

# **Local Food Business Retention and Expansion**

Includes:  
**Final Report**

**By**  
**Mary Coulas**

Completed for: GPAEDC  
Supervising Professor: Andy Mitchell  
Trent Centre for Community-Based Education

Department: Politics  
Course Code: POST 4870Y  
Course Name: Community-based research project  
Term: Spring 2011  
Date of Project Submission: August 2011

Project ID: 4195

**Call Number:**

## Paper #1 Summary

This paper is the first paper of a series of three. It illustrates the research process of the Business Retention and Expansion (BR+E) project of local food in the Peterborough Area. The main objective of this paper is to evaluate the survey methodology used within the project, thus a synopsis of what worked well and what alternatives would have worked well are emphasized in relation to previous BR+E projects. Collectively, the structure of the survey used did not accurately collect and represent the data of small businesses. It is argued that although the structure of the survey has been problematic, the BR+E method of informal (face to face), yet systematic, interviews is vital to collecting new and accurate information for local food in Peterborough. As more positive than negative features are visible through using the survey method, the paper concludes by emphasizing potential changes that would benefit the local food project as well as other future BR+E projects.

## Paper #2 Summary

This paper is the second paper of a series of three. It provides analysis of the data collected from the local food Business Retention and Expansion (BR+E) project from April to July of 2011. Based on the research results, a series of conclusions are drawn, and then related to best recommendations and the best practices of applying the recommendation to Peterborough and Area. Collectively, it is argued that connecting the three sectors of the local food system beyond the existing partnerships between producers and consumers would best be accomplished through a multi-stakeholder, for-profit food co-op, to increase the production and consumption of local food. By joining the three

sectors, obstacles and problems of niches in distribution and production will be filled. From this analysis, the best ways to create cooperation along the local agricultural value chain and to facilitate increased consumption of local production is demonstrated. The recommendations for the Peterborough Area are a collaboration of personal experience of living here and my relation to local food, the BR+E results and from best practices in other jurisdictions that have succeeded in creating a sustainable local food market. It should be noted that further data has been collected after the paper was written and that the results are from personal analysis, where as full results and analysis of the entire BR+E are coordinated by consultants of Northumberland County.

### Paper #3 Summary.

This is the third paper of a series of three. This paper includes and examination of the best practices designed to inform the local agricultural and agrifood sectors of the study results. It is illustrated that all sectors must be brought together collectively as well as individually, in an efficient and easily accessible fashion, to allow producers, processors, retailers and consumers to discuss the results that are specific to each sector. The outline also suggests a process for implementation of the recommendations emphasized in the second paper of the series. This outline includes a multi-step process that is progressive, yet simultaneously enables the inclusion of multiple and diverse group's input who are located inside and outside the local food sectors. The paper also addressed the barriers as well as opportunities that will be faced when implementing the recommendations through the multi-meeting process.

Peterborough and Area Local Food Business Retention and Expansion Project 2011: A

Critical Examination of the Methodology

Mary Coulas

Andy Mitchell

POST 4870

May 28, 2011

The Business Retention and Expansion (BR+E) survey has been recognized as a strong resource for developing short- and long-term community based economic strategies, but with closer analysis, it is evident that the structure of the survey does not accurately collect and represent the data of small businesses.<sup>i</sup> It will be argued that although the structure of the survey has been problematic, the BR+E method of informal (face to face), yet systematic, interviews is vital to collecting new and accurate information for local food in Peterborough. While this is the first BR+E project specifically focused on local food and there have been unforeseen obstacles, there have been more positive than negative factors influencing the project overall. These will be explored as well as possible alternative procedures to conducting a BR+E survey around local food.

The methodology used for the local food BR+E included visitations to community businesses that worked well in multiple ways.<sup>ii</sup> First, the survey was conducted by volunteers from the community along with individuals on the task force. This is beneficial because it combines local individuals and businesses, whom are ultimately both local stakeholders in the community, to work in partnership to identify and implement strategies that will facilitate the growth of the local food sectors. The Kenora District Agricultural Economic Impact Study recognizes this as a significant process and recommends “that government officials work closely with agri-related stakeholders... to better understand local production and market realities in order to facilitate the development of more relevant and accessible policies and programs for the region....”<sup>iii</sup> Having volunteers from the community also means that there is both personal and business oriented education and relationships taking place; thus, businesses were

identified as important in the community. The Business Retention and Expansion Manual, emphasizes that a “BR+E is community based and will only work when there is a variety of people who bring experience from all sectors.”<sup>iv</sup> Having these relationships also leads volunteers to effectively read body language, and properly and politely probe (when necessary) for further accurate information during the survey and for the follow up sheets that identified significant long-term and urgent issues.

The second benefit of using the BR+E survey is the ability to create a random sample of businesses from Kawartha Choice FarmFresh (KCFE) members.<sup>1</sup> Computer BR+E software is used to reliably project the results from the sample to the larger population of businesses from each sector (producer, processor, retailer).<sup>v</sup> This discourages favouritism and the possibility of skewed results. This is also visible in the Kenora District Agricultural Economic Impact Study where it is argued that “in order to obtain a high level of confidence in the results (approximately 95%)” those surveyed must be from random selection.<sup>vi</sup> Similarly, the third benefit of using the BR+E survey is that it identified both short (urgent) and long-term objects/needs of businesses. The Prince Albert Region Business Retention and Expansion Program stresses that the data and knowledge collected from using the BR+E surveying technique lead to strategic economic planning and the establishment of effective resources during the process and will for 5 years after the project is completed.<sup>vii</sup> The Durham Region Federation of Agriculture Business Retention and Expansion Project also emphasizes that the BR+E

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that there are many local food businesses located in the greater Peterborough area that are not members of Kawartha Choice FarmFresh who have been left out of the initial random sample. This could lead to skewed results and the exclusion of important information for future economic strategies. Having a pre-BR+E search for new KCFE members during the summer when most local food and tourism related business are visible would have been very beneficial.

was needed in order to create an economic plan to support agricultural food sectors based on recommendations and results from data collected.<sup>viii</sup> In combination, a random sample and short and long-term objectives will help a variety of businesses, not just those being surveyed.

However, I have encountered problems with the structure of BR+E survey (questions and template order) and the implementation. First, the BR+E survey does not effectively identify the diverse situations and frameworks of small businesses in relation to local food. The survey has two templates: the main used by Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) for all BR+Es, and a second which is directed at local food. The main template is important because it creates an in-depth understanding of past, present and future plans/actions of businesses that are surveyed, yet a majority of businesses emphasize that the main template is too long and generalized or overlooked small business needs. It was also seen as very limited in its relation to local food. To alleviate this problem, there should be a main template with specific business questions that focus on a specific sector (producer, processor, or retailer) followed by a template for local food. This would shorten the survey by removing questions that certain sectors cannot answer, and it would keep the focus on local food. Having three different main templates would mean each survey would be reviewed multiple times to compare trends of similarities and differences and to create strategies that connect the separate sectors where there are obstacles or no established relation.

Other BR+Es have been modeled similarly and have had positive outcomes. The Durham Region Federation of Agriculture Business Retention and Expansion Project visited two different business sectors during two different time periods: agri-food

(October-December 2010), and agri-business (January-March 2011). Information collected was analyzed with a specific focus on each sector separately, then in comparison to the other.<sup>ix</sup> Likewise, the Tourism: Brantford & Downtown Brantford Business Improvement Area Business Retention & Expansion Project also had two defined template sectors, yet they built the survey from previous tourism BR+E programs of the area (2001 and 2006). They argue the third BR+E was the most successful.<sup>x</sup> These factors need to be taken into consideration if a BR+E survey is to collect realistic information from small local food businesses.<sup>2</sup>

Although there are problems with the BR+E survey, the BR+E program has been vital to collecting information and identifying objectives for local food in Peterborough County that would not have otherwise been collected. It should be noted that in order for any data to have been collected the BR+E program had to be financed. Local Food – A Rural Opportunity, argues there is a lack of financing opportunity in most agri-related local food projects.<sup>xi</sup> Thus, as funds for this type of data collection are scarce, and the data that results is so important, it is imperative that the survey is made as effective and efficient at collecting accurate information as possible. Although the survey has significant shortcomings it should be considered an opportunity rather than a liability because it provides a framework for a more effective survey to be implemented. These changes include the adjustment of the survey structure with multiple templates and the organization and implementation of the BR+E surveys. Collectively, the changes I have

---

<sup>2</sup> The Local Food BR+E survey has a focus on agricultural and tourism related businesses who's busiest time of year is during the warmer months. It should be taken into account that each sector should be surveyed at different times periods when businesses are available over the less busy months: processors (October-November), producers (January-February) and retailers (March-April).



suggested not only provide a more accurate collection of information surrounding local food, but also foster more favorable relationships between community stakeholders.

---

## Endnotes

- <sup>i</sup> “Proudly Northumberland: East-Central Ontario Local Food Business Retention and Expansion Project,” Northumberland County, April 10, 2011, May 16, 2011, <<http://www.proudlynorthumberland.ca/pages/BRE.aspx>>.
- <sup>ii</sup> “Business Expansion and Retention: Resource Manual,” (Unknown Publisher).
- <sup>iii</sup> “Kenora District Agricultural Economic Impact Study,” (Kenora Ontario: Ontario Federation of Agriculture, October 2009) Introduction, VI.
- <sup>iv</sup> BR+E Resource Manual, page 7.
- <sup>v</sup> Fritz Scheuren, “What is a Survey?” (No Publication Information: 1980 version), accessed May 16, 2011 <[www.whatisasurvey.info/downloads/pamphlet\\_current.pdf](http://www.whatisasurvey.info/downloads/pamphlet_current.pdf)>.
- <sup>vi</sup> Kenora, page 72.
- <sup>vii</sup> “Prince Albert Regional Business Retention and Expansion Program 2009: Summary Results Report,” (Prince Albert, Saskatchewan: The Prince Albert Regional Economic Development Authority. March 31, 2009), page 4.
- <sup>viii</sup> “Durham Region Federation of Agriculture Business Retention and Expansion Project 2010 – 2011,” (Whitby Ontario: The Regional Municipality of Durham, March 2011), page 4. Fritz Scheuren, “What is a Survey?”
- <sup>ix</sup> Durham, introduction.
- <sup>x</sup> Susan Sager. “Business Retention and Expansion Project: Tourism Brantford & Downtown Brantford Business Improvement Area,” (Brantford Ontario: City and County of Brantford, Economic Development and Tourism and Government of Ontario. March 2008), Page 23.
- <sup>xi</sup> Humaira Irshad, “Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity,” (Unknown Publisher. 2010), page 23, 28.

---

## Bibliography

*Business Retention and Expansion: Resource Manual.* Unknown Publisher.

*Durham Region Federation of Agriculture Business Retention and Expansion Project  
2010 – 2011.* Whitby Ontario: The Regional Municipality of Durham, March 2011.

Irshad, Humaira. *Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity.* Unknown Publisher. 2010.

*Kenora District Agricultural Economic Impact Study.* Kenora Ontario: Ontario  
Federation of Agriculture. October 2009.

*Prince Albert Regional Business Retention and Expansion Program 2009: Summary  
Results Report.* Prince Albert, Saskatchewan: The Prince Albert Regional  
Economic Development Authority. 10 March 2009.

*Proudly Northumberland: East-Central Ontario Local Food Business Retention and  
Expansion Project.* 10 April 2011. 16 May 2011  
<<http://www.proudlynorthumberland.ca/pages/BRE.aspx>>.

Sager, Susan. *Business Retention and Expansion Project: Tourism Brantford &  
Downtown Brantford Business Improvement Area.* Brantford Ontario: City and  
County of Brantford, Economic Development and Tourism and Government of  
Ontario. March 2008.

---

Scheuren, Fritz. *What is a Survey?* No Publication Information: 1980 version used.

Accessed 16 May 2011

<[www.whatisasurvey.info/downloads/pamphlet\\_current.pdf](http://www.whatisasurvey.info/downloads/pamphlet_current.pdf)>.

Business Retention and Expansion Local Food Survey: Analysis and Recommendations  
to Increase Cooperation Along the Local Food Chain Within The Peterborough Area

Mary Coulas

Andy Mitchell

POST 4870

July 13, 2011

The local food movement continues to gain momentum within Canada, however, it remains underdeveloped in the Peterborough Area, due to the competition of larger global food markets which continue to dominate political, social and economic relations with consumers. Within the Peterborough Area, producers, processors and retailers all face obstacles in processing and distribution. This leads to gaps in the local food chain and limits the three sectors from establishing cooperation and stronger relations with local consumers. Collectively, it will be argued that connecting the three sectors of the local food system beyond the existing partnerships between producers and consumers would best be accomplished through a multi-stakeholder, for-profit food co-op, to increase the production and consumption of local food.<sup>1</sup> Results from the Business Retention and Expansion (BR+E) survey indicate that processing is a major challenge in the local food network. Aside from established abattoirs, there is a lack of fruit and vegetable processing, as well as local bakery facilities equipped to support local producers who have value-added products. These processing obstacles further complicate distribution as well as the availability and access of local food to institutions, retail, and small consumers. Processing challenges can be addressed by procuring a centralized facility that includes a community kitchen and cold storage. Once processing limitations are resolved, gaps in the local food chain can be filled as cooperation between producers, processors and retailers can be established through distribution. Potential growth in an established distribution system, Community Share Agriculture (CSA) and Restaurant Sponsored Agriculture (RSA), and the improvement of farmers markets is very important; however, these organizations can not independently develop the local food

---

<sup>1</sup> Although there is an established food co-op within Peterborough, data collected identifies that it has many limitation that do not connect all sectors.

chain to its full potential. Thus, a multi-stakeholder, for-profit local food co-op is the best solution as there is opportunity to encompass various types of local food organizations and initiatives, both established and desired, to connect and progressively meet the needs of all local food sectors.

To understand the limitation of the present local food chain within the Peterborough Area, the results of the BR+E surveys from all three sectors must be discussed.<sup>2</sup> Producers argue two main points. First, there is a lack of access to processing facilities and/or commercial kitchens where produce can be transformed into more profitable value-added products. Furthermore, there is no local food distribution system or a local food establishment that is open daily throughout the year to expand profits and marketing abilities. Second, small producers cannot reach their full potential through expanding the quantity and quality of their product because of legislative regulations and a lack of financing opportunities that limit the size of their operations. Collectively, most local food producers are small and for cooperation to occur within the Peterborough Area, small producers must be identified and treated equally through large-scale relationships at the local level in order to facilitate the right balance of competition and cooperation that allows all sectors to flourish.<sup>i</sup>

The second sector, processors, are a common and important link between producers and retailers; yet, within the Peterborough Area, there are only abattoirs. This creates gaps as certain farms that do not produce meat do not complete the food chain on a local level (or not at all), and must send their produce greater distances to be processed.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that although the BR+E was distributed to all sectors through a common survey, the results are grouped according to similar limitations of each sector.

This creates the costly financial and environmental disadvantages of food miles.<sup>ii</sup> Also, there is more competition between abattoirs because there are few. Thus the completion of the food chain only occurs between certain producers, processors and retailers who create contracts with one another. Aside from expanding processing facilities to fresh produce as well as other value-adding, there must also be a community kitchen and cold storage to secure prolonged processing and sales that surpass seasonality. New types of processing and processing facilities need to be approached with equal opportunity. Thus, there must be more access and knowledge about the political, economical and social benefits of local food processors in order to create a balanced competition and cooperation along the local food chain.<sup>iii</sup>

For retailers, the data collected identifies limitations in two ways. First, a centralized distribution network needs to be established or built from an already established distribution network. This distribution network must deliver local food produce/products to retailers, reducing the amount of time spent on securing local food for daily business operations.<sup>3</sup> Also, for local food to become more competitive with global food markets, many retailers desire an online resource and ordering system that is easily accessible, and identifies and updates all local food producers, processors, and suppliers. Second, marketing and joint cooperation through the Greater Peterborough and Area Economic Development Corporation (GPA EDC) and Kawartha Choice FarmFresh (KCFF) with other businesses of the local food chain needs to be improved, in order for

---

<sup>3</sup> Many retailers and consumers who are passion about local food find themselves spending more time searching, traveling and buying local food then using it. If cooperatives measures are to be secured along the local food chain, the time obtaining local food must be efficiently reduced.



the local food market to increase competition with international markets.<sup>4</sup> Retailers are identified as the most important sector of the local food chain because a majority of consumers in both rural and urban centers depend on the convenience retailers provide; specifically access to a wide variety of foods all year long and at a reasonable price. Most retailers are not local food centered because of the gaps in the local food chain within the Peterborough Area. For retailers to connect with the other sectors of local food there needs to be better access to processing through distribution and cooperative marketing.

Collectively, all three sectors identify a need for fruit and vegetable processing, as well as a distribution system that meets the needs of all businesses located within Peterborough and Area. Gord Hume argues the commercialization of food products is an important economic generator for municipalities, thus a community is truly defined by its support of the production, and processing and manufacturing of local food.<sup>iv</sup> Other local food systems, such as Vermont and Vancouver, have started out with similar limitations and successfully established a stronger food chain by increasing storage and processing facilities as well as establishing a small distribution system. Within Vermont, the local food system has grown very quickly but it has only been able to do so because cooperation was created through marketing and financing programs.<sup>v</sup> Within Vancouver, there is a stronger local food community because of an increase in processing facilities. Over the last 10 years these facilities have lead to rebuilding the local food infrastructure where small producers, processors and retailers are able to compete with global food

---

<sup>4</sup> KCFF has a local food directory, including dates and contact information for local food businesses, yet many individuals who use it become frustrated as it is not updated daily. If an individual is contracted seasonally to update a local food directory and provide information to all three sectors and consumers, there would be an increase in local food knowledge and consumption.

markets.<sup>vi</sup> Collectively, the results from Peterborough and Area's BR+E are both overlapping and specific to each sector, but these concerns can be, and have been met within other jurisdictions. It is understood that there is no processing facility for local fresh produce and, in order for distribution to expand, there must be increased availability of processed products. To move forward, one must acknowledge and critique present limitations of what Peterborough and Area has to offer in relation distribution as well as possible future improvements that do not already exist.

Processing opportunities including fruit and vegetable, as well as a facility equipped for baking, are essential for creating growth in all three sectors. A common initiative within growing local food chains is a community kitchen; organized by local community economic development groups to provide small food businesses with licensed kitchen space to process food.<sup>vii</sup> Many producers want more than just a community kitchen. They would prefer a facility equipped with staff that would do the processing for a low cost. This would allow producers more time for improving production and making more connections with other local food businesses.<sup>viii</sup> An example is the Vermont Food Venture Center where a shared kitchen is rented hourly for co-packing and value-adding of specialty products.<sup>ix</sup> Within Peterborough there are already established kitchens within educational institutions that could become commercial kitchens. The action of connecting the local food chain to this type of facility is still under construction. As Karen Jopling notes, "we are in the process of working with Fleming College Culinary Program to implement 'how to' seminars in canning, preserving, and freezing."<sup>x</sup> Collectively, processing must become available if a distribution system of local food is to be established and remain stable. The possibilities and limitations within the current

distribution systems need also be acknowledge in order for the local food movement to move forward.

The most common distribution systems within local food chains are called CSA and RSA. These are partnerships of mutual commitment between farms and groups of consumers. CSA and RSA members cover a farm's yearly operating budget by purchasing a share of the season's harvest before the beginning of the growing season.<sup>xi</sup> Within Peterborough both CSA and RSA are in operation. This is beneficial because they create a group of consumers who buy into the risk of local producers, which places a greater emphasis on the importance and cost of food. The consumers have access to high-quality food and the small-scale farmer has a guaranteed market.<sup>xii</sup> Within Quebec, Freme Cooperative Tourne-Sol is a CSA network that benefits all members and consumers because it challenges the mainstream business structure of food politics to ensure a healthy and sustainable lifestyle.<sup>xiii</sup>

There are limitations to these purchasing and distribution systems within the Peterborough Area. First, there is a lack of marketing and knowledge of the food market. Thus, there is a smaller number of local producers and consumers involved. Peterborough and Area has a large population that should benefit from local food, but CSA and RSA only connect a small portion of producers and consumers. If the local food movement is to expand, influence and benefit the social, political and economical atmosphere of Peterborough and area, larger markets of consumers, processors and retailers must be met. Second, there is a lack of extra financing for the marketing and distribution to retailers who have a larger business and consumers. Collectively, both CSA and RSA do not connect all the sectors of the local food chain because only producers and consumers

and certain retailers are benefitting. Leaving out processing leads to an increase demand for easy access products from larger global food markets that meet the needs of consumers.

Institutional procurement, the consumption of local food in local institutions, does not occur within the Peterborough Area but would increase the amount of food being produced and consumed within our community. Ontario's food processing sector has an estimated worth of 33 billion dollars and uses about 75% of Ontario produced food, yet a majority of the food is created through large scale, non-environmentally friendly farming and does not remain local.<sup>xiv</sup> Food that is exported is sent to international large scale processing facilities, then bought back creating an unnecessary increase in food miles and price.<sup>xv</sup> Institutional procurement would increase the consumption of local food in local institutions such as hospitals, all levels of schools, and all other public cafeterias.

Although the percentage of local food available would vary depending on seasonality, larger public institutions could build a stronger local capacity of economic and social relations to redirect money back into the Peterborough and Area agricultural sector.<sup>xvi</sup>

Within other regions, institutions like the University of Toronto are showing that preferences for local food can be contracted. The university sources up to 15% of its food from Ontario and there are plans to increase this percentage over time.<sup>xvii</sup> Likewise, the government of Nova Scotia supports local farmers using policies that encourage the purchase of local products in provincial health care and justice institutes.<sup>xviii</sup> Within Peterborough and Area, there is a desire to create a connection between the present distributor, local food producers, local food consumers/retailers and institutions.<sup>xix</sup>

Collectively, institutional procurement is needed and wanted and will benefit all sectors

of the local food chain once fruit and vegetable processing is available.

Farmers markets are also well established within Peterborough and throughout the surrounding areas and act as a distribution center where consumers, processors and retailers journey to access local food. Farmers markets are beneficial because they provide a direct marketing channel where producers utilize space (public or private) to sell their products and capture a greater portion of the food dollar while developing a loyal following of customers. In turn, consumers benefit from the freshness, fair labour, and nutrition.<sup>xx</sup> The limitations of farmers markets in the Peterborough Area is that they are non-profit and cannot maintain a continuous expansion or stability of local food distribution that meets the needs of consumers and retailers. The farmers markets use public land and some lease the space for a high price, thus public access does not ease certain regulations or costs for local food producers.<sup>xxi</sup> Although both the local food co-op and the farmers markets act as the main distribution networks, other than farm gates, they do not sustain themselves enough to expand the interest or needs of the larger population of the Peterborough Area.

In order to move past these limitations of local farmers markets, the Peterborough Area needs a local food distributor that has both a secure location and a food transportation system that reaches all local markets.<sup>xxii</sup> A secure location would reduce cost to farmers market members/vendors, provide further marketing opportunities, longer hours of operation and could be for or non-profit where any extra income created could be redirected back into the maintenance of the farmers market. An example is the Really Local Harvest Co-op in Dieppe, New Brunswick. It is the “direct marketing that generates profits” and having a secure facility to do so expands opportunities of

cooperation between all producers and processors who value-add. Furthermore, members efficiently pool products in order to meet larger supply demands from wholesale buyers.<sup>xxiii</sup> Having a transportation-based distribution system would also be beneficial because it connects local food to consumers and retailers from further distances, thus building new cooperation(s). Most gaps within local food chains are due to problems with distribution such that if a distribution system is not acquired the chain will never be completed; thus, each section loses a variety of economical and social opportunities.<sup>xxiv</sup> Collectively, processing and distribution centers are, and can be improved in the local food chain. Separately, all previously discussed initiatives of local food distribution and processing are small and self-asserted, yet they do not create cooperation along the local food chain and will not broaden the possibilities of the local food movement. Thus, many of these initiatives must come together under one for-profit business in order for the local food market to develop and remain competitive with the global food markets.

In relation, another local food distribution initiative that exists in the Peterborough Area is local food within grocery stores and a local food co-op. Within grocery stores, promotions such as Foodland Ontario are beneficial for Ontario food produced by large scale farms, but it is limiting to the small producers of local food in the Peterborough Area because there is no distribution to retail outlets. Also, the amount of produce needed continuously through out the year from each producer cannot be met through small-scale seasonal production. The local food co-op alike CSA and RSA is limited in marketing, number of members, seasonality and is mainly based around sustainable, organic produce. It should be noted that the food co-op does have an established retail outlet, yet this is limited by staffing problems, hours of operations and distribution. As addressed

within the local food chains of Vermont, “the challenge is lack of convenience and efficiency of distribution that supports a more centralized marketplace.”<sup>xxv</sup> Thus, within Vermont regional food hubs have fulfilled distribution obstacles, including consolidating, joint marketing, co-packing and transportation of products from rural farm gates to urban centers. If these services were available locally, all sectors of the local food chain would be connected and benefitting because the movement of produce from farm to processor would increase. Furthermore if processing is established, institutions, including grocery stores, would be supporting expansion opportunities to increase production of local producers, processors and retailers because local food would be easily accessible. Collectively, as demonstrated within Vermont, the connecting of all sectors of the local food chain can only occur when multiple initiatives are established and working in cooperation.

For the Peterborough Area, the solution is a multi-stake holder, for-profit co-op. This is an organization owned by the members (producers, processors, retailers and consumers) who use its services. Co-operatives can provide any product or service through empowering individuals, and encouraging healthier and stronger communities by enabling people to pool their resources, share risks and achieve common goals.<sup>xxvi</sup> As recommended in the Kenora and District Local Food Processing Business Retention and Expansion results, “producers and other interest groups need to examine the establishment of a cooperative as away to facilitate the development of local infrastructure such as processing facilities and storage facilities.”<sup>xxvii</sup> A co-op is the better initiative to pursue because it has a business like structure, yet is focused on meeting the common social and economical needs of its members.<sup>xxviii</sup> In order to secure a stable and

competitive market, there must be a linkage between all sectors, creating a shorter, more localized food supply chain based on members who support one another.<sup>xxix 5</sup> This also specifically draws in small local food businesses, and restricts the large agri-businesses and factory farms that do not develop healthy food, fair trade and labour, or sustainable agricultural techniques.<sup>xxx</sup> Peterborough Area can create a co-op like Vancouver Island Heritage Food Service Cooperative with a pilot project to complete the regional value chain and incorporate local food institutions. The Vancouver Island Heritage Food co-op is a multi-stakeholder group that includes various members: farmers, workers, co-packing businesses, alternative food distributors, and community organizations.<sup>xxxi</sup>

This can be easily be achieved and further improved within the Peterborough Area through the already long-time established co-op that currently sells local food of KCFF members. If a processing facility is established/utilized for local food processing that meets the demands of local consumers/retailers, distribution would cease to be an obstacle, as the present local distributor which is used by most retailers has expressed the desire to distribute local food within its contracts.<sup>xxxii</sup> The co-op would expand to incorporate processing through a commercial kitchen and cold storage in a joint collaboration of courses with Trent University's department of Sustainability and Fleming College Sustainable Agriculture and Culinary departments. This would provide educational seminars that promote local food through a processing and sustainable agriculture focus, expand the marketing and knowledge of local food in general, and create skilled and unskilled labour opportunities. Having a permanent location with the

---

<sup>5</sup> Within Canada there has been a decreasing agricultural population since the 1950s. Therefore, there has been a decline in political support of agriculture communities, as well as resentment towards all forms of Canadian government from the remaining farm population.



existing co-op would also allow space for the establishment of a permanent farmers market open throughout the week, year round. If large amounts of food are processed and stored, and the present distribution system was in partnership, institutional procurement could occur. A stronger CSA and RSA could simultaneously be created (with or without) transported distribution because there would be a centralized market of diverse local food products. This central location could also lead to an online distribution center where consumers place orders and create contacts with farmers/restaurants. An example of this process is The Ottawa Valley Food Co-operative which has established a monthly customized an online ordering system of local food. This networking has allowed local consumers to connect with local producers and re-establish a credible and consistent food retail and distribution system which allows producers to post available products and consumers to order the food they desire.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Collectively, a multi-stake holder, for-profit co-op would amalgamate the above local food initiatives and the already existing local food sectors. Thus, eliminating the present limitations of local food initiatives will provide cooperative relationships where local production and consumption of food will increase.

Presently, the dramatic rising of exported local food has simultaneously increased the short-term instability in Canadian agriculture and agricultural related products, as well as the overall decline of the agriculture industry in Canada.<sup>xxxiv</sup> The establishment of a multi-stakeholder, for-profit food co-op, will increase the production, competition and consumption of local food in comparison to global food in the Peterborough Area, thus reversing the decline of sustainable food networks. From the BR+E results, there is a lack of fresh produce processing facilities and local food distribution initiatives that are

occurring at the present time are limited in various ways. CSA and RSA groups have established support to local producers and a cooperation of both urban and rural communities, but these systems create closed networks, even contracts between certain consumers and producers, thus the local food movement cannot expand. Farmers markets create access to local food weekly, but as non-profit organizations that operate seasonally, there is instability in maintaining and expanding the local food movement in the Peterborough Area. Other initiatives such as institutional procurement and increased local food in grocery stores year round have been emphasized as important factors to building the local food movement, yet a processing facility must be established first. Collectively a multi-stakeholder, for profit co-op will connect all present and desired local food initiatives to producers, processors and retailers to create a larger population of local consumers that will encourage and secure an increase in production and consumption of local food.

As demonstrated in Vermont and Vancouver, completion of the local food system has economic, health, and cultural benefits. A strong local food system promotes a healthier lifestyle among residents and fosters a sense of community between producers, processors and consumers. Furthermore, If Peterborough and surrounding area completes the local food system by taking the recommendations put forth, other communities and even larger urban centers may follow suit. Therefore, a multi-stakeholder, for-profit local food co-op may not only benefit the Peterborough Area, but countless other communities as well. Thus, this grassroots movement has the potential to contribute to the increasing momentum of the local foods movement as whole.

## Notes

- 
- <sup>i</sup> “Kenora District Agricultural Economic Impact Study,” (Kenora Ontario: Ontario Federation of Agriculture, October 2009) Introduction, VI.
- <sup>ii</sup> Amy Francis, ed., *The Local Food Movement*, (Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2010) 55.
- <sup>iii</sup> Gord Hume, *The Local Food Revolution*, (St.Thomas, ON: Municipal World Inc, 2010) 86.
- <sup>iv</sup> *The Local Food Revolution*, 51.
- <sup>v</sup> Virginia Nickerson, “Understanding Vermont’s Local Food Landscape: An Inventory and Assessment of Recent Local Food Initiatives,” (The Vermont Sustainable Agriculture Council, 2008) 26.
- <sup>vi</sup> Chris Hild, “The Economy of Local Food in Vancouver,” (Vancouver Economic Development, 2009), 5.
- <sup>vii</sup> “Local Food Initiatives In Canada: An Overview and Policy Recommendations,” (Canadian Co-operative Association, 2008), 10.
- <sup>viii</sup> Karen Jopling, “Major Objectives for Kawartha Choice FarmFresh,” Face to Face Interview, June 10, 2011.
- <sup>ix</sup> Vermont’s Local Food Landscape, 10.
- <sup>x</sup> Karen Jopling Interview.
- <sup>xi</sup> Adrian Egbers and Stefan Epp, “Working Together for Local Food: Co-operative Profiles and Resources Guide,” (Canadian Co-operative Association, 2009), 8.
- <sup>xii</sup> Humaira Irshad, “Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity,” (Unknown Publisher. 2010), 13.
- <sup>xiii</sup> Working Together for Local Food: Co-operative Profiles and Resources Guide, 8.
- <sup>xiv</sup> “Local Food Movement Needs Local Processing,” Food and Farming Canada Oct. 15, 2010, June 20, 2011, <<http://www.foodandfarmingcanada.com/2010/10/29/local-food-movement-needs-local-processing/>>.
- <sup>xv</sup> *The Local Food Movement*, 55.
- <sup>xvi</sup> *The Economy of Local Food in Vancouver*, 5.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Jessica Leeder, “Campus Eating: Local-Loving Chef Changing U of T,” *Globe and Mail* [Toronto] May 14, 2011: A20.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Local Food Initiatives In Canada: An Overview and Policy Recommendations, 6.
- <sup>xix</sup> Karen Jopling Interview.
- <sup>xx</sup> Local Food Initiatives In Canada: An Overview and Policy Recommendations, 14.
- <sup>xxi</sup> *The Economy of Local Food in Vancouver*, 4.
- <sup>xxii</sup> *The Economy of Local Food in Vancouver*, 4.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Local Food Initiatives In Canada: An Overview and Policy Recommendations, 18.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Local Food Initiatives In Canada: An Overview and Policy Recommendations, 10.
- <sup>xxv</sup> Understanding Vermont’s Local Food Landscape: An Inventory and Assessment of Recent Local Food Initiatives, 25.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Local Food Initiatives In Canada: An Overview and Policy Recommendations, iii.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Kenora District Agricultural Economic Impact Study, 101.

- 
- xxviii Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity, 15.
- xxix The Local Food Revolution, 42.
- xxx Local Food Movement, 29.
- xxxi Understanding Vermont's Local Food Landscape: An Inventory and Assessment of Recent Local Food Initiatives, 25-26.
- xxxii Karen Jopling Interview.
- xxxiii Working Together for Local Food: Co-operative Profiles and Resources Guide, 20.
- xxxiv *Microeconomics Chapter 16W* "Canadian Agriculture: Economics and Policy," 5.

---

## Bibliography

- Egbers, Adrian and Stefan Epp. *Working Together for Local Food: Co-operative Profiles and Resources Guide*. Canadian Co-operative Association, 2009.
- Francis, Amy. *The Local Food Movement*. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2010.
- Hild, Chris. *The Economy of Local Food in Vancouver*. Vancouver Economic Development, 2009.
- Hume, Gord. *The Local Food Revolution*. St. Thomas, ON: Municipal World Inc, 2010.
- Irshad, Humaira. *Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity*. Unknown Publisher. 2010.
- Kenora District Agricultural Economic Impact Study*. Kenora Ontario: Ontario Federation of Agriculture, October 2009.
- Jopling, Karen. *Major Objectives for Kawartha Choice FarmFresh*. Face to Face Interview, June 10, 2011.
- Leeder, Jessica. *Campus Eating: Local-Loving Chef Changing U of T*. Globe and Mail [Toronto] May 14, 2011: A20.
- Local Food Initiatives In Canada: An Overview and Policy Recommendations*. Canadian Co-operative Association, 2008.
- Local Food Movement Needs Local Processing*. Food and Farming Canada Oct. 15, 2010, June 20, 2011. <<http://www.foodandfarmingcanada.com/2010/10/29/local-food-movement-needs-local-processing/>>.

---

*Microeconomics Chapter 16W* Canadian Agriculture: Economics and Policy. (Unknown  
Publisher or Publishing Year).

Nickerson, Virginia. *Understanding Vermont's Local Food Landscape: An Inventory and  
Assessment of Recent Local Food Initiatives*. The Vermont Sustainable  
Agriculture Council, 2008.

Recommendations For Distribution Local Food Business Retention and Expansion

Results

Mary Coulas

Andy Mitchell

POST 4870

July 27, 2011

In order for the local food market to compete with international food markets, all local food sectors must collaborate to increase the production and consumption of local food. For this to occur the local agri-food sectors of the Peterborough Area must be informed of the results from the Local Food Business Retention and Expansion (BR+E) project. It will be argued that all sectors must be brought together collectively as well as individually, in an efficient and easily accessible fashion, to allow producers, processors, retailers and consumers to discuss the results that are specific to each sector. For this to be achieved, the best practices designed to inform the argi-food sectors will be discussed as well as recommendations for potentially implementing a local food co-op that will connect all sectors.

The process of informing all local food sectors of the BR+E results should occur in a timely fashion. First, there should be an initial meeting that will include all Kawartha Choice FarmFresh (KCFF) members from all sectors, including those who participated in the BR+E survey and those who did not, as well as Karen Jopling and all consultants involved from Northumberland County. This meeting would serve as a forum to discuss the BR+E results, obstacles facing local food sectors, potential solutions as well as general recommendations for improvement. This will also empower all sectors to develop new personal and business relationships with other sectors. These members can then take this information back to their communities and organized committees to further distribute the information. Second, the Greater Peterborough Area Economic Development Corporation (GPA EDC) and Consultants from Northumberland County will distribute the results at public meetings, including municipal township and county meetings,



association meetings<sup>1</sup>, and within academic institutions (Trent and Fleming, high schools).<sup>2</sup> This will be publicized through radio advertisements, a Chex Newswatch interview, local news papers, print/electronic newsletters handed out through e-mail or at farmers markets, and personal contacts.<sup>3</sup>

Collectively, having multiple meetings with informal, yet a systematic presentation to different audiences ensures that the important information that would otherwise not be acknowledged, is gained from the results. As demonstrated within Vermont, there must be collaboration between local municipal governments and local food organizations/institutions because local governments have the resources to provide long-term support for local food initiatives that will improve local food systems.<sup>i</sup> If enough interest is expressed, the possibility of a multi-stake holder for profit co-operative can be discussed as a recommendation to solve existing problems. For this to occur, there must also be a process for developing the co-op.

As demonstrated by Co-operatives Info Guide through Canada Business Ontario, there are three phases (seven steps) to forming a successful co-operative.<sup>ii</sup> These steps are essential to creating a successful co-op, and as illustrated by The Canadian Co-operative Association these steps have been followed in a many effective types of co-ops in Canada and the United States including multiple communities of Vermont,<sup>iii</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> These would include the Cattlemen's Association, 4-H committee meetings, Health Unit, etc.

<sup>2</sup> As demonstrated in the initial process of developing the Local Food BR+E project, a one time general meeting does not inform enough people to make a project worthwhile. Having multiple meetings enables diverse groups of people to hear and discuss the results as well as potentially pass along the information and create action.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that many local residence, both rural and urban uses these form of media every day. Although some forms may be used more frequently over others, the information is still given in an informative manner that reaches many individuals.

Ottawa Valley Food Co-operative,<sup>iv</sup> Vancouver Island Heritage Foodservice Co-operative,<sup>v</sup> The Eat Local Sudbury Co-operative<sup>vi</sup> and should be used in the Peterborough Area. Phase one includes developing the co-operative business idea where a group of interested people will be assembled and a feasibility study will be preformed. Before the general meeting with all KCFF members occurs, a small meeting for the existing local food co-op, the Peterborough Co-op and the Peterborough farmers market(s) will occur to discuss the possibility of establishing a multi-stake holder for profit co-op. A co-op is a unique form of enterprise that requires a different approach to development, and since it is both a business and an association of people, the co-op's success will depend on the strength of each of these two dimensions of the enterprise.<sup>vii</sup>

If all three groups decided to move forward, then phase two (coordinating the pre-co-operative's activities) can begin. This will include individual group meetings that will occur to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) of each business.<sup>4</sup> The local food co-op and farmers market(s) would have their members/vendors at these meeting to present their own ideas and to identify if the process should continue to move forward from a producer, processor, retailer and consumer point of view.<sup>5</sup> During these meetings, a viability study will be conducted for those who want to be involved. Once the idea has been approved to progress even further, the possibility of implementing a multi-stakeholder co-op will be emphasized at the first meeting with the KCFF members, and then again at public meetings to determine if there will be enough

---

<sup>4</sup> A SWOT analysis will be preformed for each business to confirm and build upon the existing information gained from the BR+E surveys, and to include any changes that would have occurred since the surveys were done.

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that the timing of these meetings will be very influential to the strength of the overall project. See appendix for timeline.

people interested in undertaking the project. Once this has been approved to move forward the forming of the co-operative can begin.

In phase three, the organizing and start up of the co-op will first include creating the association. A committee of members who make decisions for the operation of the Co-op will be formed. Second, the organization of the enterprise will be created through a business plan.<sup>6</sup> The business plan should be created by those on the co-op committee and then finalized by the GPA EDC. Third, the GPA EDC and Northumberland County will hold a public meeting to detail the results of the BR+E project and discuss the process of developing the co-op. Once the project is scheduled to start, then the project will be heavily publicized through media, such as radio advertisements and news clips, a Chex Newswatch interview, newspaper advertisement and interviews, as well as through established newsletters and e-mails within institutions such as Trent and Fleming.<sup>viii</sup>

The limitation of this implementation process is that the results are only made public to individuals who are currently part of the local food value chain. Thus, there is a lack of input from outside sources. Yet, this structured process to discuss the results of the BR+E project and to begin implementation of the co-op is beneficial because it involves informal, face-to-face contact that creates increased participation and expressed concerns/agreement that would other wise not be obtained through a single general

---

<sup>6</sup> The business plan will detail the products and services that will be produced or sold, the organization of work and the management approach, the results of the market study and the marketing plan, the characteristics of the paid and unpaid human capital (the members), equipment and material needed, financing requirements and the financing plan. See appendix for rough draft of business plan.

meeting, e-mail, or news letters.<sup>7</sup> Having multiple meetings in a distinct time period allows progress to occur sooner and to be based on continuous input. Having the involvement of the GPA EDC and Northumberland County consultants emphasizes the importance of the results. It makes apparent the potential connections with other local agri-business sectors, as well as with other regions involved in the BR+E project, and it creates educational opportunities for individuals located outside the local food value chain once public meetings begin. Also, the participation of GPA EDC and the Northumberland County consultants is a link to potential funding<sup>ix</sup> and other agricultural related government initiatives. As Gorde Hume illustrates, bringing together the culture of a community with the municipal government will create economic stimulus, especially in tourist regions such as Peterborough Area.<sup>x 8</sup>

The results of the BR+E project must be distributed by bringing all local food sectors together collectively as well as individually through an efficient multi-meeting agenda to allow producers, processors, retailers and consumers to discuss the potential steps forward in a progressive, yet efficient fashion. Having multiple meetings that incorporate the three phases of forming a successful co-operative enables informal, yet systematic presentation to a gradually increasing audience. This ensures that important information (new and old) is continuously acknowledged. Although having the results specifically addressed to the local food sectors at first appears to be a barrier, it creates

---

<sup>7</sup> It should be noted that during the implementation of the BR+E surveys, contacts argued they did not receive the initial letter in the mail, or e-mails sent after contact had been made. Having meetings with incentives such as food, funding/marketing/business opportunities cannot be ignored in comparison to news letters/e-mails that can easily be pushed aside.

<sup>8</sup> International and national governments, as well as local municipalities require strategic thinking and planning for food security. The multi-step meetings are the stepping-stones to policies and further research that will connect all local food sectors.

the opportunity for potential recommendations to move forward quickly. This approach also creates other essential opportunities such as funding, government support and in time, larger education and support of non-local food sectors of the Peterborough Area. Since other communities with similar structures to distributing information and establishing co-operatives have been successful, it would be limiting to the local food sectors if the approach presented above was not pursued. The multi-meeting format needs to be put into action if Peterborough Area is to increase the local food production and consumption in relation to competing with international food markets.

---

Notes

<sup>i</sup> Virginia Nickerson, “Understanding Vermont’s Local Food Landscape: An Inventory and Assessment of Recent Local Food Initiatives,” (The Vermont Sustainable Agriculture Council, 2008), 34, 39.

<sup>ii</sup> GPA EDC Business Advisory Center, Informal interview, July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011.

<sup>iii</sup> Vermont’s Local Food Landscape, 40-41.

<sup>iv</sup> Adrian Egbers and Stefan Epp, “Working Together for Local Food: Co-operative Profiles and Resources Guide,” (Canadian Co-operative Association, 2009), 8.

<sup>iv</sup> Humaira Irshad, “Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity,” (Unknown Publisher, 2010), 20-21.

<sup>v</sup> Chris Hild, “The Economy of Local Food in Vancouver,” (Vancouver Economic Development, 2009), 18.

<sup>vi</sup> Working Together for Local Food (CCA), 3.

<sup>vii</sup> “How To Start a Co-op,” *Canadian Co-operatives Association*, July 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011, <<http://www.coopscanada.coop/en/coopdev/StartCoop>>.

<sup>viii</sup> Trissia Mcalister (Northumberland County BR+E Consultant), Informal telephone interview, July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011.

<sup>ix</sup> Humaira Irshad, “Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity,” (Unknown Publisher, 2010), 23, 28

<sup>x</sup> Gord Hume, *The Local Food Revolution*, (St. Thomas, ON: Municipal World Inc, 2010) 77.

---

## Bibliography

- Egbers, Adrian and Stefan Epp. *Working Together for Local Food: Co-operative Profiles and Resources Guide*. Canadian Co-operative Association, 2009.
- Greater Peterborough Area Economic Development Corporation Business Advisory Center, Informal/in person interview, July 21st, 2011.
- Hild, Chris. *The Economy of Local Food in Vancouver*. Vancouver Economic Development, 2009.
- How To Start a Co-op*. Canadian Co-operatives Association. July 23, 2011, <<http://www.coopscanada.coop/en/coopdev/StartCoop>>.
- Hume, Gord. *The Local Food Revolution*. St. Thomas, ON: Municipal World Inc, 2010.
- Irshad, Humaira. *Alberta: Local Food, A Rural Opportunity*. Unknown Publisher. 2010.
- Mcalister, Trissia, (Northumberland County BR+E Consultant), Informal telephone interview, July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011.
- Nickerson, Virginia. *Understanding Vermont's Local Food Landscape: An Inventory and Assessment of Recent Local Food Initiatives*. The Vermont Sustainable Agriculture Council, 2008.

---

## Appendices

### **Schedule for Multi-Step Meetings**

The following meetings are structured as a progressing timeline. They will take place between November 2012 and mid March 2013. Although the results will be released May 2012 a majority of local food businesses are at their seasonal peak times. The meetings have been strategically planned so that all sectors have the ability to meet with less obstacles. The spacing of the meeting also accommodates holidays and times when children are not in school as most individuals local in the local food value chain are family oriented. It should also be noted that following each meeting the consultants will allow themselves time to further discuss the results or implementation of the co-op with anyone who wishes to stay.

**First week of November 2012 :** Meeting between local food co-op, long standing Peterborough Co-op, and farmers market(s). This meeting will take 2 hours. The first hour will include discussion of the results and the obstacles that the local food sector faces. The second hour will be more positive with looking at the possibility of the multi-stakeholder co-op. Discussion of comments, concerns and the end decision to progress or not will follow.

**Last three weeks of November 2012:** Individual meetings each business (one per week): long standing Peterborough Co-op, and farmers market(s). Each will have their members/vendors/stakeholders present to discuss the results and implementation of the multi-stakeholder co-op. These meetings will take 2 hours. The first 40 minutes will be a shortened version of the results, but the main points will still be emphasized. The remaining time will include 20 minutes of discussing the implementation of the co-op followed by a viability study and SWOT (Strength, weakness, opportunities, threats of each business) analysis if each group approves further progression of co-op implementation.

**First week of December:** A meeting will occur between the Agricultural Development Officer of the Greater Peterborough Area Economic Development Corporation (GPA EDC), the local food co-op, the long standing Peterborough co-op and the farmers markets (as well as all stakeholders of each business) to design a rough outline of the business structure. A committee will be formed of members who make decisions for the operation of the Co-op. The organization of the enterprise will also be created through a business plan. This will be followed by e-mail during the following week that will allow any editing to occur and revision to be made by the communications officer at the GPA EDC. The business plan will be presented at the general meeting to KCFF members. Having a strong plan will encourage others to participate as well as the process of implementing the co-op to occur sooner.

**Second week of January 2013:** The general meeting of all Kawartha Choice FarmFresh (KCFF) members will take place. This will also include the Northumberland County



---

consultants and Karen Jopling. The results and the possibility of implementing a multi-stakeholder co-op will be discussed during a 2.5 hours meeting. During the first 1.5 hours the results will be discussed in greater detail. This will be followed by 45 minutes of explaining recommendations with emphasis on the co-op and a distribution of the business plan. A question and answer period will run until the end of the meeting and will include discussion from the members with the consultants. Anyone who is interested in further participation can sign up for more meetings to organize the co-op.

**Middle of January 2013 – Mid March 2013:** Karen Jopling of the GPA EDC and the Northumberland County consultants will hold public meetings detailing the results and to discuss the process of developing and implementing the co-op to any organization/business that will allow the meetings to take place. These meetings will vary between 1-2 hours depending on the availability of the organization.

---

## **Business Plan: Peterborough and Area's Local Food Cooperative**

### **Section #1: Executive Summary**

The local food co-op will be a multi-stake holder, for profit organization where partnership is based around meeting the needs of members and establishing a sustainable local food value chain that connects all agriculturally related food sectors (producers, processors, retailers and consumers). The location will be situated in a high traffic, yet easily visible and accessible area on either George Street or Lansdowne Street with lots of parking. Products will include fresh and processed products from local producers. Funding will be needed for start up costs. It should be noted that this business plan is general and will be built upon once the project begins. Thus, specific products, prices, funding, location, etc., cannot be determined at this point.

### **Section #2: Business Venture**

#### **Background**

- Start up date/Opening date: Spring 2013
- Name: Peterborough Local Food Co-op
- The Peterborough Local Food Co-op is a multi-stakeholder, for profit co-operative that will increase production and consumption of local food in Peterborough and Area by bringing all agri-related food sectors together (producers, processors, retailers and consumers). This will include a cold storage, community kitchen, daily farmer's market and/or Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) and Restaurant Support Agriculture network depending on if distribution is established.
- Key individuals involved: local food co-op, long running Peterborough co-op and Peterborough farmer(s) markets. This will further include any vendors of the co-ops and farmers markets who will become members. It should be noted that this organization will be owned by the members (producers, processors, retailers and consumers) who use its services. Co-operatives can provide any product or service through empowering individuals, and encouraging healthier and stronger communities by enabling people to pool their resources, share risks and achieve common goals. Being for-profit multi-stake holder organization, extra income gained from sales will go back into the maintenance of the co-op and depending on how much is left over, will be divided up between members to aid the production of local food.
- Funding potentially from different levels of government, members and organizations such as Canadian Cooperative Association. Two examples:

#### ***Co-operative Development Initiative***

---

The goal of this CDI program component is to support projects in areas of public policy priority that test innovative applications of the co-operative model. Within this goal, broad activities to be supported should contribute to: testing the co-op model in new and innovative ways; strengthening co-operatives and co-operative sectors; and generating information on best practices and lessons learned, or other information that adds to the body of co-op development knowledge. Building on the recognized strengths of co-operatives, the Government of Canada is interested in learning more about how co-operatives can contribute to meeting the economic and social needs of Canadians.

### ***The Price Pooling Program***

provides a price guarantee that protects marketing agencies and producers against unanticipated declines in the market price of their products. Program participants use the price guarantee as security in obtaining credit from lending institutions. This credit allows the marketing agency to improve cash flow of producers through an initial payment for products delivered. It also provides equal returns to producers for products of like grades, varieties and types. This program is designed to assist and encourage cooperative marketing of eligible agricultural products, including processed products.

### **Future Plans**

- Goals at year one mark: established a secure location and funding that will support the incorporation of a cold storage and community kitchen. The number of multi-stake holder members will be over 100, excluding consumer members.
- Goals at year two mark: create a contract with the local distribution network to transport local food from local producers to the co-op to be processed, and from the co-op to the retailers. The number of multi-stake holder members will increase to 125-140, still excluding consumer members. Contracts will be made with Fleming College and Trent University (through co-op opportunities) in the education process of processing food and the benefits of local food to the Peterborough Area, thus expanding the knowledge and involvement of new agriculturally related sectors.
- Goals at year three mark: the number of restaurants and local consumers using local food products year round will increase 30%-40% in relation to when the business opened. This increased consumption will lead to increased profits that will be put back into the co-op, thus more services will become available through the co-op that will further increase the production and consumption of local food.

## **Section #3: Industry and Market Analysis**

### **Industry**

- The business will be operating in the food industry (mainly processing and retailing of local food)

- 
- The trends in the food industry have moved globally within the last 50 years, and have decreased dramatically within the local food market. With the food industry moving globally, there has been a disconnection between the relationships of all the sectors (producers, processors, and retailers). Brining all the sectors back together will re-established the importance of local food in the local Peterborough community, and create an increase of local food consumption over the next 10 years.
  - A cold storage and a community kitchen will need standard/regulations met. (Ie. Red seal) depending on the size of the location and the amount of funding acquired, there could be different types of standards/regulation required.
  - For the first year the co-op will be season due to seasonal produce production. Once cold storage and processing is established, the business will operate year round.
  - Market growth cannot be tabulated because there is a lack of other successful for-profit organizations in the area undertaking the same project.

## Competition

- Major competitor(s): grocery stores who import food from international markets.

→Strengths of competitors: they have access to large amount of food year round at a lower cost. There are many grocery stores in comparison to local food co-ops. Consumers have easy access at almost any time to a grocery store verses a local food co-op/famers market.

→Weakness of competitors: the food brought in is not healthy in many ways (pesticides, un-fair labour, environmental degradation through transportation, packaging and production processes).

→Opportunities of competitors: There is an increasing demand for healthy, quality products in grocery stores, thus many consumers who are educated on the complex process of obtaining food will not shop at grocery stores.

→Threats of competitors: quickly expanding (location) at same pace that human habitats are expanding.

- Collectively, this local food co-op will benefit the Peterborough and Area community by creating access to healthy local food year round, as well as connecting local food consumers to local food producers in an effort to create a sustainable local food environment.
- To begin, the local food co-op will have little impact on the competition of grocery stores, but once the local food sectors are brought together, completing the local food value chain, there will be an increased interest and an increase in consumption of healthy local food

---

## **Customers**

- There are no targeted consumers. All demographics (age, gender, occupation, income, etc.) of consumers are wanted. The local consumers of Peterborough Area will be preferred, on the exception of tourists visiting as Peterborough is a tourist destination.
- Other consumers will be other businesses such as restaurants. If institutional procurement is established through a larger processing facility, institutions such as Trent, Fleming, the hospital and all other public cafeterias will be included.
- Primary consumers should have values and an attitude to preserving agriculture and sustainable methods.
- Once the co-op has reached it full design, including the cold storage, community kitchen/processing facility, farmers market and distribution net work, then consumers may purchase daily (excluding Sundays).

### **Section #4: Marketing Plan**

\*\*This section can not be completed until all sectors agree that a local food co-op should be established. Once location, management/ownership, pricing of products and funding is secured, this section can be completed.

This section will be created by the committee created to over-look the operations and ownership of the co-op. In relation, most advertising and promotion can and should be done in conjunction with the Greater Peterborough Area Economic Development Corporation (GPA EDC) to secure funding and relations with multiple levels of government.

### **Section #5: Management and Ownership**

#### **Management:**

A co-operative is owned by an association of persons seeking to satisfy common needs such as access to products or services, sale of their products or services, employment, etc.). This association includes one or more kinds of users or stakeholders in the enterprise, such as:

- consumers who use the enterprise to acquire products or services
- producers (such as farmers) who use the enterprise to process and market the goods or services they have produced, or to buy products or services necessary to their professional activities ; or
- workers who use the enterprise to secure their employment and control their working conditions.

The Co-operative will operate democratically (one person, one vote) through two bodies: general meetings of the members or delegates, and the board of directors, at least

---

two-thirds of whom are members elected at a general meeting. The delegate structure may reflect the size of the organization or the distance covered by the co-operative and include more than one delegate for each organization or territory represented. The co-operative's start-up capital usually comes from co-operative shares purchased by members. Federal co-operatives, however, can raise capital by issuing investment shares to members or non-members. Each member's liability is limited to the amount of his or her share in the capital. Each member has only one vote regardless of his or her capital contribution.<sup>x</sup>

### **Ownership**

- The co-op could be owned by one or multiple people. Depending on financing and location, a ownership may or may not be beneficial. Thus, ownership will be decided once a location is secured.

## **Section #6: Operating Plan**

### **Location**

- The location will be central in either the downtown core of George Street or on Lansdowne street closer to Lansdowne Place (Between George Street and the Parkway). The business will be directly visible from the roadway with lots of parking and access to and from connecting businesses.
- Zoning requirements will be discussed once a location is chosen.

### **Facility and Equipment**

- The equipment for the cold storage and community kitchen will be bought.
- Association costs will include memberships for producers and processors selling/being a vendor through the farmers market, consumer memberships (consumers do not have to be members but being a member will enable consumers to buy at lower costs), educational memberships for Trent and Fleming students involved in culinary and business relations of the co-op.