

Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Priorities for the 2018 Farm Bill: Promoting Healthy People, Healthful Food Systems and a Strong Economy

The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics is committed to improving the health of Americans by ensuring access to a nourishing, safe and affordable food supply. The Academy is also committed to ensuring that quality nutrition services and nutrition education are integral components of nutrition assistance programs. The Academy offers the following recommendations to build upon and strengthen existing Farm Bill programs; increase access to affordable, nutritious food, especially for those most in need; and improve the demand and marketplace for a diversity of foods that contribute to health and food security.

The Academy's guiding principle is our commitment to improving health for all, especially those most susceptible to and that experience food insecurity, and is the basis for our recommendations.

1. Empower Consumers – Drive Demand for and Reduce Waste of Healthful Foods

Goal: Nutrition education programs authorized in the Farm Bill are tailored to participants' education levels and lifestyles to help them make lifelong healthful behavior changes.

The Academy supports:

- Provision of sufficient funding for effective and innovative nutrition education programs and initiatives authorized in the Farm Bill Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program (SNAP-Ed) and the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).
- Identification of opportunities to ensure program effectiveness and efficiencies in public nutrition education and assistance programs to promote positive consumer behavior change.
- Initiatives to reduce consumer food waste.
- Provide support for necessary leadership within the USDA and specifically in the regional offices on nutrition and nutrition education.

Rationale

The majority of Americans should improve their diet quality regardless of income status.¹ The Academy believes that improving access/supply and education/demand for healthy foods will improve long-term health¹¹. Improving demand and consumption of healthy foods is accomplished through evidenced-based nutrition education and promotion programs authorized in the Farm Bill. The programs listed below coordinate and create synergies to maximize reach with limited funding. Effective nutrition education must be delivered with adequate dosage and intensity to empower families to make healthy choices. These recommendations aim to support the structure of the programs and improve support, coordination, expertise and leadership within USDA and as implemented through the state agencies.

SNAP Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Program, or SNAP-Ed, and the Expanded Food and Nutrition Program (EFNEP), are innovative nutrition education programs that meet the unique needs of low-income communities nationwide. These programs provide targeted, effective nutrition education that empowers families to make lasting behavior changes and build skills to manage limited resources beyond the short time that a typical SNAP participant utilizes the benefits. Nutrition education is critical to good health and the development of lifelong healthy behaviors.

Effective education strategies in combination and coordination with nutrition assistance programs ensure our federal investment in these programs is optimized.

Early adoption of healthy habits and resource management skills, coupled with systems approaches that support those habits, are key to reducing health care costs related to chronic diseases like obesity, diabetes and heart disease. Nutrition education programs simultaneously empower families to make healthier choices and provide knowledge and skills to help attain food security.

Nationally, a snapshot of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP successes show:

- Indiana household food security improved by 25% in households with at least one person participating in the SNAP-Ed curriculum compared to a control group. Participants saw lasting effects one year post interventionⁱⁱⁱ.
- A California SNAP-Ed program found a significant increase in the number of participants meeting the recommended 5+ servings of fruit and vegetables daily. The greatest improvements were seen in populations with most need for improvement: 91% improvement in the segment of the population with lowest incomes, 77% improvement in the African American population and 43% improvement in the Latino population^{iv}.
- A Pennsylvania SNAP-Ed program, as part of a multifaceted approach, has shown a 50% reduction in the incidence of overweight among elementary school students^v.
- Nationally, review of the EFNEP program showed that 94% of adults improved their diet, including consuming an additional ½ cup of fruits and vegetables daily^{vi}.
- According to an analysis by the Agricultural and Applied Economics Association, \$1 spent on the adult EFNEP program produced a benefit equivalent to \$10.96. Other results differed, ranging from Oregon's \$3.62 benefit per \$1 to Iowa's \$12.50 benefit per \$1, but all point to significant programmatic value^{vii}

Nutrition education provided through SNAP-Ed has undergone significant changes in the last seven years. The passage of the Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010^{viii} and resulting USDA guidance, regulations and the federal/state cooperation formalized and strengthened the mission of SNAP-Ed^{ix}. These changes included: adding physical activity and obesity prevention to the mission; the ability of SNAP-Ed to reach more low-income people more easily; authorization of a mix of activities to include a higher-impact blend of education, marketing, public health and community approaches; coordination with other federal agencies, especially CDC and NIH; the identification and use of evidence-based interventions; and accountability through a clear set of potential outcomes and results as detailed in the SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework.

SNAP-Ed and EFNEP continue to innovate and coordinate with other health focused programs. States like Minnesota and Iowa are leading the country to coordinate across federally funded nutrition and nutrition education programming as required by FY16 and FY17 SNAP-Ed guidance. The Iowa Nutrition Network (INN), established in the 1990s, began with a one-time infusion of funding to create this network^x. The INN fosters collaboration, nutrition leadership and the commitment among programs to discuss program successes and planning for SNAP-Ed, EFNEP, WIC, Senior Meals, Team Nutrition, Food Corps and CDC funding dedicated to nutrition and nutrition education. Minnesota has leveraged private funding through a state-based health insurer to establish a first-ever Minnesota Food Charter^{xi}. The people brought together through the Charter have worked to gather input and build consensus around food and nutrition planning and coordination throughout the state.

These two states have done amazing work, but across the nation there is a lack of sufficient resources within USDA to share and disseminate best practices. The Academy recommends that Congress direct USDA to continue their progress with state agencies and implementing agencies to

facilitate a network of shared resources and best practices, improved technical assistance and nutrition education leadership. Additional staff support within USDA headquarters, including a high-level nutrition officer and additional regional support in each of the USDA regions, could: create easily shared resources for technical assistance, especially as more comprehensive data is collected through updated EARS and utilization of the SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework; encourage a shared services model for social marketing activities; and provide leadership as directed through the SNAP-Ed guidance to support coordination within other FNS programs around nutrition education. All of these potential activities would maximize federal investments, enhance program reach and ultimately improve population health and reduce healthcare costs.

The U.S. wastes 40% of food available for consumption throughout the food supply chain^{xii}. The USDA defines food waste as “a component of food loss and occurs when an edible item goes unconsumed, as in food discarded by retailers due to color or appearance and plate waste by consumers”^{xiii}. Wasted food can occur along the entire food supply chain. Identifying where wasted food occurs along the food supply chain is necessary to develop effective strategies to increase efficiencies.

To address confusion with consumers, the Academy strongly encourages efforts by Congress to address this issue and can lend expertise to provide much needed consumer education on confusing date labeling of foods^{xiv}. We encourage Congress to work with industry to standardize date labels based on food safety standards and provide education to consumers on this issue.

2. Ensure Sound Science and Program Evaluation for Future Evidenced-Based Decision Making

Goal: A strong science portfolio informs development and enhancement of nutrition program content, and high quality, systematic monitoring and evaluation provide guidance for structuring and strengthening consumer education implementation and delivery systems.

The Academy supports:

- Establishment of a consistent USDA funding authorization to accomplish the requirements in the 1990 National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act.
- Provision of sufficient funding for the completion of the Pregnancy and Birth to 24 Months nutrition guidance project, as required in the Agricultural Act of 2014.
- Increased funding for vital primary agricultural and nutrition research: National Institute of Food and Agriculture including the 1) Agricultural and Food Research Initiative (AFRI), 2) Agricultural Research Service Human Nutrition Research Centers and 3) maintain funding for the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research.
- Adequate evaluation funding and program expertise to examine ways to improve health outcomes related to nutrition status, such as SNAP benefit adequacy, SNAP disbursement frequency (i.e., weekly or bi-monthly), reduction of participant stigma in nutrition assistance programs and child nutrition programs, and improved nutritional health of SNAP participants. These projects should adhere to rigorous study design and build on past research conducted by USDA and HHS.
- Continue to strengthen linkages to nutrition programming and nutrition education research through the Interagency Committee on Human Nutrition Research, as outlined in the National Nutrition Research Roadmap.

Rationale

More than 75,000 Academy members rely on current high-quality nutrition science and the gold standard rigorous systematic reviews – that controls for bias – conducted by the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion. Academy members perform primary nutrition research, lead systematic reviews and translate systematic reviews to actionable messages for consumers, all with the goal of improving the health of Americans.

To reflect the highest integrity, transparency and rigor, there must be an investment to meet the USDA’s mandate as required by the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990^{xv} and the Agricultural Act of 2014^{xvi}. According to 2005 study, the average cost for a systematic review was \$250,000^{xvii} and recent estimates note that these systematic reviews can cost up to \$500,000 *per question*. To meet the requirement in Agricultural Act of 2014, which called for the development of the pregnancy and birth to 24 months dietary guidance, USDA and HHS will need to conduct numerous original systematic reviews. USDA and HHS are extremely efficient with their work and leverage public/private partnerships with professional and medical associations to conduct this work. But this cannot be sustained through public/private partnerships; there must be additional federal support. With the recent review of the process related to the Dietary Guidelines for Americans by the National Academies of Medicine, clear recommendations were given that could strengthen this review process, including adequate funding^{xviii}. The upcoming Farm Bill could include language to support these efforts to continue to provide rigorous science-based reviews.

Primary research on agriculture and nutrition, through National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and Agricultural and Food Research Initiative (AFRI), the Agricultural Research Service that includes Human Nutrition Research Centers and the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research, are critical to maintain and improve the nation’s food security. This competitive funding is essential to ensure programs provide optimal food and nutrition tailored specifically to their audiences, which leads to improved nutrition and health outcomes, strengthens food security and reduces overall health care costs. According to testimony provided to the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research, “In fiscal 2015, more than 2,600 proposals were submitted for AFRI funding, requesting almost \$1.8 billion. Through a rigorous peer-review process, over 1,400 were recommended for funding, but only 569 could be supported with the funds available.”^{xix}

Released in 2016, The National Nutrition Research Roadmap was written to better outline the goals of the Interagency Committee on Human Nutrition Research (ICHNR) on researching and understanding federally supported or conducted human nutrition research and associated programming. The ICHNR was established in 1983 to better facilitate “planning, coordination, and communication” with federal agencies and departments like the USDA, NIH, HHS, DoD and others. As outlined in the roadmap, each participating group is tasked with establishing their own cooperative relationships among themselves and should focus on sharing past experiences and knowledge in their areas of human nutrition research. Overall, ICHNR believes that doing this will “effectively and efficiently advance the role of nutrition in improving and sustaining health”.^{xx}

The Farm Bill provides a time to reinforce the importance and need for investment in foundational nutrition science, and coordination of research as the federal government invests in tackling issues related to human nutrition and increasing health care costs related to diet-related chronic diseases.

3. Support Innovative Nutrition Assistance Programs to Improve Access to Healthful, Affordable and Safe Foods

Goal: Domestic and International Nutrition Safety Nets Are Protected and Strengthened by Streamlining Administrative Requirements for All Nutrition Assistance Programs and Coordinating Healthful Food Production with Nutrition Assistance Programs.

The Academy supports:

- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
 - Maintain the current structure of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). *The Academy would oppose any effort to change the structure of this program to shift to a state-based grant system, such as block grants, which would cap funding and limit the agility of the program to be responsive to fluctuating economic condition.*
 - Increase the SNAP benefit level to prevent hunger and provide resources to help families make healthful food choices.
 - Update standards for SNAP retailers that increase the availability of healthful foods.
 - Ensure final regulations lead to enhanced retail offerings to promote and sell healthy foods.
 - Ensure adequate training and technical assistance are provided to assist transition to updated standards.
 - Encourage coordination efforts with SNAP-Ed and CDC to assist retailers with strategies to improve healthier options and drive demand for these healthier options.
 - Eliminate the requirement that basic allowance for housing for our military members be included in their income calculations to receive SNAP benefits.
- Food Distribution Programs
 - Reauthorize the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) to ensure that low-income seniors have access to nutritious monthly food packages and increase funding to provide an opportunity for the two remaining states (Alabama and Wyoming) to participate in the program.
 - Maintain current funding for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) to ensure a steady flow of nutritious commodities through the emergency food system of charitable providers, such as food banks and pantries.
 - Provide adequate funding authorization for transportation of TEFAP commodities.
 - Continue support of projects to integrate more traditional foods and updates to distribution sites that allow the distribution of more fresh, frozen and perishable foods on Indian reservations and throughout the entire food distribution system.
 - Maintain current funding and integrity of the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Snack Program.
- Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentives grants:
 - Maintain funding for the successful, research-based FINI grants, which provide financial incentives for families to purchase healthful foods. Through the grant process, place priority on those projects that:
 - Seek to engage retailers of all sizes as active partners.
 - Focus on the development of technology that could facilitate use of incentives in the retail setting.
 - Encourage and prioritize coordination with nutrition education programming, such as SNAP-Ed and EFNEP.

- Encourage and provide technical assistance for projects with varying population densities and retail outlets.

Rationale

Food insecurity is declining, but is still above pre-recession level. In 2015, 12.7% (15.8 million) of households were food insecure compared to 11.1% in 2007, with the recession peak of 14.9% in 2011. Of these households, 5% experienced very low food security, meaning some members ate less. Also in 2015, 7.8% of households with children experienced food insecurity^{xxi}. SNAP, our nation's largest and widest reaching nutrition safety net, is critical to addressing basic nutritional needs for families.

Studies show SNAP is effective in reducing food insecurity and improving health. In a survey of 3,000 households with children, SNAP participation decreased odds of children experiencing food insecurity by one-third^{xxii}. In a survey of 6,500 households, SNAP participation decreased food insecurity by 6-17%, and decreased very low food security by 12-19% over six months^{xxiii xxiv}. SNAP participation during pregnancy reduced likelihood of low birth weight by 23%, and a mother's access to food assistance during pregnancy increased her child's birth weight. SNAP participation is also inversely associated with anemia, failure to thrive and nutritional deficiency.

According to a 2013 report by the IOM, individual, household and environmental factors impact the adequacy of SNAP benefits. The maximum benefit guarantee, based on the Thrifty Food Plan, may not be sufficient. The Thrifty Food Plan assumes that a family has enough time to prepare meals from scratch, does not account for geographic variation in food costs and calculates benefits based on food costs 16 months in advance. Net income deduction calculations may not be adequate. For example, households face housing costs greater than the shelter deduction cap. Medical expense deductions do not include out-of-pocket costs for non-elderly, nondisabled patients^{xxv}.

Blumenthal, Hoffnagle, Leung et al., in a 2014 survey of 522 SNAP participants, recorded that 70% disagreed that benefits were adequate to maintain a healthy diet^{xxvi}. Increased SNAP benefits may improve diet quality and decrease health care spending. Medicaid cost growth decreased in Massachusetts after SNAP benefits increased, especially among those with chronic illnesses that are highly sensitive to food insecurity^{xxvii}. Another way to address benefit adequacy issues is to pair healthy food incentives with nutrition education, which has been shown to maximize current benefit levels. In the USDA Healthy Incentives Pilot completed in 2014, a 30% incentive on targeted fruits and vegetables significantly increased participants' fruit and vegetable consumption^{xxviii}.

Food distribution programs aim to meet the needs of the communities they serve, and the Academy encourages Congress to support and maintain funding for these programs. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) supplements the diets of low-income individuals by providing emergency food and nutrition assistance, largely through food banks. In 2012, TEFAP distributed over 723 million pounds of USDA Foods, and represents a federal investment that supports producers. This investment included nearly 306 million pounds of fruits and vegetables, 180 million pounds of meat, 105 million pounds of milk and juice, and 75 million pounds of grains. Nearly 90 healthy products - including canned fruits and vegetables, dried beans, grains and pasta products, milk, juice and meat products – are provided through TEFAP to local soup kitchens, food pantries and community action agencies across the country. A recent analysis found that TEFAP foods achieved a score 89 out of 100 on the Health Eating Index, a measure of diet quality based on the Dietary Guidelines for Americans^{xxix}.

Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) is expected to serve 697,000 low-income senior citizens by supplementing their diets with nutritious USDA foods in 2017^{xxx}. This is an important supplement for older adults and protects against food insecurity and malnutrition. We applaud FNS for conducting a comprehensive food package review that includes nutritional and operational review. The Academy supports this program and is asking for an increase in funding to expand the program to the last two states that do not have this program to provide food and administrative funds to supplement the diets of older Americans^{xxx}.

4. Support the Food Supply Chain: Producers and Retailers That Create a Healthful and Safe Food System and Reduces Food Waste.

Goal: Support Producers and Retailers to Meet Demand for Healthful Foods.

The Academy supports:

- Funding and federal support for a variety of community-based and regional agriculture and food access initiatives that expand the availability of regionally-grown food, create jobs and promote economic development. Examples include Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Programs, Senior and WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Programs, Community Food Projects, and Value-Added Producer Grants.
- Farm practices and policies that conserve soil, water, air, habitat and biodiversity.
- Policies and programs to assure the next generation of farmers have access to land, skills and incentives to grow healthful foods.
- Maintaining funding for the Specialty Crop Block Grants to support food safety and drive demand through education for specialty crops to increase dietary diversity as an aid to help people achieve the Dietary Guidelines for Americans.
- Supply chain innovation for food retail outlets.
 - Reduce the cost and administrative burden for farmers markets, farm stands, green cart, community-supported agriculture, small rural grocers and other non-traditional vendors and convenience stores to accept EBT and participate in Farmers Market Nutrition Programs.
 - Provide targeted solutions for communities living in food deserts.
 - Reauthorize of the Healthy Food Financing Initiative (HFFI), which will stimulate economic development, create jobs and improve health in low-income, underserved communities and communities of color in urban and rural areas by supporting farmers and healthy food retailers to improve access to nutritious, affordable food.
 - Support nutrition assistance programs for populations that may need additional outreach and support.
 - Continue to learn from and fund pilot projects that test innovative approaches to delivery of groceries, while ensuring client privacy is protected.
 - Support community efforts to reach isolated older adults to provide healthful food options to help maintain their independence.
- Initiatives to reduce pre- and post-consumer food waste throughout the food system.

Rationale

The Academy is a steady partner with agriculture leaders as we support producers who are entrusted to create a healthy food system. We continue to ask Congress to ensure a variety of expertise and funding for community-based and regional agriculture initiatives. We know this is a wise investment that helps provide more options for consumers and expands the availability of

regionally-grown food, creates jobs and promotes economic development. Supporting producers in this way ensures survival of our most valuable resources, water and land.

We also support and recognize the need to train new farmers and ranchers to ensure that the next generation of farmers have access to land, as well as the skills and incentives to grow healthy foods^{xxxii}. The rising average age of U.S. farmers and the 8% projected decrease in the number of farmers and ranchers between 2008 and 2018 solidifies the growing recognition that new programs are needed to meet the needs of the next generation of beginning farmers and ranchers^{xxxiii}. We encourage Congress to direct USDA to find more innovative ways to provide guidance and support for beginning farmers and ranchers.

Food retailers are a critical partner in increasing food security, decreasing food waste and improving the health of all. We suggest supports and incentives for supply chain innovation that would decrease food deserts and waste, and link retailers to technical expertise to facilitate the availability of healthy options. Nutrition education and promotion efforts drive demand for healthy foods, and we encourage supply efforts also coordinate with these demand drivers to support small and large retail operations.

The USDA estimates that supermarkets lose \$15 billion annually in unsold fruits and vegetables^{xxxiv}. The Academy supports removing barriers or perceived barriers to food donation, or innovative food distribution with a strong emphasis on food safety considerations.

We applaud Congress' foresight to address the unique needs of certain populations such as veterans, seniors, homebound people and citizens living in food deserts, who struggle with food insecurity and poor access to healthy foods. We encourage Congress to continue to fund USDA pilot projects that test innovative ways to address the nutritional needs of these vulnerable groups.

The Academy strongly believes these efforts to ensure access to adequate, safe, and nutritious food will benefit economic growth, public health, agriculture and national security.

ⁱ Dietary Guidelines for Americans 2015-2020. United State Department of Agriculture and Health and Human Services. Chapter 2 Shifts Needed to Align with Healthy Eating Patterns. Accessed at <https://health.gov/dietaryguidelines/2015/guidelines/chapter-2/current-eating-patterns-in-the-united-states/#current-eating-patterns-in-the-united-states> on May 11, 2017

ⁱⁱ See, American Dietetic Association Position Paper Food Insecurity in the United States. *J Am Diet Assoc.* 2010; Volume 110, Issue 9, Pages 1368-1377

ⁱⁱⁱ Rivera, R. Maulding, M., Abbott, A., Craig, B., Eicher-Miller, H. SNAP-Ed Increases Long-Term Food Security among Indiana Households with Children in a Randomized Controlled Study. *The Journal of Nutrition.* 2016

^{iv} Sugarman, S. Foerster, S., Gregson, J., Linares, A., Hudes, M. California Adults Increase Fruit and Vegetable Consumption from 1997-2007. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior.* Volume 43, Issue 4, Supplement 2, Pages S96-S103

^vFoster et al. A Policy-Based School Intervention to Prevent Overweight and Obesity. *Pediatrics* Vol. 121, No. 4, April 2008

^{vi} USDA, National Institutes of Food and Nutrition Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. Accessed May 4, 2017 at <https://nifa.usda.gov/program/expanded-food-and-nutrition-education-program-efnep>

^{vii} Investments in EFNEP Pay Big Dividends, Now and in the Future. USDA, National Institute of Food and Agriculture Blog. Accessed May 4, 2017 at <https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2016/03/30/investments-efnep-pay-big-dividends-now-and-future>

^{viii} Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, 42 U.S.C. § 1751 et seq. (2010).

^{ix} USDA SNAP-Ed Plan Guidance and Templates. Accessed at <https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/administration/snap-ed-plan-guidance-and-templates> on May 12, 2017

^x Iowa Department of Public Health. Iowa Nutrition Network. Accessed at <http://idph.iowa.gov/inn> on May 12, 2017

-
- ^{xi} Minnesota Food Charter. Accessed at <http://idph.iowa.gov/inn> on May 12, 2017
- ^{xii} USDA Office of the Chief Economist. Food Loss and Waste Reduction Goals. Accessed on <https://www.usda.gov/oce/foodwaste/faqs.htm> on May 12, 2017
- ^{xiii} US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Loss-adjusted food availability documentation. [http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-availability-\(per-capita\)-data-system/loss-adjusted-food-availability-documentation.aspx](http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-availability-(per-capita)-data-system/loss-adjusted-food-availability-documentation.aspx). Updated October 13, 2015.
- ^{xiv} Vogliano, C., Brown, K., The State of America’s Wasted Food and Opportunities to Make a Difference. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Foundation. March 2016
- ^{xv} National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-445 - Oct. 22, 1990)
- ^{xvi} The Agricultural Act of 2014. Public Law 113-79 – February 2014
- ^{xvii} McGowan J., Sampson M. Systematic reviews need systematic searchers. *J Med Libr Assoc.* 2005 Jan; 93(1): 74–80.
- ^{xviii} National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2017. *Optimizing the process for establishing the Dietary Guidelines for Americans: The selection process*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- ^{xix} Dr. Akridge, Dean of Chair, Policy Board of Directors Board on Agriculture Assembly Association of Public and Land-grant Universities to the U.S. House Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research, March 16, 2017 <http://www.aplu.org/members/commissions/food-environment-and-renewable-resources/board-on-agriculture-assembly/akridge-APLU-BAA-Testimony-3-16-17.pdf>
- ^{xx} Interagency Committee on Human Nutrition Research. *National Nutrition Research Roadmap 2016–2021: Advancing Nutrition Research to Improve and Sustain Health*. Washington, DC: Interagency Committee on Human Nutrition Research; 2016.
- ^{xxi} USDA Economic Research Service. *Household Food Security in the United States in 2015*. September 2016. Available at: https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/err215/err215_summary.pdf?v=42636
- ^{xxii} Mabli J, Worthington J. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation and Child Food Security. *PEDIATRICS*. 2014;133(4):610-619.
- ^{xxiii} Mabli J, Ohls J. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Is Associated with an Increase in Household Food Security in a National Evaluation. *Journal of Nutrition*. 2014;145(2):344-351
- ^{xxiv} Nord M. How much does the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program alleviate food insecurity? Evidence from recent programme leavers. *Public Health Nutrition* [serial online]. May 2012;15(5):811-817
- ^{xxv} IOM (Institute of Medicine) and NRC (National Research Council). 2013. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Examining the evidence to define benefit adequacy. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press
- ^{xxvi} Blumenthal S., Hoffnagle E., et al. Strategies to Improve the Dietary Quality of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Beneficiaries: An Assessment of Stakeholder Opinions. *Public Health Nutr.* 2014 Dec; 17(12): 2824–2833. Published online 2013 Nov 8.
- ^{xxvii} Sonik, R.A. (2016). Massachusetts Inpatient Medicaid Cost Response to Increased Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Benefits. *Am J. Public Health*, 106(3), pp. 443-338
- ^{xxviii} Olsho L, Klerman J., Wilde P, Bartlett S. Financial incentives increase fruit and vegetable intake among Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program participants: a randomized controlled trial of the USDA Healthy Incentives Pilot. *The American Journal Of Clinical Nutrition*. August 2016;104(2):423-435.
- ^{xxix} U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Policy Support, White Paper on the Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), by Charlotte Cabili, Esa Eslami, and Ronette Briefel. Project Officer, Dennis Ranalli. Alexandria, VA: August 2013.
- ^{xxx} 2017 NCSFPA Conference USDA General Session. Presented in New Orleans, LA on March 13 2017. Accessed at <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/csfp/usda-general-session.pdf> on May 18, 2017
- ^{xxxi} USDA Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services. The Commodity Supplemental Food Program. Accessed at <https://www.fns.usda.gov/csfp/commodity-supplemental-food-program-csfp> on May 12, 2017
- ^{xxxii} USDA Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program. Accessed at <https://nifa.usda.gov/program/beginning-farmer-and-rancher-development-program-bfrdp> on May 12, 2017
- ^{xxxiii} USDA Census of Agriculture. Accessed at <https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/> on May 12, 2017
- ^{xxxiv}
- The Estimated Amount, Value, and Calories of Postharvest Food Losses at the Retail and Consumer Levels in the United States. USDA. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1282296/eib121.pdf>. 2014.