

Characterizing Successful Outreach in Alternative Food Networks: A Case Study of Oakland Food Access Projects

Jennie Li

Abstract Food access, the right to healthy and safe food, is a main component of the food justice movement, which seeks to address the pitfalls of the conventional food system. In places that have been deemed a “food desert”, there are no avenues to easily accessible and healthy food. Alternative food networks (AFNs) are food systems that offer different pathways to food access overlooked by the industrialized food system. Research has been conducted on assessing the impact of local food systems on their constituents, but there has been little evaluation of success within the organizational framework of AFNs themselves. In order to have a holistic sense of the impacts of AFNs, it is necessary to survey how success is defined by various AFNs. I will examine the issue of success through the aspects of outreach and target population in both theory and practice. Many food access projects have arisen in Oakland using different strategies to implement their cause. My research consists of examining two AFNs in East Oakland, SOL and Oakland Food Connection, and comparing the different practical methods and theoretical frameworks used to characterize successful outreach. How does the philosophical and organizational structure of the AFN influence the practice and results of outreach? The results of my study show that the philosophy of the organization manifests itself in the way the organization is structured and that this changes their potential population reach. I also discovered that the philosophical concept of success is not especially related to any material results in either food access project and that success cannot be quantitatively linked to outreach. My research indicates the need for multiple ways of characterizing success in AFNs that includes the impact of these organizations on the quality of life.

Introduction

The food system is a term used to describe a basic structural component of any civilization: the food system is the intersection between the biological processes used to make food, the economic and political powers that affect how food reaches us, and the social and cultural values that affect our use and intake of food (Tansey and Worsley 1995). The food system can be broken down into the six components of production, transformation (or processing), distribution, access, consumption, and output. Due to the large scale of American industrial agri-businesses, these six aspects of the government-supported food system have been made distinct processes that are separated by the distance the food travels in between each stage (Iowa State University 2005).

The conventional American food system is globalized and industrialized and thus bears many implications on the way the food system is being used. Instead of focusing on the nutritional needs of the society, the food system has been co-opted by its major constituents (agri-business industries) as a way to accumulate capital (Murdoch 2000). This becomes a health problem when the cost, not the nutritive value of the food dictates diet. Studies have shown that lower socioeconomic groups suffer disproportionately from disease of affluence in more developed countries due to poorer nutrition because of the availability and price of foods: although high calorie foods are cheaper and more available, they do not contain all of the essential nutrients and resulting effects on health include obesity, cardiovascular diseases, and diabetes (James 1997). Furthermore, the food system does not distribute food access evenly to all communities. Food deserts exist, meaning that as a result of unequal geographic access to healthy foods, not everybody has the same opportunity to fulfill their nutritional needs in healthy ways (*White et al.* 2004).

In “The Food System: A Guide”, Tansey and Worsley (2007) advance the idea that a good food system must ensure that food is safe, secure, sufficient, sustainable and nutritious for everybody in an equitable way. Food justice is a recent concept arising in food activism that encompasses this idea of a good food system, where food is a basic human right and therefore everybody should have equal access to healthy nutritious food.

The concept of food justice is embodied outside of the conventional neo-liberal capitalist food system. With the onset of the current rise in food prices and the failing economy, methods of local self-sufficiency are increasingly being emphasized to compensate for the needs of those

overlooked by the industrial food system. In places where the instituted political and social system has failed to reinforce equitable distribution of food, alternative food networks (AFNs) are a viable way of providing food to communities who are unable to access the conventional food system. Through competition with the conventional food chain, AFNs both expose and seek to remediate institutional problems (Marsden and Sonnino 2005).

While there is still debate on what constitutes an AFN, there is general consensus that one characteristic is that it seeks to create a pathway to food access different than that of the predominant industrial food network (Marsden et al. 2000). AFNs look to reach their population by creating an alternate food system driven by the concept of food quality, which not only encompasses the quality of the food product itself but all of the other aspects surrounding its production such as the social and economic relationships producer and consumer (Murdoch *et al.* 2000). AFNs generally have the four characteristics of distributing food close to its site of production, having a smaller scale food production and farm size compared to the large scale of industrial agribusiness, local food purchasing venues such as farmer's markets, and an approach that integrates social, and environmental concerns in addition to the economic priorities that are industrial agriculture's main concern (Jarosz 2002). Examples of AFNs include farmer's markets, food cooperatives, and any community supported agriculture.

Research on the effects of AFNs has been relatively minimal and has focused mostly on their effects in a community. Studies conducted locally in Oakland on food insecurity illustrate how aspects of food accessibility are addressed by different organizations, such as The People's Grocery (Haletky and Taylor 2005). Levkoe's study on a community based urban agriculture program in Toronto show that sites of the food justice movement can empower people to reclaim public spaces, acquiring valuable skills is essential to strong community building (Levkoe 2006). However, as this was a case study based on one organization, there is not enough evidence to make conclusions on the effects of AFNs as a whole. Additionally, with approximately 340,000 Alameda county residents who have low incomes and are at risk of experiencing food insecurity (US Census Bureau 2004) and the onset of increasing food prices, there is a need to more closely evaluate the effects of AFNs in a variety of ways that has not yet been addressed by current literature. To fully understand the effects of AFNs, I propose that we look at all components of this alternative system, which includes the evaluation of the organizations themselves. I believe

that by looking at various types of AFN organizations to see how they differ, we can have a more critical understanding of how AFNs function on a broader scale.

By investigating how AFNs reach their target population and conduct outreach, I hope to build upon a pluralistic model of viewing the food system by characterizing AFNs and how they determine their own practices of providing alternative food access. The research questions that I wish to investigate are:

1. Who is the AFN's target population?
2. What is successful outreach?
3. How does AFN practice of outreach match with their organizational philosophies and mission goals?

Oakland has a history of food insecurity and poverty, high crime rates, and health problems. Many organizations have risen from both outside and within the city in response to these conditions, so there are a variety of programs that have been instituted in Oakland. Furthermore, research shows that the lack of access to affordable, healthy food within the area and what organizations and programs have arisen to rectify food insecurity (Harris 2005; Unger and Wooten 2006). Oakland's variety of alternative food networks and its lack of a well instituted food infrastructure make it an ideal site to survey aspects of successful outreach in different AFN programs and organizations.

I have refined my study to examine only food access projects in Oakland. The term "food access project" has not been defined academically but has been used to categorize various organizations and projects. This is a term that I will use to describe projects that are implemented by organizations who seek to do the following:

- build and reinforce community structures
- actively increase local access to food through food distribution and food production education

Using the criteria above, I have located and identified nine food access projects in Oakland. These organizations include People United for a Better Life in Oakland (PUEBLO), People's Grocery, City Slicker Farms, Oakland Food Connection, Sustaining Ourselves Locally (SOL), Mo' Better Food, City of Oakland Parks and Recreation, Oakland Based Urban Gardens (OBUGS), and Temescal Amity Works. Of these, I chose to focus my studies on SOL and Oakland Food Connections. These two projects are a good basis for comparison due to their

small size (Oakland SOL consists of nine people and Oakland Food Connection has only two staff members) and the different statuses of their organizations (Oakland Food Connection is a non profit organization, whereas SOL has no official status). Both organizations are also located in East Oakland, which reduces the amount of confounding factors, because they are within the vicinity of the same geographically based factors (such as socioeconomic factors, and physical access to food retailers).

Since there has been no prior research examining how AFNs determine and measure successful outreach, I plan on conducting a qualitative study to investigate who and how well AFNs are reaching their intended target population. I have three study objectives in mind: firstly, to geographically lay out characteristics of the Oakland population in comparison to the target population of the food access project, second, to look at different theoretical frameworks behind each organization, and thirdly, to synthesize information from the first two study objectives with the various actual practical methods of outreach each project used. Creating a geographic information system (GIS) will be the method that best achieves my first study objective of mapping out socioeconomic and structural characteristics of Oakland in relation to one another. My second and third study objective will be accomplished by interviewing organization members on both the philosophical theory behind each organization's mode of outreach as well as the interpretation and results of its practice.

Methods

I addressed my research questions by undertaking the following activities:

1. I located and mapped defining socioeconomic characteristics of Oakland and then compared the target population of the AFN to the population of the neighborhood in which they are located.
2. I compared how the different organizations practice outreach by looking at their strategies for advertising and implementing their programs.
3. I compared the different theoretical frameworks behind the various food access projects' outreach strategies to the actual results of their programs.

The two food access projects that I chose to study were Oakland Food Connection and Sustaining Ourselves Locally (SOL). These food access projects have the best ability to make comparisons between outreach styles because of similar size and having different methods in

achieving their goal. Both organizations are located in East Oakland, and are relatively small (Oakland Food Connection has only two staff members and SOL has nine people).

Sustaining Ourselves Locally (SOL) is an organization that seeks to increase awareness and education on producing food by teaching and modeling techniques in the space they reside. Sol has been involved in an education program with Youth Employment Partnership. They also sell seasonal and organic vegetable starts to the community (Iyer 2009, pers. comm.).

Oakland Food Connection's programs revolve around providing food access through youth education programs. The Oakland Food Connection has installed rooftop agricultural beds in E.C. Reems Academy of Art and Technology. Their programs have also included the Unity High "Live" agricultural program, aimed at teaching youth to maintain urban agricultural beds at the school. Lastly, they have recently implemented a small farmer's market in November 2008 that is still in the process of expansion in the Laurel neighborhood (Lanterman 2009, pers. comm.).

Since this is exploratory research, I placed emphasis on characterizing the current situation in Oakland. I set the organizations under study within the framework of the existing conditions of Oakland by mapping out all of the locations of food access projects in Oakland and placing them within different socioeconomic contexts. The characteristics I looked at were population density (which I hoped might be an indicator of the exposure of the organization to the greater population), race (which might suggest cultural characteristics that inhibit food use and thus food access), households under the poverty line (which could indicate that food access was inhibited by financial circumstances), and the number of vehicles per household (which has the potential to directly affect transportation and thus prevent non local food access). I used Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to illustrate these socioeconomic characteristics of Oakland. GIS allowed for the visual compilation of various factors and presented information in a way that does not necessarily imply a correlation between its components. The maps are intended only as a visual aid in contextualizing the organizations that I interviewed.

I used ArcGIS software to overlay various types of population characteristics on a map of Oakland that is broken down by census block. The socioeconomic factors I investigated were poverty level, population density, race, and number of vehicles per household. I determined these categories using US census information from 2000. Both the population density and the percentage of households living below the federal poverty line were given categories in the census data. The map describing the racial plurality of Oakland was determined by assigning the

race which had the highest density to represent each census block. The average number of vehicles per household in each census block was determined by averaging the number of cars in both renter and owner occupied housing.

Since there has been no research conducted on how success is measured by food access projects, I determined that direct interviews with the organization was the most direct and effective way of answering my study questions. It was also the most efficient way of acquiring the most recent information on the organizations (especially since each of the organizations website had not been updated recently to reflect all of their current projects). I only interviewed organization members who had knowledge of the theoretical foundations and practical applications behind the organization, with one interview per organization. Both interviews lasted between forty-five minutes to an hour long. I recorded the interviews with a handheld voice recorder and supplemental handwritten notes. The topics that were covered include the infrastructure of the organization, the theoretical framework of outreach and its practical implementation, the target population the organization, and how success was determined. My interview guide is attached in the appendix.

I analyzed the interview using thematic analysis, which is a qualitative type of content analysis (Babbie 2007). I first split the content of the interviews into three different categories that addressed each of my study objectives. These categories are descriptions of populations (outcomes of outreach), organization's applied framework (practice/process of outreach), and organization's theoretical framework (theory/structure behind outreach). I used the information gathered under the population description category to perform a simple comparison between the targeted and actual populations reached by the organization to the population demographics of the organization's neighborhood plotted onto the GIS maps. With information gathered under the categories of theory and practice, I coded for emerging themes within the subcategories of success, outreach, and problems.

Results

I wanted to first look at the existing food access projects in Oakland as they relate to the existing socioeconomic geography. The following maps all pinpoint different sites where food access projects are being conducted by the eight organizations People United for a Better Life in Oakland (PUEBLO), People's Grocery, City Slicker Farms, Oakland Food Connection,

Sustaining Ourselves Locally (SOL), Mo' Better Food, Oakland Based Urban Gardens (OBUGS), and Temescal Amity Works. It should be noted that Temescal Amity Works had no specific location since their project consisted of a roaming method of distribution and organization. Furthermore, the majority of these sites consist of public parks where the City of Oakland's Office of Parks and Recreation have community gardening programs.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Figure 1: This map represents the total number of people in each census block. AFNs are not necessarily located in particularly densely populated areas. Data is from the 2000 US census.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Figure 2: This map represents the race with the highest population density in each block. AFN locations appear to be located in a variety of racial neighborhoods. It should be noted due to the way data was organized in the data tables that the Latino population does not have its own category. However, it is highly likely that the category “some other race” consists mostly of Latinos due to the fact that there is a known high percentage of Latinos in the Fruitvale area. Data is from the 2000 US census.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Figure 3: This map depicts the percentage of the population living at or below the federal poverty line. AFN locations do not seem to be particularly located in the poorest neighborhoods. Data is from the 2000 US census.

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Figure 4: This represents the average number of cars per household in each census block. More AFNs are located in areas where the average number of vehicles per household is one. The number of vehicles per household generally follows the trend of the poverty status of each block. Data is from the 2000 US census.

I also interviewed both SOL and Oakland Food Connection once, each for about fifty minutes total. Each interview was conducted at the site of the organization. I interviewed one of the founding members of Oakland SOL, and the outreach coordinator of Oakland Food Connection. In my interviews, I looked for emerging themes under characteristics of AFN target populations, and the philosophical theory behind their practice of outreach.

Research Question 1: Who is the AFNs target population? SOL's target populations have varied from project to project. Previous and current projects have included young women, kids individually and in school groups, neighbors, and families. Potential populations SOL looks

to reach in the future include the local needle exchange group, the homeless, the disabled, and more families.

Oakland Food Connections' target demographic included the children at both Unity high and E.C. Reems Technical Arts school for their after school programs and the surrounding adjacent neighborhoods of their Farmer's Market in the Laurel community. Although Oakland Food Connection is still in the process of actualizing who their population will eventually consist of, the umbrella term used was to support "the people who need help" especially in terms of having problems with basic needs like food access, but financial difficulty was included as well. As of the moment, the Laurel Farmer's Market is intended to be as inclusive to its surrounding neighborhoods as possible until more can be determined about their desires and needs. Possible future target populations included adjacent communities and neighborhoods such as Allendale, Seminary, the Diamond district, parts of Fruitvale, and Maxwell Park. There was no other descriptions assigned to these populations other than by their neighborhood names and it was emphasized that the scope and intended population of the Farmer's Market was still being determined.

Research Question 2: How do AFNs define successful outreach? The topics covered in this research question included how the organizations defined and measures success as well as how they characterize outreach. Both Oakland SOL and Oakland Food Connection defined successful outreach in terms of unquantifiable aspects, specifically for a change in behavior and attitude as a measure of success. Success is tangible when people "get it", meaning that they show and volunteer their enthusiasm for various educational concepts and programs that are provided. Similarly, SOL mentions that "moments where [participants] stop and think" indicates success in reaching their population.

Both organizations also consistently made the distinction between outreach as a physical process of distributing information on the organization's activities and outreach as a form of making personal connections with those who have been reached. For example, both organizations have a website and an email list serve in order to distribute information on the events and programs they are holding. However, when asked to characterize successful outreach, neither organization spoke of these modes of outreach. In fact, in the interview with Oakland Food Connection, although there are hundreds of people who subscribe to their personal email

list, the idea that any tangible effects could be measured through this mode of outreach was quickly dismissed.

Additionally, Oakland SOL mentioned that methods for successful outreach included organizing and holding events for the specific purpose of increasing use of their space, or “outreach events”. The purpose of outreach events would be to explain the potential uses of Oakland SOL’s spaces and to show how Oakland SOL can supplement any community member’s agenda.

Research Question 3: How does AFN practice of outreach match with their theory?

Topics that covered aspects of this research question in the interview included analysis on mission statements, definitions of success, the actual number of participants, as well as their standards in measuring their own assessment of their success rate.

SOL’s main purpose is “to live in a way that is as least harmful to the earth as possible in all aspects of life and to share that way of life with other people so to educate those who don’t think about it and to learn from those who do think about it”. Additional goals mentioned were to connect people with the earth through food, and to strive to impact larger systems such as food access.

Oakland SOL’s outreach efforts are self confessed as minimal, but word of mouth seems to figure prominently in how people discover their space. In addition, foot recruiting of households was mentioned for a family dinner program, as well as networking with organizations, such as Cycles of Change, whose mission is to promote healthy and sustainable neighborhoods through bike education and funnels a variety of kids through SOL. In fact, SOL is oftentimes a final destination for Cycles of Change to visit. Additionally, SOL throws two large events per year for friends and colleagues who have interests similar to SOL, each event comprising of about a hundred and fifty people. The total number of users per year is estimated to be anywhere between three hundred to seven hundred people. Elementary to middle school aged kids use the facilities the most, but other groups that have used SOL’s facilities have included women in or at risk of prostitution. SOL is currently working on a program for disabled youths as well as another summer times youth employment program. SOL mentioned that they have an email list that they use to keep people updated, but they didn’t take this potential population reach into account when asked to consider whom they have reached.

Oakland Food Connection, on the other hand, viewed outreach as essential, stating several times that the existence and success of the farmer's market is very integral to its use by the Laurel community it is located in. Oakland Food Connection seeks to integrate their farmer's market into the various needs of neighborhoods that are surrounding the Laurel community, as well, and are currently in the process of expanding both the number of vendors at the market as well as the clientele. Oakland Food Connection believes that by adhering to local systems of advertising is a better match of the practice of outreach with the philosophy of being a community organization. For example, advertising in the *MacArthur Metro* (a local newspaper) was found to be more successful and effective than advertising in the *East Bay Express* because the *Metro* had high readership in the immediate community that the farmer's market pertained to, whereas the advertisement in the *East Bay Express* was lost among all of the other information that is included in a publication that has a potentially wider reach. Oakland Food Connection also conducted outreach through posting on local email lists (which is a mode of communication that is again highly used by the Laurel community), attending neighborhood events (such as the neighborhood watch programs that are prevalent in the Laurel community). For the success of the farmer's market, the best method was reported to be by word of mouth.

Currently, the outreach strategies for increasing the user-ship of the farmer's market are being reevaluated for a broader geographical scope that hasn't been exactly specified. Oakland Food Connection is confident that with the participation of the current constituents of the farmer's market, who were described as being "a community with more dispensable income", the user-ship of the market could be expanded to support other groups lower in socioeconomic status. The philosophy behind determining the scope of the outreach at the moment is to methodically advertise to all neighboring communities and then adapt to responses, which I will call the "shoot in all directions" model of outreach. This method requires more time and work than a two-person staff can provide, so all of the various modes of outreach being used are undergoing evaluation for their continued use. For example, attending events has been the least successful strategy in terms of recruiting, but this has still been one mode of outreach kept based on the principle that organizations should have a corporal presence in the neighborhood and that "it's good to attach a face to a name". It was also mentioned that the organization did not have the budget to effectively advertise in larger publications that have a broader audience: the

example of the situation with *East Bay Express* could have been remedied if Oakland Food Connection had paid for a better advertising spot in the newspaper.

Discussion

Although both Oakland SOL and Oakland Food Connection have overlapping ideas and activities concerned with empowering a community in need, both enter their work with different structural and organizational philosophies that ultimately manifest in different relationships with their community. Both Oakland SOL and Oakland Food Connection aim to be a community resource that empowers its users, meaning that they especially target those who have difficulty with basic needs. In Oakland SOL, this manifests itself in specific programs aimed at different disadvantaged groups (such as their summer youth employment program and their upcoming program for disabled youths). Oakland Food Connection uses both strategies of targeting specific groups (such as their work at Unity High and E.C. Reems which is specifically for youths at the school) as well as a more open and inclusive target population for their farmer's market.

The results of my second research question addressing how AFNs defined success indicate that there is continuity between the two organizations in terms of the way success is described as a behavioral change that can't be easily measured in quantifiable terms. Despite the fact that Oakland Food Connection has nonprofit status and is thus potentially accountable to outside financial sources to prove their reach, success was never described in terms of quantification during the interview. Furthermore, both organizations made a clear distinction between the two ideas of outreach as surface contact and successful outreach as a measure of the quality of the impact of interactions between the organization and their participants. This seems to be indicative of a general understanding by AFNs that success is multifaceted and includes qualitative aspects such as impact on behavior and attitude, and not just a nominative number of people served.

I will be using organizational theory to classify and understand the philosophical approach of the organization as based upon their form in discussing of my third research question. My form of analysis is taken from the studies of Hannan and Freeman (1977, 1986), organizational ecologists who argue that as organizations are dynamic to the environment and the interest of the analyst, the only kind of classification of organizations is through the organization's formal structure or normative order.

The structure of Oakland SOL is non-hierarchical and resembles a network organizational structure: their intents are less didactic and are instead geared towards being a facilitating institution (Stanford 2007). This is built into the structure of the organization: the fact that the organization members enter the organization with the intent of using their living space for the purpose of their mission goals indicate an approach to building connections and integrating themselves within the community lifestyle. As a result, the activities and events that are thrown by SOL have less of an overarching goal and are driven more on the principles of creating a fixed space. In terms of expansion into the community, SOL's approach is much slower because their focus is on the space and how they themselves are a part of the community, not the expansion of a cause. SOL's philosophy is that of an insider, where change is promoted by becoming a part of the community that is affected by the change. As a result of this basic organizational structure and philosophy, SOL appears to be limited to only operating within their immediate community.

Oakland Food Connection, on the other hand, operates more like an advocacy group. The organizational structure of the group is that of a strong/project matrix where there is a visionary, or project leader role (the founder who dictates what projects occur) and then the functional manager, whose duty it is to actualize the project (Stanford 2007). By virtue of being a nonprofit organization, that is an entity separate from the community, Oakland Food Connection is more goal oriented when addressing change in the community than SOL: Oakland Food Connection approaches their goals as an outside agent to the community they seek to improve. Oakland Food Connection's organizational strategy thus allows for the potential of a larger reach in expanding their programs outside of their current project areas given that they obtain more resources and a larger budget.

I realize that my interpretations of each organization's philosophies might be heavily influenced by the background and philosophies of the people that I have interviewed. This is of special concern when interpreting the interview from Oakland Food Connection, because my interviewee is the only other staff member in the organization and is in charge of several programs, and is thus ultimately in charge of fulfilling the project ideas and missions begun by the founder of the organization (Lanterman 2009, pers. comm.). Thus, the perspective that is given comes from somebody who is not originally from the community and who has an academic background on community activism, which differs from the founder's original history

of having grown up in East Oakland as a child. In the instance of SOL, although I have categorized their outreach strategy as being an insider movement, it is good to note that all of the current and previous members of SOL were not previously a part of the Fruitvale community, and with the exception of two people (including the person I interviewed) all the members of SOL had jobs outside of the community.

In looking at the primary concerns of SOL and Oakland Food Connection to affect qualitative lifestyle changes, it does not make sense to categorize their success empirically. Instead, by conducting more surveys on AFN organizational philosophies of outreach, we can learn to predict the populational scope in which an AFN will act. This will allow for future studies comparing the potential reach of audiences to the actual impact of AFNs, which may be an indicator of how successful AFNs are as a whole entity in providing practical alternative food access.

From a cultural-biological perspective, society and culture have evolved as a way for humans to advance themselves by providing a way to get enough nutrients to its people. Evolutionarily, then, the responsibility of the society is to provide its components with basic needs. Furthermore, if the issue of food access is indeed a human rights issue, as the food justice movement has advanced it to be, then the government is responsible for equal food access to all of its citizens (Levkoe 2006). Since food deserts do indeed exist in areas such as West Oakland, then the United States government (as an entity that is supposed to represent and provide for its citizens) has implemented a food system that does not provide for all of its constituents.

AFNs have had to imagine and implement different strategies in response to the holes in the conventional food system. If we understand that food systems are ultimately supposed to provide a basic need, then we need to change the predominant mind frame of measuring the success of food systems empirically to encompassing its impact on the quality of life as well.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks goes to Gabrielle Wong-Parodi, who was integral in advising me on all aspects of this project, Carson Baucher who guided me through ArcGIS, and Claire Doran who was my personal editor. Nathan McClintock, Clara Nicholls, and Eric Holt-Gimenez were also extremely helpful in conceptualizing my project. I would also like to thank Matt Kondolf, who was my faculty advisor and aided me in getting clearance from the Committee for the Protection

of Human Subjects. Additionally I would like to thank my ES 196 classmates and instructors for input and support throughout this entire past year.

References

- Babbie E.R. The Practice of Social Research, 11th edition, Wadsworth Publishing: 2007, 184.
- Dutton D. B. 1978. Explaining the Low Use of Health Services by the Poor: Costs, Attitudes, or Delivery Systems? *American Sociological Review* 43:348-368.
- Edwards B, K. Martell, A. Pratt. Hunger: The Faces and the Facts. Alameda County Community Food Bank; March 2006.
http://www.accfb.org/pdfs/hunger_poverty_alameda_august_2007.pdf, accessed January 30, 2009.
- Greene J.C. Qualitative program evaluation: practice and promise. In: Denzin NK, Lincoln YS, eds. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994, 530-44.
- Harris N.K. Assessment of New Approaches to Food Security in West Oakland. Berkeley: University of California, Department of Environmental Sciences; 2005.
<http://nature.berkeley.edu/classes/es196/projects/2005final/Harris.pdf>, accessed January 30, 2009.
- Hannan M. T., J. Freeman. 1986. Where Do Organizational Forms Come from? *Sociological Forum* 1:50-72.
- Hannan M. T., J. Freeman. 1977. The Population Ecology of Organizations. *The American Journal of Sociology* 82:929-964.
- Iowa State University. 2005.
http://www.las.iastate.edu/WSP_KCGS_Partners/english/modules/Gender%20Food%20and%20Globalization/key_concepts.htm last updated June 30, 2006, accessed January 28, 2009.
- Iyer, Deepa. Founding member, Sustaining Ourselves Locally, Oakland, California. 2009, personal communication.
- Jarosz L. 2008. The city in the country: Growing alternative food networks in Metropolitan areas. *Journal of Rural Studies* 24:231-244.
- James WP, Nelson M, Ralph A, *et al.* Socioeconomic determinants of health. The contribution of nutrition to inequalities in health. *BMJ* 1997; 314: 1545-9.
- Lanterman, Tori. Staff, Oakland Food Connection, Oakland, California. 2009, personal communication.

- Levkoe C. 2006. Learning Democracy Through Food Justice Movements. *Agriculture and Human Values* 23:89-98.
- Marsden T., J. Banks, and G. Bristow. 2000. Food supply chain approaches: exploring their role in rural development. *Sociologia ruralis* 40(4):424
- Murdoch J., T. Marsden, and J. Banks. 2000. Economic Geography. Quality, nature and embeddedness: some theoretical considerations in the context of the food sector 76:107.
- Nugent R. 2000. The impact of urban agriculture on the household and local economies. *Growing cities, growing food: urban agriculture on the policy agenda* (Ed. N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Gundel, U. Sabel-Koschella and H. de Zeeuw) DSA, Eurasburg 67-97.
- Sonnino R. and Marsden, T. 2006. Beyond the Divide: Rethinking Relationships Between Alternative and Conventional Food Networks in Europe. *Journal of Economic Geography* 6(2):181-199.
- Stanford N. 2007. *Guide to Organisation Design; Creating High-Performing and Adaptable Enterprises*. Profile Books Limited/The Economist, London. 306 pp.
- Tansey, G., W.T. Worsley. 2007. *The Food System: A Guide*. Earthscan, London. 260 pp.
- Unger S., H. Wooten. *A Food Systems Assessment for Oakland: Toward a Sustainable Food Plan*. Berkeley: Mayor's Office of Sustainability; University of California, Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning; 2006.
- U.S. Census Bureau; Census 2000, Summary File 3, Matrix P1, P6, P88, and H44; generated by Jennie Li; using American FactFinder; <<http://factfinder.census.gov>>; (16 March 2009).
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2004. Table DP-3 Selected Economic Characteristics: 2004. 2008:1
- Watts D.C.H., B. Ilbery, D. Maye. 2005. Making reconnections in agro-food geography: alternative systems of food provision. *Progress in human geography* 29:22-40.
- Wei, X., D. Zakus, H. Liang, X. Sun. 2005. The Shanghai case: a qualitative evaluation of community health reform in response to the challenge of population ageing. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management* 20(3): 269-286.
- White M, Bunting J, Williams E, Raybould S, Adamson A, Mathers J. Do 'food deserts' exist? A multi-level, geographical analysis of the relationship between retail food access, socio-economic position and dietary intake. London: Food Standards Agency, 2004.

Appendix

Interview Guide:

1. What is the name of the organization?
2. What is your role in the organization?
3. How does the organization function? (Who runs what?)
4. Stasis of organization: permanence of staff, permanence of programs.
5. What's the mission or goal of the organization?
6. What is the organization doing to fulfill its mission? (What programs are being offered?)
7. What is your definition of success?
8. How do you measure success? What are the ways you measure?
9. What is the importance of outreach to your organization?
10. What characterizes successful outreach?
11. What methods are you using to reach your participants?
12. What forms of outreach have been the most effective and why?
13. How do you characterize the populations that you want to reach? Who is actually being reached?
14. How many people are being reached?
 - a. If an exact number is given: How was this number determined? Annual reports?
 - b. If there is no data: Give a minimum estimate of how many people you think are being reached.
15. Are there problems that have been encountered in outreach? OR Why do you think there is a discrepancy between your ideal population and the actual population you are reaching?
16. Are you working towards remedying these problems in outreach? And if so, how?