

Local Food Purchase Assistance Program (LFPA): Request For Proposals (RFP) FY 2023-2024

Purpose

The Utah Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) requests proposals for projects to implement the USDA Local Food Purchase Assistance Cooperative Agreement (LFPA) Program in Utah. The purpose of this program is to improve food and agricultural supply chain resiliency.

The program achieves this purpose by:

- 1. Providing an opportunity for States and Tribal Governments to strengthen their local and regional food system.*
- 2. Help to support local and socially disadvantaged producers through building and expanding economic opportunities.*
- 3. Establish and broaden partnerships with local producers and the emergency food distribution community, and local food networks, including non-profits to ensure distribution of fresh and nutritious foods in underserved communities.*

RFP Summary

RFP Title: Local Food Purchase Assistance Program (LFPA): Request For Proposals (RFP) FY23

Application Release Date: December, 12th 2022

Application Submission Date: January 30th, 2023 by 5:00 PM Mountain Time via email to nloots@utah.gov.

Award Notification and Comments: February 10th, 2023

Funding Period: **April 1, 2023- December 31st, 2024 (21 months)**

Funding Amount: Applicants may request between \$150,000- \$1,000,000 for the full funding period

Anticipated Awards: 3-6

Payment Method: Cost Reimbursement - all awardees will be reimbursed for allowable costs incurred as part of this funding opportunity. (If this is prohibitive for your organization please reach out to nloots@utah.gov)

Selection Method: Competitive

Application Information and Requirements

- Applications must be complete when submitted. Please refer to the application checklist below to ensure you submit a complete application.
- Applications must be submitted in an **email attachment as a single PDF document**. Please contact Natalie Loots at nloots@utah.gov if this method of submission poses a challenge for you or your organization.
- All proposed projects must directly address how local food products will be grown, transported, stored and distributed to underserved Utahns.
- Proposed projects must have at least one project partner. A Letter of Support (LOS) from each project partner must be included as part of the application.
- **Applications must be submitted by 5:00 PM Mountain Time on January 30th, 2023 as one PDF document via email to nloots@utah.gov with the subject line “(organization name) LFPA RFP Submission”. Late materials will not be reviewed or scored.**

Application Restrictions

- **Applicant organizations must be based in Utah.**
- **All food must be distributed free of charge only to populations that meet the definition of ‘underserved communities’.**
- **All food distribution must occur within the state of Utah.**
- **Cost Restrictions:**
 - **Equipment:** Defined as “tangible personal property (including information technology systems) having a useful life of more than one year.”
 - ***Unallowable Equipment Costs:***
 - Equipment with a per-unit cost of more \$5,000
 - Lease-to-own or rent-to-own equipment
 - ***Allowable Equipment Costs:***
 - Purchase of equipment under \$5,000 per unit.
 - Rental costs of equipment. Vehicles may be leased but not purchased. The lease or rental agreement must terminate at the end of the funding period.
 - **Construction:**
 - ***Unallowable Construction Costs:***
 - The acquisition of buildings, facilities, or land or to make additions, improvements, modifications, replacements, rearrangements, reinstallations, renovations, or alterations of an existing building or facility (including site grading and improvement, and architecture fees).
 - This also includes construction and construction-related materials, which may include, but are not limited to, the purchase of building materials such as wood, nails, concrete, asphalt, roofing, gravel, sand, paint, insulation, drywall, or plumbing.
 - Lease-to-own or rent-to-own building, facilities or land agreements.
 - ***Allowable Construction Costs:***
 - Rental costs of land and building space. The lease or rental agreement must terminate at the end of the funding period.
 - **Indirect costs** are unallowable. All costs must be directly related to the project proposal and be justified in the budget.

- At least 60% of funding must be spent on the purchase of food products. Up to 40% may be used for staff time, allowable equipment, travel, and other allowable expenses.
 - 75% of funds spent on food must be purchased from producers that meet the definition of 'socially disadvantaged producers.' 100% of food products must be purchased from 'local producers'. (Purchasing from Utah-based producers is preferred)
 - 100% of food products must meet the definition of 'local food'.
- Funding may not be used for lobbying.
- **Definitions:**
 - Underserved communities: Populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life, such as:
 - Black, Latino, and Indigenous/Native American persons, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and other persons of color
 - Members of religious minorities
 - LGBTQ+ persons
 - Persons with disabilities
 - Persons who live in rural areas
 - Persons otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality
 - Socially disadvantaged producer: A producer that meets one or more of the following requirements:
 - Is a member of a group whose members have been subject to discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, disability, sex, sexual orientation.
 - Has veteran status
 - Is under the age of 35
 - Has been farming for 10 years or less.
 - Is a limited-resource farm household; **must meet both** of the following criteria:
 - Low farm sales for 2 years in a row. Low farm sales means gross farm sales less than \$180,300/year.
 - Low household income for 2 years in a row. Low household income means that current-year income falls below the national poverty level for a family of four with two children (\$27,750 in 2022) or is less than half of the county median household income.
 - Local producers: Farmers, ranchers, producers, processors or distributors and other businesses involved in food production or distribution that are located in the state of Utah or within 400 miles of the distribution site.
 - Local food: Food that is raised, produced, aggregated, stored, processed, and distributed in the locality or region where the final product is marketed to consumers, so that the total distance that the product travels between the farm or ranch where the product originates and the distribution site is at most 400 miles, or both the final market and the origin of the product are within the the state of Utah.

Review Process

All applications submitted under the guidelines above will be reviewed and receive feedback. A review committee will evaluate completed applications using a standardized score sheet. For questions on the review process please email Natalie Loots at nloots@utah.gov. See Appendix A for a sample score sheet.

Application Assistance

Utah LFPA RFP Office Hours

Applicants have the opportunity to attend office hours meetings to ask questions or receive clarification on the RFP. This will occur during the following times:

Thursday, December 15 · 11:00am – 12:00pm

Google Meet joining info

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/yau-rgjg-fwf>

Or dial: (US) +1 650-530-6104 PIN: 270 554 892#

Tuesday, January 10, 2023 · 4:00 – 5:00pm

Google Meet joining info

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/xeb-qyiw-dwx>

Or dial: (US) +1 216-930-9061 PIN: 591 762 608#

Wednesday, January 18, 2023 · 9:00 – 10:00am

Google Meet joining info

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/qvp-gsiu-irr>

Or dial: (US) +1 385-645-6729 PIN: 906 137 255#

Application Checklist

The following items are required to be included with each application. Applications with missing or incomplete items may not be reviewed or scored.

- ☐ Organization Background
- ☐ Project Description
- ☐ Project Partners
- ☐ Action Plan
- ☐ Timeline
- ☐ Budget
- ☐ Plan for Sustainability
- ☐ Letters of Support for each Project Partner included
- ☐ Application submitted as **one pdf document** via email to nloots@utah.gov

Application: Local Food Purchasing Assistance Program

Organization Background

Organization Name:

Brief organization description (e.g., mission, population served, overview of work):

Project Description

Project Title:

Project Lead

Name:

Address:

Phone #:

Email:

**Funding
Amount
Requested**

Total amount for project period (April 1, 2023- December 31st, 2025):

Brief description of proposed project to help reviewers gain a high-level understanding of the proposal:

Is this an expansion of an existing project or program?

☐ **YES**

☐ **NO**

If this proposal will expand on an existing project or program, please describe the new activities and outcomes expected as a result of this funding:

Project Partners

Applicants are expected to prioritize collaboration and partnership building while implementing projects. Project partners are organizations or individuals who will actively collaborate on this project. Partners could be producers you will purchase food products from, organizations that will fulfill one of the project roles such as transportation or distribution or an organization that will coordinate a specific aspect of the project. **At least one project partner is required.** If necessary, add more rows for additional partners. A Letter of Support from each project partner must be included at the end of your submitted application.

Project Partner 1	Partner name:
	Organization Partner Represents:
	Brief Organization Description:
	Email:
	Partner Role and Responsibilities in this Project (please be specific):
Project Partner 2 (optional)	Partner Name:
	Organization Partner Represents:
	Brief Organization Description:
	Email:
	Partner Role and Responsibilities in this Project (please be specific):

Action Plan

All proposed projects must directly address how local food products will be grown, transported, stored and distributed to food insecure Utahns. Include how these activities will be achieved and who will be responsible for coordination and implementation of activities. Be as specific as possible. Additionally, where indicated, include how the purchase and distribution of food will be tracked. This information will be required to be reported to DHHS on a regular basis.

Production

Please address the following:

- How many producers do you estimate to work with over the project period?
- How will you form relationships with eligible producers?
- If known, who will be producing the food and what products?

- What is the estimated amount of food that will be purchased during the project period (dollars or lbs)?
- At least 75% of funds spent on food products must be purchased from producers that meet the definition of “*socially disadvantaged*” and 100% of food products must be purchased from ‘*local producers*’. How will this be tracked?
- 100% of food products purchased must travel a total of less than 400 miles away from the point of distribution. How will this be tracked?

Individual(s)/organization(s) responsible for coordination and implementation of production activities:

Transportation and storage

Please address the following:

- How will food products be stored and transported to the distribution site?
- How far will food products need to travel?
- How frequently?
- How long will food products be stored?

Individual(s)/organization(s) responsible for coordination and implementation of transportation and storage activities:

Distribution

Please address the following:

- From what locations or sites will food be distributed?
- How often will food be distributed?
- Estimated amount of food that will be distributed at each location?
- What underserved communities will receive food?
- How will you ensure the population served meets the USDA definition of “underserved communities”?
- How will you track the amount of food distributed?
- How will you track the number of individuals served?

Individual(s)/organization(s) responsible for coordination and implementation of distribution activities:

Please provide a timeline correlated to the activities outlined in the action plan. Please be as detailed as possible and add extra rows if necessary.

[illegible]

Budget		
All activities requiring funding must be outlined in the budget. Please ensure the budget clearly aligns with the action plan and timeline; it is assumed that funding will be spent on any and all activities outlined in the action plan unless explicitly indicated otherwise. Please add additional rows or categories if needed. For Budget Restrictions see Application Restrictions Page 2 of Application. (See Appendix B for Budget Example).		
Project Period (22 months)		
Category	Justification	Requested Funds
Staff Time		
Transportation Costs		
Equipment		
Food Products		
Total		

Sustainability Planning

Proposed projects should consider how impact can be sustained after the funding period ends. Projects with sustainability planning will be prioritized for funding.

How do you plan to build lasting partnerships with farmers?. How do you anticipate these relationships changing after the funding period is over? Do you see any opportunities to continue purchasing from farmers after the funding period ends?

END APPLICATION

References:

Definition of Socially Disadvantaged Producer:

<https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/farm-economy/socially-disadvantaged-beginning-limited-resource-and-female-farmers-and-ranchers/#:~:text=The%20USDA%20defines%20social%20disadvantaged,and%20Asian%20or%20Pacific%20Islander.>

USDA AMS Local Food Purchase Assistance Program:

<https://www.ams.usda.gov/selling-food-to-usda/lfpacap>

AMS General Terms and Conditions:

<https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/FY2019GDTermsandConditions.pdf>

Appendix A: Sample Score Sheet

Reviewer ID: Applicant Organization Name: Project Title:			
PROJECT PARTNERS (10 POINTS)			
No appropriate partners and stakeholders are identified OR those listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertainty whether partner will enhance the project Multiple appropriate partners or stakeholders appear to be missing, Disconnect between partners listed in the action plan and partners providing letters of support. 	The partners and stakeholders identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertainty whether partner will enhance the project Multiple appropriate partners or stakeholders appear to be missing. Letter(s) of support raise questions as to partners' role in and understanding of the project, and/or role differs between action plan and letters of support. 	The partners and stakeholders identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner role will enhance the project Project would benefit from an additional key partnership Letters of support adequately demonstrate partner's role in and understanding of the project, which matches the action plan. 	The partners and stakeholders identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner role will enhance the project. No valuable partnerships have been excluded. Letters of support clearly indicates the partners' role in and understanding of the project, which matches the action plan
(0-2)	(3-5)	(6-8)	(9-10)
Comments:			Score:
PROJECT ACTION PLAN (20 POINTS)			
Action plan is inadequate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the objectives and activities are not at all cohesive and fundamentally lacking; Person responsible for the activity is not identified and/or has no experience for the task at hand. Scope of activities does not seem achievable 	Action plan contains some appropriate objectives and activities, but stated objectives or activities are insufficient: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sizable gaps in the action plan exist, crucial objectives and activities appear to be missing Person responsible for activity may have an unclear role or not make sense Scope of activities seems somewhat achievable 	Action plan is mostly sufficient but would benefit from some additional detail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities are mostly clear, but additional details would be useful Would be enhanced with 1-2 additional activities that appear to be missing Person responsible makes sense and role is clear Scope of activities seems reasonably achievable 	Action plan is outstanding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall cohesion between respective activities is excellent No major objectives, activities, or details have been omitted. Person responsible makes sense and role is clear Scope of activities seems highly achievable
(0-5)	(6-10)	(11-15)	(16-20)
Comments:			Score:
PROJECT TIMELINE (10 POINTS)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline is unclear, incomplete and does not correlate with most action plan activities Timeline does not seem achievable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline is somewhat unclear, incomplete and only correlates with some action plan activities Timeline seems somewhat achievable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline is mostly clear, complete and mostly correlates with action plan activities Timeline seems reasonably achievable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline is clear, complete and directly correlates with action plan activities Timeline seems highly achievable
(0-2)	(3-5)	(6-8)	(9-10)

Comments:			Score:
PROJECT BUDGET and BUDGET JUSTIFICATION (10 POINTS)			
<p>Budget is poorly constructed and disconnected from project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget justification is missing or excludes key items. Budget contains major restricted items. Budget has multiple major red flags. 	<p>Budget is moderately constructed to connect to the project action plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some budget items are not included in justification or are not included in the action plan. Budget may contain restricted items, though they are minor. Budget has some minor red flags or one major red flag. 	<p>Budget matches well with scope or work as offered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most items have adequate justification, however a few items may not be sufficient or appropriate for proposal Budget contains no restricted items. Budget is free of any major red flags and has few minor red flags. 	<p>Budget is well crafted, efficient, and in synergy with project plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget justification includes all items listed in budget and adequately reflects proposed work and project needs. Budget contains no restricted items. Budget is free of any red flags.
(0-2)	(3-5)	(6-8)	(9-10)
Comments:			Score:
PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY (10 POINTS)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of sustainability may be offered, but misunderstands what it means to sustain a program. Role of partners in sustainability is missing or unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of sustainability may be offered, but clear elements and details are missing. Role of partners in sustainability is weak or less than certain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some components of the project may not be sufficiently sustained or sustainability could be improved. Role of partners in sustainability is acknowledged and likely to occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All or nearly all program components have sufficient indication of future sustainability. Role of partners in sustainability clearly understood and utilized.
(0-2)	(3-5)	(6-8)	(9-10)
Comments:			Score:
OVERALL PROJECT COHESION AND CLARITY (15 POINTS)			
<p>Application sections are poorly developed or missing. Action plan activities are missing. The application elements function as standalone ideas that do not interlock into a cohesive plan. Major spelling and grammar issues.</p>	<p>Most application sections could use additional detail and explanation. Some action plan activities are unclear or confusing. The application elements are somewhat disjointed with a choppy or confusing flow. Noticeable spelling and grammar issues.</p>	<p>Some application sections are well described while others could use additional detail. Most action plan activities are clearly described. The application components are somewhat connected throughout, with only minor omissions or disconnects identified. Mostly free of spelling and grammatical errors.</p>	<p>All application sections have robust detail.. All action plan activities are clearly described. The application functions as a cohesive unit with logical activities, appropriate justifications, and clear flow. Excellent attention to spelling and grammar.</p>
(0-3)	(4-7)	(8-11)	(12-15)
Comments:			Score:

Appendix B: Example Budget

Budget

All activities requiring funding must be outlined in the budget. Please ensure the budget clearly aligns with the action plan and timeline; it is assumed that funding will be spent on any and all activities outlined in the action plan unless explicitly indicated otherwise. For Budget Restrictions see Application Restrictions Page 2 of Application.

Project Period (22 months)

Category	Justification	Requested Funds
Staff Time		
<i>Program manager .5 fte</i>	<i>\$25/hour x 20hrs/week x 96 weeks</i>	<i>48,000</i>
Transportation Costs		
<i>Fuel for delivery truck</i>	<i>400 miles/week x 40 weeks @ 10mi/gal x \$5/gal</i>	<i>\$8,000</i>
Equipment		
<i>Fridge</i>	<i>1 fridge for storage of dairy and produce</i>	<i>\$3,500</i>
Food Products		
<i>230,000 lbs apples</i>	<i>\$0.60/lb</i>	<i>\$138,000</i>
<i>20,000 gals milk</i>	<i>\$1.69/gal</i>	<i>33,800</i>
Totals		\$231,300