Building a Values-Based Food Distribution System:

Challenges and Opportunities for Small Producers in Boulder County, Colorado

by

Hannah Leto

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science in Sustainable Food Systems

Executive Director, Swette Center for Sustainable Food Systems:

Kathleen Merrigan

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2025

Abstract

Boulder County, Colorado, has emerged as a progressive leader in local agricultural infrastructure. Through initiatives like Restore Colorado and OSCAR (Office of Sustainability, Climate Action & Resilience), the county is developing strategies to preserve agricultural land, promote sustainable land management, and improve equitable access to fresh food (Boulder County Office of Sustainability, Climate Action, and Resilience, n.d.). These programs support key food system sustainability goals, including food and nutrition security, cultural and economic diversity, environmental health, and climate resilience (UN, 2015). The county's investment in regenerative agriculture (particularly on public land) reflects a long-term commitment to ecological and community well-being.

Boulder County has a strong base of small-scale producers contributing to the local food economy, which makes it a compelling case study for sustainable food distribution models. With 826 farms reported in the 2022 Census of Agriculture, it has also cultivated meaningful connections between producers and households, institutions, and restaurants through initiatives such as the Boulder County Farmers Market (BCFM) (USDA, 202; Boulder County Farmers Markets, n.d.). Founded in 1987, the market stands out for its strict "growers-only" policy, requiring vendors to sell only what they produce themselves—preserving authenticity and strengthening trust between farmers and customers (Worrell, 2021). Operating two days a week—Saturdays from April to November and Wednesday evenings from May to October—it draws thousands of visitors at peak season and serves as both a community gathering place and a major sales outlet for local producers (Worrel, 2021; Project for Public Spaces, n.d.). Market leadership emphasizes that the farmers themselves provide a vital link between the community and the land, allowing residents to engage with the agricultural cycles that sustain them (McCracken, 2022).

Using a combination of qualitative research methods, including semi-structured interviews with local farmers and chefs and comparative analysis of global models, thisstudy identifies key opportunities and challenges facing small-scale producers in regional food distribution. Five primary distribution channels were identified as the most relevant to small producers: Direct-to-Consumer (DTC), Retail, Institutional,

Wholesale, and Alternative markets. Each channel presents advantages and tradeoffs in terms of infrastructure, profitability, and alignment with sustainability values.

While Boulder County already provides strong policy and community support, producers continue to face systemic barriers, including limited access to cold storage, inefficient delivery systems, and inconsistent market coordination. The report concludes that small-scale farmers can reduce economic risk and enhance resilience by combining multiple distribution channels. Recommendations include expanded food hub infrastructure, increased support for beginning farmers with business development tools, and incentivizing consumer procurement of local foods. These strategies can help Boulder County continue to develop and strengthen values-driven, regionally adapted food system, while also serving as a model for other jurisdictions that may not yet be as focused on sustainable agriculture, offering valuable insights for communities seeking to enhance their own food systems."

Dedication

To the farmers, chefs, and food system advocates who dedicate their lives to nourishing communities and protecting the land, your resilience, creativity, and commitment inspire this work.

And to my family, thank you for grounding me and always encouraging me to move forward.

Acknowledgments

This research would not have been possible without the generosity and insight of the local producers, chefs, aggregators, and food system stakeholders in Boulder County who shared their time, stories, and expertise with me. Your work is at the heart of this paper.

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my graduate committee for their thoughtful guidance and support throughout this process. Special thanks to Joe Dobrow for your mentorship and encouragement.

I also want to thank the team at Slow Food Denver for your partnership and dedication to building a better food system. Your work continues to shape and inspire mine.

Table of Contents

Glossary

Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) – A model where consumers purchase a subscription or "share" from a local farm and receive regular distributions of seasonal produce and other farm products (Woods, Ernst, & Tropp, 2017).

Direct-to-Consumer (DTC) Sales – A sales model in which producers sell directly to consumers through farmers' markets, roadside stands, CSAs, or online platforms, bypassing intermediaries (LeRoux et al., 2014).

Farm-Related Income – Revenue earned by farms from non-crop/livestock sources, such as agritourism, custom services, or on-farm product processing (U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2020).

Food Hub – An organization or business that actively manages the aggregation, storage, processing, distribution, and marketing of locally or regionally produced food products (Boulder County Farmers Markets, n.d.; Shariatmadary et al., 2023).

Market Value of Products Sold – The total income generated from the sale of crops, livestock, and other farm products before subtracting expenses (USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2020).

Net Cash Farm Income – The profit remaining after a farm deducts production expenses from total income, including sales and government payments (USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2020).

Per Farm Average – The average value of a financial or production metric (e.g., income, expenses) calculated across all farms in a given region (USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2020).

SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) – A federal program that provides food-purchasing assistance to low-income individuals; some local food markets and hubs accept SNAP benefits (USDA, 2012).

Sustainable Agriculture – Farming that meets current food needs without compromising future generations, balancing environmental health, economic profitability, and social equity (Liz Carlisle et al., 2019; Wezel et al., 2020).

Value Chain Coordination – The strategic collaboration between producers, processors, distributors, and retailers to create more efficient, transparent, and equitable local food systems (Diehl, 2020; Bielaczyc et al., 2023).

WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) – A federal nutrition program supporting low-income pregnant and postpartum individuals and young children; some local farms and food hubs offer WIC-compatible produce programs (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2010).

Introduction & Background

As global supply chains grow increasingly vulnerable to economic, political, and environmental disruptions, communities across the United States are reevaluating how food is produced, distributed, and consumed. In recent years, interest in local food systems, which are defined by regional production, shorter supply chains, and closer relationships between producers and consumers, has gained momentum as a response to these threats. While the concept of “local” varies by region, The 2008 U.S. Farm Bill defines local food as that marketed within 400 miles of its origin or within the state where it was produced (National Agriculture Library, n.d.). The 2011 Food Safety Modernization Act uses a slightly smaller area of proximity when it refers to producers that are located 275 miles or less from their customers, or within the same state (National Agriculture Library, n.d.).

Local food systems offer a range of ecological and social benefits: reducing transportation-related emissions, preserving farmland, boosting local economies, and providing consumers with fresher, more nutritious food. These systems also help reestablish trust and transparency in food sourcing, giving consumers a better understanding of where their food comes from and how it is produced. They also offer

economic advantages for producers, including higher prices for goods, more reliable market relationships, and increased social recognition within their communities (Enthoven, 2021).

Boulder County, Colorado, has long been a leader in food sustainability, rooted in a strong commitment to environmental stewardship and a politically engaged population. The county's history with natural foods dates back over a century, with institutions like the Colorado Sanitarium pioneering plant-based diets and health-conscious food products. This historical foundation, coupled with the growth of health food stores and local markets, has positioned Boulder County as a hub for sustainable food practices and a model for other communities seeking to prioritize healthy, environmentally friendly food systems (Lehndorff, 2024).

However, Boulder County's agricultural sector has faced significant challenges in recent years. Between 2017 and 2022, the county saw an 18% decrease in the number of farms, from 1,012 to 826, and a 31% decline in total farmland, from 107,043 acres to 74,242 acres (USDA, 2017; USDA, 2022). The average farm size also shrank by 15%, from 106 acres to 90 acres, indicating a shift toward smaller-scale operations (USDA, 2017; USDA, 2022). Despite a 139% increase in farm-related income, from $11,376 per farm in 2017 to $26,908 per farm in 2022, overall financial sustainability remains fragile(USDA, 2017; USDA, 2022). While total production expenses reached $35.7 million in 2022, the county's aggregate net cash farm income was negative, with a loss of $2.89 million, highlighting the ongoing economic instability that small farms face (USDA, 2022). These figures underscore the financial challenges that Boulder County's agricultural sector continues to struggle with, even as income per farm rises.

A central player in the county's food systems work is the Office of Sustainability, Climate Action, and Resilience (OSCAR), which leads numerous initiatives in partnership with local and national organizations. One of its flagship programs, Restore Colorado, operates in collaboration with nonprofit organizations Zero Foodprint, Mad Agriculture, as well as the USDA. The program raised over $300,000 during its two-year pilot through small surcharges at over 40 participating restaurants and food businesses (Boulder County Office of Sustainability, Climate Action, and Resilience, n.d.). These funds were redistributed to 12 Colorado farms and ranches to support regenerative practices such as compost application, cover cropping, windbreak planting, and rotational grazing (Boulder County Office of

Sustainability, Climate Action, and Resilience. (n.d.). After its successful pilot phase and endorsement from the Governor, Restore Colorado signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Colorado Department of Agriculture to expand the program statewide. It now operates as a public–private funding model for climate-smart agriculture, where food businesses contribute via micro-fees and farmers apply for grants to fund sustainable land management (Boulder County Office of Sustainability, Climate Action, and Resilience. (n.d.).

Boulder County has also demonstrated leadership in incentivizing organic agriculture. The county offers a 50% rent discount for the first three years and covers 50% of certification costs for producers leasing public land who commit to transitioning to organic production (Boulder County Office of Sustainability, Climate Action, and Resilience, n.d.). This policy not only promotes environmental stewardship but also helps reduce financial barriers for emerging or transitioning farmers.

Another critical piece of Boulder County's food infrastructure is the BCFM Food Hub, which operates year-round to connect producers and consumers through weekly online ordering and curbside pickup (Boulder County Farmers Markets. (n.d.)). The Hub serves Boulder, Longmont, and Lafayette and plays a vital role in supporting small-to-mid-sized farms. Beyond its commercial function, it actively supports food access initiatives by accepting Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits, offering Women Infants and Children (WIC) delivery programs, and partnering with local organizations to improve nutrition for low-income families (Boulder County Farmers Markets, n.d.). The Food Hub also aims to reduce food waste, provide aggregation and distribution services, and increase transparency and traceability—cornerstones of a resilient local food system (Boulder County Farmers Markets, n.d.).

Despite this strong foundation and widespread interest in sustainable food systems, Boulder County still faces persistent challenges. According to Census Reporter (ACS, 2023), the City of Boulder has a population of approximately 105,893 and a relatively high per capita income of $54,998 (S. Census Bureau, 2018). However, the poverty rate in Boulder is 22.3%, nearly double the metro average of 11.4% and more than double the statewide rate of 9.3% (S. Census Bureau, 2018). The median household income, at $75,923, is also less than that of both the Denver metro area and the state overall (S. Census

Bureau, 2018). These statistics underscore the importance of building a food system that prioritizes equity and accessibility alongside sustainability.

Further complicating matters is the nature of Boulder's housing market and workforce related to the student population of the University of Colorado Boulder. The city is densely populated, highly educated, and youthful, with a relatively high degree of population turnover (S. Census Bureau, 2018). These characteristics can make it difficult to establish long-term relationships between producers and consumers, which are often central to the success of local food systems.

A key structural challenge lies in the logistics of fresh food distribution. While interest in "eating local" is widespread, the ability of small and mid-sized farms to meet the scale, timing, and consistency demanded by institutional buyers is limited (Boulder County Farmers Markets, n.d.). Restaurants that are committed to sourcing locally face difficulties in supply, coordination with farmers, and insufficient product volume to justify the higher cost (Boulder County Office of Sustainability, Climate Action, and Resilience, n.d.). These inefficiencies often result in food waste, missed market opportunities, and financial strain on producers—despite the mutual interest in collaboration between chefs, farmers, and consumers.

These challenges are not unique to Boulder. A national study of local food systems found that the promise of these networks hinges on the development of distribution infrastructure that can efficiently move fresh food from farm to consumer (Lynch et al., 2018). This includes not only physical infrastructure—such as aggregation hubs, storage, and transportation—but also digital platforms, policy support, and cooperative networks that make coordination more seamless (Lynch et al., 2018). Across the U.S., and in Boulder County, these systems are often underdeveloped or underutilized, leaving even the most enthusiastic stakeholders burdened by the logistical limitations they aim to overcome.

Methodology

This research employed a qualitative research design to evaluate sustainable distribution models for small producers within the context of the urban food system in Boulder County, Colorado. Data was

collected through semi-structured interviews with local Boulder County farmers, chefs, and food system stakeholders. The interview question guide focused on farm characteristics, current distribution practices, perceived barriers and opportunities, and visions for a more efficient and equitable local food system. Participants were selected with the assistance of Slow Food Denver. The goal was to capture diverse perspectives based on farm size, product type, distribution channels, and market engagement.

All interviews were conducted remotely via Zoom or phone and were recorded and transcribed for analysis. This paper reports on findings specific to Boulder County and forms part of a broader effort to inform strategy development for sustainable food distribution in Colorado.

This study design was reviewed and deemed exempt by the Arizona State University Institutional Review Board (IRB), pursuant to Federal Regulations[45 CFR 46.102(e)] tests, surveys, or observation (low risk), on 7/22/2025. The IRB study number for this project is 0002257.

Research Design

Given the complexity and context-specific nature of food distribution, a qualitative approach was selected to capture the depth and nuance of stakeholder experiences.

Four individuals participated in the interviews; three interviewees are farmers, and one interviewee is a chef. Interviewees were recruited with the help of Slow Food Denver Executive Director, Lilly Steirer. The interview questions were open-ended; the complete list of questions can be found in Appendix A. The research was structured to gather personalized, descriptive data that could inform strategy development. Through the semi-structured interviews, the study sought to uncover patterns, challenges, and opportunities across the identified distribution channels. The interdisciplinary nature of food systems research allows this paper to explore the social, economic, and environmental dimensions of local food distribution.

The study also explored peer-reviewed articles for a more in-depth understanding of distribution models in other regions with strong local agricultural systems. Through the literature review, common themes and best practices emerged to reflect the recommendations presented at the end of the paper.

Study Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of this study. First, the research relied on a small sample size of participants, which limits the generalizability of the results within and beyond Boulder County. The qualitative design generated in-depth insights but does not allow for statistical analysis or broad population-level conclusions. Second, participation was limited to those who were available and willing to be interviewed, which may have introduced self-selection bias. While effort was made to include a diverse range of stakeholders, not all sectors of the local food system are equally represented.

The rapidly changing national political climate adds volatility to this research, as shifting policies may impact food systems. Additionally, the study's timing limits its ability to capture evolving market dynamics or long-term trends, suggesting the need for future research to track these changes over time. Despite these limitations, the study offers valuable perspectives that can inform future research, policy development, and practical improvements in local food distribution.

One potential next step for this research is to conduct a focus group with producers and institutional buyers to further validate themes and collaboratively design improved distribution strategies.

Comparative Analysis of Distribution Channels

The analysis of small-scale distribution systems identified five primary channels through which producers bring food to market: direct-to-consumer (DTC), retail, institutional, wholesale, and alternative markets.

Each channel was assessed for its viability, scalability, and alignment with sustainable food system values.

Direct-to-Consumer (DTC)

Farmers Markets

Farmers markets are a cornerstone of local food distribution, offering small-scale producers direct access to consumers in ways that are both economically viable and socially enriching. These markets are more than just sales venues—they are dynamic community spaces where farmers build relationships, gain visibility, and establish trust with their customers. Selling at farmers markets provides producers with a high sense of recognition socially, as they are often viewed as stewards of the land and valued contributors to local health and resilience (Enthoven, 2021). For consumers, these markets are places to align purchasing decisions with personal values—supporting small farms, reducing environmental impact, and investing in regional economies (Enthoven, 2021).

Economically, farmers markets provide critical stability for small and mid-sized farms. Farmers market vendors may receive higher profit margins at farmers markets compared to other marketing channels, and selling food locally through direct-to-consumer marketing channels, which include farmers markets, is associated with higher rates of business survival (Witzling, 2025). Farmers markets serve as one of the few low-barrier entry points for new and beginning farmers, enabling them to launch small operations, test products, and develop a customer base without the need for significant upfront investment (Farmers Coalition, 2022). In 2017, of the $2.9 billion in direct-to-consumer sales nationwide, farmers markets accounted for $5.1 million (USDA, 2017).

This dual role of supporting the economic viability of small farms while strengthening community ties, positions farmers markets as an essential component of a local food system.

Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)

Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) programs have been part of the U.S. local food movement since the early 1980s, with two of the first programs founded in New Hampshire and Massachusetts—both of which remain active today (Wolnik, 2019). In Colorado, one of the oldest examples is Monroe Organic Farms, located in Weld County just northeast of Boulder County, which has been operating a CSA since the early 1990s (Boulder County Farmers Market, 2024). CSA programs represent a key direct-to-consumer distribution model that offers economic security, social engagement, and alignment with agroecological values (Wezel, 2020). In a CSA, farmers and consumers (members) form long-term partnerships in which upfront payments help cover production costs, ensuring that both the risks and rewards of the harvest are shared (Egli, 2023). CSA aims to create an alternative distribution system that is independent of the conventional market, provides access to healthy food, and fosters direct connections between consumers and farmers (Samoggia et al., 2019). These programs promote fairness, reciprocity, and place-based transparency between growers and consumers (Wezel, 2020).

Socially, CSAs help cultivate lasting relationships between farmers and community members through clear communication, reliable delivery, and consumer education about seasonality and crop variability (Woods, 2017). Some farms rely on core groups of volunteer members to assist with operational tasks such as food distribution, marketing, and budgeting, while others invite members to help with activities like weeding or harvesting during the season. Community development is further strengthened through farm events, tours, potlucks, newsletters, and educational programs (Samoggia, 2019). The CSA model also enables farmers to build a recognizable brand within their communities, enhancing visibility and social recognition (Woods, 2017).

Economically, CSAs offer a stable and often scalable income stream by eliminating the multiple intermediary steps common in conventional supply chains. This allows farmers to retain a greater share of the value and set prices they deem fair for their labor and production costs (Samoggia et al., 2019). In a comparative study conducted in the peri-urban region of Beijing, China, conventional, organic, and CSA farms were surveyed using a questionnaire, and CSA operations were found to have the highest gross

income, averaging $40,740 USD per hectare (approximately $16,500 USD per acre) (Zhen et al., 2020). According to the 2017 *Census of Agriculture*, of the $2.9 billion in direct-to-consumer sales nationwide, community supported agriculture accounted for $2.3 million (USDA, 2017). Together, these social, economic, and ecological benefits position CSAs as a resilient and values-driven distribution model that can strengthen local food systems while providing farmers with stable markets and communities with direct access to fresh, sustainably grown food.

Online Sales & Home Delivery

Farmers in Boulder County, with its proximity to Denver, are strategically positioned to expand their direct-to-consumer (DTC) sales by moving online. Given the county's location on the urban fringe, farms can tap into the larger urban market, where consumer demand for local and sustainably produced food is growing. Farmers have increased their use of online sales and marketing since March of 2020, reflecting a broader trend in the DTC space. Online platforms like Barn2Door provide farmers with the ability to "sell what they grow, how they want," offering flexibility through CSA shares, custom produce boxes, and other options (Barn2Door, n.d.). Many of Boulder County's consumers are younger, more educated, and have higher local food expenditure levels, making this demographic well-positioned to engage with online DTC sales (O'Hara, 2020). Transitioning online also allows Boulder County farmers to expand their customer base beyond local markets and capitalize on the growing consumer interest in direct access to fresh food.

However, not all farms or farmers are suited for online sales. Currently, white, female, and younger farmers, as well as farms with higher gross farm incomes or those not growing vegetables, are more likely to use online sales (O'Hara, 2020). The transition presents challenges related to scalability, logistics, and digital literacy. Farmers will need to invest in technology, manage delivery logistics, and adapt to the demands of online platforms to fully leverage these sales models. For some, these barriers may limit the potential of online sales, particularly for those with limited infrastructure or resources. While online sales can open up new markets, it may not be the right fit for all, especially farmers with limited access to technology or those whose operations don't align with the demands of online platforms.

These platforms are particularly beneficial for new farmers who may lack established retail relationships. Many CSA operators have adapted to modern market demands through web-based sales, for increased organization and efficiency (Woods, 2017). Successful online sales operations require tech-savviness, digital marketing skills, and the ability to manage logistics such as packaging, cold storage, and delivery. Without shared infrastructure, online DTC channels can become inefficient and environmentally costly, particularly due to high per-unit delivery emissions (Van Touch, 2024). While online platforms offer valuable tools for expanding market access and enhancing farm resilience, they are most effective when supported by broader investments in infrastructure, cooperative networks, and digital training. For new farmers, these platforms should be considered as part of a diversified distribution strategy.

On-Farm Sales

Farm stands and U-pick operations are especially appealing distribution channels for small-scale or beginning farmers. These models are among the least risky marketing options, with relatively low start-up and maintenance costs compared to wholesale or restaurant sales (LeRoux et al., 2014). By selling directly from the farm, producers reduce transportation expenses, avoid intermediaries, and retain flexibility over pricing and inventory. These hyperlocal systems also foster strong customer relationships grounded in transparency and place-based trust. Beyond providing a point of sale, they offer an experiential element—inviting consumers to engage with the land, learn about seasonal crops, and build lasting loyalty. While their reach is often limited to local customers and seasonal windows, they serve as vital entry points for farmers looking to build community ties and gain market experience with minimal barriers.

Retail

Grocery Shops & Co-ops

Grocery stores can offer small-scale farmers a more scalable sales channel than direct-to-consumer models. These partnerships allow farms to diversify income streams and reach a larger customer base,

including those who may not shop at farmers markets or subscribe to CSAs (Wezel, 2020). Retail buyers—particularly at independently owned stores—are often open to sourcing from local producers, especially those using organic or sustainable practices (Enthoven, 2021). However, these relationships come with challenges. Retailers have little tolerance for complexity, so food supplied to them usually has to be very consistent in terms of size, appearance, and quality—standards that can be difficult for small farms to meet. Farmers must also meet strict food safety standards, maintain consistent volume, and invest in compliant packaging, which can require significant investment and coordination (Gaitán-Cremaschi, 2019). Moreover, producers may receive a smaller share of revenue when selling through grocery stores due to the involvement of multiple intermediaries in the supply chain (Wezel, 2020). While the exposure and volume potential may be greater, the economic return per unit sold is often lower compared to direct channels.

In Boulder County, the shift to retail has been tempered by the closure of some smaller independent retailers who might have been eager to partner with local growers (Wood, 2021). Despite this, there remains a strong local interest in sourcing food from small-scale farms. Co-ops like Waves of Grain and Boulder Cooperative Food offer promising alternatives. Waves of Grain, a farmer-owned co-op based in Boulder, connects consumers directly with local farmers, aggregating products and offering them through farmers' markets, online sales, and farm stands.

Similarly, Boulder Cooperative Food offers a model for small-scale farmers to provide affordable, bulk food to local consumers. Members place orders for bulk food directly from suppliers, which helps keep costs low and ensures that profits remain within the community (Boulder Cooperative Food, n.d.). Like Waves of Grain, Boulder Cooperative Food does not have a brick-and-mortar location and is managed by a small staff, which can lead to challenges when staffing shortages occur. Despite these potential limitations, these co-ops support small producers by offering more equitable relationships and better margins than typical grocery retailers, making them a valuable outlet in Boulder County’s food system.

Importantly, co-ops like Waves of Grain and Boulder Cooperative Food contribute to the broader community by returning more revenue to the local economy compared to national chains, supporting job

creation and economic vitality (U.S. Department of Agriculture, n.d.). USDA support for co-ops, including cooperative development education, technical assistance, and financial programs, helps strengthen these enterprises and build resilient local food systems (U.S. Department of Agriculture, n.d.). Despite their benefits, the absence of widespread co-ops in Boulder County highlights a gap in the market, suggesting that further co-op models could offer greater opportunities for small-scale producers in the region.

Restaurants

Restaurants, particularly those emphasizing seasonal, farm-to-table menus, are ideal partners for small-scale farmers. Farm-to-table-minded chefs tend to value freshness, flavor, and transparency, all of which are qualities that small producers often excel at providing. Farm-to-table models generally involve direct sourcing from farms to kitchens, bypassing traditional wholesale and retail channels (Holt, 2024). This approach allows chefs to build supply networks that support unique, seasonal menus and provide farmers with steady, like-minded buyers. However, sourcing for restaurants requires flexibility and clear communication, as volume needs often shift weekly. Fragmented regional sourcing can increase costs for both parties, making collaboration and shared logistics essential to sustaining this distribution model (Holt, 2024).

Organizations like Slow Food USA emphasize the importance of these partnerships through programs like the Snail of Approval, which recognizes restaurants that uphold values of good, clean, and fair food by sourcing locally and supporting sustainable producers (Slow Food USA, n.d.). This kind of public recognition helps elevate restaurants that invest in chef–farmer relationships, providing visibility for both parties and reinforcing the importance of transparency and traceability in the food system (Slow Food USA, n.d.).

Building strong chef–farmer relationships is central to the farm-to-table movement: chefs rely on trust and direct coordination with growers to adapt menus as seasonality and availability change—a dynamic that strengthens local food systems and supports farming resilience.

Institutional

Schools

Institutional buyers like K–12 schools and universities represent a high-volume market with major potential for small-scale farmers. These institutions can provide consistent and sizeable sales opportunities, particularly for producers facing the unpredictability of direct-to-consumer channels. Schools often aim to integrate local and nutritious foods into meals, aligning with values around community health and educational enrichment—for example, by supporting nutrition education or farm-based learning activities. Farmers who successfully sell to schools can earn steadier revenue and reach students regularly, without the need for individual consumer outreach (National Farm to School Network, 2016).

However, institutional procurement comes with barriers. Additionally, most schools do not operate during the summer, leading to inconsistent cash flow for farmers working with them. Contracts often involve rigid procurement standards, strict food safety requirements, reliable (and sometimes restrictive) delivery schedules, and consistent volume expectations. Without support, small farms struggle to meet these demands. Regulatory systems are designed around large-scale industrial producers, which places disproportionate burdens on small farms (USDA, 2020). While many school food service directors express interest in sourcing locally, actual integration remains limited (USDA, 2020). According to the 2023 Farm to School Census, School Food Authorities (SFAs) reported that staffing, cost, and local food availability were significant barriers to conducting farm-to-school activities. SFAs further noted that additional funding, particularly funding targeted for farm-to-school initiatives, along with technical assistance in finding and procuring local foods, would be the most helpful strategies for encouraging greater participation in farm-to-school programs (Machata,2023).

To improve access, programs like the USDA's Patrick Leahy Farm to School Grant Program offer funding, training, and technical support to help small producers successfully partner with schools (USDA, n.d.-a). Similarly, Local Food Purchasing Incentives (LFPIs) implemented in many states provide schools with

extra funds to buy locally, allowing them to pay competitive rates that support small producers more effectively (National Farm to School Network, n.d.-a).

Research also shows that farm-to-school models yield strong local economic benefits. Case studies have found that for every $100 spent on farm-to-school purchases, approximately $82 stays in the regional economy—more than with many other local food sales channels—and generates ripple effects in related sectors (National Farm to School Network, n.d.-b). Nationally, 74% of school food authorities now participate in some form of local food purchasing, representing $1.8 billion in school-based local food sales across the country (USDA, n.d.-a).

Other Institutions (Hospitals, Correctional Facilities, Corporate Cafeterias)

Beyond schools, institutions such as hospitals, correctional facilities, and corporate cafeterias also represent promising, high-volume markets for small-scale farms. Hospitals and universities serve thousands of meals daily, and corporate campuses often operate in-house cafeterias or host CSA pickups and farmers markets—creating opportunities for sustained local purchasing (ChangeLab Solutions, 2021; Washington State Department of Agriculture, n.d.).

These institutions face many of the same challenges outlined above, including complex procurement systems, shifting demand, food safety compliance, and systemic preference for centralized distributors (Washington State Department of Agriculture, n.d.). Without logistical support or policy incentives, small producers often struggle to access these markets (USDA, 2012).

Initiatives like the Community Alliance with Family Farmers' (CAFF) Farm to Cafeteria program are working to reduce these barriers. CAFF provides technical assistance to small- and mid-size producers, helping them navigate institutional procurement and increase their presence in settings such as hospitals and university dining halls (CAFF, n.d.). The organization has highlighted success stories where local food purchasing was integrated into institutional wellness and sustainability initiatives (CAFF, n.d.; ChangeLab Solutions, 2021).

Correctional facilities have also participated in regional Farm to Institution programs. For example, the New England Governors' Association partnered with USDA Rural Development to increase sourcing from local producers for institutions such as prisons and hospitals (USDA, 2012). While momentum is growing, further progress will require aggregators, cooperative distribution infrastructure, and targeted public policies that help level the playing field for small-scale producers.

Wholesale

Foodhubs

Food hubs act as intermediaries between small farms and larger markets by aggregating, storing, processing, and distributing local food products while preserving traceability and supporting ecological practices (USDA, 2012). These hubs enable small producers to scale their reach without assuming the full burden of marketing and logistics. In doing so, they allow producers to increase their bargaining power by working collectively rather than independently (Bielaczyc et al., 2023). According to the USDA's local food system initiatives, nearly 90% of food hubs source primarily from small- and mid-sized farms, and over 80% report that they help ensure fair pricing and increase market access for those farms (Bielaczyc et al., 2023).

The 2017 National Food Hub Survey identified at least 400 food hubs across the U.S. However, the 2021 survey faced challenges due to an outdated list, invalid emails, and closures related to high staff turnover and the COVID-19 pandemic. Ultimately, only 107 food hubs were surveyed in 2021 (Bielaczyc, 2023). The possibility that there are now fewer food hubs than in 2017 reflects the impact of the pandemic on food hub operations. Since 2021, there has been no widespread national survey of food hubs in the United States.

Food hubs are not without trade-offs. As they grow, some adopt "asymmetrical trade-off systems" in which the need for volume begins to outweigh equity and inclusion, which marginalizes the producers they were designed to support (Shariatmadary et al., 2023). This risk increases when hubs mimic industrial

wholesale models that prioritize efficiency over shared governance. Research shows that while food hubs often contribute to environmental and economic sustainability, their social sustainability depends on their internal design and values (Shariatmadary, 2023; Carloni, 2025).

To fulfill their potential as equitable market intermediaries, food hubs must be intentionally designed with transparency, producer participation, and infrastructure investment in mind. While few currently operate under cooperative or shared-ownership models, democratic governance structures remain one of the most effective ways to preserve producer influence and uphold the mission of regional food justice (Carloni et al., 2025). In this way, food hubs can move beyond aggregation toward structural transformation—strengthening small farms while shifting power dynamics within the food system.

Boulder County's food hub, operated by the BCFM, provides a valuable local resource for small producers in the region. By removing barriers such as distribution costs and market access, the BCFM food hub strengthens the position of small farmers in the local food system. For small producers in Boulder County, this food hub offers an ideal opportunity to leverage the existing infrastructure and support of their community, enabling them to scale their businesses while remaining true to their values of sustainability and regional food justice. By taking full advantage of this resource, local farmers can thrive without losing their influence in the marketplace or their commitment to equitable food systems (Boulder County Farmers Markets, n.d.).

Distributors

Large distributors such as Sysco and US Foods are generally not a viable option for small-scale farms due to structural mismatches in volume, pricing, and production practices. These wholesale systems prioritize efficiency, standardization, and predictability, which require consistent, large-volume deliveries and uniform product quality. Small farms struggle to meet these demands without compromising core

ecological and economic values (Gaitán-Cremaschi et al., 2019). Entering these distribution channels frequently requires farms to scale up in ways that are neither environmentally sustainable nor financially feasible, leading to increased debt, risk, and loss of autonomy.

Additionally, wholesale pricing models offer minimal profit margins that often fail to cover the true costs of sustainable production. Small producers are thus incentivized to conform to industrial norms—such as monocropping and synthetic input use—in order to remain competitive. This dynamic reflects what researchers describe as a “hybrid system” closely aligned with the conventional food system: one that emphasizes marketable health claims, such as the freshness or organic status of produce, while tailoring production to the logic of industrial agriculture and large-scale retail markets (Gaitán-Cremaschi et al., 2019). As a result, small farms that enter this system may find themselves participating in a version of corporate greenwashing that dilutes the original intentions of sustainable food systems.

Secondary and Alternative Markets

Secondary and alternative markets provide valuable avenues for small farms to manage surplus, reduce waste, and enhance community food access. Examples include food donations to pantries, partnerships with gleaning and recovery organizations, and the creation of value-added products like jams or sauces. Organizations such as Second Chance Foods, in Hudson Valley, New York, demonstrate how farms can participate in surplus rescue programs: through on-farm gleaning partnerships and donations of field surplus, Second Chance Foods channels produce into its Food Rescue Hub, using extensive cold storage and a commercial kitchen to transform and distribute food to those in need (Second Chance Foods, n.d.). While surplus recovery and food rescue models embody agroecological principles like recycling, fairness, and participation (Nicholls,2020), they generally play a supplementary—not core—role in most farms’ distribution strategies.

Secondary and alternative markets offer resilience but require additional capacity. Coordination with recovery groups, processing facilities, and cold storage infrastructure is often necessary. Farms must

navigate food safety regulations when donating or processing goods, and transactions tend to be non-commercial, limiting revenue capture. Although food rescue initiatives can enhance community access and reduce waste, small producers can only rely on these channels primarily for risk management, rather than income generation (Second Chance Foods, n.d.).

Analysis of Interviews

This section brings together qualitative data from four in-depth interviews with key players in Boulder County's local food economy—two small-scale farmers, one aggregator, and one chef/buyer—alongside relevant quantitative trends from their operations. The objective is to examine current fiscal bottlenecks, environmental costs, and systemic barriers, while identifying patterns that could inform more sustainable and scalable distribution models for small-scale agriculture.

Founding Vision and Philosophy

Each participant shared a strong sense of purpose and guiding values around their work. Mark of Esoterra Culinary Garden, began farming due to his love of good food and made it his mission to grow exceptional ingredients for chefs. Inspired by the quality and community he observed in farmers markets and CSAs, he built a chef-focused model rooted in aesthetic quality, seasonality, and close culinary collaboration. Although his farm spans just three acres, it has grown quickly through regenerative and innovative practices. Delivery is treated as more than logistics, it's a chance to build relationships and reinforce shared farm-to-table values. He prioritizes alignment over expansion and is willing to turn down clients who don't fully embrace the vision.

Andrew of Community Table Farms, has shifted their focus from solely growing to regional capacity-building, taking on the role of an aggregator to support a more resilient local food system. After reaching the limit of what they could produce independently, to meet the needs of his CSA members, he began sourcing from others and now work with 27 local producers, purchasing a wide range of products

including meat, vegetables, fruit, pasta, and bread. His vision emphasizes connectivity, aiming to strengthen the regional food network by coordinating labor, distribution, and market access. This collaborative model not only diversifies product offerings but also supports the viability of other small producers. With 60 CSA members now receiving food through this network, the operation exemplifies how aggregation can stabilize local supply chains—a necessity in the face of rising labor costs and limited access to land and capital for small farms.

Vanita of Switch Gears Farms, approaches farming as both a livelihood and a form of food justice. Vanita and her husband Bret, manage every aspect of production and distribution for the CSA, farmers market booth, and nonprofit partnerships. While deeply committed to community access, their model is stretched by land tenure limitations, lack of cold storage, and long delivery runs that strain time and infrastructure.

Paul, executive Chef and Co-Owner of the Denver restaurant Coperta, emphasized that while restaurants value local sourcing in principle, they also require consistency, pricing transparency, and ease of ordering. Managing multiple producer accounts and unpredictable delivery logistics makes it difficult to rely on small farms, even for values-driven kitchens. His ideal system is one where ethical sourcing aligns with business needs through streamlined, chef-facing distribution.

Farming Practices and Sustainability

Each farm shared a strong commitment to ecological practices and minimizing environmental impact. Mark, uses compostable packaging and grows with the seasons to reduce resource inputs and waste. Andrew mentioned using non-mechanized cooling techniques like ice baths and cooler beds. Vanita described switching from compostable to plastic bags, citing concerns about durability and food quality, noting she feels that plastic is often necessary for maintaining the cold chain in their production operations. All acknowledged the tension between environmental values and logistical constraints.

Food waste emerged not as a problem of overproduction, but as a consequence of inadequate infrastructure—especially when packaging fails or delivery delays compromise freshness. Spoilage was

more frequently attributed to cold chain breakdowns than to surplus harvests. Without robust on-farm storage or coordinated recovery systems, these losses remain economically difficult and environmentally frustrating.

Across all interviews, producers expressed deep commitment to environmentally sustainable practices, though logistical and financial barriers often force compromises. While all aim to reduce waste and resource use—through seasonal production, compostable packaging, or energy-saving cooling techniques—cold chain failures and limited storage infrastructure frequently result in spoilage, particularly for vegetable delivery. The shared tension between environmental values and operational constraints highlights a critical need for affordable, reliable, and scale-appropriate cold storage and transport solutions to reduce waste and support ecological goals, especially given that the farmers interviewed primarily grow vegetables and that the chef and aggregator primarily source from small-scale vegetable farmers.

Culinary Collaborations

Mark's model is grounded in strong chef relationships, where deliveries are not just transactional but built on education, seasonal planning, and shared aesthetic standards. Although Mark works with numerous restaurants, he is selective about partnerships, prioritizing quality and values alignment over volume.

From Paul's perspective, while restaurant kitchens often value local food, they are hindered by logistical inefficiencies. Managing multiple small accounts increases administrative burdens. Paul advocates for a chef-facing distribution system that maintains the personal touch of farm relationships while streamlining logistics, making local food a more viable and consistent option in fast-paced culinary environments.

However, the culinary opportunities and challenges identified through interviews in Boulder County may not be universally applicable. For example, the chef-facing distribution model works well in Boulder County due to its high density of restaurants and proximity to the larger urban area of Denver. In contrast,

Delta County, another agricultural area with a focus on sustainability and local food systems on Colorado's Western Slope, would require adjustments due to demographic and logistical differences.

Delta County spans over 1,100 square miles and has a population of around 31,000, compared to Boulder County's denser population of approximately 325,815 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). This difference in population density significantly impacts the feasibility of implementing centralized ordering and consistent delivery models. While Boulder County has a high concentration of restaurants, including a robust farm-to-table scene, Delta County has fewer dining establishments, making it less viable to support high-volume local food distribution.

This highlights that while personal relationships between chefs and farmers are key in any local food system, distribution models must be adapted to fit the specific logistical and demographic characteristics of each region.

Crop Selection and Innovation

Crop decisions across farms are largely shaped by the needs of their buyers and the logistics of their distribution systems. Mark emphasized growing for aesthetic and seasonal integrity, selecting crops that look beautiful on the plate and reflect what is currently at peak freshness. Andrew sources produce and seeds from partner farms while considering what will hold up through packaging and transport. Overall, the focus of all participants is on quality, durability, and compatibility with partner expectations rather than scale or volume.

Community Engagement

All participants are deeply embedded in their communities, although the nature of their engagement varies. Mark focuses on long-standing restaurant partnerships, while Vanita has built a base of CSA members and carries out weekly packing and delivery. Andrew, has a history of work with community

nutrition and food access programs, including public benefits like WIC and food pantries. Aggregation has helped scale community participation by linking farms that couldn't otherwise meet demand.

Despite strong values and engagement, barriers persist. Newer producers described challenges breaking into Boulder's competitive restaurant market and have sought opportunities in neighboring Denver instead. Across interviews, limited land access, long delivery routes, and lack of cold storage were identified as significant obstacles to deeper community integration.

Notably, all participants acknowledged that new or under-resourced producers face exclusion from established networks, suggesting that community connection is as much about infrastructure and equity as it is about values.

Distribution

Direct-to-Consumer (DTC)

Andrew and Vanita operate robust CSA programs, with deliveries to multiple drop points in Denver. Vanita uses a personal vehicle without refrigeration. Andrew runs a coordinated aggregation system that pulls from nearly 30 farms. DTC models are valued for customer loyalty and reduced dependency on wholesale pricing, but inefficient routes and fuel use increase cost and environmental burden.

Retail

Mark specializes in retail distribution to chefs, delivering directly to restaurant accounts and working with the local specialty distributor Altamira to increase reach. His model is built on personal relationships and shared values, with delivery serving as a key touchpoint for reinforcing farm-to-table principles. At peak season, the farm distributes to up to 50 restaurants, with a strong group of committed, like-minded chefs forming the core of their client base.

Initially, Mark handled deliveries himself, viewing them as a way to connect with chefs, share product knowledge, and build trust. Although the farm has since scaled and added dedicated delivery staff, the goal remains to have drivers hand off produce directly to the kitchens they work with. Mark also supports chef relationships by offering value-added experiences such as farm tours, which help deepen chefs' understanding of seasonal products and sourcing practices.

While some chefs push back on pricing, Mark emphasizes that their model prioritizes vision and execution over volume and cost-cutting. Success in this channel depends not only on high-quality produce but also on finding culinary partners who are aligned with the farm's mission and are capable of executing a true farm-to-table experience.

Institutional

Vanita engages with institutional buyers, primarily through nonprofit food access programs. Infrastructure limitations, such as lack of cold storage and long transport times prevent broader access to schools, hospitals, or other large buyers. Participants noted that institutional markets tend to favor larger producers already equipped with storage and logistics systems.

Wholesale

Andrews model most closely resembled small-scale wholesale. By pooling products from multiple farms, they can meet larger orders and streamline deliveries with volunteer labor. Paul reported working with food hubs in the past and has worked with Community Table Farms. He believes food hubs have potential, but mentioned that in the past small growers have placed restrictions around how much a restaurant can order, and inconsistent product availability.

Alternative Markets

Vanita reported donating surplus produce when possible. While compostable packaging aligned with environmental values, she mentioned that compostable packaging is too fragile to withstand transport

and storage. As a result, alternative markets for surplus produce, such as food pantries or donation networks remain underdeveloped and under-resourced.

Conclusions

Across Boulder County's local food economy, small-scale producers are innovating despite significant logistical, financial, and structural constraints. Their distribution strategies span a wide spectrum ranging from direct-to-consumer models and restaurant partnerships to aggregation networks, each shaped by distinct values, resources, and challenges. One truth remains clear: conventional food systems make it difficult for small producers to scale without compromising either their principles or their long-term viability.

No single distribution model is universally effective. CSAs and farm stands foster strong community ties and provide upfront capital, but require considerable labor and delivery coordination. Chef and restaurant collaborations can offer higher margins and values-aligned sourcing, but demand consistency and efficiency. Aggregated models improve scale and diversity but present coordination and labor hurdles. Institutional and wholesale markets remain largely inaccessible without infrastructure, and alternative or niche markets often lack the economic returns needed to sustain small farms.

Many of these inefficiencies stem from gaps in infrastructure. Compostable packaging that aligns with sustainability goals may fail in real-world distribution. Delivery often involves long routes in non-refrigerated vehicles, compounding the time and labor burdens on already stretched producers.

Yet in the face of these barriers, deep commitment to environmental stewardship, food quality, and community values remains a powerful unifier. For many, farming is not just a job it is a calling.

Mark described his work as a journey guided by passion and principle: "Once you start down a path, you don't know where it will lead. Being in alignment with nature and your community will keep you on the path." Vanita and her husband expressed a similar ethos, cultivating their small plot to grow vegetables and fruits in a way that nourishes both people and the planet. Andrew, a lifelong gardener, described the

local farming community as one sustained by mutual support and knowledge-sharing. Paul emphasized that the local food system is still emerging, and offers real hope for reconnection to place, to people, and to purpose.

These individuals are united not by a single business model, but by a shared belief in the transformative power of food to regenerate land, foster equity, and strengthen communities.

The path to success, then, lies not in choosing one distribution model over another, but in strategically combining several channels to build resilience. This blended approach allows producers and food system actors to remain nimble, values-aligned, and economically viable.

To truly strengthen Boulder County's food system, individual innovation must be matched by shared infrastructure, collective planning, and supportive policy frameworks. Practical interventions such as cooperative delivery networks, mobile cold storage, sustainable packaging, and streamlined ordering systems can reduce labor burdens and food loss while preserving the integrity of local sourcing relationships.

Ultimately, local food systems are not peripheral; they are foundational to economic vitality, climate resilience, and community well-being. But sustainable food systems are not built in isolation. They emerge in the spaces between growers and buyers, policy and practice, values and logistics. The goal is not simply to scale up or down but to scale smartly, through participatory, coordinated networks that allow local food to thrive.

Recommendations

While small producers in Boulder County work tirelessly to build values-based food systems, they continue to face significant structural barriers, such as distribution inefficiencies, fragmented logistics, limited cold storage, and weak institutional support. These challenges often force producers to choose between sustainability and scale, undermining the long-term viability of the local food economy. Despite

these constraints, there are promising strategies that can help reshape the region's distribution landscape into one that is both ecologically resilient and economically viable.

The following five recommendations offer targeted, cross-sector solutions to help producers, buyers, and policymakers transition from fragmented efforts to coordinated systems. Together, they form an integrated approach to strengthening Boulder County's local food infrastructure without compromising the principles that define it.

1. **Strengthen Aggregation and Shared Logistics**

The majority of small farms in Boulder County can't individually meet the volume or variety needed for wholesale or institutional demand. Regional aggregation models, such as formal food hubs or informal cooperatives, allow producers to combine their outputs, improving product consistency and diversity while reducing per-unit delivery costs. Given Boulder County's high density of small farms and proximity to Denver, aggregation could enable producers to reach a wider, urban customer base, enhancing market access without compromising their sustainable practices.

Shared delivery infrastructure further amplifies these benefits. Coordinated delivery routes, pooled labor, and shared refrigerated vehicles not only reduce fuel consumption and emissions but also alleviate the time and labor burdens that limit small producers. National examples, such as food hubs recognized by the USDA, have demonstrated how these systems can improve market access and help maintain producer identity and values (ATTRA, 2021).

2. **Invest in Cold Chain Infrastructure and Packaging Solutions**

Maintaining cold chain integrity is essential for preserving product freshness, reducing waste, and enabling producers to serve buyers beyond Boulder County. The high cost of refrigerated trucks and storage presents a significant barrier. However, low-cost alternatives, such as insulated containers, on-farm ice machines, or mobile cooling units, can extend shelf life and support regional distribution.

Boulder County's engaged citizenry and commitment to sustainability could help support local funding or partnership programs for these essential infrastructure investments.

Packaging is another pain point. While compostable packaging aligns with sustainability goals, it often lacks the durability needed for efficient distribution. A hybrid approach, using reusable bins or recycled plastic for wholesale and cooler bags for CSA deliveries, can strike a balance between environmental sustainability and practicality. The USDA's Resilient Food Systems Infrastructure Program offers funding opportunities for investments like these, which would benefit Boulder County's producers while enhancing supply chain efficiency (USDA, 2022).

3. **Promote Coordinated Sourcing and Relationship-Based Buying**

Buyers, particularly chefs, small retailers, and institutional food services are critical to the success of regional food systems, but fragmented supply chains make it challenging for them to source local products consistently. Boulder County's proximity to Denver and its reputation as a hub for sustainability could facilitate the development of tools like multi-farm ordering platforms, seasonal product lists, and regular delivery schedules, making it easier for buyers to commit to local purchasing.

Formalized, long-term agreements such as CSA-style arrangements with restaurants or seasonal procurement contracts, can provide price stability for farmers while ensuring quality and reliability for buyers. Relationship-based systems, which prioritize transparency and mutual benefit, are more resilient to market disruptions and align well with Boulder County's progressive and sustainability-driven culture (Lynch et al., 2018).

4. **Advance Policy to Support Local Food Logistics**

Local government and policymakers have an important role to play in facilitating the growth of sustainable food systems. Boulder County should continue to support policy that supports small-scale aggregation centers, shared-use kitchens, urban food hubs, and decentralized distribution sites. These changes would foster more accessible infrastructure, helping small producers overcome logistical challenges.

Furthermore, providing subsidies or low-interest financing for cold storage, mobile aggregation units, and shared vehicles would help reduce infrastructure costs, especially given the high demand for local food in Boulder's markets.

5. **Launch Pilot Programs to Test Scalable, Regionally Adapted Solutions**

Boulder County doesn't need to wait for large-scale policy shifts or external funding to begin transforming its local food distribution systems. By working collaboratively, food system actors, including farmers, aggregators, chefs, and others can design and implement small-scale pilot projects tailored to local needs. These pilots could test a range of practical solutions, including:

- **A Farm Logistics Cooperative:** A shared delivery system coordinated by 5–10 producers, pooling routes and labor while tracking savings in fuel, time, and emissions.
- **A CSA + Wholesale Hybrid Program:** A flexible model blending individual subscriptions with centralized restaurant and retailer purchasing. This structure would stabilize revenue for producers while offering buyers reliable access to local goods.
- **Cooling Infrastructure Microgrants:** A locally organized fund to help farms acquire affordable cooling tools like insulated containers or portable fridges, with measurable tracking of waste reduction and shelf-life improvements.
- **Packaging Innovation Trials:** Joint testing of reusable, recyclable, or hybrid packaging across CSA, retail, and restaurant channels to evaluate durability, ease of use, environmental impact, and consumer feedback.

These pilot efforts don't require perfect conditions they require a willingness to experiment, share resources, and document outcomes. By leading their own innovation efforts, Boulder County producers and partners can build scalable models rooted in the region's values and realities. Even small-scale procurement innovations can yield measurable economic and health benefits when grounded in community collaboration and systems thinking (Lynch et al., 2018).

Ultimately, local food cannot succeed without local distribution systems that reflect the same values of transparency, equity, and sustainability. The region must begin to treat distribution as a shared civic infrastructure, not just a backend logistics function. That means shifting the work of sustainability onto systems that include farms, buyers, consumers, nonprofits, and policymakers. Combining several distribution channels, including those linked to niche markets for specialty produce, represents a diversification strategy that reduces the economic risk associated with dependence on a single channel (Enthoven, 2021). The future of Boulder County's local food economy lies in smart, cooperative scaling not by shrinking industrial models down, but by scaling regionally adapted, relationship-driven systems.

References

Barn2Door Admin. (2025, June 6). How to sell produce online. Barn2Door. Retrieved from https://www.barn2door.com/blog-all/how-to-sell-produce-online

Bielaczyc, N., Colasanti, K., Atwell, E., & Bomstein, E. (2023). Findings of the 2021 National Food Hub Survey. Michigan State University Center for Regional Food Systems. Retrieved from http://foodsystems.msu.edu/2021-food-hub-survey

Boulder Cooperative Food. (n.d.). *Boulder Cooperative Food*. Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://bouldercooperativefood.org/

Boulder County Sustainability, Climate Action & Resilience Plan (2022) [PDF]. Retrieved June 21, 2025, from https://assets.bouldercounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/BoCo-2022-Sustainability-Plan.pdf

Boulder County Farmers Markets. (n.d.). Food Hub. Retrieved June 21, 2025, from https://bcfm.org/food-hub

Boulder County Farmers Markets. (2024, September 16). *At Monroe Organic Farms, young farmers build on generations of wisdom*. https://bcfm.org/at-monroe-organic-farms-young-farmers-build-on-generations-of-wisdom/

CAFF. (n.d.). FARM-TO-CAFETERIA. Community Alliance with Family Farmers. Retrieved August 4, 2025, from https://caff.org/farm-to-market/

Carbine, A. J. (2022, September 13). Cold storage: A hot topic for regional food systems. New Venture Advisors. https://www.newventureadvisors.net/cold-storage-a-hot-topic-for-regional-food-systems/

Carlisle, L., Montenegro de Wit, M., DeLonge, M. S., Calo, A., Getz, C., Ory, J., Munden-Dixon, K., Galt, R., Melone, B., Knox, R., Iles, A., & Press, D. (2019). Securing the future of US agriculture: The

case for investing in new entry sustainable farmers. *Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene, 7*(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.356

Carloni, E., Giordano, C., Di Fiore, G. N., Mulazzani, L., Setti, M., Falasconi, L., & Marini Govigli, V. (2025). Promoting sustainable food systems: An empirical analysis of local food hub governance models and structures in 12 African settings. *Environmental Science & Policy, 164*, 103983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2024.103983

ChangeLab Solutions. (2021, May). Modeling healthy institutional purchasing & sales. ChangeLab Solutions. Retrieved from https://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/2021-05/CLS-BG243-3-Modeling-Healthy-Institutional-Purchasing-Sales_FINAL_ACCESS_20210525.pdf

Diehl, J. A. (2020). Growing for Sydney: Exploring the Urban Food System through Farmers' Social Networks. Sustainability, 12(8), 3346. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12083346

Egli, L., Rüschhoff, J., & Priess, J. (2023). *A systematic review of the ecological, social and economic sustainability effects of community-supported agriculture*. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 7*, Article 1136866. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1136866

Enthoven, L., & Van den Broeck, G. (2021). Local food systems: Reviewing two decades of research. *Agricultural Systems, 193*, 103226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103226

Farmers Market Coalition. (2022). *Farmers market facts & figures 2022*. https://farmersmarketcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Farmers-Market-Facts-Figures-2022.pdf

Galle, N. (2025, August 1). Local Line and Farmers' Truck partner to expand local food access in 26 states. Local Line. Retrieved from https://www.localline.co/blog/local-line-and-farmers-truck-partner

Gaitán-Cremaschi, D., Klerkx, L., Duncan, J. et al. Characterizing diversity of food systems in view of sustainability transitions. A review. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 39, 1 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-018-0550-2

Hodges, A. W. (2014). Local and regional food systems in Florida: Values and consumer impacts [Journal article]. Journal of Agricultural & Applied Economics. DOI:10.22004/ag.econ.169063. Retrieved from https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/169063/

Holt, D. (2024, January 25). The farm-to-table movement: A complete guide. Hitchcock Farms. Retrieved August 4, 2025, from https://www.hitchcockfarms.com/blog/farm-to-table-movement

LeRoux, M., Roth, M., Shaw, M., & Schmit, T. (2014, July). Guide to marketing channel selection: How to sell through wholesale and direct marketing channels (Cornell Small Farms Program). Cornell Cooperative Extension of Tompkins County. Retrieved from https://smallfarms.cornell.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Guide-to-Marketing-Channel-1ib5phn.pdf

Lehndorff, J. (2024, May 8). Boulder's natural foods history is longer than you think. Boulder Weekly. https://boulderweekly.com/food/nibbles/boulder-natural-foods-history/

Lynch, J., Meter, K., Robles-Schrader, G., Phillips Goldenberg, M., Bassler, E., Chusid, S., & Jansen Austin, C. (2013). Exploring economic and health impacts of local food procurement [Report]. Crossroads Resource Center. https://www.crcworks.org/EHimpacts.pdf

Machata, N., Jennings, L., Morrison, H., & Boyle, M. (2024). *2023 Farm to School Census Report*. Report submitted to the Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Decision Information Resources.https://fns-prod.azureedge.us/sites/default/files/resource-files/2023FarmToSchoolCensusReport_v3.pdf

Minor, T., Astill, G., Raszap Skorbiansky, S., Thornsbury, S., Buzby, J., Hitaj, C., Kantor, L., Kuchler, F., Ellison, B., Mishra, A., Richards, T., Roe, B., & Wilson, N. (2020, January). Economic drivers of

food loss at the farm and pre-retail sectors: A look at the produce supply chain in the United States (Economic Information Bulletin No. 216). U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. https://ers.usda.gov/sites/default/files/_laserfiche/publications/95779/EIB-216.pdf

McCracken, A. (2022, November 7). *Boulder Farmers Market musings*. *CU Boulder Coloradan Magazine*. https://www.colorado.edu/coloradan/2022/11/07/boulder-farmers-market-musings

National Farm to School Network. (2016). Helping more farmers bring farm to school. https://www.farmtoschool.org/news-and-articles/helping-more-farmers-bring-farm-to-school

National Farm to School Network. (n.d.-a). Local food purchasing incentives. https://www.farmtoschool.org/policy/lfpi

National Farm to School Network. (n.d.-b). Seeds Farm reaps rewards with farm-to-school.https://www.farmtoschool.org/news-and-articles/seeds-farm-reaps-rewards-with-farm-to-school

Nicholls, E., Ely, A., Birkin, L. et al. The contribution of small-scale food production in urban areas to the sustainable development goals: a review and case study. Sustain Sci 15, 1585–1599 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00792-z

Pressman, A. (2013). Food hubs: A producer guide (ATTRA publication IP455). National Center for Appropriate Technology. Retrieved from https://attra.ncat.org/publication/food-hubs-a-producer-guide/

Project for Public Spaces. (n.d.). *Boulder County Farmers' Market*. Retrieved from https://www.pps.org/places/boulder-county-farmers-market

Shariatmadary, H., O'Hara, S., Graham, R., & Stuiver, M. (2023). Are Food Hubs Sustainable? An Analysis of Social and Environmental Objectives of U.S. Food Hubs. Sustainability, 15(3), 2308. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032308

Samoggia, A., Perazzolo, C., Kocsis, P., & Del Prete, M. (2019). *Community supported agriculture farmers' perceptions of management benefits and drawbacks*. *Sustainability, 11*(12), 3262. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11123262

Second Chance Foods. (n.d.). Food Rescue Hub: Connecting surplus with community needs. Retrieved August 4, 2025, from https://secondchancefoods.org/process/food-rescue-hub

Slow Food USA. (n.d.). Snail of Approval. Retrieved August 4, 2025, from https://slowfoodusa.org/snail-of-approval

United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1). UN. https://sdgs.un.org/goals

U.S. Census Bureau (2018). American Community Survey 1-year estimates. Retrieved from Census Reporter Profile 7 page for Boulder, CO http://censusreporter.org/profiles/16000US0807850-boulder-co/

U.S. Census Bureau. (2020). *Delta County, Colorado*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://data.census.gov/profile/Delta_County,_Colorado?g=050XX00US08029

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (n.d.-a). Co-ops: A key part of rural America. Retrieved August 4, 2025, from https://www.usda.gov/node/6394

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2010). Farm to institution initiatives. In Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food Compass. Retrieved from https://www.usda.gov/sites/default/files/documents/6-Farmtoinstitution.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (n.d.-b). Farm to school. https://www.fns.usda.gov/f2s/farm-to-school

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2020). Farm to school literature review. https://fns-prod.azureedge.us/sites/default/files/resource-files/Farm-to-School-LitReview.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. (2022). *Colorado county profile: Boulder County (cp08013)*. https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2022/Online_Resources/County_Profiles/Colorado/cp08013.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2012, February). Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food Compass. Retrieved from https://www.usda.gov/sites/default/files/documents/KYFCompass.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. (2012). Census of Agriculture. https://www.agcensus.usda.gov

United States Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. (2022). Local Food Marketing Practices Survey highlights. https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/Highlights/2022/local-foods.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2022, June 1). USDA announces framework for shoring up the food supply chain and transforming the food system to be fairer, more competitive, more resilient [Press release]. Retrieved from https://www.usda.gov/about-usda/news/press-releases/2022/06/01/usda-announces-framework-shoring-food-supply-chain-and-transforming-food-system-be-fairer-more

Van Touch, V., Tan, D. K. Y., Cook, B. R., Liu, D. L., Cross, R., Tran, T. A., Utomo, A., Yous, S., Grunbuhel, C., & Cowie, A. (2024). Smallholder farmers' challenges and opportunities: Implications for agricultural production, environment and food security. *Journal of Environmental Management, 370*, 122536. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.122536

Waves of Grain. (n.d.). *About Waves of Grain*. Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://wavesofgrain.co/pages/learn-about-waves-of-grain

Wezel, A., Herren, B.G., Kerr, R.B. et al. Agroecological principles and elements and their implications for transitioning to sustainable food systems. A review. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 40, 40 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-020-00646-z

Witzling, L., Shaw, B. R., & Wolnik, D. (2025). U.S. farmers market attendance and experiences: Descriptive results from a national survey. Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development, 14(1), 227–249. https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2025.141.017

Wood, T. (2021, April 24). *Alfalfa's closure poses challenge for Boulder walkable neighborhoods vision*. *Daily Camera*. https://www.dailycamera.com/2021/04/24/alfalfas-closure-poses-challenge-for-boulder-walkable-neighborhoods-vision/

Woods, T., Ernst, M., & Tropp, D. (2017, April). Community supported agriculture: New models for changing markets (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service). Retrieved from https://www.ams.usda.gov/sites/default/files/media/CSANewModelsforChangingMarketsb.pdf

Wolnik, D. (2019, February 19). *The evolution of the CSA – part 1: The rise, decline, & reinvention*. Farmers Market Coalition. https://farmersmarketcoalition.org/the-evolution-of-the-csa-part-1-the-rise-decline-reinvention/

Worrell, G. (2021, May 18). *Boulder County Farmers Market keeps to its homegrown roots*. Longmont Leader. Retrieved from https://www.longmontleader.com/local-news/boulder-county-farmers-market-keeps-to-its-homegrown-roots-3978553