Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program Outcomes and Indicators

The grant program outcomes and performance measures outlined below reflect direct stakeholder feedback and provide a framework that allows grant recipients to evaluate project activities more accurately in relation to each program's statutory purpose.

For recipients, the measures are:

- More feasible to accomplish and measure within a grant's period of performance;
- Better aligned with grant program purpose and recipient activities; and
- More reflective of work performed during the project.

These performance measures will go into effect beginning with the FY2022 grant application cycle.

Outcome 1: De	evelop Business Plans and Feasibility Studies
1.1 Number of	feasibility studies conducted
	· —
1.2 Number of	the following identified through needs assessment or feasibility studies:
1.2.a	New markets
1.2.b	Unmet consumer needs
1.2.c	Barriers to local foods
1.2.d	Unserved populations
1.2.e	Supply chain gaps
1.2.f	Partnership opportunities
1.2. g	Other identified needs
1.3 Number of	projects:
1.3.a	Deemed viable after conducting feasibility study, or
1.3.b	Deemed not viable after conducting feasibility study
1.4 Number of	business development plans created
Outcome 2: Fa	ncilitate Regional Food Chain Coordination and Increase Capacity of Direct-to- Entities
	er of partnerships and/or collaborations established between producers/ processors and all supply networks Of those established:
2.1.a	The number formalized with written agreements (i.e. MOU's, signed contracts, etc.)
2.2 Of the total	number of partnerships and collaborations identified in 2.1, the number that reported:
2 2 a	Expanded/improved regional food systems

	2.2.b	Higher profits
	2.2. c	More efficient transportation
	2.2.d	Improved marketing channels
	2.2.e	Other mid-tier value chain enhancements
2.3 Tot	tal numb	er of stakeholders trained on how to develop or sustain a direct-to-consumer enterprise
	<u>-</u> ·	
	2.3.a	Of those trained, the number that are new/ beginning producers
2.4 Nu	mber of	strategic plans developed or updated
	otal number of new direct producer-to-consumer market access points established Of those, ne number that were:	
	2.5.a	Farmers markets
	2.5.b	Roadside stands
	2.5.c	Agritourism
	2.5.d	Grocery stores
	2.5.e	Wholesale markets/buyers
	2.5.f	Restaurants
	2.5.g	Agricultural cooperatives
	2.5.h	Retailers
	2.5.i	Distributors
	2.5.j	Food hubs
	2.5.k	Shared-use kitchens
	2.5.l	School food programs
	2.5.m	Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
	2.5.n	Other
	2.5	
Outco	me 3: D	evelop the Market for Local/Regional Agricultural Products
		stakeholders that gained technical knowledge about producing, preparing, procuring, essing local/regional foods Of those, the number that were:
	3.1.a	Farmers markets
	3.1.b	Roadside stands
	3.1.c	Agritourism
	3.1.d	Grocery stores
	3.1.e	Wholesale markets/buyers
	3.1.f	Restaurants
	3.1.g	Agricultural cooperatives
	3.1.h	Retailers
	3.1.i	Distributors

	3.1.j	Food hubs
	3.1.k	Shared-use kitchens
	3.1.l	School food programs
	3.1.m	Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
	3.1.n	Other
3.2		er of delivery systems/market access points that increased engagement with nal producers Of those, the number that were:
	3.2.a	Farmers markets
	3.2.b	Roadside stands
	3.2.c	Agritourism
	3.2.d	Grocery stores
	3.2.e	Wholesale markets/buyers
	3.2.f	Restaurants
	3.2.g	Agricultural cooperatives
	3.2.h	Retailers
	3.2.i	Distributors
	3.2.j	Food hubs
	3.2.k	Shared-use kitchens
	3.2.l	School food programs
	3.2.m	Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
	3.2.n	Other
3.3		new tools/ technologies developed to improve local/regional food processing, aggregation, or storage
	3.3.a	umber of stakeholders trained to use new tools/technologies
3.4	Number of	delivery systems/market access points that reported increased or improved:
	3.4.a	Processing
	3.4.b	Distribution
	3.4.c	Storage
	3.4.d	Aggregation of locally/ regionally produced agricultural products
3.5		er of delivery systems/market access points that established and/or expanded nal agricultural product or service offerings Of those, the number that were:
	3.5.a	Farmers markets
	3.5.b	Roadside stands
	3.5.c	Agritourism
	3.5.d	Grocery stores
	3.5.e	Wholesale markets/buyers
	3.5.f	Restaurants

	3.5.g	Agricultural cooperatives
	3.5.h	Retailers
	3.5.i	Distributors
	3.5.j	Food hubs
	3.5.k	Shared-use kitchens
	3.5.l	School food programs
	3.5.m	Community-supported agriculture (CSAs)
	3.5.n	Other
3.6	Number of	delivery systems/market access points that reported increased:
	3.6.a	Revenue
	3.6.b	Sales
	3.6.c	Cost savings
	too 4. I.	and and Viability of Local/Decisional Duady says and Duagosays
Ou	tcome 4: Ir	ncrease Viability of Local/Regional Producers and Processors
4.1	Number of	producers/processors who gained knowledge about new market opportunities
		producer/processors that reported increased engagement with new delivery systems or
		ess points
4.3	Number of	producers/processors that implemented new or improved operational methods
4.4	Number of	value-added agricultural products developed
4.5	Number of	producers/processors that reported selling new local/regional food products
	4.5.a	Number that reported selling new value-added products
4.6		producers/processors that reported a reduction in on-farm food waste through new oportunities and marketing
4.7	Number of	producers/ processors that reported increased:
	4.7.a	Revenue
	4.7.b	Sales, and/or
	4.7.c activitie	Cost savings due to local/regional food, operational, and/or value-added product es
4.8	Number of	local/regional agricultural jobs
	4.8.a	Created
	4.8.b	Maintained
4.9	Total numb	per of new producers who went into local/regional food production Of those, no are:
	4.9.a	Beginning farmers/ranchers
	4.9.b	Veteran farmers/ranchers

Outcome 5: Improve Food Safety of Local/Regional Agricultural Products

5.1	1 Number of stakeholders that gained knowledge about prevention, detection, control, and/or intervention food safety practices, including relevant regulations to mitigate risk (and to improve their ability to comply with the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) and/or meet the standards for aligned third party food safety audits such as Harmonized GAP/GHP)		
5.2	Number of	stakeholders that:	
	5.2.a	Established a food safety plan	
	5.2.b	Revised or updated their food safety plan	
5.3	.3 Number of specialty crop stakeholders who implemented new/improved prevention, detection, control, and intervention practices, tools, or technologies to mitigate food safety risks (and/or to improve their ability to comply with the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA) and/or meet the standards for aligned third party food safety audits such as Harmonized GAP/GHP)		
5.4	5.4 Number of prevention, detection, control, or intervention practices developed or enhanced to mitigate food safety risks		
5.5	Number of	stakeholders that used these grant funds to:	
	5.5.a	Purchase	
	5.5.b	Upgrade food safety equipment	
Ou	tcome 6: Ir Products	ncrease Consumption and Consumer Purchasing of Local/Regional Agricultural	
6.1		per of consumers who gained knowledge about local/regional agricultural products ne number of:	
	6.1.a	Adults	
	6.1.b	Children	
6.2 Total number of consumers who purchased more local/regional agricultural products Of the number of:			
	6.2.a	Adults	
	6.2.b	Children	
6.3	Number of	additional local/regional agricultural product customers counted	
6.4	Number of	additional business transactions executed for local/regional agricultural products	
6.5	Increased s	ales measured in:	
	6.5.a	Dollars	
	6.5.b	Percent change	
	6.5.c	Combination of volume and average price as a result of enhanced marketing activities	
	·		