



**Final Report on
ReFresh Foods Program Review
Submitted to Food for Life Board
September 25th, 2010**



Table of Contents

	Page Number
Background	3
Methodology for the Program Review	4
Results of Stakeholder Interviews: The Six Questions and Beyond	5
Recommendations	7
Comparison of Fee Schedules	8
Draft Policy on Food Quality	8
Final Comment	8
Appendices	
Appendix I Member Agencies 2009/10	10
Appendix II List of Persons Interviewed	11
Appendix III Draft Food Quality Policy	12
Appendix IV Results of January 2010 Member Agency Survey	16
Appendix V Summary of ReFresh Operational Performance 09/10	18
Appendix VI 2009/10 RFF Fee Schedule from Member Agency Contract	21

Background

In 2006, Food for life convened a meeting of food banks in Halton Region, with the support and encouragement of United Way Oakville and the Regional Municipality of Halton. The presenting facts were:

- OAFB was developing a new Provincial food distribution Network
- Only two food banks were members of OAFB
- Huge unmet need in Halton, an estimated 31,000 people
- No organized collaboration amongst food banks and other food agencies

In May, 2007, a project began with financial support from Halton Region. The Project charter stated “We are creating a blueprint for connecting up to nine Halton Region food banks and a food recovery program (Food for Life) to each other and to the Provincial Food Distribution Network. This blueprint qualifies and quantifies the feasibility, costs and benefits of doing so, as well as the requirements for moving from the current supply system to the new one, via an implementation plan.” The Project Team consisted of an outside consultant, an expert in logistics, a representative from Halton Region, two from food banks and one from Food for Life. The steps in the project included food bank site visits to assess distribution capacity, visits to Waterloo and Northumberland County to observe best practices, a definition of the need in Halton Region and a consultation process with stakeholders.

In October, 2007, the Team submitted its final report, entitled “Food For All: A Blueprint for Regional Collaboration in Halton to Acquire and Distribute More, Fresher Food to Halton’s Hungry”. It proposed a new model, based on a regional hub, and showed how it could work. It proposed a tripling of the amount of food distributed, with more fresh and frozen foods. The main sources of food would be food industry corporations in Halton Region, OAFB and Food Banks Canada (National Food Sharing System). The warehouse and refrigerated distribution would enable ReFresh to obtain food donations in large amounts, so that these could be warehoused centrally and delivered to member agencies on an as required basis, in smaller shipments. The response to the recommendations from stakeholders was positive.

In 2008, the search for funding began and an implementation project team was assembled. Approximately \$500,000 was raised and in December, 2008, ReFresh Foods was launched. As of January, 2010, the operation is based in a warehouse and offices in Burlington, with a large freezer and a large cooler. There is a medium duty truck with a refrigerated box and staff includes a program manager, driver, and a manager of Corporate Food Solicitation. The program is the responsibility of the Food for Life Board of Directors and a ReFresh Foods Advisory Council has been established to advise the Board. It is composed of the 12 member agencies which have a contractual relationship with Food for Life as the legal entity.

In July, 2010, at a meeting of Health and Social Services Committee of Halton Regional Council, a concern was raised about the annual fees charged to ReFresh member agencies. The specific concern was that these fees may constitute a barrier to food distribution in Halton Region, since not every potential organization has become a ReFresh Foods member agency. The Board decided that, with about 18 months' operating experience, it was time to review the program, (including the fee schedule), in the context of a general question: what changes or improvements in operations are recommended?

Methodology for the Program Review

The Board decided to conduct interviews with representatives from each of the member agencies, key stakeholders and funders. The purpose of these interviews was to address six questions about what ReFresh Foods/Food for Life can do

1. To increase the volume of food distributed in Halton Region
2. To increase the proportions of meat, dairy and fresh produce donated to ReFresh
3. To improve the quality (freshness) of food distributed
4. To improve operational efficiency and reduce the operational cost per pound of food distributed
5. To reduce the probability of foodborne illness occurring as a result of food distributed
6. To maintain high satisfaction levels with ReFresh Foods on the part of member agencies and food donors

The Board asked that these same questions be considered by staff, independent of the stakeholder interviews.

Furthermore, as part of the Program Review, the Board directed staff to compile a summary of fees charged by peer organizations, including Waterloo Regional Food Bank, Mississauga Food Bank, Hamilton Food Share Bank, Daily Bread Food Bank and Northumberland Food for All. The Board also directed staff to develop a new policy on food quality, to articulate and explain the criteria used, by food type, to determine if an offer of food would be accepted or declined, as well as to describe the expert resources available to staff in their decision-making.

Review of Draft Report: Findings and Recommendations

The draft report has been reviewed by the ReFresh Advisory Council at its meeting on September 16, 2010.

Submission of Final Report

After review by the ReFresh Foods Advisory council, the report was revised and completed. It was presented to the Board on September 25 and approved.

Results of Stakeholder Interviews: The Six questions and Beyond

1. How to increase the volume of food sourced and distributed

There were several suggestions, including:

- Use business executives who are on our Boards to contact their colleagues at higher levels in food industry organizations for donations of product
- Establish more delivery points, especially in those areas where there is no public transit. Some possibilities include Glad Tidings Church, Calvary Baptist Church and North Burlington Baptist Church, and a Milton agency
- Encourage member agencies to continue to augment their refrigeration capacity, noting that there has already been a significant increase here, e.g. Kerr Street Ministries, Compassion Society and Georgetown Bread Basket Food Bank and others

2. How to increase proportions of meat, dairy, eggs

One respondent suggested that consideration be given again to accessing the OAFB bulk buying program, e.g. for skim milk powder, since milk is in such short supply. Concern was expressed about baked goods other than bread and other “junk food” items, since the problems of child obesity are well-known. (This respondent is involved in the “Healthy Weights” Program.) It is clear that member agencies want more food in these categories; although some say they are at capacity now in terms of volume of food received.

3. How to increase the quality of food

The question about food quality usually elicited a flow of compliments, e.g. “the produce is wonderful” and “produce is awesome” and “the quality is excellent”. One respondent said her member agency does not accept any food that is past the best before date, because this sends a negative message to struggling, low income families, which may not have the information to interpret the meaning of the date for a particular product.

4. How to reduce the probability of foodborne disease

Respondents expressed support for a collaborative approach to conducting the Food Banks Canada self-assessment and to working on areas for improvement.

5. How to improve operational efficiency

There is strong support for the continued integration of ReFresh Foods and Food for Life operations, based upon an understanding of the benefits this will bring.

6. How to maintain high levels of satisfaction with member agencies

All respondents expressed their satisfaction with ReFresh Foods, consistent with the responses to the survey done earlier in the year. (One member agency has given notice that it will not renew its membership at the end of 2009/10, citing a concern with food quality, and it did not participate in this Program Review.)

Many suggestions were made, mostly specific to a particular member agency. These are listed below.

- a. Produce a weekly delivery schedule, send it to member agencies and then stick to it. The member agency would like a set day each week for delivery, or at least advance notice of delivery, because a staff person has to be despatched to receive the delivery.
- b. Because it can be confusing for a member agency when ordering a product for the first time, it is important to provide a clear description, including the size of the product. One respondent requested complete information on the product, to the extent that this is available. Another suggested attaching a digital photo of the new product. Another suggested giving a “meal equivalent” as an aid to ordering appropriate quantities.
- c. Provide member agencies with a running total of the food volume they have received to date, when this is requested. The quarterly reporting is not sufficient, according to one respondent.
- d. Put a compost bin on the truck, so produce can be sorted en route and spoiled items removed before delivery. Sometimes there are waste disposal problems at the member agency.
- e. Make ordering less complicated, by returning to an email message with the list of available food items embedded in the message, rather than as an attachment. There are fewer steps to complete an order and send it back.
- f. The problem with bulk food offers is that some member agencies lack the staff or volunteers to do the re-packaging necessary. Could some member agencies do the re-packaging on behalf of others? Perhaps they could thereby earn “credits” towards their annual fees.
- g. One member agency operates a large community meal program on a daily basis. If they could receive daily updates on food available, then they could plan their menu accordingly, order food and take delivery daily between 3:00-5:00 pm.
- h. One member would like bulk purchases of bags for bread product
- i. One member requested a column next to the Best Before column indicating recommended use by a particular date
- j. Recommended having links on our website with our members for sharing ideas

Comments on the fee schedule

Generally, respondents are quick to say it's a good deal, when they consider what they get for what they pay. For example, one respondent said they get \$16.00 worth of food for every dollar in fees. (In 2009/10, fees totalled less than \$20,000, or about 5% of the ReFresh operating budget.) However, some respondents express concern about their future ability to pay the fees. For example, one member agency is paying their annual fee out of funds from a three-year grant. They worry about whether or

not the grant will be renewed. One or two respondents said they adjust their ordering so as to stay within their current fee category. Here, the fee schedule acts as a disincentive to order more food. Another respondent mentioned the incentive to share food with ReFresh, when they receive a donation larger than they can absorb. There is an incentive to share, because the weight of food donated to ReFresh is deducted from the food which they have received, when the annual fee is calculated. This calculation potentially keeps them in a lower fee category. No respondent agreed with the statement that paying an annual fee makes them feel more engaged, or more committed to the success of the network. Respondents said that paying a fee did not affect their behaviour. Several respondents suggested that if a member agency is experiencing difficulty, then the Board should be able to take extenuating circumstances into account, when determining the annual fee payable. One respondent asked if a member agency could contribute volunteer hours, perhaps to a fund raising event, in lieu of part of the annual fee payment.

Recommendations

1. Recruit more member agencies, especially in the northern part of Halton Region.
2. Continue to integrate ReFresh Foods and Food for Life operations, where this brings increased efficiency and/or improved service to member agencies.
3. Search for a long-term funder to replace the annual revenue raised by fees, which are just under \$20,000 in 2009/10.
4. For the fiscal year Oct 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011, while replacement funding is being sought, amend the contract with member agencies to allow the Board to take into account extenuating circumstances, if a member agency is experiencing great difficulty in paying all or part of its annual fee.
5. Using a collaborative approach, measure member agency compliance with those food safety standards which are relevant to their particular operations, using the self-assessment tool developed by Food Banks Canada, and then address any shortcomings identified during that process.
6. Strive for consensus among member agencies on a policy which defines criteria for accepting donated food products for distribution to member agencies. But put a policy in place.
7. Find a venue for re-packaging bulk items that meet Halton Public Health requirements.

Comparison of Fee schedules

There is a wide variance in fees among similar distribution centres in various areas across the province as outlined in the following chart:

Agency	Fee/Membership
Waterloo Food Bank	\$300 – \$30,000 based on agency type and agency mandated fees
Mississauga Food Bank	\$100 membership fee per year+ \$500/month delivery fee (4 deliveries per month)
North York Harvest	\$25 per year membership fee
Second Harvest	No fee
Northumberland Food for All	\$25 - \$150 based on type of agency

Draft Policy on Food Quality

Staff have produced a draft policy, which is attached as an appendix. We hope that this draft will provide a focus for discussion amongst stakeholders, (including funders and regulatory bodies). We hope the outcomes will include a clear policy statement understood by everyone about what food products are safe and acceptable to ReRefresh and to all member agencies. A product may be safe to eat but not necessarily nutritious; it is clear to some respondents that we need more discussion on this issue before we draw the proverbial line in the sand.

A Final Comment

It is probably true that in every survey, surprising information comes to light. This is true for the ReRefresh Foods Program Review. Many examples were given for what may be termed a “ripple effect”. Respondents told stories about the intersection of community development and food security, if you’ll pardon the jargon. In other words, stories about progress in helping people get the food they need. Stories about events that occurred because of the creation of the network of ReRefresh Foods and its member agencies. For example, the Halton Fresh Food Box Program needed warehouse space for its growing packing operations only a couple days a month; it didn’t make sense to rent warehouse space. Now the Program is co-located with ReRefresh Foods, with ample space for its conveyor belt and packing operations, and ReRefresh has a much-appreciated contribution to warehouse rent. For example, the volunteer who coordinates the outreach program at Bill Shackleton Place in Burlington became interested in food security issues and started a community garden involving 12 families living in the complex. For example, the new rector at St. Albans church in Acton wants to start a community dinner program, and has approached the hub in Acton for Our Kids Network, seeking a source for food. The

food packaging program of the Acton Hub had outgrown its school location, and recently moved to Bethel Church, which provides a group of volunteers who receive, sort and distribute the food. Not only that, but several of the volunteers have animals (chickens, pigs, horses) so they take the waste food home to feed the animals! For example, the Royal Canadian Legion bought a commercial freezer for the Salvation Army Milton food bank. Now the food bank takes weekly deliveries of bread, which it never was able to do before, and it gives the bread out on a daily basis to clients. For example, ReFresh Foods was unsuccessful in obtaining food donations from Gordon Food Service, which has its Ontario distribution centre in Milton. A year after an introductory meeting with Milton Meals-on-Wheels staff, ReFresh Foods got a call from them asking if ReFresh could pick up food two days a week at GFS! For example, one member agency operates a food bank, where some clients who are mentally ill are chronically disruptive when they come for their food. Staff felt they had no choice but to allow them to remain as clients, since they needed the food. Then the staff learned about an outreach program in their town in which volunteers deliver food received from Food for Life to each client at home. They are now transferring their disruptive clients to this outreach program, (since they are not disruptive in their home environment), thereby solving the behaviour problem without depriving their clients of food!

Appendix I

Member Agencies 2009/10

Compass Point Bible Church

Compassion Society

Bill Shackleton Place

Food for Life

Georgetown Bread Basket Food Bank

Halton Food for Thought

Hope Place Centres – Women’s Treatment Centre

Hope Place Centres – Halton Recovery House

Our Community Cares, Reach Out Centre for Kids

Our Kids Network – Acton Hub

Our Kids Network – Aldershot Hub

Partnership West

Salvation Army Milton

Appendix II: List of Persons Interviewed

Lori Brading, Georgetown Breadbasket Food Bank

Gayle Cruikshank, Halton Food for Thought

Sheila Slattery Ford, Our Kids Network , Aldershot Hub

Alison Hilborn, Our Kids Network, Acton Hub

Elena Battista, Our Kids Network

Esmeranza Peacock, Compass Point Bible Church

Tim Span, Point Compass Bible Church

Benjamin Ward, Kerr Street Ministries

Shawn Kelsey, Our Community Cares, Reach Out Centre for Kids

Paula Mazzarolo, Hope Place Centres

Adelina Augusto, Hope Place Centres

Mina Wahidi, Compassion Society of Halton

Lori Booth, Compassion Society of Halton

Paul Millar, Forestview Church Without Walls, Bill Shackleton Place

Liz Brophy, Bill Shackleton Place

Rusty Baillie, Oakville Community Foundation

Barbara Burton, United Way of Oakville

Chandra Hardeen, United Way of Oakville

Erin McAllister, United Way of Oakville

Janice Moro, Home Suite Hope

Nicole Croft, Home Suite Hope

Appendix III: Draft Food Quality Policy



FOOD FOR LIFE CANADA INC.

POLICY CATEGORY	Governance
POLICY NUMBER	8
TITLE OF POLICY	Food Quality and Safety Standards
APPROVED BY	Board
DATE OF APPROVAL	Draft
REVISION DATE	

Purpose of Policy

To reduce health and safety risks in the collection of surplus food from food suppliers and the subsequent food delivery to our member centres, agencies and outreach programs.

Policy Statement

Food for Life is committed to providing a nutritious variety of foods that meet or exceed all quality and safety standards. Food for Life and ReFresh Foods will comply with all regulatory and legislative requirements pertaining to food quality and safety. We will do routine record keeping to document compliance. We will regularly monitor compliance and provide written reports.

Policy Application

a) Regulatory Environment

Food for Life and Refresh Foods are food recovery programs and therefore are subject to all relevant municipal, provincial and federal food safety regulations. The most important of these is the “Health & Promotion Act-Food Premises” that is enforced at the municipal level by the local public health department. FFL & Refresh Foods staff liaise with the Halton Region Public Health Department on a regularly to ensure that we are in compliance with the applicable regulations.

Halton Region Public Health staff members provide additional information & guidance on food safety issues & acceptance of food donations when required. All staff members of Food for Life and Refresh foods have completed the “Food Handlers Certification Course” that is offered by the Halton Region Public. We also monitor the Canadian Food Inspection Agency food safety + allergen recalls on a daily basis. The Ontario Association of Food Banks and Food Banks Canada serve in an advisory role to FFL & Refresh Foods in regards to: food safety, food handling standards, food donation acceptance policies, food distribution etc.

b) Food Storage Requirements

FFL & ReFresh Foods use refrigerated vehicles in conjunction with a warehouse which has a walk-in cooler and walk-in freezer. Temperature integrity of refrigerated or frozen foods is ensured by pre-cooling vehicles to necessary temperature, measuring temperature of food at pick-up and daily during storage at our facility. Temperatures are recorded and donations are stored in appropriate storage area:

1. Ambient warehouse space on pallets (not floor) in a clean and organized manner
2. Walk in Cooler at 4 C or lower in a clean and organized manner
3. Walk in Freezer at -18C or lower in a clean and organized manner

c) Accepted Food

i) Food-type Categories

The following four categories assist FFL & ReFresh Foods in determining the relative risks associated with each type of food handled and provide guidance on what precautions should be taken and which foods should be accepted for donation. All potential donors are required to provide the following information:

1. Name & Address & Phone # of Donor
2. Reason for Donation
3. Best Before Date
4. Amount of product available for donation
5. Product modification details if applicable
6. Potential Safety and Quality Issues
7. Product description and size

Category 1: Non-perishable Foods

These foods are viewed as having the lowest risk. Category 1 includes non-perishable foods (items that do not require refrigeration). Examples include: pre-packaged foods, canned products and dry goods such as flour, sugar, pasta, breads and pastries (without cream or meat fillings), cereal, crackers etc.

These foods will be stored on pallets at ambient temperature in a clean and inspected warehouse facility.

Acceptance Criteria:

- I. Driver or consignee will conduct visual inspection to ensure that product is in a clean and reasonable condition. Outside packaging (boxes, cartons) may be damaged, however

donation cannot be accepted in internal packaging envelopes have been damaged or comprised.

- II. Product can be accepted beyond best date according to the following sources:
 - 1. Letter from manufacturer stating length of time product can be consumed beyond best before
 - 2. Input from Halton Region Public Health
 - 3. Information from Food Handlers Storage Guide

Category 2: Low Risk Perishable Foods

Category 2 foods include low risk perishable foods such as fruit and vegetables. These foods will be stored in a refrigerated walk in cooler at 4C or lower. Donations will be transported in a refrigerated vehicle that has been pre-cooled to 4C.

Acceptance Criteria:

- I. Driver or consignee will conduct visual inspection to ensure that produce is clean and in reasonable condition. Produce cannot be infected with moulds, be in a state of significant deterioration or spoilage (contain browning, large areas of bruising) or be infected with insects (fruit flies). No leaking boxes or packages can be accepted.
- II. Outside packaging (boxes, cartoons) may be damaged, however donation cannot be accepted if internal packaging envelopes have been damaged or comprised. (packaged salads, packaged cut vegetables etc).
- III. Product can be accepted beyond best date according to the following sources:
 - 1. **Letter from manufacturer stating length of time product can be consumed beyond best before**
 - 2. **Input from Halton Public Health Department*(see asterisk explanation below)**
 - 3. **Information from Food Handlers Storage Guide**

Category 3: Potentially Hazardous Foods

Category 3 includes potentially hazardous foods such as: dairy & dairy products, egg and egg products, meats, poultry, seafood, all frozen foods, butter etc. (Basically any product requiring refrigeration or freezing). It is critical that potentially hazardous foods are kept at a temperature of 4°C (40°F) or less, or -18C or less for frozen foods. Donations will be transported in a refrigerated vehicle that has been pre-cooled to appropriate temperature and proper thermometers will be used to check the temperature of potentially hazardous food when it is received and during storage at FFL & ReFresh Foods storage facility. These foods will be stored in either a walk in cooler at 4C or lower or walk-in freezer at -18C.

Acceptance Criteria:

- I. Driver or consignee will conduct visual inspection to ensure that product is clean and in reasonable condition. Outside packaging (boxes, cartoons) may be damaged, however donation cannot be accepted if internal packaging envelopes have been damaged or comprised.
- II. Driver will measure temperature of food at time of pick-up. Food must be at 4C for refrigerated foods and -18C for frozen foods. If not, donation will not be accepted. (ensures temperature integrity of donation).
- III. Foods must be in their original unopened containers. However frozen pizzas, prepared meals can be accepted without outer packaging. (e.g. frozen reclamation)

Category 3 products are not accepted beyond their best before date.

Category 4: High Risk Foods

This category includes prepared meals from restaurants, catering companies & Community & Corporate events (e.g MS Rona Bike Tour, Mercedes Benz Run, Terry Fox Run), and any other source. This category present special challenges as several food categories may available during 1 donation event. (e.g. fruit, bread and sausage). Also prepared foods at restaurants and catering events need to be kept at the appropriate “hot” temperature during serving times and then brought down to 4C for donation purposes.

* The legislation regarding best before dates is under the Food and Drugs Act B.01.007. The Food and Drug Regulations (FDR) currently require that, with certain exceptions, prepackaged foods with a durable life of 90 days or less be labeled with either a best before date and instructions for proper storage, or a packaged on date and durable life information. Foods with a shelf life of longer than 90 days do not require best before dates.

However, the durable life date (best before date) is not a date after which the product is considered to be unsafe or inedible, nor is it a guarantee of freshness or quality. That is because the durable life date marking system (which each manufacturer determines for themselves) is based upon freshness, rather than safety. There is no restriction on the selling date and it is not illegal to sell a product after the best before date. The best before date serves only as a reference point for consumers who have the option of not purchasing the product should they encounter a date which has passed. The product may still be consumed beyond that date providing it is in an acceptable condition.

Although there is no requirement to label products with a durable life of more than 90 days with a best before date, some companies may opt to use a production date but there is no format required by regulation.

September 2010 - Draft

Appendix IV: Results from January 2010 Member Agency Satisfaction Survey

ReFresh Foods Member Satisfaction Survey 2009/10

Agency: 14 surveys returned Contact:12 members

Refresh Foods wants to know how we are doing. Please fill out the survey and email back to Marcus Logan (marcus@refreshfoods.ca)

1. Member satisfaction:

ReFresh Foods is interested in how we are performing to your expectations. Please answer the following questions based on your experience participating in the Refresh Foods initiative since January 2009.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The quality of food is generally satisfactory.	13/14			1/14	
The quantity of food is generally satisfactory.	13/14			1/14	
The frequency and reliability of deliveries is generally satisfactory.	14/14				
ReFresh Foods has met its obligations according to the agreement.	13/14			1/14	

	Yes	No	Comments
Are the proportions of the various food types which you receive satisfactory?	14/14		
If not, why not?			

2. Client satisfaction:

ReFresh Foods is interested in how we are performing to your client's expectations. Please answer the following questions based on your experience participating in the Refresh Foods initiative since January 2009.

	Yes	No	Comments
Has your agency been able to give more food to your clients because of ReFresh Foods?	14/14		
Are your clients receiving more fresh and/or frozen food because of ReFresh Foods?	12/14	2/14	-do not order frozen items as they are usually past date
Have any of your clients reported a food borne illness from food given by ReFresh Foods?		14/14	

3. Advisory Council:

Please provide information on the ReFresh Foods Advisory Council.

	Yes	No	Comments
Have you attended ReFresh Foods Advisory Council meetings?	14/14		
Are the Advisory Council meetings useful to your agency?	14/14		
Have you had adequate opportunity to comment on budgets, fees, policies?	13/14	1/14	
What opportunities do you see for improving the donation and distribution of food in Halton	- hoping that as the economy turns around more donors will give fresh produce to lessen hunger in Halton.		
Who else at your agency contributed to the answers on this survey?			

4. Additional Comments: please provide us with your comments about the initiative.

Section 1:

Section 2. we have not taken any fresh produce because of other suppliers.

Section 3: need more non-outdated items

Section 4: Wonderful initiative keep up the good work

Appendix V: Summary of ReFresh Operational Performance in 2009/10

a) Total pounds of food obtained, by food type

Food Donations by Category for Q1, Q2 & Q3

<u>Food Category</u>	<u>Total Weight in lbs</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
Produce	98,627.06	100+ (75,000 lbs)
Meat	15,495.20	62 (25,000 lbs)
Frozen/Cold	39,205.41	52.2 (75,000 lbs)
Dairy	6236.8	62.3 (10,000 lbs)
Dry (non-perishables)	156,469.96	89.4 (175,000 lbs)
Beverages	67,089.1	100+ (20,000 lbs)
NF(non food items)	9,293.2	93 (10,000 lbs)
Bread	561.55	Na
Grand Total	392,978.28	99.3% (395,000 lbs)

Note: food totals from Oct 1st 2009 to June 30-2010

Food Donations by Donor Type for Q1, Q2 & Q3

<u>Donor</u>	<u>Weight in lbs</u>
Prospect List – Halton Companies	217,770.4
OAFB + NFSS*	119,052.52 lbs
Other Agencies	56,155.55

*Ontario Association of Food Banks and National Food Sharing Systems (Food Banks Canada)

Food Donations by Category from Oct 1st 2009-Aug 6th - 2010

<u>Food Category</u>	<u>Total Weight in lbs</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
Produce	113,409.86	100+ (75,000 lbs)
Meat	15,474.2	62 (25,000 lbs)
Frozen/Cold	43,237.41	57.6 (75,000 lbs)
Dairy	8097.00	80.9 (10,000 lbs)
Dry (non-perishables)	159,040.96	90.8 (175,000 lbs)
Beverages	69,001.00	100 + (20,000 lbs)
NF(non food items)	10,661.20	100+ (10,000 lbs)
Sodexo Lunch Program	4,850	Na
Bread	561.55	Na
Grand Total	424,354.18	100% + (395,000 lbs)

Note: food totals from Oct 1st 2009 to Aug 6th-2010

b) Total pounds delivered to each member agency for Q3 2009/10:

Food for Life	71,543
Compassion Society	56,298
Kerr St Ministries	27,488.
Food for Thought	24,774
Compass Point Bible Church	14,622
Salvation Army Millton	10,431
Hope Place Centres	10,007
Bill Shackelton Place	9,819
Our Community Cares	8,893
Our Kids Network, Acton	8,098
Georgetown Bread Basket	7,612
Our Kids Network, Aldershot	7115
Home Suite Hope	1,360
Partnership West	771
Outside Region (Feed the Children, Good Shepherd, Mississauga Food Bank, Second Harvest)	85,159
Inventory	15,000
Total Q3 2009/10	358,989

c) Operational cost per pound delivered, 2009/10 vs. 2008/09

2009/10 Q3 cost per pound \$ 0.37 per pound vs year end 2008/09 \$0.64 per pound

d) Sources of food

Al Ferri & Sons
Agram Meats
Allison Farm Market
Canadian Open Golf
Tournament
Chudleigh's
Canadian Tire Distribution
Center
Cheese of Canada
Christies (Kraft)
Circus Chocolates
English Bay Batter
Gay Lea Foods
GreenField Organic Farms
Homestead Foods
Ippolito Fruit & Produce
Innovative Health Sciences
Kraft-Oakville

Mercedes Benz Event
Oak Run Bakery
Ready Bake Foods/Weston
Bakeries
Roseland Produce
Reckitt Benkiser
R.S.S.B
Reunion Island Coffee
Sobeys Distribution Center
Sun Rich Fruits
Voortmans Cookies
4 Star Dairy
Sysco
Millards Refrigeration
Fiesta Foods
Gordon Food Service
Sodexo

e) Cost of operations

08/09- actual \$150,582
09/10 – projected \$ 192,029

Appendix VI: 2009/10 RFF Fee Schedule from Member Agency Contract

Fee Schedule for the 12 Months Ending September 30, 2010

The fees payable are based upon the total weight of food delivered to the member agency by RF in the 12 month period ending September 30, 2009. * Fees are shared operating costs.

Up to 2,500 pounds: \$500.00
2,501 to 5,000 pounds: \$950.00
5,001 to 10,000 pounds: \$1,900.00
10,001 to 15,000 pounds: \$2,850.00
15,001 to 20,000 pounds: \$3,800.00