RETHINKING SCHOOL LUNCH

## OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FEASIBILITY STUDY

**Executive Summary** 



CENTER FOR ECOLITERACY

(510) 845-4595 www. ecoliteracy.org

# Rethinking School Lunch OUSD Feasibility Study

### **Executive Summary**

December 12, 2011

#### Contents

#### Introduction 2

OUSD's Vision 3

#### **Key Findings and Recommendations 6**

#### **Facilities 6**

Findings 6 Recommendations 7 Facilities Timeline 8

#### Finances 10

Findings 10 Project Cost Estimates 10 Capital Improvements 10 Additional Staff Projections 12 Program Recommendations 12 Potential Sources for Project Funding 12 Yearly Ongoing Operating Revenue vs. Expense Projections 13 Potential Sources for Ongoing Operations Funding 13 Recommendations 13

#### Food and Health 15

Findings 15 Recommendations 15

#### Wellness Policy 15

Findings 15 Recommendations 15

#### **Teaching and Learning 16**

Findings 16 Recommendations 16 The Dining Experience 16 Findings 16 Recommendations 17

#### Procurement 17

Findings 17 Recommendations 17

#### Waste Management 18

Findings 18 Recommendations 18

#### **Professional Development 18**

Findings 18 Recommendations 19

#### Marketing and Communications 19

Findings 19 Recommendations 19

#### Appendix 20

Center for Ecoliteracy Feasibility Study Staff 20 Consultants 21 School–Community Kitchen Site Selection Criteria 22 Central Commissary Analysis and Estimate 23 Central Commissary Pre-design Cost Estimate 25 Program Recommendation Cost Estimates 26 About the Center for Ecoliteracy 28

## Introduction

During the 2010–2011 school year, a team of expert consultants commissioned by the Center for Ecoliteracy conducted a comprehensive review, in collaboration with Oakland Unified School District, of the District's Nutrition Services program. This executive summary includes the major findings of that effort and its primary recommendations for 2011–2016.

The purpose of this study, entitled "Rethinking School Lunch Oakland," was to create a road map for comprehensive reform of school food in the District. It was designed to emphasize a focus on Nutrition Services facilities, since inadequate facilities was presented as a primary obstacle to realizing the District's vision for school food in Oakland. As OUSD Nutrition Services Director Jennifer LeBarre observed, "While OUSD has made great improvement in the meals served to students through the National School Lunch, Breakfast, and Snack Programs, more must be done. However, we have reached the point where change can't continue without drastic change in our facilities." The study emphasized examining the feasibility of improving the nutritional quality and content of District meals through a new, green Central Commissary; upgrade of existing kitchens; and installation of "School–Community Kitchens" in each of OUSD's seven districts.

Simultaneously, in order to consider Nutrition Services in its entirety, the study applied the Center for Ecoliteracy's Rethinking School Lunch planning framework. This wholesystems approach, developed over more than 15 years of engagement with school food issues, identifies ten interrelated dimensions of school food operations, including facilities, finances, food and health, wellness policy, teaching and learning, the dining experience, procurement, waste management, professional development, and marketing and communications.

The Rethinking School Lunch Oakland project is funded by the TomKat Charitable Trust with the S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation. Rethinking School Lunch Oakland is one of a suite of projects, Rethinking California School Lunch, supported by the TomKat Charitable Trust in fulfillment of its commitment to health, education, sustainable agriculture, and care for the environment.

The Center for Ecoliteracy is a public foundation, located in Berkeley, California, whose mission is education for sustainable living. The Center is best known for its pioneering work with school gardens, school lunches, and integrating ecological principles and sustainability into school curricula. The Feasibility Study is one of a series of Center projects and publications under the rubric "Rethinking School Lunch." These include ideas and strategies for improving school food, teaching nutrition, supporting sustainable food systems, and designing education programs focused on understanding the relationships between food, culture, health, and the environment. (See appendix for consultants commissioned by the Center.)

#### **Oakland Unified School District**

Oakland Unified School District is a large urban district in Northern California. The largest enrollments by ethnicity and race in OUSD are Latino (39.3%), African American (32.5%), Asian (13.2%), and white (7.4%). Nutrition Services serves 89 schools with a combined enrollment of 38,000 students; more than 70 percent are eligible for free and reduced-price meals. The District currently serves a daily average of about 7,200 breakfasts, 21,200 lunches, and 8,400 snacks, a total of 6.6 million meals a year.

Like most large urban districts in a difficult economic climate, OUSD faces significant challenges. The Center for Ecoliteracy elected to work with the District because it also exhibits many qualities indicating its readiness for innovation in its meals program. Among the most important of these indicators are a history of substantial efforts to improve school food; visionary, committed District leadership, including Superintendent Tony Smith, his cabinet, and Nutrition Services Director Jennifer LeBarre; important linkages to the wider Oakland community; collaboration with the active Oakland School Food Alliance; a comprehensive Wellness Policy developed with community support; a new Strategic Plan that reflects an understanding of the need to develop social, emotional, and physical health; and recognition of the role of the school meal program in creating equitable opportunities for learning.

#### **OUSD's Vision**

Jennifer LeBarre has articulated a vision to dramatically improve the quality of school meals, elevate the status of school meals, and solidify the meal program's role as a key component of students' academic experience. In particular this vision can contribute substantively to implementing the OUSD Wellness Policy and the District's Five-Year Strategic Plan.

**OUSD Wellness Policy.** Following a process involving extensive participation by the Oakland community, the policy was adopted in 2001, five years before the federal government required wellness policies in all districts. Among other provisions, the policy calls for the following:

- Ensuring that no OUSD student goes hungry
- Providing food and beverages that promote good health
- · Collaborating with community organizations, parents, students, and staff
- Using biodegradable, compostable, or recycled disposable supplies to the maximum extent possible
- Establishing a garden for each school site of sufficient size
- Providing adequate time and facilities for students to purchase and eat meals and clean up

**Five-Year Strategic Plan (2011–2016).** The Strategic Plan was created to help enable OUSD to fulfill the ambitious mission of becoming a Full Service Community District that serves the whole child, ameliorates systemic inequalities, and provides each child with excellent teachers every day.

To realize this objective, the Strategic Plan calls for developing each Oakland public school into a "Full Service Community School" modeled on the Children's Aid Society's "developmental triangle." One side of this triangle is "developing social, emotional, and physical health." A second side is "ensuring a high-quality instructional core." The third side is "creating equitable opportunities for learning." School food relates to and is foundational to all three of these goals.

The quality of the food children eat at school and at home — and the habits they develop from eating and learning about good food — are integral to the triangle's first side: developing social, emotional, and physical health, and consequently to being able to perform better academically. The Nutrition Services vision enunciated by Jennifer LeBarre includes the following goals:

- At least 60 percent of the food served will be cooked from scratch
- The food that is not freshly prepared will be minimally processed
- No ingredients will include high fructose corn syrup or trans fats
- At least 25 percent of produce will be fresh, local, pesticide-free, or organic
- The Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program will be in place throughout the District
- Fresh fruit/vegetables will be offered at every after-school snack program
- 25 percent of produce will be sourced locally; 25 percent of other items will be California-based
- A District farm/garden will be created to supply fresh produce to the meal program and offer experiential opportunities for academic instruction and for vocational education

As the Center for Ecoliteracy has demonstrated (for example, in its book *Big Ideas: Linking Food, Culture, Health, and the Environment*), food is an excellent focus for integrating a wide range of academic subjects, both in the classroom and in experiences such as school gardens, supporting the triangle's second side: ensuring a high-quality instructional core. (See discussion of Teaching and Learning below.)

Center for Ecoliteracy

4

With respect to the third side of the triangle, creating equitable opportunities for learning, Superintendent Tony Smith has said,

School food reform is not separate from school reform; it's part of the basic work we have to do in order to correct systemic injustice, pursue equity, and give our children the best future possible. We are committed to building a school district that provides quality education and equitable outcomes for all children — and to make this goal a reality, we have to create conditions that allow children to grow and to learn at high levels. This starts with taking care of our students' most basic needs, such as nutrition, so they can develop and reach their full potential.

**School-Community Kitchens.** The Feasibility Study also identifies an important opportunity to support the Full Service Community Schools dimension of the Strategic Plan. As part of kitchen renovation that is at the heart of the Feasibility Study, we recommend that 14 kitchens be designed as "School-Community Kitchens." (See Facilities discussion below.) After feeding students during the school day, these "kitchens that moonlight," as Jennifer LeBarre calls them, would be available to the public yearround, including weekends and evenings, for purposes ranging from hunger alleviation to vocational training, emergency preparation, hospice support, cooking collectives, community food processing, and rental space for local enterprises. These School-Community Kitchens have the potential to help OUSD realize the Strategic Plan's objective that the District "evolve the idea of school-community partnerships from simply after-school programming or space-sharing or visiting campuses into true and authentic collaborations in service of thriving students."

## Key Findings and Recommendations

## Facilities

#### **Definitions of Proposed Facilities**

For the purposes of this Feasibility Study the following terms will be used to describe the categories of proposed facility improvements.

**Central Commissary.** Central facility to receive deliveries and prepare items to be sent to the District's 89 other kitchens. It will include facilities for receiving and shipping, storage, food-preparation bulk staging, equipment washing, waste treatment, and training and education, as well as administrative offices.

**Cooking Kitchens.** Kitchens with enough equipment and capacity to meet health and safety standards and cook from scratch as well as to finish "fresh-prepared" meals using recipe kits from the new Central Commissary.

**School-Community Kitchens.** Serve as Cooking Kitchens during the school day and be available when school is not in session for a variety of community uses including employee, student, and parent cooking classes; community events; emergency preparedness; and small business owners on a fee-for-service basis where legally feasible.

**Finishing Kitchens.** Include basic equipment to prepare meals from recipe kits of bulk ingredients from the Central Commissary.

#### Findings

On the basis of ten criteria developed by OUSD administration and the Center for Ecoliteracy, site reviews of over 20 school kitchens and schools without kitchens, plan reviews of an additional 30 cafeterias and kitchens, and explorations of many possible sites for a new Central Commissary, the Feasibility Study found:

- Twenty-five of OUSD's 89 schools are served by Cooking Kitchens, where meals are produced on-site.
- Three of these kitchens also serve as Central Kitchens; they produce prepackaged lunches and breakfasts that are re-thermalized in mobile cabinets at 64 "Satellite" school sites which do no cooking. Together these three kitchens are responsible for 73 percent of all the District's meals.

- The chief Central Kitchen, at Prescott Elementary School, was designed to serve 8,000 meals a day. It is currently preparing 20,000.
- A majority of the existing equipment in the Cooking Kitchens is old and nonfunctional, and should be removed and replaced.
- Scratch cooking is not possible in most of the District's kitchens. Thirty-five "Satellite" school sites which do no cooking have no serving equipment or serving counters. Others have some equipment and infrastructure, but need substantial upgrades.
- The District's primary vendor, Sysco, delivers directly to many of the schools a costly process that could be eliminated if all deliveries went to a Central Commissary and were then redistributed by refrigerated trucks that are already traveling to schools across the District on a daily basis.
- We have adopted criteria for selecting 14 schools (one elementary and one secondary school in each of OUSD's seven districts) for creation of School– Community Kitchens. (See appendix.) Several sites already have full-service kitchens with bulk-serving counters in place. The Downtown Education Complex and Castlemont High School are determined to be the best suited of the sites to be fully equipped.

#### Recommendations

- Find District-owned property to create a 44,000-square-foot **Central Commissary** to realize considerable savings compared to building anew. (For details, see appendix.)
- Develop a 1.5-acre District **Farm / Garden** to be co-located with the Central Commissary.

Center for Ecoliteracy

- Remove, repair, or replace nonfunctional kitchen equipment; install new equipment; remodel as necessary; and upgrade storage areas, floors, walls, and ceilings for the following (numbers based on current OUSD sites):
  - 17 Cooking Kitchens
  - 14 School-Community Kitchens (at one elementary and one secondary school in each of OUSD's seven districts)
  - 58 Finishing Kitchens
- Upgrade serving areas as appropriate.
- Install hydration stations at all schools.
- Renovate all elementary school sites to meet health and safety codes and equip for salad bars.
- Supply all school sites with sinks and dishwashers to allow for conversion to permanent five-compartment trays, including stainless steel flatware.

#### **Facilities Timeline**

#### Year 1

| Central Commissary Site   | Begin planning, fundraising, and community approval process to build Central Commissary |
|---------------------------|---|
| School-Community Kitchens | Complete upgrading of sites now in process  |
| Cooking Kitchens          | Begin upgrading of 17 current<br>Cooking Kitchens                                       |

#### Year 2

#### Year 3

| Central Commissary Site   | Begin development of District farm / garden  |
|---------------------------|--|
| School-Community Kitchens | Begin upgrading at sites needing extensive renovation                                    |
| Cooking Kitchens          | Complete renovation of all<br>Cooking Kitchens   |
| Finishing Kitchens        | Begin renovating 30 "Satellite<br>Sites" to become Finishing<br>Kitchens                 |
| Salad Bars                | Begin renovation and equipping<br>for 28 salad bars at schools not<br>currently equipped |

#### Year 4

| Central Commissary Site | Complete Central Commissary, put into service |  |
|-------------------------|---|--|
|                         | Purchase delivery trucks                      |  |

#### Year 5

| Salad Bars | Complete equipping of salad<br>bars left from year 3 |
|------------|--|

#### Years 6–10

| Complete renovations and<br>equipping of remaining School-<br>Community Kitchens |
|--|
| Complete renovation of<br>remaining sites appropriate for<br>Finishing Kitchens  |
|  |

Center for Ecoliteracy

www.ecoliteracy.org

## Finances

#### Findings

- Nutrition Services assumes that it is critical to build a reserve equal to about three months' operating expenses (about \$3.6 million dollars). Once this reserve is established, additional revenues may be available to be applied to this project.
- Current market conditions indicate the cost of converting existing District sites to be \$400 to \$450 a square foot, depending on variables such as the need for retrofitting.
- The cost of converting a District site to a Central Commissary would be half the cost of new construction, and far less time-consuming.
- Estimated cost of upgrades for School-Community Kitchen sites which need extensive renovation is \$310,000 to \$381,000 per site.
- Although average attendance within OUSD has decreased since 1998, participation in the meals program has increased in recent years (lunches served annually are up by nearly 300,000 since 2007–2008). Jennifer LeBarre reports that participation is high at the elementary and middle school levels, but can be increased substantially at the high school level; it is important to note that the open-campus model will be changed to a closed-campus approach.

#### **Project Cost Estimates**

The best cost estimate to fund the project is approximately twenty-six to twenty-seven (26–27) million dollars over the course of the next five years. Estimates were provided by Jennifer LeBarre, David Binkle, and Steve Marshall, and are based on the timetable presented in the Facilities section.

#### **Capital Improvements**

#### Year 1

| Complete upgrading of School-Community Kitchen sites now in process | No additional expenses |
|---|------------------------|
| Upgrades to Cooking Kitchens that are not Community Kitchens        | \$425,000              |
| Planning: Community Bond  | \$25,000               |
| Fundraising: For Planning   | \$25,000               |
| Subtotal Year 1   | \$475,000              |

#### Year 2

| Central Commissary (44,000 sq. ft.)  | \$20,823,352 |
|--|--------------|
| Subtotal Year 2  | \$20,823,352 |
| Year 3   |              |
| Upgrade of School-Community Kitchen sites needing extensive renovation                       | \$1,875,000  |
| Renovation to Bulk Meal Service (30) (Converting Satellite Facilities to Finishing Kitchens) | \$500,000    |
| District Farm Development  | \$500,000    |
| Elementary Salad Bar Equipment   | \$500,000    |
| Complete renovation to Cooking Kitchens that are not Community Kitchens                      | \$500,000    |
| Subtotal Year 3  | \$3,875,000  |
| Year 4   |              |
| Delivery Trucks  | \$420,000    |
| Subtotal Year 4  | \$420,000    |
| Year 5   |              |
| Commercial Composter   | \$33,000     |
| Subtotal Year 5  | \$33,000     |
| Grand Total Capital Improvements First 5 Yrs   | \$25,626,352 |

Years 6–10 not forecast

#### Additional Staff Projections

Two staff positions proposed by Nutrition Services will contribute to implementation of this program: an Assistant Director and a Training and Special Projects Director. Combined costs for these two positions, including benefits, are projected at \$162,500, representing less than 1% increase in Operations. Once Satellite Kitchens have been renovated into Finishing Kitchens beginning year 4, additional staff will be needed at each site, and implemented on an as-needed basis. The projected annual cost for staffing up to 30 Finishing Kitchens is \$600,000, representing an additional 3.5% increase in Operations.

#### **Program Recommendations**

| Years 1-2                           | \$357,245 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Year 3                              | \$127,850 |
| Year 4                              | \$147,850 |
| Year 5                              | \$317,850 |
| Grand Total Program Recommendations | \$950,795 |

(See appendix for details.)

#### **Potential Sources for Project Funding**

A number of potential sources of funding have been identified, including:

- Local support (e.g., a bond measure, a community taxing district or parcel tax, a public-private partnership for joint venture, capital campaign and public relations initiative)
- State of California programs
- Federal programs (e.g., Department of Commerce, Federal Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Agriculture)
- Philanthropic programs
- Investment strategies
- Bank funding

#### Yearly Ongoing Operating Revenue vs. Expense Projections

(To be in effect when renovation of facilities is complete and program is in place)

| Classified Salaries                                 | \$5,170,600  |
|---|--------------|
| Employee Benefits                                   | \$3,354,017  |
| General Supplies                                    | \$684,500    |
| Food  | \$6,249,750  |
| Equipment   | \$85,000     |
| Other   | \$1,289,352  |
| Subtotal Expenses                                   | \$16,833,219 |
| Revenue: 2009–2010                                  | \$15,726,271 |
| Projections: Increase revenue by 6.6% to break-even | \$1,106,948  |
| Subtotal Income                                     | \$16,833,219 |
|   | ψ10,000,210  |

#### Potential Sources for Ongoing Operations Funding

- OUSD Nutrition Services revenue generation (e.g., increase in participation levels, services to the District, contracted services to other local agencies, charter schools, or other school districts), and increase in efficiency and productivity
- Grants
- Investment strategies

#### Recommendations

- Convene a fundraising committee comprising District personnel, community advocates, and consultant specialists in food service design and bank and bond financing to evaluate funding opportunities.
- Compare multiple scenarios for scope and timing of elements of the project, to be evaluated according to their funding and programmatic implications.
- Hire a grant-writing specialist using the Fundsnet database and other resources.
- Establish a prospect pool through creation of a list of individual donors; local, regional, and national companies and corporations; as well as foundations and

associations and industry. Infogroup's "OneSource" <sup>TM</sup> or Hoover's are good sources of business development information.

Undertake an analysis of competitive school food scenarios to determine if the
District is receiving the best value from its primary vendors and achieving maximum
efficiency and productivity. The analysis should be conducted independently from the
District and current supplier, potentially as a research project for university business
schools in the area like the University of California, Berkeley.

## Food and Health

#### Findings

- New recipe menu development is minimal.
- There are few to no menu items made from scratch.
- Nutrition Services lacks an easy-to-use system for new and existing vendors to acquire public procurement contracts.

#### Recommendations

- Develop 36 to 40 new seasonal recipes per year reflecting the ethnic traditions of Oakland students.
- Serve fresh local fruits and vegetables in every school every day; increase scratch cooking as new facilities permit.
- Add salad bars to every elementary school that does not have them.

## **Wellness Policy**

#### Findings

- The OUSD Wellness Policy exceeds federal requirements.
- There is active community support for change in school lunch.
- There is no current structure under which all groups receive information and updates and have the opportunity to plan community support campaigns for District-wide improvement.

#### Recommendations

- Convene quarterly meetings with the Oakland School Food Alliance and Nutrition Advisory Committee.
- Convene food banks, farmers markets, and urban farming groups.
- Increase and sustain the community's support for funding and programming needs.

## **Teaching and Learning**

#### Findings

- Barriers to integrating food and food systems into curricula include a lack of awareness of available resources within the District.
- Teachers report a lack of time or motivation for a program that is considered an addon to the "real" curriculum.
- Garden programs rely on garden instructors who do not have teaching credentials, most of whom are not paid.

#### Recommendations

- Revise job description of District Garden Coordinator to increase support and services to school sites.
- Develop food and food-systems curricula aligned with national academic standards.
- Select at least three model schools (elementary, middle, and high) for observation of lessons and cross-discipline professional development.
- Establish an infrastructure for food-related high school internships.

## **The Dining Experience**

#### Findings

- Most of the sites visited were clean and well lit, with adequate space, but the appearance of the dining environment was, at times, makeshift, with post-consumer waste collection in the middle of the room.
- Nutrition Services site staff is not trained in controlling/responding to lunchroom disruptions and there is no safety training and instruction in District security procedures.
- Site staff observed that students are readier to learn when recess occurs before lunch and noted the importance of providing fresh fruit snacks.

#### Recommendations

- Train all food service staff in existing protocol and security procedures; provide training to principals in protocol and procedures and the importance of adult presence in the lunchroom.
- Instruct elementary school principals in schools receiving Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program grant funds to implement recess before lunch.
- Offer a mid-morning snack of fresh fruit to ensure that students have energy until lunch.

## Procurement

#### Findings

- Nutrition Services has developed a definition of "local," set purchasing goals, and identified local sources for several products.
- Achieving goals for local, fresh procurement is hampered by absence of a Central Commissary as well as an easy-to-use system for new and existing vendors to acquire procurement contracts.
- There appears to be no individual in Nutrition Services responsible for reviewing product label definitions and identifying sources of product.

#### Recommendations

- Purchase 25 percent of produce from within the three-tier purchasing system developed by Nutrition Services in first year; increase local purchasing to 35 percent in second year.
- Finalize draft for Guide for Local Vendors.
- Investigate and implement contracts with local farmers.

## Waste Management

#### Findings

- OUSD has a written policy to achieve 75% diversion from landfills by 2115 and 90% reduction by 2020, but does not have a written cafeteria waste prevention plan or policy in place.
- Cafeteria waste prevention and reduction plans are usually created by a few individuals at the school site, rather than from replicating successful programs already in place.
- Barriers to improve the system include students hurrying through lunch so they can go to recess, food quality at "Satellite" sites and lack of plumbing at "Satellite" sites, so nothing can be washed and reused.

#### Recommendations

- Select custodians and other staff members from schools recycling food waste to train staff from other schools ready to implement programs.
- Eliminate or reduce purchase of food-related items most prevalent in the waste stream.
- Purchase high-volume composters for Central Kitchen and other kitchens producing a significant amount of waste.

## **Professional Development**

#### Findings

- There is limited professional development for Nutrition Services employees.
- Staff members attending pilot classes were enthusiastic and have cooking skills, knowledge, and ability to scale up recipes.
- Facilities for professional development appear to be available and adequate.

#### Recommendations

- Begin offering five cooking classes (three hours each) annually for Central Commissary teams and Cooking Kitchen teams.
- Expand classes to include teams from School-Community Kitchens as they become ready for cooking.

### **Marketing and Communications**

#### Findings

- Nutrition Services conducts age-appropriate taste-testing events with students before introducing new recipes and vendor products.
- Existing school-site-based educational programs linked to school meals could be incorporated into an outreach program.
- There are community-based programs that address food security and educational goals that could factor into an outreach program.

#### Recommendations

- Target eligible nonparticipating students and their families with an outreach program with a goal of 20 percent increase in participation.
- Conduct a direct mail campaign, coordinated outreach with service organizations, and weekly targeted sampling of scratch-cooked items.
- Implement an ongoing taste-testing program that includes weekly targeted sampling of made-from-scratch items.

Center for Ecoliteracy

19

## Appendix

#### Center for Ecoliteracy Feasibility Study Staff

**Zenobia Barlow (project director)** is cofounder and executive director of the Center for Ecoliteracy. She was principal investigator on the Food Systems Project, named by the USDA as a top-ten community food security project; convened networks of food service innovators, sustainable agriculture activists, and change agents from six Northern California counties; facilitated a food service directors' roundtable; and has directed the Center's Cooking with California Food and Rethinking California School Lunch initiatives. She coedited *Ecological Literacy: Educating Our Children for a Sustainable World* and *Ecoliteracy: Mapping the Terrain.* She serves on the board of directors of the David Brower Center and is a Fellow of the Post Carbon Institute.

**Jim Koulias (project manager)** is deputy director of the Center for Ecoliteracy. He is a former bilingual/multicultural elementary school teacher with a degree in intercultural communication. Prior to joining the Center for Ecoliteracy, he worked in the computerbased filmmaking industry, served as a producer and senior project manager, and pioneered Web-based communications strategies and websites for businesses around the world. He has served as project manager for all of the Center's publications and Rethinking School Lunch planning, seminars, and website dissemination since 2004.

**Michael K. Stone (report editor and executive summary editor)** is senior editor at the Center for Ecoliteracy. He is the primary author of *Smart by Nature: Schooling for Sustainability* and coedited *Ecological Literacy: Educating Our Children for a Sustainable World*. He has edited Center publications since 2004, including the *Rethinking School Lunch Guide, Cooking with California Food in K–12 Schools,* and food-related website resources. Michael was managing editor of *Whole Earth* magazine and the *Millennium Whole Earth Catalog*; wrote for *The Toronto Star* and *The New York Times,* among other publications; and served as a founding faculty member and academic vice president of World College West in northern California.

**Karen Brown (designer)** is creative director at the Center for Ecoliteracy. She is an award-winning designer whose work has been included in the Smithsonian Institution and Cooper-Hewitt National Design Museum, and featured in *The New York Times*, *Architectural Digest, House Beautiful*, and on NBC's *Today*. She is a committed advocate for local food and fiber. She has designed most of the Center's publications, including the *Rethinking School Lunch Guide, Cooking with California Food in K–12 Schools*, and *Big Ideas: Linking Food, Culture, Health, and the Environment.* 

**Carolie Sly (Teaching and Learning and Waste Management)** is education program director for the Center for Ecoliteracy. She founded a high school for at-risk youth and taught at San Francisco State and public schools in Davis and Napa, California. She earned a doctoral degree in science education from the University of California, Berkeley

and has coauthored books and articles, including the award-winning *California State Environmental Education Guide* and the Center for Ecoliteracy's *Big Ideas: Linking Food, Culture, Health, and the Environment.* She also coauthored the Center's discussion guide for the Oscar-nominated documentary *Food, Inc.* and the PBS documentary *Nourish.* 

#### **Project Coordination**

Evans & Brennan, LLC (see biographies for Ann M. Evans and Georgeanne Brennan)

#### Consultants

**David Binkle (Finances)** owns California Culinary Consulting and is deputy director of the Food Services Division of the Los Angeles Unified School District. He is a certified executive chef, certified culinary administrator, and certified executive pastry chef, with more than 30 years of experience as a senior food service administrator, corporate chef, culinary arts instructor, and food services director. He holds a bachelor's degree from the Oklahoma Panhandle State University System and certificates from the Culinary Institute of America, and is completing a master's from California State University, Northridge.

**Georgeanne Brennan (Food and Health, Wellness Policy, Dining Experience, Procurement, Professional Development, Marketing and Communications)** is a principal at Evans & Brennan, LLC. She is an award-winning cookbook author, journalist, and food policy consultant with a distinguished culinary and business career spanning several decades. Over the past several years she has piloted professional development with the Davis (California) Joint Unified School District. She is the author of more than 30 books on cooking and food and is a cooking school owner and teacher.

Ann M. Evans (Food and Health, Wellness Policy, Dining Experience, Procurement, Professional Development, Marketing and Communications) is a principal at Evans & Brennan LLC. She has a long involvement in sustainable food systems, community leadership, educational reform, and the marketplace, including a 30-year career with California state government. She has worked for a decade with Davis Joint Unified School District, bringing expertise as former mayor of Davis and special advisor to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. She works with rural and urban communities to improve children's health through rethinking school lunch.

**Steve Marshall (Facilities)** is president of The Marshall Associates, Inc., a 50-year-old internationally known food service consulting firm located in Oakland. He has designed over 50 central commissaries, over 100 main kitchens of world-class hotels and restaurants worldwide, and been part of the local, sustainable organic kitchen design movement from the beginning, with over 100 "scratch cooking" corporate cafeterias for Silicon Valley companies as well as the Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School in Berkeley.

#### School–Community Kitchen Site Selection Criteria

| 1.  | Fiscal Responsibility                           | Construction planned or school already a cooking kitchen.   |
|-----|---|---|
| 2.  | Existing Infrastructure/Planned<br>Construction | The kitchen currently is a<br>Cooking Kitchen, has existing<br>plans to become a Cooking<br>Kitchen, or was a Cooking<br>Kitchen within the last 10–15<br>years.                        |
| 3.  | Instructional Garden Space                      | Open space is available on<br>school property that is either<br>currently used as instructional<br>garden or could be.  |
| 4.  | Community Commitment                            | Community has expressed to<br>Nutrition Services that it wants<br>change in meal program OR has<br>supported programs such as<br>produce markets.                                       |
| 5.  | Instructional Leadership                        | Instructional leader has started<br>work on creating community<br>school, expressed interest to NS<br>about being a community<br>kitchen, OR has supported other<br>health initiatives. |
| 6.  | Community Accessibility                         | School can easily be reached via public transportation/walking.   |
| 7.  | Free/Reduced %                                  | Free/reduced percentage of 50% or higher.   |
| 8.  | High Enrollment                                 | Current enrollment of 300 or higher.  |
| 9.  | Location in food desert                         | The school is located in what would be considered a food desert.  |
| 10. | Health Clinic                                   | An Oakland Health Clinic is colocated at the school site  |

Center for Ecoliteracy

#### **Central Commissary Analysis and Estimate**

The Marshall Associates, Inc.

#### Square Feet

| STORAGE AND RECEIVING<br>Receiving Area and Dock: Vestibule indoor<br>Bulk Dry Storage: 3 Tier (160 Pallets)<br>Cooler, Meat, Produce & Dairy: 3 Tier (90 Pallets)<br>Bulk Freezer: 3 Tier (120 Pallets)<br>Storekeeper Office: 3 Spaces & Break Room<br>Mech/Elec Room | 2,000<br>3,300<br>2,000<br>2,200<br>1,250<br>420  |
|---|---|
| Subtotal  | 11,170  |
| KITCHEN<br>Walk–In Thaw Cooler<br>Breakdown Freezer<br>Day Dry Storage<br>Preparation & Ingredient Control<br>Can Opening<br>Cook-Chill Area<br>Utility Cooler/Freezer<br>Production Cooking/Kitchen<br>Bakery<br>Mechanical Room/Ice Building                          | 500<br>250<br>400<br>2,750<br>200<br>1,000<br>800<br>2,300<br>2,300<br>2,000<br>1,440   |
| Subtotal  | 11,640  |
| BULK STAGING LINE AREA<br>Inventory Cooler/Blast Chillers<br>Cart Parking<br>Food Cart Makeup Area<br>Dispatch Cooler<br>Dispatch Dock  | 1,600<br>1,000<br>2,400<br>2,400<br>2,400   |
| Subtotal  | 9,800   |
| SANITATION<br>Janitor<br>Utensil Wash Area and Cart Washing<br>Subtotal   | 80<br>1,300<br>1,380  |
|   | Receiving Area and Dock: Vestibule indoor<br>Bulk Dry Storage: 3 Tier (160 Pallets)<br>Cooler, Meat, Produce & Dairy: 3 Tier (90 Pallets)<br>Bulk Freezer: 3 Tier (120 Pallets)<br>Storekeeper Office: 3 Spaces & Break Room<br>Mech/Elec Room<br>Subtotal<br>KITCHEN<br>Walk–In Thaw Cooler<br>Breakdown Freezer<br>Day Dry Storage<br>Preparation & Ingredient Control<br>Can Opening<br>Cook-Chill Area<br>Utility Cooler/Freezer<br>Production Cooking/Kitchen<br>Bakery<br>Mechanical Room/Ice Building<br>Subtotal<br>BULK STAGING LINE AREA<br>Inventory Cooler/Blast Chillers<br>Cart Parking<br>Food Cart Makeup Area<br>Dispatch Cooler<br>Dispatch Dock<br>Subtotal<br>SANITATION<br>Janitor<br>Utensil Wash Area and Cart Washing |

Center for Ecoliteracy

| E. ADMINISTRATION AND UTILITY AREAS         |        |
|---|--------|
| 1 Conference Room                           | 240    |
| 2 Training Room (40 Seats)                  | 400    |
| 3 Lobby at Entry                            | 400    |
| 4 Supervisor Offices: Production (6 Spaces) | 720    |
| 5 Central Work Station Complex              | 1,000  |
| 6 Copy and Production Room                  | 300    |
| 7 Director's Office                         | 250    |
| 8 Assistant Director's Offices (3 Spaces)   | 360    |
| 9 Secretary Offices (2 Spaces)              | 240    |
| 10 Staff Restrooms and Lockers              | 480    |
| 11 Mechanical Area                          | 480    |
| 12 Electrical Area                          | 150    |
| 13 Utility Area                             | 100    |
| 14 Lunch Room Serving and Test Kitchen      | 1,200  |
| Subtotal                                    | 6,320  |
| RECAP                                       |        |
| A. Storage and Receiving                    | 11,170 |
| B. Kitchen                                  | 11,340 |
| C. Bulk Staging Line Area                   | 9,400  |
| D. Sanitation                               | 1,380  |
| E. Administration and Utility Areas         | 6,320  |
|   |        |
| All Subtotals                               | 39,610 |
| 10% – Circulation Factor                    | 3,961  |
|   | 3,901  |

Center for Ecoliteracy

#### Central Commissary Pre-design Cost Estimate

| Description                    | Square<br>Footage | Equipment<br>Cost per<br>Sq. Ft. | Total Equipment<br>Cost |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Remodel Existing District Site | 43,571            | \$150.00                         | \$6,535,650.00          |

| Description   | Square  | Interior Cost | Total Interior    |
|---|---------|---------------|-------------------|
|   | Footage | per Sq. Ft.   | Construction Cost |
| Central Commissary/Kitchen<br>square feet (minus 7,500 square<br>feet Storage Area) | 36,071  | \$200.00      | \$7,214,200.00    |

| Description                    | Square  | Interior Cost | Total Interior    |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                | Footage | per Sq. Ft.   | Construction Cost |
| Storage Area Construction Cost | 7,500   | \$50.00       | \$375,000.00      |

| Sub-Total Central Kitchen Construction   | \$14,124,850.00 |
|--|-----------------|
| 20% jobsite management permits, insurance and bonding  | \$2,824,970.00  |
| Construction cost contingency (12%)  | \$1,694,982.00  |
| 43,571 square feet x \$50 per SF for unknown seismic, utility,<br>sprinkler and roof upgrades. | \$2,178,550.00  |
| TOTAL BUDGET*  | \$20,823,352.00 |

\*Note: Escalation should be anticipated for increases in labor and materials until the Central Commissary is completed.

| Escalation |
|------------|
| 3.5%       |
| 4.0%       |
| 4.5%       |
|            |

#### **Program Recommendation Cost Estimates**

#### Years 1-2 Program Recommendations

| Food and Health Consulting and Staff Release Time                     | \$13,400  |
|---|-----------|
| Wellness Policy Consulting  | \$40,000  |
| Teaching and Learning Consulting and Coordination                     | \$54,000  |
| Dining Experience Grant Writing                                       | \$20,000  |
| Procurement Consulting  | \$33,625  |
| Waste Management Equipment and District<br>Sustainability Coordinator | \$93,000  |
| Food Services Professional Development                                | \$18,500  |
| Marketing and Communications  | \$84,720  |
| Subtotal Year 1 Program Recommendations                               | \$357,245 |

#### Year 3 Program Recommendations

| Food and Health Staff Training                       | \$1,700   |  |
|--|-----------|--|
| Wellness Policy Consulting                           | \$10,000  |  |
| Teaching and Learning Consulting and Coordination    | \$60,000  |  |
| Waste Management District Sustainability Coordinator | \$40,000  |  |
| Food Services Professional Development               | \$9,250   |  |
| Marketing and Communications                         | \$6,900   |  |
| Subtotal Year 3 Program Recommendations              | \$127,850 |  |
| Food and Health Staff Training                       | \$1,700   |  |
| Commissary Training for New Meal Preparation         | \$80,000  |  |
| Wellness Policy Consulting                           | \$10,000  |  |

| Food Services Professional Development  |
|---|
| Marketing and Communications            |
| Subtotal Year 4 Program Recommendations |

Waste Management District Sustainability Coordinator

Center for Ecoliteracy

\$40,000

\$9,250

\$6,900

\$177,850

#### Year 5 Program Recommendations

| Food and Health Staff Training                       | \$1,700   |
|--|-----------|
| Wellness Policy Consulting                           | \$10,000  |
| Dining Experience Consulting                         | \$30,000  |
| Procurement Consulting                               | \$25,000  |
| Waste Management District Sustainability Coordinator | \$40,000  |
| Food Services Professional Development               | \$34,250  |
| Marketing and Communications                         | \$176,900 |
| Subtotal Year 5 Program Recommendations              | \$317,850 |
|  |           |
| Grand Total Program Recommendations                  | \$950,795 |

Center for Ecoliteracy

www.ecoliteracy.org

#### About the Center for Ecoliteracy

The Center for Ecoliteracy is dedicated to education for sustainable living. Through its initiative Smart by NatureTM, the Center offers expertise, inspiration, and resources to the sustainability movement in K–12 education.

Rethinking School Lunch Oakland is part of the Center's Rethinking School Lunch suite of projects, including an extensive online *Rethinking School Lunch Guide*, workshops and professional development seminars, and consulting with schools and districts. Other Rethinking School Lunch publications include a cookbook and professional development guide (*Cooking with California Food in K–12 Schools*), a conceptual framework for integrating learning in K–12 classrooms (*Big Ideas: Linking Food, Culture, Health, and the Environment*), discussion guides for films such as *Food, Inc.* and *Nourish: Food + Community*, and essays on the Center for Ecoliteracy website.

The Center's other resources include the books *Smart by Nature: Schooling for Sustainability*, which showcases inspiring stories about school communities across the nation, and *Ecological Literacy: Educating Our Children for a Sustainable World*. Jossey-Bass will publish *Ecoliterate: How Educators Are Cultivating Emotional*, *Social, and Ecological Intelligence*, by Daniel Goleman, Lisa Bennett, Zenobia Barlow, with professional development by Carolie Sly in August 2012. The Center's services include seminars, academic program audits, coaching for teaching and learning, in-depth curriculum development, keynote presentations, technical assistance, and a leadership training academy.

For further information, see www.ecoliteracy.org.



#### A PROJECT OF THE CENTER FOR ECOLITERACY

MADE POSSIBLE WITH THE GENEROUS SUPPORT OF THE TOMKAT CHARITABLE TRUST AND THE S.D. BECHTEL, JR. FOUNDATION