 3804 establishes the Farm to School and School Garden Fund. The fund’s purpose is to promote students’ consumption of local produce and increase the prevalence of school gardens. Schools may use the funds to purchase equipment and educational materials. The bills direct the Tax Commissioner to include a space on the state income tax return to allow taxpayers to contribute to the fund.

DEAD

S. 7925

Establishing a Farm to School Task Force

S. 7925 establishes a task force to study and make recommendations on how to provide fresh foods in all school districts in the state while supporting New York local agriculture. The commissioner is responsible for developing a program based on the findings of the task force and requiring all school districts in the state to provide fresh foods to students in a manner that supports New York local agriculture.

DEAD

A. 6733/S. 252
A. 7011/S. 1430 (2017)

Permitting School Districts to Favor Locally Sourced Food

A. 6733/S. 252 allows the Board of Education, on behalf of a school or school district, to include in bid specifications language favoring local or regional procurement of goods.

DEAD

A. 981/S. 3242

Establishing a Community Gardens Task Force

A. 981/S. 3242 updates the goals of the state’s Community Gardens Task Force to include development of after-school programs that establish, maintain, and expand community gardens in the state. The amendment also includes a directive for the task force to submit a report to the Governor and the legislature on the status of community gardens in New York addressing the number, nature, and location of community gardens, description of the costs, benefits and impacts of community gardens, as well as the assessment of the successes, failures, and barriers in developing, maintaining, and expanding community gardens.

DEAD
A. 877/S. 4853  
A. 2899/S. 3290 (2017)  
A. 760/S. 5476 (2013)

**Relating to Instruction in Food, Agriculture and Nutrition Education**

A. 877/S. 4853 requires all schools in the state to include food, agriculture, and nutrition as an integral part of health education for elementary and high school students. School authorities are required to provide the necessary facilities, time, and resources for educators to effectively teach food, agriculture, and nutrition.  

**DEAD**

A. 10320/S. 7847

**Expanding the Thirty Percent New York Grown Food Purchasing Incentive for School Meals**

A. 10320/S. 7847 seeks to expand the 30 percent incentive program in New York to include purchases of food products from New York state farmers, growers, producers, or processors made for its school breakfast program. Currently, any school food authority in the state is eligible for a 25-cent subsidy for any meal provided that the school food authority has purchased at least 30 percent of its total cost of food products for its school lunch program from New York state farmers, growers, producers or processors in the preceding school year. This bill would allow school food authorities to attribute money spent on New York food purchases made for its school breakfast program as well.  

**DEAD**

A. 9503C/S. 7503C  

**Appropriating Funds for Farm to School Programs**

A. 9503C/S. 7403C appropriates funding for additional services and expenses to develop farm to school initiatives in the state that will help schools purchase more food from local farmers and expand access to healthy local food for school children. The funds are to be awarded through a competitive process.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**

A. 3951/S. 5920

**Establishing a Career and Technical High School Diploma**

A. 3951/S. 5920 establishes a career and technical education (CTE) pathway to a high school diploma including courses of study in agriculture education.

**DEAD**

2018

A. 09506B/S. 07506-B  
A. 1446/S. 1239 (2017)  
A. 9379/S. 7525 (2016)

**Reimbursing Schools for Purchasing New York Grown Food**

A. 09506B/ S07506-B provides that any school food authority shall be eligible for a twenty-five cents subsidy for any school meal served provided that the school food authority certifies to the State Education Department that such food authority has purchased at least 30 percent of its total cost of food products for its school lunch service program from New York state farmers, growers, producers or processors in the preceding school year.

**INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS**
2017

A.B. 6910B/S. 5251-B
Concerning the Purchase of Local Farm Products for School Meals
New York A.B. 6910B/S. 5251-B amends existing law to allow a school district or a board of cooperative educational services to separately and directly purchase foods from local producers or producer associations if the producer association is made up of ten or fewer farms and the amount of purchase does not exceed $50,000. However, the bill also provides that these institutions may apply to the Commissioner of Education to obtain permission to purchase more than $50,000 from local farmers and producers when no other growers have offered to sell to the school and within certain expenditure limitations.
CODIFIED AT N.Y. GEN. MUN LAW §103 (CONSOL. 2017).

A. 5510
Requiring State Agencies to Prefer to New York Vendors
A. 5510 requires state entities to purchase competitively-priced New York grown, produced, or harvested food products. Prior versions of the law only encouraged state entities to purchase New York food products. By requiring state entities to purchase local foods, A. 5510 gives local farmers a competitive advantage and makes it easier for schools to purchase local foods.
DEAD

A. 5689/S. 4281
Increasing the Small Purchase Threshold for Foods
A. 5689/S. 4281 amend existing procurement law to allow school nutrition programs to use simplified contract procedures for purchases up to $150,000, the federal small-purchase threshold. By allowing schools to use informal contract procedures for goods that cost less than $150,000, A5689/S enables schools to purchase from local farmers.
DEAD

A. 6123/S. 4486
Requiring School Districts to Purchase New York Food Products
A. 6123/S. 4486 require school districts to purchase food products grown or raised in New York. The state Board of Education may waive the requirements to purchase state products when the existing quantity is insufficient. It may also do so if the price of New York foods exceeds 110 percent of the price of comparable, available foods. By requiring state entities to prefer New York products, A. 6123/S. 4486 give local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts and enable schools to purchase local foods.
DEAD

A. 7003/S. 1904
Recognizing Students Involved in Farm to School and School Garden Activities
A. 7003/S. 1904 direct the Commissioner of Education to create an annual award recognizing students who have demonstrated creativity or initiative working in a farm to school or school garden program. Students may use the award as a credit against tuition fees in their first semester at a state-run or city-run college.
DEAD

A. 7007/S. 1463
Recognizing School Staff Involved in Farm to School and School Garden Activities
A. 7007/S. 1463 direct the Commissioner of Education to create an annual award to recognize school staff contributions to farm to school or school garden programs.
DEAD
S. 1471
Concerning a Study on Vermont’s VT-FEED Program
S. 1471 requires the state Department of Agriculture to conduct a year-long study of Vermont’s Food Education Every Day Program. The Department’s report must include recommendations that include potential legislation. The bill specifies that the report must also discuss program models, philosophies, curriculum, and staff training programs.
DEAD

S. 3035
Creating the School-to-Pantry Donation Credit
S. 3035 creates a school-to-pantry donation credit. The bill allows schools to claim a tax credit for garden products they donate to a local pantry.
DEAD

S. 4980
S. 6288 (2016)
Establishing an Aggregation, Storage, and Distribution Pilot Program
S. 4980 requires the state Office of General Services to reserve space within at least one of its food warehouses to aggregate, store, and distribute foods produced on local farms. The Office is responsible for working with the Departments of Education and Agriculture to facilitate sales between farmers and schools the warehouse currently serves. After one year, the Office must submit a report assessing whether the state should expand the pilot program.
DEAD

2014
A. 9946
Providing School Districts with Flexibility to Order from Smaller Farm Associations
This bill defines the circumstances that exempt school districts from a formal bid procedure waiver. School districts need not apply for a waiver when purchasing food that costs less than $25,000 or is produced by associations of ten or fewer farmers. By simplifying contract procedures for these purchases, A. 9946 makes it easier for schools to purchase from local farmers.
DEAD

2013
A. 880/S. 1427
A. 7488/S. 4924A (2011)
Requiring School Districts Purchase Local Food Products
These bills require school districts to purchase food products that are grown, produced, harvested, or processed in New York. The bills waive this requirement when food products are not competitively priced or available in sufficient quantity. A.880/S. 1427 give local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, enabling schools to purchase local foods.
DEAD

A. 5218/S. 2332
Allowing the Donation of Excess Food from School Meals
These bills direct the state Commissioner of Education to establish voluntary guidelines enabling a school, university, or other educational institution to donate excess meal-program food to voluntary food assistance programs. The Commissioner coordinates donations with the farm to school and the New York Kids Week programs.
DEAD
**A. 5322 / S. 2374**  
**Enacting the Omnibus Obesity and Respiratory Illness Reduction Act**  
A. 5322/S. 2374 authorize an array of public health initiatives to promote pre-natal, child, and maternal health. The bills require the Commissioner of Education to develop voluntary guidelines that help educational institutions donate excess food to assistance programs. The Commissioner coordinates donations with the farm to school and the New York Kids Week programs. A. 5322/S. 2374 also establish a fund that can, in part, support obesity research and educational projects.  
*DEAD*

**A. 6628 / S. 2438**  
**A. 10101 / S. 7114 (2012)**  
**Combatting Adult and Childhood Obesity**  
A. 6628/S. 2438 direct the Department of Agriculture to coordinate with the Department of Health to implement a program to stem childhood obesity. The program encourages students to eat fresh, local produce and promotes community gardens producing fresh fruits and vegetables.  
*DEAD*

**A. 6997 / S. 3144A**  
**Establishing a Kitchen Facilities Program**  
A. 6997/S. 3144A establish a program to award grants to small food business incubators and shared-use kitchens. Local development corporations, municipalities, schools, and other nonprofit organizations are eligible to apply for grants. Kitchens equipped to process fresh fruits and vegetables can support farm to school procurement and education.  
*DEAD*

**A. 7572 / S. 5552**  
**Training Small Businesses to Sell New York Farm Products**  
A. 7572/S. 5552 create training programs in each region to support small businesses, such as farms, that sell New York food products. The bills allow the state Department of Agriculture and Markets to invite counties, municipalities, and school districts interested in purchasing locally sourced food to the training programs.  
*CODIFIED AT N.Y. GEN. MUN. LAW § 104B*

**A. 7913**  
**Establishing a Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program**  
A. 7913 directs the state Department of Education to establish a fresh fruit and vegetable program to defray the cost of using fresh or minimally processed produce in school meals. The program provides school meal programs an additional 5 cents per federally reimbursable meal to make fresh produce more affordable.  
*DEAD*

**S. 3224**  
**Creating the New York State Healthy Kids Act**  
S. 3224 establishes nutritional standards for select foods and beverages sold in schools. The bill requires that the standards encourage schools to purchase locally or regionally produced fresh fruits, vegetables, meat, and dairy products.  
*DEAD*
2011

A. 1389A/S. 614
Financing the Transportation and Distribution of New York State Grown Products
A. 1389A/S. 614 create a program to provide loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, and grants to local or regional organizations to distribute New York farm products. The program connects farmers with food service providers, such as restaurants, schools, food retailers, and other institutions.

CODIFIED AT N.Y. AGRIC. & MARKETS LAW § 16

A. 1569
Creating the Healthy Kids Pilot Program
A. 1569 creates the Healthy Kids Pilot Program to encourage students to develop healthy eating habits. It provides ten school districts with grant money to offset the cost of selling healthy items, instead of junk food, in vending machines. A. 1569 appropriates $2 million for the pilot program.

DEAD

2003

A. 2652A/S. 6024A
Supporting School Food Purchases from Farms
A. 2652A/S. 6024A include several provisions to help schools purchase local farm foods. For example, the bills allow school districts to purchase directly from associations of a specified size when no smaller associations are available. They also raise the cap on direct purchases from 15 cents to 20 cents per meal. A. 2652A/S. 6024A require the Department of Education to develop regulations that (1) support the state Farm to School Law, (2) allow schools to pay farmers more than the national wholesale price for locally grown foods, (3) encourage school districts interested in purchasing local farm products to notify farmers, and (4) set rules for school purchases from midsize associations.

CODIFIED AT N.Y. GEN. MUN. LAW § 103 (2004)

2001

A. 7684/S. 4866
Establishing a Farm to School Program
These bills establish a farm to school program to help educational institutions purchase New York farm products. The state Commissioner of Education is responsible for providing relevant information to farmers, farm organizations, and institutions interested in establishing farm to school programs. A. 7684/S. 4866 require the Department to coordinate with the Department of Agriculture and Markets to host promotional events such as New York Harvest and the New York Kids Week. New York Kids Week promotes local food to children through school meals and classroom activities.

CODIFIED AT N.Y. AGRIC. & MARKETS LAW § 16 & N.Y. EDUC. LAW § 305 (2002)
North Carolina

2017

H.B. 603/S.B. 637
Appropriating Funds for the Small Farms to Healthier Schools Pilot
H.B. 603/S.B. 637 appropriate funds for a pilot farm to school program. The bills allot $340,000 for fiscal year 2017 and $330,000 for fiscal year 2018. H.B. 603/S.B. 637 specify that $60,000 in fiscal year 2017 and $120,000 in fiscal year 2018 will offset the higher cost of locally-grown products. The pilot will reimburse schools in the North Central region based on the number of served meals that include local food. The remaining funds will be used to provide technical assistance to local farmers and develop local infrastructure.

DEAD

H.B. 837
Funding a REAL School Gardens Pilot Program
This bill appropriates $650,000 in funding for REAL School Gardens to run a three-year pilot program to transform designated outdoor spaces into outdoor learning centers in elementary schools. The pilot includes an aligned curriculum that provides nutrition education to support healthy eating habits through project-based learning.

DEAD

H.B. 893
Appropriating Funds for Healthy Schools
H.B. 893 appropriates $10 million for fiscal year 2017 to help school districts implement state nutrition standards. School districts may use the funds to purchase food, equipment, and supplies, as well as pay salaries and benefits for food service staff. Schools can increase local food purchases with this money.

DEAD

2016

S.B. 770
Providing Regulatory Relief to the Agricultural Community
S.B. 770 authorizes local school boards to develop policies that maximize the purchase of food grown or raised in North Carolina. The bill encourages school boards to establish a price preference percentage allowing schools to pay a certain proportion more than the lowest responsible bid for North Carolina foods. This price preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts, making it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

CODIFIED AT N.C.G.S. § 115C-264.4

2015

H.B. 609
H.B. 803 (2013)
H.B. 840 (2011)
Authorizing the Healthy and High Performance Schools Act of 2015
H.B. 609 authorizes a host of initiatives to better student health, including additional reimbursements for school meals, money for district kitchen and food hub facilities, local food promotion events, a statewide school gardens program, and a Healthy Students and Youth Commission. The bill establishes school wellness policy requirements that include local procurement goals. H.B. 609 also allows schools to serve produce grown in school gardens, encourages composting, and supports nutrition education.

DEAD
2012

**H.B. 1099**

Supporting Farm to School Procurement

H.B. 1099 encourages schools to participate in the Farm to School Program and the North Carolina Procurement Alliance, a voluntary school-purchasing consortium that helps to drive down food costs by purchasing in aggregate. The bill appropriates funds to support the Alliance and to cover the cost of equipment updates to prepare locally grown fruits and vegetables.

*DEAD*

**S.B. 491**

Continuing the North Carolina Local Food Advisory Council

This bill extends the life of the North Carolina Local Food Advisory Council, responsible for developing sustainable, local food programs and policies. One such policy is to increase the amount of sustainable, local food in school meals.

*CODIFIED AT N.C.G.S. § 106-830 ET SEQ., BUT REPEALED JULY 31, 2013*

2010

**H.B. 1832/S.B. 1284**

Creating a Farm to School Coordinator Position

These bills establish a permanent position in the state Department of Agriculture to oversee the state farm to school program, as the Legislative Task Force on Obesity recommended. The bills appropriate $65,000 for the position. The coordinator is responsible for encouraging more schools to participate in the farm to school program; developing educational resources such as curricula; maintaining a list of farmers interested in selling their products to schools; and providing technical assistance to such farmers. The bills also direct the coordinator to standardize the small purchase threshold for child nutrition programs so that schools may more easily purchase local foods from farmers. H.B. 1832/S.B. 1284 require the Department to issue an annual report and to collaborate with the Child Nutrition Program, the Department of Health and Human Services, and other groups working on child nutrition.

*DEAD*

**S.B. 897**

Appropriating Money for a Farm to School Program Position

This bill reassigns a vacant position within the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services to support the North Carolina Farm to School Program.

*INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS; SEE CHAPTER 31, LAWS OF 2010*

Ohio

2018

**S.B 287**

Developing Health Standards for K-12

OH S.B. 287 requires the state board of education to develop and adopt standards for health education for students in kindergarten through twelfth grade.

*DEAD*
2011
H.B. 240
Creating the Ohio Sustainable Food Advisory Council
This bill establishes the Ohio Sustainable Food Advisory Council to help develop a sustainable food economy in Ohio. The bill encourages the Council to consider the amount of sustainable, local food used in public school meals and the nutritional, behavioral, and performance benefits that an increase in this amount could cause.
DEAD

Oklahoma

2015
H.B. 1167
Promoting Child Nutrition through the School Assemblies Act
H.B. 1167 allows school boards to organize annual nutrition-related assemblies for students and parents. These assemblies may occur during or after regular school hours. The bill encourages schools to distribute statewide directories of nutrition-related programs and to form public-private partnerships to cover costs associated with the assemblies.
DEAD

S.B. 1357
Relating to the Oklahoma Food Service Advisory Council
S.B. 1357 adds a school food position to the state Food Service Advisory Committee. The bill requires that one member represent the School Nutrition Association in Oklahoma. Such committees can encourage state institutions, including schools, to purchase local foods or renovate kitchens to serve fresh local produce.
CODIFIED AT OKLA. STAT. TIT. 63, § 1-106.3 (2016)

2008
H.B. 2833
Authorizing the Oklahoma Food Security Act
This bill establishes an Oklahoma Food Security Committee to coordinate food services among federal, state, faith-based, and nonprofit organizations. The bill encourages existing programs to expand outreach efforts. For example, H.B. 2833 encourages the Committee to help farmers’ markets acquire technology to accept food stamps. The bill supports school efforts to expand student access to healthy foods; local food economies; and community gardens. H.B. 2833 requires the Committee to compile county and community food security data in an annual report.
CODIFIED AT OKLA. STAT. TIT. 56, § 245 ET SEQ.

2006
H.B. 2655
Creating a Farm to School Program
This bill establishes the Oklahoma Farm to School Program and creates a director position within the state Department of Agriculture. The director provides training and technical assistance to school food services personnel; facilitates communication between farmers and school districts; oversees a public awareness campaign; and seeks grants from funding sources. H.B. 2655 also requires the Department of Agriculture to establish a website to coordinate fresh food procurement.
CODIFIED AT OKLA. STAT. TIT. 2, § 5-60 ET SEQ.
### Oregon

#### 2020

**S.B. 5723**

**Reducing Funds for the Farm to School Grant Program Due to COVID-19**

S.B. 5723 reduces the amount of funding for Oregon’s Farm to School Grant Program until June 2021 due to COVID-19 budget shortfalls.

*INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS*

#### 2019

**H.B. 2579**

**Relating to the Farm to School Program**

H.B. 2579 appropriates funding for the state’s Farm to School Grant Program and updates the noncompetitive and competitive entity eligibility. Eligible entities for the noncompetitive grant process now include providers of center-based programs for children in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) and entities that provide meals through the Summer Food Service Program; eligible entities for the competitive grant process now includes providers of center-based programs for children in CACFP and producers of food produced or processed in Oregon, including farmers, ranchers, and seafood harvesters. H.B. 2579 also adds an evaluative component to the grant program, including assessing administration and the economic impact, educational outcomes, and health outcomes of the program.

*CODIFIED AT OR. REV. STAT. § 336.431*

#### 2017

**H.B. 2038**

**H.B. 2721 (2015)**

**Appropriating Money to Help Schools to Purchase Oregon Food Products**

H.B. 2038 appropriates $4.5 million for grants to reimburse school districts for their purchases of Oregon-grown and Oregon-processed foods and for school districts and their partners to provide food-based, agriculture-based, and garden-based educational activities. The bill continues programs, expands eligible entities, and specifies that a school district may not use funds to supplant purchases the district was making prior to participation in the grant program.

*CODIFIED AT OR. REV. STAT. ANN. § 336.431*

#### 2015

**S.B. 501**

**Clarifying Farm to School Legislation**

S.B. 501 amends existing farm to school legislation. The bill clarifies the processes by which schools may apply for grants, explaining that noncompetitive grants may pay for food produced in state and competitive grants may cover food-based, agriculture-based, and garden-based educational activities.

*CODIFIED AT OR. REV. STAT. § 336.431*

**S.B. 5507**

**Relating to State Financial Administration**

S.B. 5507 appropriates $3.3 million for the farm to school program for the 2015 through 2017.

*INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS; SEE CHAPTER 837, 2015 LAWS*
2013

H.B. 2174
Establishing the Oregon Food Products Program
This bill changes the name of the Oregon Farm to School and School Garden Program to the Oregon Food Products Program. It allows grants to also fund fisheries projects and fisheries-based educational activities. H.B. 2174 also appropriates money from the General Fund to the Department of Education for awarding related grants.

DEAD

H.B. 2648
Removing Spending Requirements for Farm to School Grants
Oregon issues grants to reimburse school districts for providing food-based educational activities and for the costs associated with purchasing local food products. Existing law requires that the state spend a certain percentage of grant funding on educational activities and a certain percentage of funding on food costs. This bill eliminates these requirements.

DEAD

H.B. 2649
Funding the Oregon Farm to School and School Garden Program
Oregon issues grants to reimburse school districts for providing food-based educational activities and for the costs associated with purchasing local food products. Existing law requires that the state spend a certain percentage of funding on educational activities and a certain percentage of funding on food costs. H.B. 2649 requires that at least 80 percent of the grant money cover the cost of fresh, Oregon foods, and another 10 percent fund educational activities. The bill also sets forth new criteria that school districts must meet in order to receive a state Department of Education grant and appropriates $500,000 for the program.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS; SEE CHAPTER 652, 2013 LAWS

H.B. 3046
Appropriating Money for the Oregon Farm to School and School Garden Program
This bill appropriates an undisclosed amount of money from the General Fund for the Farm to School and School Garden grant program. Schools may use these grants to cover costs incurred purchasing fresh, Oregon food products and providing food-based, agriculture-based, and garden-based educational activities.

DEAD

H.J.M. 10
Supporting the Inclusion Local Food in School Meals
This bill urges Congress to pass school nutrition legislation to facilitate school purchases of locally produced food.

DEAD

2011

H.B. 2800
Expanding the Farm to School and School Gardens Program
This bill expands the Oregon Farm to School and School Garden Program. It directs the Department of Education to award grants to school districts to help cover the costs incurred purchasing fresh, Oregon food products and providing food-based, agriculture-based, and garden-based educational activities. H.B. 2800 also appropriates $200,000 for grants.

CODIFIED AT OR. REV. STAT. § 336.426 AND APPROPRIATIONS WERE INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS; SEE CHAPTER 663, 2011 LAWS
2009

**H.B. 2800**  
Expanding the Farm to School and School Gardens Program  
H.B. 2800 authorizes the state Economic and Community Development Department to reimburse school districts 15 cents per lunch and 7 cents per breakfast served that contains fresh, local produce. The bill also awards grants for schools to provide food-based, agriculture-based and garden-based educational activities. The bill appropriates $22,580,000 for both initiatives.  
*DEAD*

2008

**H.B. 3601**  
Establishing the Farm to School and School Garden Program  
This bill directs the state Department of Education to establish the Oregon Farm to School and School Garden Program. The bill requires the Department to coordinate with the Department of Agriculture to encourage school districts to (1) use Oregon foods and produce from school gardens, (2) promote food and garden-based educational activities, and (3) help school districts incorporate farm to school and school garden projects into wellness policies.  
*CODIFIED AT OR. REV. STAT. § 336.426*

2007

**H.B. 3185**  
Establishing a School Garden Program  
This bill requires the Department of Education to establish a school garden program. The Department is responsible for overseeing garden-based education programs, awarding grants, and coordinating farm to school activities with district wellness policies.  
*DEAD*

**H.B. 3307**  
Requiring the Department of Agriculture to Support a Farm to School Program  
This bill requires the state Department of Agriculture to work with the Department of Education to develop a farm to school program. The Department of Agriculture is responsible for developing local procurement strategies for schools and connecting farmers to schools. H.B. 3307 appropriates $175,000 for these efforts.  
*DEAD*

**H.B. 3476**  
Creating a Farm to School Program  
This bill requires the Department of Education to develop a farm to school program. The program must (1) help schools use produce from school gardens and other Oregon producers, (2) reimburse schools 7 cents for meals using such products, (3) coordinate with school wellness policies, and (4) evaluate the effects of farm to school activities. H.B. 3476 appropriates $175,000 for the program.  
*DEAD*
Pennsylvania

2019

H.B. 1514
Establishing a Farm to School Grant Program
H.B. 1514 establishes a Farm to School Grant Program that focuses on locally grown foods provided from Pennsylvania farms, nutrition education, direct marketing opportunities for Pennsylvania farmers, family and community involvement, and school field trips to nearby farms. Grants are available to applicants who are able to incorporate all of the program requirements, have a high percentage of children receiving free and reduced-price school meals, can procure locally grown foods, and possess the potential to increase markets for local agricultural producers and the ability to sustain the program.

CODIFIED AT 3 PA. CONS. STAT. §10901 ET SEQ.

2017

H.B. 178
Including Agriculture Education in the School System
This bill amends existing law to increase the integration of agricultural education into the public school curriculum. It establishes a Commission for Agricultural Education Excellence to develop and implement a statewide plan for agricultural education. The Commission must include two farmers and a teacher from a school district, among others. The bill also creates the position of an executive director to oversee agricultural education at all levels and expands the Nonprofit School Food Program to provide a free meal to any student upon request.

CODIFIED AT 24 PA. CONS. STAT. § 15-1529.1

2016

H.R. 1003
Recognizing National Teach Ag Day
This resolution celebrates the 250 agricultural educators in Pennsylvania.

ADOPTED

2006

S.B. 1209
Establishing the Healthy Farms and Healthy Schools Act
This bill creates a statewide program to provide grants to expand farm to school activities in kindergarten classrooms. Program activities may include nutrition and agriculture education for students, training for teachers and staff, educational activities for parents, and educational experiences that teach young children about sources of food. Grant amounts may not exceed 75 percent of a school's costs or $15,000. S.B. 1209 also requires the Department of Agriculture to compile a list of Pennsylvania farmers interested in supplying food to local schools.

CODIFIED AT 3 PA. CONS. STAT. § 2501 ET SEQ.

2004

H.R. 821
Urging Congress to Support the Farm to Cafeteria Projects Act
This resolution urges Congress to support the Farm to Cafeteria Projects Act of 2003. It also encourages Congress to support any other legislation that helps schools purchase local foods, provide healthier and fresh food; educate students about foods grown in their communities; or expand market opportunities for local farms.

ADOPTED
Puerto Rico

1999

S. B. 1736
Concerning the Sale of Agricultural Products
S. B. 1736 provides that schools attached to the agricultural education program or programs that specialize in agriculture shall retain 60 percent of the total proceeds of their sales and may use those proceeds to improve the agricultural projects conducted on school farms.
CODIFIED AT 3 L.P.R.A. § 143H

1925
Concerning Gardens for Local Schools
This law, part of the Education Title, directs municipal departments to provide each rural school with agricultural implements and land to be used as a school garden or agricultural demonstration field.
CODIFIED AT 18 L.P.R.A. § 548

1923
Concerning Agricultural Supplies in Rural Schools
This law, within Title 22 “Public Works” under Rural Improvements, states that each rural school shall be given domestic animals, seeds, agricultural implements, fertilizers, and such other things that may be necessary for the establishment of agricultural gardens.
CODIFIED AT 22 L.P.R.A. § 116

Rhode Island

2014

H.B. 7810
Establishing the Division of Agriculture
This bill clarifies the role of the Division of Agriculture within the state Department of Environmental Management. It provides a statement of policy for the Division and lists the Division’s responsibilities. These responsibilities include (1) marketing Rhode Island-produced food, farm products and services; (2) protecting and expanding agriculture in the state; and (3) participating in efforts to strengthen regional food systems.
DEAD

H.R. 8109 /S.R. 2760
Commending Environmental Council of Rhode Island Education Awardees
These resolutions commend the 2000—2013 recipients of the John H. Chafee Conservation Leadership Award. The Leadership Award recognizes Rhode Island organizations, municipal governments, and businesses for their efforts to improve the health of the Rhode Island environment. These resolutions commend one of the recipients, the non-profit organization, Kids First, for the Rhode Island Farm to Produce to School Lunch Program.
ADOPTED
2013

**H.B. 5135**

Expanding the Farm to School Tax Credit

This bill expands the farm to school income tax credit to include milk or milk products. H.B. 5811/H.B. 5845 (2007) established the tax credit to allow entities that provide food and services to schools to reduce the amount of income tax they owe based on the food they purchase.

*DEAD*

2007

**H.B. 5811/H.B. 5845**

Creating a Tax Credit For Providing State-Grown Produce To Schools

This legislation creates a tax credit for entities providing food and services to schools. Entities may reduce the amount of income tax owed based on the amount of produce they purchase. The credit is worth 5 percent of the cost of the produce.

*CODIFIED AT R.I. GEN. LAWS § 44-30-27*

South Carolina

2013

**S.B. 191**

**H.B. 4200 (2011)**

Creating a Program for Locally Grown Foods in School Meals

This bill creates a state Department of Agriculture program to encourage schools to serve locally grown, minimally processed farm food. The program must (1) promote local farms to food service programs; (2) establish a structure to facilitate communication between school districts, institutions, farmers, and produce distributors; (3) encourage food service personnel to use locally grown, farm fresh products; (4) assist school districts that participate in the program; and (5) coordinate across state agencies.

*CODIFIED AT S.C. CODE ANN. § 46-3-25*

Tennessee

2019

**H.B. 977/S.B. 674**

Creating an Agriculture Education Pilot for High School Students

H.B. 977/S.B. 674 establishes a four-year agriculture education pilot project for high school students to provide them with knowledge on how to use agricultural skills toward starting a business based in agriculture. The pilot program aims to partner with agricultural farmers, business owners, and organizations around the state to provide hands-on opportunities for students to gain skills that will be useful in careers in agriculture. The program would support students in exploring dual enrollment courses at state institutions of higher education and in setting career goals related to agriculture.

*DEAD*
2017

**H.B. 851/S.B. 1028**

Supporting Local Food Procurement

H.B. 851/S.B. 1028 establish multiple structures to support local food procurement, including a council, statewide procurement goal, and price preference for local foods. The 33 member local food, farms, and jobs council is responsible for providing technical assistance to state agencies and farmers, developing aggregation and processing infrastructure for local foods, and designing a state food promotion label. The bills also set a goal to have state entities purchase 20 percent of food products from local sources by 2024. To help meet this goal, H.B. 851/S.B. 1028 allow state agencies to purchase local foods that cost up to 110 percent of the lowest responsible bid.

*DEAD*

2008

**H.B. 3158/S.B. 3341**

Complying with Nutritional Meal Program Requirements

These bills direct school districts to submit a plan detailing how they will comply with the nutritional breakfast and lunch program requirements. H.B. 3158/S.B. 3341 require that the plan consider local agriculture product availability, freshness, and methods of transportation. The bills also suggest districts allow flexible bidding processes which enable local farmers to bid on portions of a given contract, rather than the entire contract. Allowing such flexibility makes it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

*CODIFIED AT TENN. CODE ANN. § 49-6-2303*

Texas

2019

**H.B. 1696/S.B. 788**  
S.B. 60 (2017)  
S.B. 1107 (2013)

Establishing a Price Preference for Texas Agricultural Products

H.B. 1696/S.B. 788 requires school districts and universities to choose Texas agricultural products when the cost and quality are equal to out-of-state products. When out-of-state products are of equal quality but lower cost, schools may still purchase agricultural products produced, processed, or grown in state but the cost may not exceed 107 percent of the lower-priced product. This 7 percent price preference gives local farmers bidding on school meal contracts a competitive advantage, enabling schools to purchase local foods.

*DEAD*

2017

**H.B. 2438**

Establishing a Preference for Foods from Smaller Producers

H.B. 2438 requires school districts to purchase fresh produce from small farms, community gardens, cooperatives, or greenhouses when possible. This preference gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts and enables schools to purchase local foods.

*DEAD*
H.R. 192
Recognizing 4-H Day at the State Capitol
H.R. 192 establishes 4-H Day at the State Capitol. This resolution notes that food, nutrition, and agricultural education are the most popular 4-H programs in Texas.

ADOPTED

2015

H.B. 1006
Establishing a Preference for Texas Agricultural Products
H.B. 1006 requires state agencies to purchase agricultural products manufactured, produced, or grown in Texas when possible. The bill gives local farmers a competitive advantage when bidding on school meal contracts and enables schools to purchase local foods. If no Texas farm products are available, the bill requires that state agencies then choose agricultural products offered by Texas vendors.

CODIFIED AT TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 2155.444

H.B. 3290
Creating a Farm to School Community Connections Pilot
H.B. 3290 establishes a $5 million grant program to promote awareness of and access to fresh produce. School districts may use the grant funds to purchase food, provide educational programs, and schedule field trips. In addition, H.B. 3290 authorizes the state Department of Agriculture to offset food distribution costs and reimburse school districts 15 cents for every lunch served that contains fresh, local produce.

DEAD

H.R. 1507
Recognizing 4-H Day at the State Capitol
This resolution establishes a 4-H Day at the state capitol.

ADOPTED

S.B. 1204
Waiving License Fees for Certain Aquaculture and Hydroponics Educational Programs
S.B. 1204 authorizes the state Department of Agriculture to waive license fees for public school aquaculture programs. To qualify for the fee waiver, a school must demonstrate that the program promotes sustainable agriculture involving both aquaculture and hydroponics.

CODIFIED AT TEX. AGRIC. CODE ANN. § 134.014

2011

H.B. 2669
Creating an Advisory Committee to Study Urban Farming
H.B. 2669 requires the state Commissioner of Agriculture to establish an advisory committee for urban gardens, which include school gardens. The committee is responsible for investigating the status of urban farms and recommending ways the state can support these farms. H.B. 2669 suggests creating a property tax incentive to reduce the costs of operating an urban farm. The bill also directs the committee to report its findings to the legislature.

DEAD
S.B. 199
Extending Grant Eligibility to Nonprofit Organizations that Partner with Schools
This bill expands the scope of agricultural awareness grants for schools. S.B 199 specifies that eligible grant recipients can include nonprofit organizations that partner with schools.
CODIFIED AT TEX. AGRIC. CODE ANN. § 48.001

2009
S.B. 1027
Establishing an Interagency Farm to School Coordination Task Force
This bill establishes an interagency farm to school coordination task force. Members of this task force include representatives from the state Departments of Agriculture, Health, and Education, as well as fruit and vegetable producers, school food service organizations, food distribution businesses, child nutrition advocacy organizations, parent organizations, and nutrition educators. The task force is required to update nutrition and food education resources, expand food-focused experiential education programs, identify funding sources, create a local foods database for school use, train farmers and ranchers to market their products to schools, and provide technical assistance to schools.
CODIFIED AT TEX. AGRIC. CODE ANN. § 12.0026

Utah

2007
H. 124
Promoting Agricultural Education
This bill directs the Department of Agriculture to work with the State Board of Education to promote agricultural education and appropriates money for promotion.
DEAD

US Virgin Islands

2016
Bill No. 31-0359
Funding the Farm to School Program
This bill provides additional fiscal year 2016 appropriations for some programs, including $10,000 for the Farm to School Program.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2015
Bill No. 31-0186
Funding Farm to School Activities
This bill appropriates $35,000 in matching funds for fiscal year 2016 to aid in the expansion of farm to school activities in the territory.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL BUDGET DOCUMENTS
2012

Bill No. 29-0160
Enacting the Agriculture in the Classroom Act
The Agriculture in the Classroom Act authorizes and establishes an integrated basic agricultural education program within the current curriculum administered in every public school in the Virgin Islands. It also provides for the Agriculture in the Classroom Leadership Council and the Agriculture in the Classroom Fund.

*CODIFIED AT 17 V.I.C. § 41F*

2010

Bill No. 28-0189
Creating the Farm to School Program
This bill establishes the Farm to School Program within the USVI Department of Agriculture to facilitate and promote the sale of Virgin Islands-grown farm products by farms to school districts. It provides for the establishment of a database of farmers interested in selling their products to schools, and for the establishment of the Virgin Islands-Grown for Virgin Islands Kids Week during the National Agriculture Week annually held in March. The bill also encourages school districts to purchase from farmers; provides for outreach, guidance, and training to districts and schools concerning the value of and process for purchasing produce; and directs the USVI Department of Education to arrange connections between local producers and students through field trips and in-school visits.

*ENACTED, YET TO BE CODIFIED*

2006

7 V.I.C. § 16
Promoting the Agricultural Industry
This law directs the USVI Department of Agriculture and Department of Education to work together to promote sustainable agriculture by incorporating agricultural science courses in the curriculum at all grade levels, including kindergarten, and by providing agriculture programs through the school system.

*CODIFIED AT 7 V.I.C. § 16*

1992

Providing for Special Nutrition Programs
This law directs that nutrition programs include locally grown or produced foods where feasible.

*CODIFIED AT 17 V.I.C. § 141*

Vermont

2020

H.C.R. 245
Designating Farm to School Awareness Day
These resolutions designate a Farm to School Awareness Day at the Vermont State House.

*ADOPTED*
2019

H. 79 & H. 525
Relating to Eligibility for Farm to School Grant Assistance
H. 79 and H. 525 amend the Rozo McLaughlin Farm to School Program to include organizations administering or assisting in the development of farm to school programs as eligible entities to apply for a farm to school grant.

CODIFIED AT 6 V.S.A. § 4721

2018

H.16
Funding the Farm to School Program
This bill appropriates a one-time appropriation of $50,000 in addition to the annual appropriation of $181,000 for farm to school initiatives within the Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets for fiscal year 2019.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2017

H. 438
Relating to Health Promotion
This bill includes provisions that require Vermont schools to develop wellness plans that establish health promotion and disease prevention activities during the school day. The bill requires schools to promote healthy behavior in curricula and facilities plans. Farm to school activities promote healthy behavior through education and in school gardens.

DEAD

S. 33
H. 828/S. 169 (2016)
Relating to the Rozo McLaughlin Farm to School Program
Most notably, this bill allows early childhood education centers receive farm to school funding. It also amends the language authorizing the program to add a purpose and goals, which were previously not included. According to S.33, the purpose of the grant program is to enhance students’ educational experience, improve their health, and support the state’s local food economy. Goals include establishing educational programming in 75 percent of schools and schools’ purchasing 50 percent of food from local sources by 2025. Among other things, this bill expands the scope of activities that grants fund and aligns farm to school activities with the state’s School Wellness Policy Guidelines.

CODIFIED AT 6 V.S.A. CH. 211 AT SEC. 4719

2016

H. 827/S. 202
Establishing a Universal Meals Pilot Project under the Farm to School Program
H. 827/S. 202 establish a pilot project to provide universal breakfast and lunch, as well as to increase awareness of local food products. The pilot project will occur in four schools over a two-year period. Participating schools will receive training on how to increase local food purchases and will track health, meal participation, and procurement data.

DEAD
2015

H. 485
Establishing the Agricultural and Rural Heritage Special Fund

H. 485 establishes the Agricultural and Rural Heritage Special Fund with funds collected from the state rooms tax. Six percent of the fund supports the Farm to School Program, which the bill recognizes as a priority in primary education.

DEAD

2014

H.C.R. 299
Encouraging the Use of Local Foods in School Cafeterias

This bill congratulates the winners of Junior Iron Chef Vermont competition, an event celebrating Vermont’s farm to school movement. The recipes students create feature local ingredients and can easily be used in school cafeterias. Junior Iron Chef Vermont began in 2008 as a collaboration between the Burlington School Food Project and Vermont Food Education Every Day to teach Vermont students the importance of healthy eating and using whole, local foods.

ADOPTED

2013

H.C.R. 1
Congratulating Food Works

This bill recognizes the Food Works food hub on their 25th anniversary of providing fresh, local food and education programs. Food Works distributes local foods to public schools and pre-schools, supports the growth of small farms, and plays a significant role in the farm to school movement.

ADOPTED

H.C.R. 64
Celebrating the Use of Local Foods in School Cafeterias

This bill congratulates the winners of the sixth annual Junior Iron Chef Vermont competition. This event celebrates Vermont’s farm to school movement.

ADOPTED

2011

H. 287
Creating a Local Foods Coordinator Position as Part of the Rozo McLaughlin Farm to School Program

This bill establishes the Local Foods Coordinator position within the state Agency of Agriculture. The Local Foods Coordinator is responsible for supporting farm to school programs, matching producers with commercial and institutional markets, encouraging state employees to enroll in local community supported agriculture organizations, developing a database of producers and potential purchasers, and providing technical support to food security efforts. The bill also requires the Agency of Agriculture to coordinate with the Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund to implement the farm to plate investment program.

CODIFIED AT VT. STAT. ANN. TIT. 6, § 4724
2009

H. 192
Encouraging the Use of Local Food in Vermont’s Schools
This bill directs the Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of Human Services, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Food, and Markets to develop a statewide milk and meat pilot program. The pilot would test the effectiveness of a centralized network to purchase milk and meat for school meals, as well as offer technical assistance to schools using local foods. The legislation further directs the Department of Education to apply for federal stimulus funds to purchase local fruits and vegetables through the federal fruit and vegetable grant program.

_ENACTED AS ACT 51, LAWS OF 2009_

H. 313
Encouraging Economic Development in Vermont
H. 313 establishes numerous programs and policies to foster economic development. The bill includes provisions for the Farm to Plate Initiative, directing the Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund to develop a ten-year strategic plan to strengthen Vermont’s farm and food sector. One of the goals of the Initiative is to support existing farm to school programs, specifically to increase school purchases of local foods. The legislation authorizes $100,000 from the state fiscal stabilization funds for the program for fiscal year 2010.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2008

H. 537
Appropriating Money for Farm to School Grants
This bill appropriates $85,000 for the farm to school program. It also appropriates $40,000 for the Food Education Every Day Program to provide farm to school education and teacher training services to more school districts.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2007

H. 91
Creating the Rozo McLaughlin Farm to School Program
This bill creates the Rozo McLaughlin Farm to School Program in the state Agency of Agriculture, Food, and Markets. The Program awards grants to help Vermont schools develop relationships with local farmers and producers. Schools may use the funds for equipment, resources, and training to increase use of local foods in school meals. Schools may also purchase items, including local farm products, and provide professional development to support hands-on education about nutrition and farm to school connections. H. 91 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to help implement educational programs for farmers to increase sales to schools, and the Commissioner of Education to expand regional training for school staff to use locally grown foods. Each grant award may not exceed $15,000.

CODIFIED AT VT. STAT. ANN. TIT. 6, § 4721—23

H. 522
Strengthening Vermont Agriculture
This bill requires the state Agency of Agriculture, Food, and Markets, to work with the Agency of Administration and the Department of Buildings and General Services to help the state adhere to its “buy local” campaign. With the “buy local” campaign, state agencies would purchase local food and dairy products.

CODIFIED AT VT. STAT. ANN. TIT. 6, § 3312, BUT THE H. 522 PROVISIONS WERE LATER REPEALED
2006

**H. 456**

Establishing Mini-Grants for Vermont Food Products and Nutrition Education

This bill establishes a mini-grant program to help schools increase their use of local farm products and to teach students about farm to school connections. Schools may use grant awards to purchase equipment, resources, and materials that increase local food use. Schools can also use funds for professional development for teachers. H. 456 also requires that the Secretary of Agriculture, Food, and Markets; the Commissioner of Education; and the Secretary of Human Services to report strategies that will increase school and state agency use of Vermont food products.

*CODIFIED AT VT. STAT. ANN. TIT. 6, § 4721—23*

2004

**S.J.R. 59**

Urging the United States Congress to Pass the Farm to Cafeteria Projects Act

This resolution urges the United States Congress to enact the Farm to Cafeteria Projects Act, or similar legislation.

*ADOPTED*

---

**Virginia**

2015

**H.J. 692**

Designating Farm to School Week

This resolution designates the first full week in October as Farm to School Week in Virginia.

*ADOPTED*

2010

**H.J.R. 95**

Designating Farm to School Week

This joint resolution recognizes the significant progress of the Farm to School Program and establishes the second full week of November as annual Farm to School Week.

*ADOPTED*

2007

**S.B. 797**

Establishing a Farm to School Website

This bill requires the state Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services to establish a public website to encourage schools, universities, and other educational institutions to purchase Virginia agricultural products. The website must include information such as farmers’ contact information and the amount and type of produce available.

*CODIFIED AT VA. CODE ANN. § 3.2-102*
S.J.R. 347
Establishing a Farm to School Task Force
This joint resolution authorizes the Secretaries of Education and Agriculture and Forestry to establish a Farm to School Task Force. The Task Force is responsible for studying methods to provide local food information to the Department of Education, school districts, and institutions of higher education.
ADOPTED

Washington

2020
H.B. 2325/S.B. 6168
Appropriating Supplemental Funds for the Farm to School Program 2020–2021
H.B. 2325/S.B. 6168 appropriates $250,000 for fiscal year 2020 and $250,000 for fiscal year 2021 to be used solely for the department’s regional markets program which includes the farm to school program.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

H.B. 1863/S.B. 5804
Updating Agriculture, Food and Natural Resource Education Programs
H.B. 1863/S.B. 5804 establishes a learning opportunity in the agriculture, food, and natural resource career cluster area as a Career and Technical Education Program in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide students with opportunities to develop fundamental leadership and communication skills, develop an applied understanding of the agricultural industry and its potential, explore and understand career opportunities through supervised experiences, engage with industry mentors, and plan for career and college success.
DEAD

2019
H.B. 1109
Appropriating Funds for the Farm to School Program
H.B. 1109 appropriates $250,000 for fiscal year 2020 and $250,000 for fiscal year 2021 to be used solely for the department’s regional markets program which includes the farm to school program.
INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

2017
H.B. 1508
Promoting Student Health and Readiness
H.B. 1508 promotes student health in various ways; one such way is to support farm to school activities. The bill directs the Departments of Education and Agriculture to work together to increase local food consumption by providing technical assistance to both farmers and food service providers. H.B. 1508 also authorizes the Department of Education to award grants to students to participate in community food projects. Eligible grant projects target low income and at-risk youth populations. These projects may help improve food security, count for academic credit, or provide career and college support. H.B. 1508 also encourages schools to develop organic gardens that provide produce for school meals.
CODIFIED AT WASH. REV. CODE § 28A.235.150
H.B. 1542
Engaging Youth in Farming to Prevent Dropout
H.B. 1542 authorizes pilot projects to establish an alternative high school program that introduces at-risk youth to farming. As in H.B. 1508 (2017), the pilot projects may help improve food security, count for academic credit, or provide career and college support.

DEAD

H.B. 1551/S.B. 5708
H.B. 1164 (2015)
Enhancing Student Nutrition with Equipment Assistance Grants
H.B. 1551/S.B. 5708 establish the Apple a Day Act, a competitive grant program for equipment assistance in public schools. The goals of the program are to improve the quality of school meals, increase consumption of whole foods and awareness of local agriculture, and encourage scratch cooking methods.

DEAD

H.B. 1552
Fostering Economic Growth in Washington through Food Production
H.B. 1552 directs Washington State University to study and develop a 10-year plan to expand the state’s food production, processing, and distribution capacity. One of the bill’s goals is to link local farms to schools. This bill is similar to H.B. 1710 (2015), except that H.B. 1710 (2015) appropriated funds specifically for farm to school programming.

DEAD

H.B. 1562
Defining the Goals of the Washington Food Policy Forum
H.B. 1562 refines the purpose and goals of the existing state food policy forum, which include increasing local farm product sales and reducing food insecurity. The bill includes a variety of more specific goals, one of which is to determine how the state can procure more local food products for schools.

DEAD

H.R. 4605
Recognizing the Importance of Combating Child Hunger
H.R. 4605 recognizes the work of individuals fighting child hunger. The resolution acknowledges farm to school efforts providing healthy, local foods for children and economic opportunities for Washington farmers.

ADOPTED

2015
H.B. 1685
Establishing a Washington Food Policy Forum
H.B. 1685 establishes a state food policy forum, the goals of which include increasing local farm product sales and reducing food insecurity. The bill lists a variety of more specific goals, one being to determine how the state can procure more local food products for schools. H.B. 1685 also directs the state university to conduct a study on local foods; this study would detail effective strategies to increase local foods education in schools and community groups.

DEAD
H.B. 1710
Fostering Economic Growth in Washington
H.B. 1710 recognizes the importance of local foods and appropriates money to the state Department of Agriculture to revitalize its farm to school program. One of the bill’s goals is to link local farms to schools. In addition, the bill directs Washington State University to develop a ten-year plan to expand the state’s food production, processing, and distribution capacity. This bill is similar to H.B. 1552 (2017), except that H.B. 1552 does not include funding for the initiatives.

DEAD

2014
H.B. 2098
Restructuring the Departments Responsible for Implementing Washington’s Farm to School Program
This bill amends existing farm to school legislation to include the Department of Enterprise Services as one of the agencies required to consult with the Department of Agriculture on Washington’s farm to school program.

DEAD

H.B. 2185/S.B. 6002 (2014)
H.B. 1276 (2013)
Engaging Youth in Farming to Prevent Dropouts
H.B. 1542 authorizes pilot projects to establish an alternative high school program to introduce at-risk youth to farming. As in H.B. 1508 (2017), the pilot projects may help improve food security, count for academic credit, or provide career and college support.

S.B. 6002 WAS INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS; H.B. 2185 DIED

H.B. 2410
Establishing a Grant Program to Enhance Student Nutrition in Public Schools
This bill establishes Apple a Day, a competitive grant program, to help public schools purchase equipment to increase schools’ capacity to store, prepare, and serve minimally processed whole foods. The bill provides that the Superintendent of Public Instruction will prioritize schools that have already engaged in farm to school efforts or already purchase Washington-grown food as grant recipients.

DEAD

2013
S.B. 5901
Providing Education Reforms
This bill repeals RCWA 28A.320.185, which permits school gardens or farms.

DEAD
2008

H.B. 2798/S.B. 6483
Creating a Farm to School Program

These bills include several provisions related to local food production: a farm to school program, the Washington Grown Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Grant Program, new food procurement and contract procedures, and local foods appropriations. The farm to school program is responsible for facilitating school purchases of Washington-grown food, while the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Grant Program provides funding to purchase nutritious snacks. H. 2798/S.B. 6483 also encourage state institutions to purchase Washington-grown produce to the maximum extent possible, and allow school districts to develop new contract policies, such as a price preference policy. And, as a result of this legislation, schools can grow fruits and vegetables for educational purposes. In 2008, the state authorized $1.49 million to implement the legislation – $600,000 of this sum became available to elementary schools with high numbers of low-income students for the fruit and vegetable snack program.

CODIFIED AT WASH. REV. CODE § 15.64.060, BUT SINCE REPEALED

2002

H.B. 2657
Encouraging State Institutions to Purchase Washington Agricultural Products

This bill requires the Department of General Administration to encourage state and local agencies to purchase Washington agricultural products when available. The bill requires the Department of General Administration to work with the Department of Agriculture to recommend strategies to increase public purchase of Washington agricultural products.

CODIFIED AT WASH. REV. CODE § 43.19.706, BUT REPEALED JUNE 12, 2008

West Virginia

2020

S.B. 173
S.B. 14 (2019)
S.B. 572 (2018)

Creating the West Virginia Farm to School Program

These bills create the West Virginia Farm to School Grant Program to promote fresh, healthy, and local agricultural products in public schools and to provide an incentive for farmers to sell local foods to public schools in the state.

DEAD

2017

S.R. 21

Designating a West Virginia Local Foods Day

This resolution establishes February 23, 2017 as West Virginia Local Foods Day in the legislature. Local food economies allow state institutions, including schools, to purchase foods grown nearby. They may also promote other farm to school activities.

ADOPTED
2016
S.R. 10
Designating a West Virginia Local Foods Day
This resolution establishes January 26, 2016 as West Virginia Local Foods Day in the legislature. Local food economies allow state institutions, including schools, to purchase foods nearby. They may also promote other farm to school activities.
ADOPTED

2015
S.R. 33
Designating a West Virginia Local Foods Day
This resolution recognizes the importance of local food economies and establishes February 17, 2015 as West Virginia Local Foods Day in the legislature. Local food economies enable state institutions, including schools, to purchase local foods. They may also encourage other farm to school activities.
ADOPTED

2014
H.R. 15
Recognizing the Importance of Vocational Agricultural Programs
This resolution recognizes the importance of retaining vocational agricultural programs in West Virginia schools. The resolution notes that such programs are vital to the future of agriculture in West Virginia and promote healthy lifestyles by increasing access to local agricultural products.
DEAD

S.R. 16
Designating Preston County Day
Recognizing the County for its history, culture, and economy, this resolution designates February 5, 2014, as Preston County Day in the legislature. The resolution acknowledges that Preston County has a rich agricultural heritage and is a state leader in agriculture. The resolution further acknowledges that the Department of Agriculture started the statewide Farm to School Initiative at Preston High School.
ADOPTED

2013
S.B. 663
Creating the West Virginia Feed to Achieve Act
This bill encourages healthy food initiatives such as community gardens and farm to school programs. It mandates that the state Department of Education and each county board of education establish a fund providing food to students through various initiatives, including farm to school activities and community gardens. S.B. 663 requires state and local educational entities work with the federal and state Department of Agriculture, Department of Health and Human Resources, local master gardeners, county extension agents, and other experts to develop programs that teach students how to produce healthy food.
CODIFIED AT W. VA. CODE § 18-5D ET SEQ., REPEALING W. VA. CODE § 18-5-3
Wisconsin

2020

A.B. 56/S.B. 59
Appropriations for the Farm to School Grant Program
A.B. 56 appropriates $90,500 to administer the state’s farm to school program in 2019–2020 and $90,600 to administer the program in 2020–2021. S.B. 59 appropriated the same amount as A.B. 56 with an additional $200,000 each year (2019–2020 and 2020–21) for the state’s farm to school grant program but it did not pass.

A.B. 56 WAS INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS; S.B. 59 DIED

2017

A.B. 45/S.B. 14
A.B. 87 (2015)
Purchasing from Wisconsin Businesses
A.B. 45/S.B. 14 amend the provision of the state code that gives American-made products a competitive advantage in the contract process. The bills require government entities to purchase at least 20 percent of their products and services from Wisconsin-based businesses and to increase this percentage annually. This local preference provision makes it easier for schools to purchase local foods.

DEAD

A.B. 64/S.B. 30
Eliminating the Farm to School Program and Council
This is a broad budget bill that includes funding for the statewide Farm to School Program. The original version of this bill recommended eliminating this program, but the final version of the bill did not do so.

INCLUDED IN ANNUAL STATE BUDGET DOCUMENTS

A.B. 215
Requiring Health Education
A.B. 215 requires health courses for grades 7 through 12 to include nutrition education. The course should provide information about the Dietary Guidelines for Americans and educate students about the role food plays in promoting health, preventing chronic disease, and maintaining a healthy weight. Food education is one of the core tenets of farm to school programs.

ENACTED; YET TO BE CODIFIED

2015

A.B. 89
A.B. 304 (2013)
Allocating Money for Farm to School Grants
A.B. 89 provides funding for the farm to school grant program. The program connects schools to nearby farms, educates students about nutrition and agriculture, and supplements farm incomes. Existing law authorizes such a program, but previous budget acts did not allocate funds.

DEAD
2011

**S.B. 567**

**Establishing a Pilot Farm to School Program**

This bill directs the Department of Public Instruction administer two pilot farm to school programs in rural school districts where at least 65 percent of the pupils are eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch. It also appropriates money to support Public Instruction positions to oversee the programs.

*DEAD*

2009

**A.B. 746**

**Establishing a Farm to School Program**

This bill requires the state Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection to promote the use of state-grown food in school meals through Farm to School programs. The bill creates a farm to school coordinator position within the Department, a state farm to school advisory council, and a farm to school grant program to provide funds to school districts, nonprofit organizations, and others. A.B. 746 requires the Department to facilitate school purchases of local foods and provide technical assistance to food service personnel. The Department must also promote nutrition and agricultural education, including farm visits, cooking demonstrations, composting, and gardening at schools.

*CODIFIED AT WIS. STAT. § 15.137 AND WIS. STAT. § 93.49*

**Wyoming**

2017

**S.F. 123**

**Covering Processing Costs for Donated, Local Meat**

S.F. 123 establishes a pilot project to increase the availability of Wyoming meat products in school lunches. The pilot project provides $25,000 in grants to cover the costs associated with processing Wyoming meat donated to a school district.

*ENACTED, BUT NOT YET CODIFIED*

2015

**H.J. 6**

**Supporting Policies that Promote Local Food Production**

H.J. 0006 recognizes the importance of developing local food systems and educating the public about their benefits. The resolution encourages government agencies to support educational institutions promoting local foods, and specifically promotes farm to school efforts.

*ADOPTED*
2009

**H.B. 194**

**Wyoming Healthy Food Initiative Act**

This bill ensures that state institutional food service programs purchase, to the extent possible, food grown, processed, and prepared in Wyoming. It establishes an executive task force to help schools and other state institutions purchase local foods and appropriates $66,000 for the task force. The legislation's purposes include helping individuals develop healthy eating habits and improving food producers' access to markets. H.B. 194 promotes food that is fresh and minimally processed, low in pesticide and herbicide input, pasture-based, hormone- and antibiotic-free, and not genetically modified. It also promotes activities that provide students with hands-on learning opportunities including nutrition and agriculture education, animal husbandry and cooking demonstrations, school gardening and composting programs, and farm and ranch visits.

*DEAD*
APPENDIX
Methodology: The Coding Process

Authors searched for legislation between 2019–2020 for each state, Washington, DC, and US territories using the following keywords:

“Farm to school” or “Farm-to-school”
“Farm to preschool”
• “farm to child care”
• “farm to early care and education”
• “farm to table”

“School gardens”
• “gardens”
• “gardening”

“Local procurement”
• “small purchase threshold”
• “procurement”
• “school meals”
• “school food procurement”

“Food education”
• “agriculture education”
• “nutrition education”

“Universal meals”
• “CEP” and “community eligibility expansion”
• “free meal”
• “free and reduced-price lunch”
• “universal school breakfast/lunch”
• “no cost meal”

“Food education”
• “agriculture education”
• “nutrition education”

“Socially disadvantaged”
• “producers of color”
• “farmers of color”
• “minority farmers”

“COVID-19”
• “coronavirus”
• “pandemic”

The threshold questions were used to determine whether a policy would be included in the final dataset for analysis. Thus, each bill introduced in 2019 or 2020 included in this Handbook answers a “yes” to at least one of the threshold questions below:

Does the bill/resolution...

• explicitly include local food procurement or a local food preference within a farm to school context?
• explicitly include school gardens within a farm to school context?
• explicitly include food and/or agriculture (i.e., garden, farm) and/or nutrition education within a farm to school context?
• establish a universal meals program or include funding for universal meals?
• expand the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)?
• explicitly give procurement preference to small producers or producers of color?
• include support measures for farmers or school food service in response to the COVID-19 pandemic?

Once a bill passed at least one of the threshold questions, we identified any additional farm to school related components the bill contained, including:

• Statewide farm to school programs
• Task forces, councils and working groups
• Farm to school coordinator positions
• Grant programs
• Appropriations & other revenue streams
• Reimbursement & incentive programs
• State databases or directories
• Pilot programs
• Food hubs
• Economic development, food Security, and health Policies
• Economic, health and racial equity
• Promotional programs or events
• Resolutions
Additional Farm to School Resources

Click on any document for more information

**National Farm to School Network Resources**
- About National Farm to School Network
- National Farm to School Network Website
- Policy Webpage
- Equity Webpage
- Core Values
- Farm to School Advocacy Fact Sheet
- Benefits of Farm to School Fact Sheet
- Economic Impacts of Farm to School: Case Studies and Assessment Tools
- Evaluation for Transformation: A Cross-Sectoral Evaluation Framework for Farm to School
- State Farm to School Networks Toolkit
- State Farm to School Positions Guide

**Farm to School Advocacy Tools & Resources**
- National Farm to School Network Advocacy Fact Sheet
- DC Hunger Solutions, Healthy Tots Sign-on Letter
- Ecotrust, The Impact of Seven Cents
- Community Food Security Coalition, Strengthening Farm to School Programs: A Policy Brief for State & Local Legislators

**Alabama**
- Farm to School Reimbursement Promotion
- Alabama Farm to School Reimbursement Training Video
  (For any questions, please contact Beth Spratt, AL Department of Agriculture & Industries at beth.spratt@agi.alabama.gov)

**Alaska**
- Information Insights, Process Evaluation of the First Year of Alaska’s Farm to School Program

**Texas**
- Interagency Farm to School Coordination Task Force, Shaping Texas’ Farm to School Future

**Vermont**
- Support Expanding Farm to School in Vermont
- Benefits of Farm to School in Vermont
- Celebrating Increased Farm to School Funding
- Universal School Meals Serve up Many Benefits

**Wisconsin**
- Maintain funding for the Wisconsin Farm to School Program

**General Advocacy Tools & Resources**
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Center to Prevent Childhood Obesity, Advocacy Resource Guide
- School Nutrition Association, State and Grassroots Advocacy Tools
- Voices for Healthy Kids, Healthy Food Access Messages
- Voices for Healthy Kids, Tips for Effective Messaging to Support Public Policy Change

**Other Databases, Reports, & Resources**
- Food Policy Networks’ Food Policy Council Database
- National Association of State Boards of Education’s School Health Policy Database
- US Department of Agriculture’s Farm to School Census
- US Department of Agriculture, Trends in US Local and Regional Food Systems
- US Department of Agriculture, Farm to School Literature Review
- US Department of Agriculture, Using DoD Fresh to Purchase Local Foods
- US Department of Agriculture Farm to School Grant program
US Territories

Beginning in 2017, the National Farm to School Network expanded to include the five US territories of American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands. As a result, the 2018 edition of this Handbook was the first time these territories were included. However, legislation in Guam, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands dates back as far as the 1920s, well before the farm to school movement was recognized or established, and demonstrates a long-standing commitment to serving nutritious food in schools while supporting local agricultural economies.

Puerto Rico has a long history of supporting agricultural education in schools. A 1923 law in Puerto Rico (codified at 22 L.P.R.A. § 116) mandates that rural schools receive agricultural supplies such as seeds, domestic animals, and agricultural implements to establish school gardens. A 1925 law (codified at 18 L.P.R.A. § 548) provides that each rural school receive a parcel of land to be used as a school garden and such agricultural implements as may be necessary to cultivate it. In 1999, Puerto Rico enacted legislation (codified at 3 L.P.R.A. § 143h) allowing schools with agricultural education programs to retain 60 percent of the total proceeds of their sales in order to improve school gardens.

The US Virgin Islands and Guam have both passed laws related to incorporating locally produced foods in school meals. A 1992 law in the US Virgin Islands (17 V.I.C. § 141) requires government-funded nutrition programs to include locally grown or produced foods wherever possible. In Guam, Bill No.22 (LS) (1995) encourages government agencies to give preference to local produce and fish.

The analysis and bill summaries sections in this Handbook includes all legislation introduced and passed in US territories since 2002. National Farm to School Network is grateful to be working with partners in the territories to grow and sustain active and robust farm to school networks to advocate for stronger farm to school legislation.
Overview

Hawai‘i’s modern-day farm to school movement began in 2005, when local advocacy organizations convened to research farm to school programs nationwide and turn the findings into a Hawai‘i-based farm to school program. The first farm to school program in Hawai‘i, the ‘ĀINA In Schools program, was a grassroots initiative launched by the Kōkua Hawai‘i Foundation. In 2008, The Kohala Center launched the Hawai‘i Island School Garden Network to support farm to school initiatives on Hawai‘i Island. Then, in 2010, advocates created the Hawai‘i Farm to School and School Garden Hui (statewide network) to strengthen Hawai‘i’s farm to school movement through capacity building and professional development, policy development and advocacy, and resource development and sharing. The Hui is comprised of five island-level networks, community organizations, schools, producers, and representatives from the University of Hawai‘i, as well as from the Hawai‘i State Department of Health, the Department of Education (HIDOE), and the Department of Agriculture (HDOA).

Since then, Hawai‘i has embedded a farm to school coordinator first into HDOA and then into HIDOE. In 2015, S.B. 376 (Act 218) established a farm to school program and coordinator position within HDOA to address issues of supply, demand, procurement, and consumption of Hawai‘i-grown foods within state facilities (primarily schools). In 2018, the Hawai‘i State Legislature funded HIDOE’s School Food Services Branch to create a farm to school coordinator position to increase procurement of local foods in public schools across Hawai‘i. As of 2019, the Hawai‘i Farm to School Program is primarily overseen by HIDOE, and HDOA no longer employs a farm to school coordinator. However, HDOA is working to establish one new “farm to state” position to continue supporting agricultural initiatives that address the issues of supply, demand, and consumption of Hawai‘i-grown foods, and will be asking the 2019 legislature for the funding required to run this program.

STRATEGY 1:
CONVENE STAKEHOLDERS TO COALESCE AROUND AND SPUR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

In 2014, advocates hosted a conference of key stakeholders, including advocates and relevant state agencies, to facilitate conversations around strengthening the farm to school movement in Hawai‘i. During that conference, HDOA committed to establishing a coordinator position within the agency. The Hawai‘i Farm to School and School Garden Hui then organized a “Farm to School Legislative Breakfast” event in January 2015 and led advocacy efforts at the capitol to engage legislators in passing the bill, S.B. 376, to create that position. Governor David Ige signed the bill into law in 2015 and the position was funded by the legislature for one year (2016). In 2017-2018, HDOA relied on the Agricultural Development and Food Security Special Fund to support the position. This fund, established in 2010 (H.B. 2421) through the “Barrel Tax” levied on fuel imports, supports initiatives designed to increase Hawai‘i’s food and energy self-sufficiency and has been utilized for farm to school efforts in the state.
CASE STUDY 1: Hawai‘i

STRATEGY 1: Farm to school procurement emphasizes not only locally grown and raised foods but also culturally relevant foods. The Farm to School Advisory Group leveraged foundation funding to hire a sustainable food service consultant in 2016 to develop a small-scale pilot program in the Kohala Complex on Hawai‘i Island. Using feedback from students and staff about their eating and cooking preferences, they were able to pilot a move from processed to scratch-cooked meals that included traditional foods from local suppliers. Recent federal grant funding has further enabled schools to integrate these types of traditional foods into their meals. In 2018, Hawai‘i received two USDA Farm to School Grants. One of the grants enables a local breadfruit producers’ cooperative to collaborate with HIDOE to incorporate more breadfruit into meals and farm to school education. The other grant enables HIDOE to train cafeteria staff in preparing locally sourced, scratch-cooked meals from local farmers, as well as local distributors in how to contract with HIDOE.

STRATEGY 2: CULTIVATE STRONG ADMINISTRATIVE CHAMPIONS

Advocates had primarily relied on private funds to support movement-building efforts for farm to school in the state. Passage of S.B. 376 in 2015 and continued advocacy from the Hui and grassroots advocates prompted Lieutenant Governor Shan Tsutsui to focus on farm to school as one of his legacy initiatives. Lieutenant Governor Tsutsui created a Farm to School Advisory Group, which helped to further embed farm to school efforts within state government. Ultimately, the support of the Office of the Lieutenant Governor helped expand the initiative into the ‘Aina Pono Hawai‘i State Farm to School Program, now housed within HIDOE’s School Food Services Branch.

STRATEGY 3: INVEST IN ALL THREE FARM TO SCHOOL CORE ELEMENTS

Farm to school includes the three core elements of procurement, gardens, and education. In 2015, in addition to S.B. 376 focused on procurement, the Hawai‘i legislature adopted S.R. 80, which connected farm to school and school gardens with the need to increase the agricultural workforce and support food security and self-sufficiency in Hawai‘i. This resolution requested that the University of Hawai‘i convene a working group to develop a coordinated framework of support for preschool through post-secondary (P-20) agricultural education, including an implementation plan. The group has provided annual reports to the legislature and in 2019 is working toward establishing and funding a full-time P-20 Agriculture Education Coordinator for the state through S.B. 762. Housed in the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, the coordinator would focus primarily on integrating agricultural education into teacher education programs.

Discussions are also underway to increase support for school garden programs from within the HIDOE Office of Curriculum and Instructional Design, as approximately 67 percent of public K-12 schools (171 of 256) in the state use gardens for standards-based instruction.

STRATEGY 4: INTEGRATE TRADITIONAL, LOCALLY GROWN FOODS INTO SCHOOL MEALS

Farm to school procurement emphasizes not only locally grown and raised foods but also culturally relevant foods. The Farm to School Advisory Group leveraged foundation funding to hire a sustainable food service consultant in 2016 to develop a small-scale pilot program in the Kohala Complex on Hawai‘i Island. Using feedback from students and staff about their eating and cooking preferences, they were able to pilot a move from processed to scratch-cooked meals that included traditional foods from local suppliers.

Recent federal grant funding has further enabled schools to integrate these types of traditional foods into their meals. In 2018, Hawai‘i received two USDA Farm to School Grants. One of the grants enables a local breadfruit producers’ cooperative to collaborate with HIDOE to incorporate more breadfruit into meals and farm to school education. The other grant enables HIDOE to train cafeteria staff in preparing locally sourced, scratch-cooked meals from local farmers, as well as local distributors in how to contract with HIDOE.
Since 2001, Michigan advocates have promoted farm to school ideals and practices. For example, starting in 2004, the Groundwork Center for Resilient Communities launched farm to school classroom programming in one school district in northwest Lower Michigan, which spread quickly to schools throughout the region. In 2007, the Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems (CRFS) hired a full-time Farm to Institution Specialist to support activities across the state through research, education, and outreach. Since 2011, CFRS has administered the MI Farm to School Grant Program, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

In 2009, stakeholders across the nonprofit, government, academic, philanthropic, and private sectors came together to develop the 2010 Michigan Good Food Charter, a “roadmap for a food system rooted in local communities and centered on good food.” The Charter recommended, among other initiatives, a match incentive of 10 cents per school lunch through public-private partnerships for school districts to purchase locally grown produce. Through USDA child nutrition programs, schools have only about $1 to $1.20 per meal to spend, and, of that, only about 20 to 30 cents for fruits and vegetables.

In 2013, the Groundwork Center successfully piloted this matching program with funds from several local businesses, individuals, and foundations. The program has now evolved into a state-funded pilot program called 10 Cents a Meal for School Kids and Farms. Through competitive grants administered by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), school districts can receive up to 10 cents per meal in incentive matching reimbursement to purchase and serve Michigan-grown fruits, vegetables, and legumes served as part of any USDA child nutrition program (school breakfast, lunch, afterschool snacks, and suppers). 10 Cents a Meal program funding is appropriated annually as part of the state’s education budget, and the legislature has expanded both the funding and geographic reach of the pilot each year. In the 2016-2017 school year, the state-funded pilot project (S.B. 801) appropriated $250,000, which served 48,000 students in 16 districts. In the 2017-2018 school year, the legislature appropriated $375,000 (S.B. 133), serving 95,000 students in 32 districts. The current appropriation (H.B. 5579) for the 2018-2019 school year is $575,000, which serves over 134,000 students in 57 school districts.

**Overview**

Since 2001, Michigan advocates have promoted farm to school ideals and practices. For example, starting in 2004, the Groundwork Center for Resilient Communities launched farm to school classroom programming in one school district in northwest Lower Michigan, which spread quickly to schools throughout the region. In 2007, the Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems (CRFS) hired a full-time Farm to Institution Specialist to support activities across the state through research, education, and outreach. Since 2011, CFRS has administered the MI Farm to School Grant Program, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

In 2009, stakeholders across the nonprofit, government, academic, philanthropic, and private sectors came together to develop the 2010 Michigan Good Food Charter, a “roadmap for a food system rooted in local communities and centered on good food.” The Charter recommended, among other initiatives, a match incentive of 10 cents per school lunch through public-private partnerships for school districts to purchase locally grown produce. Through USDA child nutrition programs, schools have only about $1 to $1.20 per meal to spend, and, of that, only about 20 to 30 cents for fruits and vegetables.

In 2013, the Groundwork Center successfully piloted this matching program with funds from several local businesses, individuals, and foundations. The program has now evolved into a state-funded pilot program called 10 Cents a Meal for School Kids and Farms. Through competitive grants administered by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), school districts can receive up to 10 cents per meal in incentive matching reimbursement to purchase and serve Michigan-grown fruits, vegetables, and legumes served as part of any USDA child nutrition program (school breakfast, lunch, afterschool snacks, and suppers). 10 Cents a Meal program funding is appropriated annually as part of the state’s education budget, and the legislature has expanded both the funding and geographic reach of the pilot each year. In the 2016-2017 school year, the state-funded pilot project (S.B. 801) appropriated $250,000, which served 48,000 students in 16 districts. In the 2017-2018 school year, the legislature appropriated $375,000 (S.B. 133), serving 95,000 students in 32 districts. The current appropriation (H.B. 5579) for the 2018-2019 school year is $575,000, which serves over 134,000 students in 57 school districts.
**CASE STUDY 2: Michigan**

Strategic partnerships between government, nonprofit, and grassroots sectors have been critical to the program’s success. MDE administers the program and publishes yearly reports to the Michigan legislature with the assistance of the Groundwork Center, CRFS, the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, and representatives (e.g., food service directors) from each eligible region.

CRFS leads evaluation of the 10 Cents a Meal program, primarily through monthly surveys of participating food service directors to document perceived impacts and outcomes, including feedback from kids who participate in the school meal program. In the 2018-2019 pilot year, evaluation efforts expanded to include cafeteria and classroom surveys of students in a subset of participating districts. The Groundwork Center provides communications and outreach support, such as managing the [10 Cents a Meal website](#), which houses success stories, reports, and other resources.

The Groundwork Center has also collaborated with other organizations and coalitions to elevate the profile of 10 Cents across the state, such as with Healthy Kids, Healthy Michigan, a coalition of over 100 organizations dedicated to reducing childhood obesity. 10 Cents a Meal is now one of Healthy Kids, Healthy Michigan’s top policy priorities.

---

### STRATEGY 2: CULTIVATE DIVERSE, MULTI-SECTORAL PARTNERSHIPS

Strategic partnerships between government, nonprofit, and grassroots sectors have been critical to the program’s success. MDE administers the program and publishes yearly reports to the Michigan legislature with the assistance of the Groundwork Center, CRFS, the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, and representatives (e.g., food service directors) from each eligible region.

CRFS leads evaluation of the 10 Cents a Meal program, primarily through monthly surveys of participating food service directors to document perceived impacts and outcomes, including feedback from kids who participate in the school meal program. In the 2018-2019 pilot year, evaluation efforts expanded to include cafeteria and classroom surveys of students in a subset of participating districts. The Groundwork Center provides communications and outreach support, such as managing the [10 Cents a Meal website](#), which houses success stories, reports, and other resources.

The Groundwork Center has also collaborated with other organizations and coalitions to elevate the profile of 10 Cents across the state, such as with Healthy Kids, Healthy Michigan, a coalition of over 100 organizations dedicated to reducing childhood obesity. 10 Cents a Meal is now one of Healthy Kids, Healthy Michigan’s top policy priorities.

---

### STRATEGY 3: FOCUS ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND NETWORK BUILDING

Technical assistance, training, and network building have taken many forms to positively impact the program. For example, the Michigan Farm to Institution Network, which CRFS coordinates, worked with Cultivate Michigan Marketplace (a statewide campaign to help grow farm to institution programs) to hold events in 10 Cents regions to connect food service buyers with suppliers.

Advocacy training has also been critical. After food service directors received support in how to contact their legislators, the 10 Cents a Meal program later expanded to regions where legislators had received contact from food service directors and other stakeholders in their districts.

The Groundwork Center is also launching a 10 Cents network to link communities, farm to school champions, school districts, and policymakers. The network will be a platform to share experiences and strategies that build grassroots knowledge about the 10 Cents a Meal program.

---

### STRATEGY 4: SHARE RESOURCES AND MEASURE IMPACT

Advocates have developed a wide range of promotional and educational resources that have influenced the program’s expansion. The [10 Cents website](#), in addition to resources for schools and farms, houses “tools for communities” such as awareness-raising fact sheets. A recent survey by the Groundwork Center indicated that respondents had taken action to promote 10 Cents a Meal in 56 of Michigan’s 83 counties.

CRFS’s monthly surveys of food service directors also gathers data on the impact this program has on children. In the 2017-2018 school year, food service directors identified 65 Michigan-grown fruits, vegetables, and legumes that they tried with students for the first time, up from 30 in the 2016-2017 school year.

MDE also contracts with FarmLogix to streamline invoice tracking and facilitate data collection and reporting. In the 2017-2018 school year, 112 farms in 34 Michigan counties sold 80 different products through the 10 Cents a Meal program, plus an additional 19 businesses such as local processors, distributors, and food hubs.
Trends in 2014 State Farm to School Legislation

New Mexico has been a national leader in farm to school legislation, passing its first farm to school law in 2001. The 2001 resolution (H.J.M 34) directed the New Mexico State Department of Agriculture (NMDA) and the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) to research strategies to include local foods in public school meals. In 2005, a bill that limited and removed unhealthy food competitors in schools (H.B. 61) garnered strong public support. The measure passed, resulting in the removal of unhealthy foods that compete with healthier options from elementary schools and minimizing these foods in middle and high schools.

H.B. 61, combined with changes to federal nutrition guidelines in 2007, inspired an innovative farm to school bill that year that would have appropriated $1.44 million for a New Mexico-grown fresh fruit and vegetable procurement program. This bill did not pass, but the legislature did appropriate $85,000 for NMDA to pilot such a procurement program in the Albuquerque public school system. This pilot was so popular that the legislature now appropriates $85,000 for the Albuquerque school district to purchase New Mexico-grown produce every year.

Meanwhile, advocacy efforts were underway to expand farm to school funding statewide. Bills were introduced each year in 2013 and 2014 that would have appropriated $1.44 million to procure local fruits and vegetables. Neither the 2013 nor the 2014 bill passed. However, other measures were successful. The legislature appropriated $100,000 (H.B. 2) in 2013, $240,000 in 2014 (S.B. 313), $364,000 in 2015 (H.B. 2), and $250,000 in 2016 (H.B. 2) for the New Mexico Grown Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Grant Program, a project of NMPED that reimburses schools operating a National School Lunch or Breakfast Program for local fresh fruit and vegetable purchases. The farm to school budget was then zeroed out in 2017 due to a difficult state budget year. However, in 2018, funding was not only restored but increased to $425,000 (H.B. 2). Advocates are seeking to obtain permanent funding for the incentive program in 2019 to avoid having to go through the appropriations process each year to secure funds, or facing a situation like the one in 2017 when funding ceased altogether.

As a result of the increasing interest and activity surrounding local fruit and vegetable purchasing for school meals, NMPED established a permanent Farm to School Specialist position in early 2018. The new position manages the New Mexico Grown program and evaluates data on school purchases, farm sales, and more.
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New Mexico has been a national leader in farm to school legislation, passing its first farm to school law in 2001. The 2001 resolution (H.J.M 34) directed the New Mexico State Department of Agriculture (NMDA) and the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) to research strategies to include local foods in public school meals. In 2005, a bill that limited and removed unhealthy food competitors in schools (H.B. 61) garnered strong public support. The measure passed, resulting in the removal of unhealthy foods that compete with healthier options from elementary schools and minimizing these foods in middle and high schools.

H.B. 61, combined with changes to federal nutrition guidelines in 2007, inspired an innovative farm to school bill that year that would have appropriated $1.44 million for a New Mexico-grown fresh fruit and vegetable procurement program. This bill did not pass, but the legislature did appropriate $85,000 for NMDA to pilot such a procurement program in the Albuquerque public school system. This pilot was so popular that the legislature now appropriates $85,000 for the Albuquerque school district to purchase New Mexico-grown produce every year.

Meanwhile, advocacy efforts were underway to expand farm to school funding statewide. Bills were introduced each year in 2013 and 2014 that would have appropriated $1.44 million to procure local fruits and vegetables. Neither the 2013 nor the 2014 bill passed. However, other measures were successful. The legislature appropriated $100,000 (H.B. 2) in 2013, $240,000 in 2014 (S.B. 313), $364,000 in 2015 (H.B. 2), and $250,000 in 2016 (H.B. 2) for the New Mexico Grown Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Grant Program, a project of NMPED that reimburses schools operating a National School Lunch or Breakfast Program for local fresh fruit and vegetable purchases. The farm to school budget was then zeroed out in 2017 due to a difficult state budget year. However, in 2018, funding was not only restored but increased to $425,000 (H.B. 2). Advocates are seeking to obtain permanent funding for the incentive program in 2019 to avoid having to go through the appropriations process each year to secure funds, or facing a situation like the one in 2017 when funding ceased altogether.

As a result of the increasing interest and activity surrounding local fruit and vegetable purchasing for school meals, NMPED established a permanent Farm to School Specialist position in early 2018. The new position manages the New Mexico Grown program and evaluates data on school purchases, farm sales, and more.

CASE STUDY 3:
New Mexico
Advocacy & Partnerships to Increase Local Fruit & Vegetable Procurement

Overview

New Mexico has been a national leader in farm to school legislation, passing its first farm to school law in 2001. The 2001 resolution (H.J.M 34) directed the New Mexico State Department of Agriculture (NMDA) and the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) to research strategies to include local foods in public school meals. In 2005, a bill that limited and removed unhealthy food competitors in schools (H.B. 61) garnered strong public support. The measure passed, resulting in the removal of unhealthy foods that compete with healthier options from elementary schools and minimizing these foods in middle and high schools.

H.B. 61, combined with changes to federal nutrition guidelines in 2007, inspired an innovative farm to school bill that year that would have appropriated $1.44 million for a New Mexico-grown fresh fruit and vegetable procurement program. This bill did not pass, but the legislature did appropriate $85,000 for NMDA to pilot such a procurement program in the Albuquerque public school system. This pilot was so popular that the legislature now appropriates $85,000 for the Albuquerque school district to purchase New Mexico-grown produce every year.

Meanwhile, advocacy efforts were underway to expand farm to school funding statewide. Bills were introduced each year in 2013 and 2014 that would have appropriated $1.44 million to procure local fruits and vegetables. Neither the 2013 nor the 2014 bill passed. However, other measures were successful. The legislature appropriated $100,000 (H.B. 2) in 2013, $240,000 in 2014 (S.B. 313), $364,000 in 2015 (H.B. 2), and $250,000 in 2016 (H.B. 2) for the New Mexico Grown Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Grant Program, a project of NMPED that reimburses schools operating a National School Lunch or Breakfast Program for local fresh fruit and vegetable purchases. The farm to school budget was then zeroed out in 2017 due to a difficult state budget year. However, in 2018, funding was not only restored but increased to $425,000 (H.B. 2). Advocates are seeking to obtain permanent funding for the incentive program in 2019 to avoid having to go through the appropriations process each year to secure funds, or facing a situation like the one in 2017 when funding ceased altogether.

As a result of the increasing interest and activity surrounding local fruit and vegetable purchasing for school meals, NMPED established a permanent Farm to School Specialist position in early 2018. The new position manages the New Mexico Grown program and evaluates data on school purchases, farm sales, and more.

STRATEGY 1:
BUILD STRONG PARTNERSHIPS TO GROW PUBLIC AND POLITICAL SUPPORT

New Mexico has passed farm to school legislation thanks to the strong partnerships among agencies, schools, nonprofits, and farmers, which built demand across the state for farm to school legislation. These organizations initially focused on farm to school as a business opportunity for New Mexico farmers; once a relationship formed between nonprofits and state agencies, legislation and funding took off. Increased public support for farm to school, showcased through advocacy events like the New Mexico Food and Farms Day and School Nutrition Day at the New Mexico State Capitol, combined with agencies’ ability to conduct per-student cost analyses for meals, made the case for the legislature to start appropriating funds for the local procurement program. Farm to school advocates plan to continue building relationships among farmers, schools, communities, and the legislature to increase the amount of local foods in school meals in the future.
CASE STUDY 3: New Mexico

STRATEGY 2:
FOCUS ON FLEXIBLE AND EASY-TO-ACCESS REIMBURSEMENTS

In New Mexico, the lump-sum incentive grant program through New Mexico Grown has proven to be the best way to meet the needs of the broad range of public, charter, and tribal schools across the state. Food service directors and school food authorities want flexibility in the types of food served to their students. The reimbursement grant approach minimizes paperwork for school districts by providing a lump-sum reimbursement for local produce purchasing, rather than a per-meal incentive (as in the Michigan case study).

Any school food authority in New Mexico operating a National School Lunch Program or School Breakfast Program is eligible to apply for reimbursement grants for local fruits and vegetables purchased. This includes private, charter, and tribal school food authorities. Each year, NMPED issues a request for proposals. To receive reimbursement, school food authorities apply for a specific amount of funding. NMPED’s competitive grant process prioritizes funding for schools based on the school’s (1) intention to regularly use local produce; (2) need for funding due to scarcity of fresh produce or the school’s remote location; (3) plan for purchasing and using the produce, and maintaining or increasing local purchases in the future; (4) percentage of students eligible to receive free or reduced price lunch; and (5) wellness policy including information on the benefits of healthy eating.

STRATEGY 3:
EMBED PROGRAM COORDINATION AND EVALUATION INTO THE STATE IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

The growth of New Mexico Grown led to the need for a permanent farm to school coordinator position. Housed in NMPED, the agency that administers child nutrition programs, the Farm to School Specialist administers the reimbursement program and evaluates the local procurement program’s impact on New Mexico public schools in terms of local produce purchased and students served. The coordinator’s evaluation and suggestions are expected to help improve the local procurement program and strengthen farm to school procurement infrastructure in New Mexico to reach more schools and integrate other locally produced foods.

STRATEGY 4:
EXPAND MARKET OPPORTUNITIES FOR FARMERS

The New Mexico Grown bidding process makes it easier for local producers to receive a fair price for their products by taking their proximity to the school district into account in setting prices. The universal bid opens market access to all New Mexico producers; however, direct farm to school relationships are prioritized (within 100 miles from each school district). The bid process then allows producers to set their price district by district, which allows transportation costs to be included in the pricing. This supports New Mexico’s emerging farm to school value chain because growers do not have to absorb the costs of transporting product far distances.

NMPED also plans to focus on aligning production seasons and menu planning as a way to increase local products in school meals, and will require all school food authorities, growers, and distributors taking part in the New Mexico Grown program to attend a meeting focused on this strategy.

Once the farm to school program has permanent funding and procurement infrastructure is fully established for fruits and vegetables, farm to school advocates plan to expand this program to senior centers. Advocates are also looking to expand the local fruit and vegetable procurement program beyond produce to include locally raised and processed beef.
Overview

The US Virgin Islands (USVI) has long been working towards a robust farm to school program to connect the islands of St. Croix, St. John, and St. Thomas. Even before there was a national farm to school movement, a 1992 USVI law directs school nutrition programs to include locally grown foods wherever feasible (17 V.I.C. § 141). In 2010, USVI enacted the Farm to School Act (Bill No. 28-0189) that established a formal farm to school program within the Virgin Islands Department of Agriculture (VIDA) to promote the sale of locally grown produce in schools. In 2012, the legislature enacted the Agriculture in the Classroom Act (Bill No. 29-0160) to integrate basic agricultural education into public school curriculum. The Act’s goals include ensuring students can explain or demonstrate where their food originates; participate in a school garden; identify good food choices; and understand that farmers and others make a living by growing and producing food, fiber, and fuel. The Act also requires each public elementary school to develop a school garden or greenhouse on school grounds to use as an educational resource.

In 2014, Governor Kenneth Mapp made farm to school a territorial priority, in part inspired by then-First Lady Michelle Obama’s efforts to improve children’s access to healthy foods. This priority resulted in a partnership between the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) and VIDA to increase farm to school procurement. It also led to the creation of school district agricultural director positions to support school gardens and identify curricula that align with the requirements of the Agriculture in the Classroom Act.

USVI has leveraged conferences and events to raise awareness and support for farm to school. In 2015, the Virgin Islands Good Food Coalition—in partnership with VIDE—held USVI’s first farm to school conference entitled Linking the Chain, funded by a USDA Farm to School Grant. The conference brought together over 100 farm to school stakeholders from across the territory. Then, in 2018, VIDE’s St. Croix District used federal grant funds to hold the Transforming Lives Conference, which targeted 50 students and sought to raise awareness of the role of farm to school in increasing public health and combating childhood obesity. The VIDE School Food Authority similarly seeks to nurture healthy food habits in schoolchildren by celebrating Farm to School Month each October.

Building on these considerable achievements, the Virgin Islands—through the USVI Farm to School Network—is planning to introduce a series of bills to expand farm to school in the 2019 legislative session.

STRATEGY 1:
HARNESS LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT

State Senators Shawn Michael Malone and Patrick Brown showed an early interest in farm to school. Their staff researched farm to school legislation, resulting in the bill that led to the establishment of the USVI Farm to School Program. The Farm to School Act (Bill No. 28-0189) directed VIDE and VIDA to collaborate in implementing the Virgin Islands Farm to School Program. The Act tasked VIDA with working with local producers to encourage sales to schools and other educational institutions, creating and maintaining a farmer database, facilitating purchases from local farmers by interested schools, and providing outreach and guidance to farmers interested in participating in farm to school. It also directed VIDE to establish promotional events; work with schools to purchase local products; provide outreach, guidance, and training to school districts, food service directors, and others; work with VIDA to arrange events to connect local growers and purchasers; and arrange for farmers and students to interact, including farm field trips and in-school presentations.
CASE STUDY 4:
US Virgin Islands

Continued

STRATEGY 1 (CONTINUED):
HARNESS LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT

Funding for the USVI Farm to School Program comes primarily from the federal school meal reimbursement program, with some match from the local government through various special funds. In 2015, $35,000 was appropriated from the Casino Revenue Fund as match to aid in the expansion of the program. In 2016, an additional $10,000 was appropriated through the Legislative Community Reinvestment Act for the Farm to School Program. That same year, VIDE established a position to coordinate program functions. In total, approximately $80,000 has been allocated to the program to date.

STRATEGY 2:
CULTIVATE STRONG NETWORKS

After the enactment of the Farm to School Act, advocates from the islands of St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John came together to establish a network to raise awareness and educate stakeholders about the Farm to School Program. The Farm to School Network has the support of the St. Croix Foundation, a community philanthropic foundation that recognizes that farm to school promotes economic development and public health. In fact, farm to school is increasingly being viewed as a pillar for community resilience in the face of economic challenges and extreme weather events.

The Farm to School Network has also partnered with the Virgin Islands Good Food Coalition to get additional local food products into school cafeterias. Additionally, in 2018, to celebrate Farm to School Month, the VIDE School Food Authority partnered with Ridge to Reef Farm Hub in St. Croix to introduce students to new ways of incorporating fresh, local produce into their daily meals. Ridge to Reef Farm Hub delivered 365 cases of produce items including lettuce, cucumbers, carambola fruit, seasoning peppers, basil, Spanish thyme, sage, garlic, chives, cilantro, and oregano to various school kitchens in St. Croix.

STRATEGY 3:
EMPOWER TEACHERS TO INTEGRATE FARM TO SCHOOL CURRICULUM

In 2018, the USVI Farm to School Network conducted curriculum integration training to empower teachers and school district staff to increase farm to school educational opportunities. Premised on the fact that school garden success depends, in no small part, on teacher interest and buy-in, VIDE leveraged US Department of Education grant funding to pilot an Edible Education teacher training. To date, 24 teachers and district staff have gone through the training and have begun piloting cross-curricular integration of garden and nutrition education in classroom activities.

STRATEGY 4:
EVALUATE PROGRAM NEEDS & PLAN AHEAD

As of the time of this report, the USVI Farm to School Network is advocating to amend the Farm to School Act to provide for the allocation of 10 percent of the federal meal reimbursement dollars for locally purchased produce, and for the local legislature to appropriate a matching fund to further build out program infrastructure. Additional program infrastructure activities would include purchasing kitchen equipment, hosting farm to school conferences, and training cafeteria staff on how to use fresh produce. The Network also seeks to amend the Act to formalize the Farm to School Program Manager position, and officially proclaim October as Farm to School Month in the Virgin Islands.
Overview

In 2006, in a collaborative and bipartisan effort, the Vermont legislature passed the Rozo McLaughlin Farm to School Act (H.91), which established the nation’s first farm to school grant program. The Act directed the Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets (VAAFM), Agency of Education, and Department of Health to work together to support the grant program, including developing the application and selecting awardees, illustrating Vermont’s institutionalized commitment to support farm to school.

In 2009, VAAFM and Vermont FEED (a statewide farm to school organization) formed the Vermont Farm to School Network to support the growing number of schools engaged in farm to school activities. The Network developed a goal that by 2025, 75 percent of Vermont schools would be engaged in integrated food system education and offer nourishing meals, with 50 percent of food purchased from local or regional sources. To ensure collaboration between public and private partners, VAAFM and the Network received a grant from the Vermont Community Foundation in 2014 to systematically identify the most effective leverage points to reach the Network’s goal.

In 2017, the legislature passed S.33, which amended the original Farm to School Act. S.33 embedded the Network’s goal and included a new program definition that mirrors the Network’s model of change, which integrates and connects the three C’s: the Classroom, with standards-based curriculum development; the Cafeteria, through local food purchasing and nutrition education; and the Community, by reconnecting people to their food sources—farms and farmers. The bill also made early childhood providers eligible grant recipients. The expansion to early childhood was fueled by data showing that 90 percent of brain development occurs before the age of five and that healthy eating enhances healthy brain development.

STRATEGY 1: COMMIT TO COLLABORATION

The Vermont Farm to School Network is broad and includes farmers, processors, advocacy groups, state agencies, schools, and other institutions. Since 2009, Vermont FEED has served as the backbone organization for the Network: facilitating local connections, fostering local engagement, and working to increase farm to school initiatives statewide. Network members work in Action Teams towards the Network goal and provide statewide leadership, coordination, and advocacy. For example, as part of a farm to school legislative campaign, the Network activated 326 self-identified champions throughout the state. Champions signed supporter cards, attended public hearings, submitted letters to local newspapers, and contacted their legislators by phone or mail to advocate for farm to school.
The Network’s effort in 2014 to create a strategic “systems map” of all the interconnected components and leverage points for farm to school success in Vermont helped the various Network members coalesce around agreed-upon goals and tactics. In one participant’s words, “systems mapping transformed this group from a loose learning network to an action-oriented collaborative with a shared vision and shared priorities. People are aligned and energized in a way they weren’t before.”

Over six months, 60 individuals came together and identified 180 different people, programs, and policies that impact farm to school and drew out four primary leverage points to create long-term change in the farm to school context. Policy is one of the four identified leverage points (the other three are the relative value of farm to school, supply and profitability, and market and network coordination). The Network then identified three primary policy objectives: (1) starting farm to school during early childhood; (2) embedding the Network’s goal into legislation; and (3) establishing a base funding level of $500,000 annually for the Farm to School Grant Program. With the enactment of S.33, the Network succeeded in accomplishing the first two priorities. The Network also successfully increased funding in fiscal year 2019 to $231,875.

STRATEGY 3:
RAISE AWARENESS AND BUILD SUPPORT AT THE STATEHOUSE

Advocates have achieved improvements in quantifying the impacts and outcomes of farm to school and in communicating a consistently clear message, which is essential for raising legislators’ awareness and support. Network advocates testify to the legislature annually about farm to school benefits. Events at the Vermont State House like Farm to School Awareness Day educate legislators on the value of farm to school through the perspectives and stories of those it impacts: farmers, teachers, food service providers, and kids. The Network organizes advocates to participate in the event and a school meal is served in the State House cafeteria. In a ceremony at the end of the day, VAAFM awards certificates to all new Vermont Farm to School grantees.

Vermont FEED also organizes Junior Iron Chef VT, a cooking competition for students focused on healthy, local, meals cooked from scratch. Winners of the competition come to the State House to cook their winning meals for the legislature.

STRATEGY 4:
DIVERSIFY GRANT OPTIONS AND OFFER TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Based on best practices and feedback from over 50 stakeholders, the Farm to School Grant Program was modified in 2018 to only offer two types of grants: $15,000 child nutrition grants and $1,000 early childhood infrastructure grants. The child nutrition grants come with technical assistance in addition to financial assistance. Technical assistance includes a farm to school coach who provides additional capacity to grantees to implement their programs, procurement and curriculum professional development training, and program viability training. The smaller infrastructure grants provide funding to help immediately implement changes in kitchens or meal programs by enabling the purchase of kitchen equipment or supplies. These small infrastructure grants seek to broaden the network of providers engaged with farm to school and target early childhood education programs, which became eligible entities after the passage of S.33.

Around the same time as the passage of S.33, VAAFM piloted a universal meals grant in five schools over an 18-month period through the Farm to School Grant Program. Through this pilot, five grants were awarded, enabling 1,700 students to access at least one new universal meals program (breakfast, lunch, or summer meals). While the pilot is no longer running, Vermont advocates remain very interested in exploring statewide universal free school meals as a farm to school strategy and anti-hunger solution.
## State Rankings Chart

**Successful State Farm to School Legislation 2002-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>STATE SCORE</th>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>PROCLAMATIONS / RESOLUTIONS</th>
<th>DATABASE</th>
<th>TASK FORCE / COUNCILS</th>
<th>PILOT</th>
<th>LOCAL PREFERENCE</th>
<th>UNFUNDED PROGRAM</th>
<th>FUNDED FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAMS / INCENTIVES</th>
<th>REIMBURSEMENT PROGRAMS</th>
<th>FUNDED COORDINATOR PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Virgin Islands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>