

A Location-based Promotion Program for Washington Food and Agricultural Products

Report to the Legislature

As required by Engrossed Senate Bill 5341

Derek I. Sandison, Director



Washington
State Department of
Agriculture

Derek I. Sandison, Director

agr.wa.gov



AGR Publication No. 101-10008 (N/5/24)

Do you need this publication in an alternate format?
Contact WSDA at (360) 902-1976 or TTY Relay 800-833-6388

Contents

Background	01
Approach	02
Key Findings	08
Recommendations	16
Next Steps	22
Appendix A - Example Questions for Other State Marketing Programs	23
Appendix B - Food Policy Forum Appointed Members	24
Appendix C - Commodity Commissions and Industry Associations (<i>interviewed</i>)	26
Appendix D - Example Questions for Commodity Commissions and Industry Associations	27
Appendix E - Agricultural and Food Promotion Organizations (<i>interviewed</i>)	28
Appendix F - Seafood Marketing Meeting Participating Organizations	30

A woman with dark hair, wearing a light blue cardigan, is smiling as she pushes a red shopping cart through a grocery store aisle. The cart is filled with various items, including a bouquet of flowers and a red bag. The aisle is lined with shelves of products, and the background is slightly blurred. The entire image has a semi-transparent purple overlay.

**A Location-
based Promotion
Program for
Washington Food
and Agricultural
Products**

Background

During the 2023–2024 legislative session, the legislature passed [Engrossed Senate Bill 5341](#) (ESB 5341), now codified in RCW 15.155, which enabled Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) to create a location-based promotion program for Washington food and agricultural products. This is more commonly known as a statewide marketing or “brand” program. For the purposes of this report, the WSDA location-based program will be referred to as the “Program” from here on forward, because the program does not have an official name yet.

The legislature previously found that Washington was one of few states without a state program to help food and agricultural producers promote their products based on where the product is grown, raised, or caught. Examples of other state programs around the nation, include, “[Jersey Fresh](#),” “[California Grown](#),” and “[Certified South Carolina](#).”

The primary goal of the WSDA Program is to help consumers support Washington producers and the state’s agricultural economy by raising the visibility of Washington agricultural products in the marketplace. There are many ways the program intends to do this. The first is to better identify Washington food and agricultural products with a logo or other identifying mark on product labels or packaging. Identifying products as being of Washington-origin on the label will help producers differentiate their products from a crowded marketplace and help consumers more easily find them. Furthermore, the legislation intends that this program has the potential to help institutions such as schools, hospitals, colleges, and universities better identify and procure Washington grown and produced products.

Secondly, the legislature intends that this program build upon Washington’s strong reputation for positive characteristics such as food quality and food safety. These characteristics and others will be an integral component for establishing the brand’s values. The development of brand values is important for building, sustaining, and managing a marketing program such as this one.

Thirdly, the legislature intends that this program be voluntary, sustainable over time, and suitable for Washington producers at all scales and in a wide range of markets. The Program will strive to support Washington producers in a way that is equitable and inclusive. Program management, leadership, and execution have been crafted to meet these goals.

The legislature required that WSDA gather advisory committee input and submit recommendations for program development and implementation to the appropriate legislative committees prior to program development. This report serves that function.

Approach

In October 2023, WSDA hired a full-time employee as the Program Administrator. The primary purpose of this role has been to conduct research, gather feedback, ensure that ESB 5341 directives were carried out to the best extent, and compile necessary information to assist the WSDA Director in compiling this report.

WSDA performed research and stakeholder engagement in the following areas:

- I. Research of other states' marketing programs
- II. Research into past marketing efforts in Washington
- III. Engagement of an advisory committee
- IV. Stakeholder engagement
- V. Contracted consumer research



I. Research of other states' marketing programs

WSDA conducted a thorough review of existing state marketing programs from around the nation. The Program Administrator ascertained information about marketing efforts, budgets, participation structures, eligibility requirements, and operations. In addition, WSDA conducted one-on-one interviews with program staff to glean what is working well, what could be improved, and what they wished they would have known at the start of their programs. A list of example questions is listed in Appendix A. These lessons will inform the build-out of the WSDA Program.

II. Research into past marketing efforts in Washington

The Program Administrator examined Washington State's former state agricultural marketing program, "From the Heart of Washington," which was dissolved in 2008. The archived material included consumer surveys, marketing strategies, press releases, and program graphics. Interviews were conducted with two former WSDA employees who worked on the "From the Heart of Washington" program.

III. Engagement of an advisory committee

ESB 5341 required that the WSDA Director establish an advisory committee with representatives from interested agricultural and food production organizations for the purpose of identifying the appropriate scope and nature of a voluntary location-based program to brand and promote local food and agricultural products.

The Washington State Food Policy Forum (FPF) is a "cross-sector group of food system stakeholders with representatives from across the state" that was established by the legislature and is co-convened by WSDA and the Washington State Conservation Commission to make recommendations for improving the food system of Washington ([Washington State Food Policy Forum](#)). The FPF has an extensive history engaging in work focused on establishing a location-based promotion program for food and agricultural products.

Due to the history of engagement around this topic from the FPF, WSDA partnered with the FPF to create a work group to act as the advisory committee and provide valuable industry input. Two meetings were organized by the FPF in March 2024. A list of appointed FPF members can be viewed in Appendix B. The Program Administrator assisted in organizing the FPF advisory meetings and contracted with a consulting company to act as a facilitator.

The FPF advisory meetings primarily focused on the following topics:

- Eligibility requirements
- Participation structure
- Program priorities
- Program costs
- Opportunities and challenges for program equity

The Program Administrator shared information gathered from the advisory committee and initial impressions from other stakeholder engagement at the quarterly FPF meeting on April 4, 2024. This meeting offered an additional opportunity for the FPF to provide advisory feedback to WSDA.

IV. Stakeholder engagement

For this report, stakeholder engagement has been separated into the following categories:

- A. Washington state commodity commissions and industry associations**
- B. Agricultural and local food promotion organizations**
- C. Seafood-focused groups**
- D. Tribal-focused food organizations**



A. Washington state commodity commissions and industry associations

The Program Administrator conducted one-on-one interviews with representatives from Washington state commodity commissions and industry associations. A list of these interviewees is listed in Appendix C. During the interviews, the Program Administrator asked if there were additional organizations that should be contacted, which led to other fruitful conversations.

The Program Administrator sought to ascertain what was working well, what could be improved, and how this program could best support needs and efforts. Some examples of questions which were asked are listed in Appendix D. It should be noted that the Program Administrator contacted several other organizations but due to scheduling and time constraints, not all were able to respond. Organizations that did not respond will continue to be engaged as the Program moves forward.

B. Agricultural and local food promotion organizations

To receive input regarding crops not represented by a Washington commodity commission, and to solicit feedback from smaller-scale producers, the Program Administrator engaged a variety of other agricultural organizations and product promotion groups oriented to local and regional markets. These are listed in Appendix E.

In addition to one-on-one interviews, the Program Administrator presented at meetings and attended conferences to solicit feedback regarding the Program. This included getting feedback during a [“WA Meat Up”](#) meeting on March 16, 2024, organized by WSDA and Washington State University Extension (WSU).

The Program Administrator also interviewed WSDA staff because WSDA acts as an important resource provider for producers at many scales. Feedback was solicited from these areas: Farm to School, Small and Direct Marketing Farm Assistance, Animal Health, Meat and Poultry Assistance, International Marketing, and Hemp Licensing.

C. Seafood-focused groups

On January 10, 2024, WSDA staff participated in a seafood marketing meeting organized by Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) and Washington Sea Grant. Meeting members include industry representatives from DFW, University of Washington, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC). Fishermen, seafood processors, and seafood buyers also attended. A full list of members is in Appendix F.

At the January 10 meeting, participants contributed their opinions via an anonymous poll containing four questions:

1. *Would your industry support a program if it required products to be 100% caught, harvested, and processed in Washington?*
2. *Who should qualify for the program in the seafood industry?*
3. *What will be most beneficial from the WSDA Program?*
4. *How much should industry members pay annually to participate?*

After the poll closed, the Program Administrator and DFW facilitated a discussion around these topics.

To gain perspective regarding the shellfish industry, the Program Administrator interviewed the WSDA Aquaculture Coordinator. The Program Administrator also attended the Wild Seafood Connection conference in February 2024, to solicit feedback from the wild seafood industry.



D. Tribal-focused food organizations

The Program Administrator engaged the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC) and Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fisheries Commission (CRITFC). The Program Administrator presented a program overview and solicited feedback at a NWIFC meeting on April 16, 2024.

The Program Administrator engaged the Intertribal Agriculture Council and its American Indian Foods (AIF) program. The AIF program offers producers an opportunity to self-identify their products as “Made/Produced by American Indians” with a label. A state marketing program that offers something similar is the “Made/Grown in Montana” program, which offers a “Native American Made – Made in Montana” label. On April 23, 2024, WSDA staff solicited feedback from Washington producers participating in the AIF program.

V. Contracted consumer research

Gathering input from consumers plays an integral part in developing and supporting the Program. In spring 2024, WSDA contracted with a marketing firm to conduct a survey of consumer attitudes toward Washington’s products. Approximately 500 people were surveyed. Results from this initial survey will help inform the Program and potential marketing focus areas.



Key Findings

I. Research of other states' marketing programs

WSDA identified several successful programs in other states that are comparable to what WSDA is creating, including “Idaho Preferred,” “Certified South Carolina,” “Minnesota Grown,” and “Pennsylvania Preferred.” These programs are primarily focused on supporting food and agricultural producers. Participants must apply for participation and meet specific eligibility requirements.

WSDA research found that the most effective state programs have the following elements, among other shared characteristics:

- A. Stand-alone program website**
- B. Strong social media presence**
- C. An online application process in addition to a paper form**
- D. A robust budget with state support**



A. Stand-alone program website

WSDA research found that almost all other state programs have a stand-alone program website, in addition to information about the program housed on their agency website. A professionally designed program website allows producers to easily apply for participation and access marketing materials. The website also acts as an important place for consumers to learn about the program and its goals. An example of this comes from the “Pennsylvania Preferred” program:

1. [Pennsylvania Preferred](#) stand-alone program website
2. [Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture website](#) with information about the Pennsylvania Preferred program

B. Strong social media presence

The most effective state programs have their own social media accounts and “handles” separate from department accounts. This distinction allows consumers to connect with the brand’s values. Consumers have high engagement rates on posts about producers, seasonal produce, promotional activities, and events. One example of this is in Idaho where the state program, “Idaho Preferred,” has a highly engaged Instagram following, versus the less visited Idaho State Department of Agriculture landing page:

1. [Idaho Preferred](#) Instagram profile
2. [Idaho State Department of Agriculture](#) Instagram profile

C. An online application process in addition to a paper form

The most successful programs have online applications on program-specific websites that take less than 10 minutes to complete and are technologically intuitive to use. Applicants can upload their information including business documents and product photos. In the application process, the applicant can pay online for program participation and logo-licensing usage. Some program staff mentioned that these types of websites and applicant forms typically cost about \$100,000 to design and build, one year to complete, and at least \$10,000 to maintain each year.

In addition to the online application, effective programs also offer a separate paper form for those with limited access to internet services. A paper form also allows for translation into other languages.

A primary finding of this research is that it takes program staff a lot of time and work to complete the application review process. Successful state programs have at least two or three staff members total, one of which is dedicated to participant outreach and data management. This role oversees collecting, reviewing, authenticating, processing, organizing, and storing of application and participant data.

D. A robust budget with state support

Effective programs have strong support from their state budget. Program budgets were, on average, at least \$1 million annually. Effective programs maintained a mix of funding sources from state money, federal grants, and participation fees. Individual producers pay an annual fee of \$50–\$100 to participate. Producers receive materials such as stickers, twist ties, posters, price cards, or promotional items for free.

Successful programs offer participants access to the use of a digital logo, digital directories, marketing campaigns, business development opportunities, trainings, and other resources. A robust budget from the state allows programs to hire and maintain staff and implement marketing strategies that typically include seasonal campaigns, retail promotions, social media campaigns, and participant highlights. The most effective marketing strategies are implemented at regional, statewide, and international scales.



II. Research into past marketing efforts in Washington

WSDA's historical review found that the "From the Heart of Washington" program was primarily built upon one-time federal funding and did not provide a sustainable structure over time. Although the program had initial success building relationships with statewide grocery and retail stores, not enough energy was put into developing relationships with producers. Additionally, there was not enough energy dedicated to sustaining relationships with industry stakeholders over time. Producer buy-in and industry support is paramount for a future program's success. That is why listening to producer stakeholder input is so important as this new WSDA Program is being developed.

III. Engagement of an advisory committee

Key input and recommendations from the advisory committee included:

- Produce should be 100% grown in Washington to be eligible for participation in the Program
- The application and renewal process should be relatively easy to complete
- Program offerings, such as logo, marketing materials, trainings, and opportunities to participate in other promotional activities should be clearly explained to potential participants to demonstrate value of the Program
- The cost of program participation should be low
- There should be a sustained effort to communicate with consumers, and should include regional, statewide, and international marketing efforts
- Trusted community leaders should be engaged to solicit feedback on program development
- The Program should contract and retain marketing professionals
- The Program needs to deliver a range of services and resources including a logo, consumer education, and marketing campaigns

Advisory committee members that work with commodities and large-scale operations agreed that there should be a cost to participate. Advisory committee members that work with smaller-scale producers voiced that farmers and food business owners are less likely to participate in marketing programs when there are fees to participate.

The committee noted that some products cross national and international borders for packing/processing, but traceability technology exists that could provide means to identify products that might be eligible for the program. If the Program's value is demonstrated to industry manufacturers, aggregators, distributors, and food processors, they will be more likely to use technology and

tracking information to separate Washington products co-mingled with non-Washington produce and commodities.

A potential concern is brand confusion and label fatigue. Many other certification and labeling efforts already exist, such as “Organic,” “Non-GMO,” “Certified Naturally Grown,” etc. — plus the additional regional labels such as “Genuine Skagit Valley” or “Kitsap Fresh.” The advisory committee voiced that the WSDA Program will need to have clearly defined brand values and desirable program offerings to distinguish itself from other efforts. It was suggested that creating an effective program will require hiring a consulting firm.

The advisory committee suggested continued examination of how this WSDA Program may affect existing statewide and regional branding efforts, and to explore if there are potential opportunities for collaboration.

When advisory committee feedback was shared with the full Forum, Forum members were eager to discuss how the logo and brand’s values would be developed with the assistance of a consulting firm.



IV. Stakeholder engagement

A. Key findings from Washington state commodity commissions and industry associations:

- For commissions with strong existing marketing programs, it will likely be best to work directly with commodity commission leadership so that the Program can support their existing marketing efforts
- Many commissions expressed that they were willing to pay a fee to participate in the Program, approximately \$200–\$500 per year
- Co-mingling of crops with other out of state products occurs, thus necessitating need for traceability efforts for marketing purposes
- Packing houses, processors, and merchants have traceability technology, but value in the Program must be demonstrated to merit efforts required to trace and separate Washington-origin products from others
- Livestock and livestock products such as beef, pork, and poultry may need some eligibility requirements that take into account the lack of processing facility infrastructure in Washington state for direct marketing producers, and the lack of breed stock such as poults, calves, and piglets
- Some commodity groups currently associate their products and marketing identity as from the “Northwest,” “Inland Northwest,” or “Pacific Northwest”
- Some products such as beer, wine, and distilled spirits have especially strict state and federal product labeling requirements

B. Key findings from agricultural and local food promotion organizations:

- Small-scale producers would strongly benefit from free marketing materials and/or cost-share type offerings from the Program
- Small-scale producers are less likely to pay fees to participate in the Program
- Working or contracting with existing promotional groups could be beneficial to disseminate information about the Program to smaller-scale producers
- Value of the Program must be clearly demonstrated in order for producers and supporting organizations such as food hubs or wholesale distributors to participate
- Some supporting organizations such as wholesale distributors were willing to pay \$100–\$500 per year to participate in the Program
- Producers and processors want a mix of offerings from the Program including consumer education, statewide marketing campaigns, and access to the Program’s digital logo

- The Program will best serve Washington producers and consumers by filling in marketing and promotion gaps, instead of duplicating existing efforts
- Previous marketing efforts with the grocery and retail sectors have been challenging, suggesting that a more targeted approach may be most effective

C. Key findings from seafood-focused groups:

- The groups supported allowing fish caught in waters extending into the “Exclusive Economic Zone” (generally extending about 200 miles from Washington’s shore) to qualify as Washington products
- Fish caught near multiple state borders may be more difficult to track but should be included in the program, such as salmon caught in the Columbia River
- It would benefit Washington producers if Alaskan product was excluded from the Program
- Some Washington seafood processors process fish caught from Washington, Oregon, and Alaskan waters, therefore traceability efforts will need to be employed
- Traceability for Washington grown shellfish is relatively easy, given that most production occurs in the intertidal areas of Washington’s coastline
- Due to ocean acidification, the Washington shellfish industry commonly buys “seeds, spat, spawn, or larvae,” from Washington, Oregon, California, and Hawaii



D. Key findings from tribal-focused food organizations:

- There was strong interest in creating a “tribally produced in Washington” type logo as a part of the WSDA Program
- The Intertribal Agriculture Council’s American Indian Food Program expressed interest in continuing to support Washington’s efforts and potential areas of collaboration should be further explored
- More time is needed to further engage specific tribes in Washington, especially in regard to program eligibility requirements

V. Contracted consumer research

At the time of this report being written, results from the contracted consumer research are not yet available. WSDA anticipates that more consumer surveys and focus groups will be necessary in the future.



Recommendations

The primary finding from WSDA research and stakeholder engagement is that there is broad stakeholder interest and support for development of a robust program along the lines that exist in other states — and that more time is needed to thoughtfully build out this program and carry out the legislative directives.

ESB 5341 and RCW 15.155 state that WSDA’s report to the legislature must include, but is not limited to, the Director’s and advisory committee’s recommendations on how to proceed or not proceed with developing and implementing the following program elements:

- a. Eligibility criteria
- b. Application and approval process
- c. Licensing fees and cost recovery mechanisms
- d. Creation and protection of logo or labels and trademark ownership or licensing rights
- e. Cooperative agreements to jointly carry out program or program-sanctioned activities
- f. Any other action designed to help Washington food and agricultural producers promote their products and make them more visible and appealing to consumers and more competitive in the local, regional, national, and international marketplace



Based on WSDA's research, input from the advisory committee, and broad stakeholder engagement and input, the WSDA Director recommends the following:

a. Eligibility criteria

The Program should include the following products:

- Fresh produce including fruits and vegetables
- Wheat and other grains
- Beef, pork, and other livestock products
- Poultry products and eggs
- Dairy products
- Honey
- Mushrooms
- Seafood and aquaculture products
- Beer/Wine/Spirits
- Non-alcoholic beverages
- Processed foods
- Cut flowers
- Christmas trees
- Plants and seeds
- Animal feed and pet food

There is clear agreement that produce included in the program be 100% grown in Washington state. More time is needed to further examine specifics related to the other product categories before defining precise eligibility criteria for each.

For example, more communication with industry stakeholders is needed to further define and develop the eligibility requirement for livestock. This includes where livestock is born, raised, grazed, fed, and processed; and parameters around percentage of life spent in Washington.

More time is also needed to determine an eligibility model for processed and manufactured foods. Although many other state programs use a percentage of ingredients grown within the state for this requirement, WSDA research found that using this framework can sometimes be confusing to program participants and consumers alike. WSDA staff will continue to review all possibilities and seek stakeholder input for refining the eligibility criteria.

The Program should initially exclude the following categories, with the understanding that these items may be included later:

- Hemp. The hemp industry is currently in flux with regard to state and federal regulations.
- Natural fibers and wax. Fiber or animal products such as leather, wool, yarn, or wax are sometimes processed in a way that results in a craft or textile-type product which can be difficult to track and authenticate.

b. Application and approval process

WSDA identified that more research is needed before defining a final application and approval process.

Based on review of other state programs and stakeholder input, WSDA is considering an application and approval process in which the applicant self-attests its qualification and commits to abide by program eligibility requirements, in combination with application review by program staff. This would occur on an annual basis with a requirement for returning participants to renew their participation through a streamlined process, ensuring that business information remains current with WSDA. The application process should be straightforward and easy to use and should communicate information to potential applicants regarding eligibility requirements, logo and licensing requirements, participation fee details, and offer an online way to pay for any program fees.

To support the management of the application and approval process, an additional FTE focused on outreach should be hired to perform recruitment of new participants and to manage the application and approval process.

The Program should create and maintain a stand-alone website that can house an online application as well as a stand-alone social media presence. WSDA should acquire and employ a data management software to support program functions.



c. Licensing fees and cost recovery mechanisms

The Program should charge participants a fee to participate.

In order to reduce barriers and support inclusive access to participation for as many farms and food businesses as possible, WSDA will explore varied levels of participation suitable for different categories or scales of participants, including a tiered-cost approach. For example, different participant categories might include: producer, processor, retail partner, distributor, or supporting organization such as a commodity commission.

The average cost to participate for individual producers should be relatively low, in the range of \$25–\$150 per year. Other categories of participation may be more, for example in a range from \$50–\$500 per year. WSDA needs to do more in-depth fiscal analysis and stakeholder testing to finalize participation tiers and costs.

Participants should have access to free marketing and promotional materials through the Program. In addition, offering a cost-share structure for some program services may also be an effective way to alleviate the burden to small-scale-producers. For example, the “Minnesota Grown” program offers a [cost-share program](#) when the “Minnesota Grown” logo is added to labels, signage, or packaging. Participants may be eligible to be reimbursed 50% of design and printing costs up to \$300. Additionally, another program offers 50% reimbursement to participants who perform website design, digital advertising, or e-commerce creation up to a maximum of \$3,000.

d. Creation and protection of logo or labels and trademark ownership or licensing rights

WSDA should contract with a qualified firm to help facilitate the creation and selection of the program name and logo(s) and to finalize the brand’s values. Consumer and producer surveys, focus groups, and other engagement opportunities will be necessary.

WSDA will consult with the Attorney General’s Office for work related to licensing agreements and trademarks. For example, as a requirement for participation in the Program, participants will likely be asked to sign a licensing agreement that includes a description of how the logo should or should not be used. Participants will have access to a digital logo for use on items such as a website, packaging, or signage in ways that are in compliance with the product eligibility criteria and other program requirements.

e. Cooperative agreements to jointly carry out program or program-sanctioned activities

The Program will investigate collaborations with a variety of organizations including but not limited to commodity commissions, other state and federal agencies, and existing marketing brands and promotion programs. More time is needed to further explore what these cooperative agreements may look like.

f. Any other action designed to help Washington food and agricultural producers promote their products and make them more visible and appealing to consumers and more competitive in the local, regional, national, and international marketplace

More time is needed to explore how other actions may assist program participants and Washington food and agricultural producers. Trade show type events, business-to-business opportunities, and other business development events are among a range of activities for the benefit of program participants that the Program may consider sometime in the future after the Program is established. The Program Administrator will continue to conduct outreach to stakeholders to best address this recommendation, especially with small-scale producers, grocery store leaders, and product buyers.



Budget Considerations:

In addition to the program elements, WSDA considered and sought input on the budget requirements for the Program.

Currently, the budget for this work sustains a Program Administrator (FTE) with very limited funds for other program needs such as contracting for professional marketing services, travel, and materials. The current budget is not sufficient to develop and sustain a program that meets the needs and opportunities identified by the advisory committee and expressed by program stakeholders.

Stakeholders communicated expectations for a wide range of Program offerings in-line with what other effective state programs provide. Effective programs maintain a mix of funding sources from state funds, federal grants, and participation fees. Individual producers pay an annual fee, with an understanding that these fees do not cover all program costs. Therefore, it is anticipated that what is needed is a mix of funding sources, including, but not limited to:

1. State funds to hire and sustain at least two FTEs, contracting services for marketing and promotions, website, supplies, and materials
2. Federal grants to support specific and targeted promotions (one example could be the USDA Specialty Crop Block Grant program)
3. Participant fees to recoup some program costs and demonstrate value in the Program

An initial budget that would be in line with other effective state marketing programs would likely be in the range of at least \$1–\$2 million per year. This budget would support what stakeholders expressed they want in an effective state program.

Next Steps

The Program Administrator will continue to conduct outreach and stakeholder engagement to finalize intended eligibility requirements, application process, and associated fees, which will then be formally established through the rule making process. WSDA will engage consulting firms to create the brand's values and logo(s), design marketing and promotional materials, and create a program website. The exact scope of this work will depend on securing the necessary funding.

A request for ongoing funding to implement and sustain the Program, based on the recommendations provided in this report, will be submitted to the legislature in 2025. In addition to requesting sustainable funding through the State General Fund, WSDA will also seek supplementary funds from sources such as federal grants for suitable marketing campaigns and promotional activities.

WSDA anticipates the Program will be officially opened to participants in 2025/2026.



Appendix A — Example Questions for Other State Marketing Programs

1. *When did your program start?*
2. *How many participants do you have in the program?*
3. *What are the benefits of the program for participants and the State?*
4. *What are some challenges you see with your current program?*
5. *What are the qualifications for being in the program — percent or geographic location?*
6. *What's the application process like for participants?*
7. *How do you assist historically disadvantaged participants to enter the program?*
8. *Do you collect annual financial or other data from participants?*
9. *How do you measure program effectiveness and success?*
10. *Would you have done anything differently when starting the program?*

Appendix B — Food Policy Forum Appointed Members

1. Aaron Czyzewski, Food Lifeline
2. Addie Candib, American Farmland Trust
3. Ali Jensen, Whatcom County Health Department
4. Amy Ellings, Washington State Department of Health
5. Aslan Meade, Thurston Economic Development Council
6. Babette Roberts, Washington Department of Social and Health Services
7. Brian Estes, LINC Foods
8. Brooklyn Holton, Initiative for Rural Innovation and Stewardship
9. Caleb Gwerder, Washington State Farm Bureau
10. Chad Kruger, Washington State University — CSANR
11. Chris Cary, Food Northwest
12. Chris Elder, Whatcom County Public Works
13. Chris Voigt, Washington State Potato Commission
14. Claire Lane, Washington State Anti-Hunger and Nutrition Coalition
15. Colleen Donovan, Washington State Farmers Market Association
16. Dan Wood, Washington State Dairy Federation
17. Dani Madrone, American Farmland Trust (alternate for Addie Candib)
18. Derek Sandison, Washington State Department of Agriculture
19. Diane Dempster, Clark County Food System Council
20. James Thompson, State Conservation Commission
21. Jamielyn Wheeler, Northwest Harvest
22. Jennifer Otten, University of Washington, Department of Food Systems, Nutrition, and Health
23. Jon DeVaney, Washington State Tree Fruit Association
24. Judy Warnick, Washington State Legislature
25. KayDee Gilkey, Washington Association of Wheat Growers (alternate for Michelle Hennings)
26. Kristine Perry Clark, County Food Systems Council (alternate for Diane Dempster)
27. Leanne Eko, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
28. Linda Neunzig, Snohomish County
29. Marcia Ostrom, Washington State University, Food Systems Program

30. Marie Spiker, UW Nutritional Sciences Program (alternate for Jennifer Otten)
31. Mary Dye, Washington State Legislature
32. Mary Embleton, King Conservation District
33. Melissa Spear, Tilth Alliance
34. Mia Gregerson, Washington State Legislature
35. Michelle Hennings, Washington Association of Wheat Growers
36. Nate Lewis, Washington Farmland Trust
37. Patrick “PJ” Cawley, Charlie’s Produce
38. Richard Conlin, Conlin Columbia Partnership for Cities
39. Tim Crosby, Thread Fund
40. Tina Sharp, Thurston Economic Development Council (alternate for Aslan Meade)
41. Tom Salzer, Washington Association of Conservation Districts
42. Yasmin Trudeau, Washington State Senate

Appendix C — Commodity Commissions and Industry Associations (Interviewed)

Washington Alfalfa Seed Commission

Washington Apple Commission

Washington Asparagus Commission

Washington State Beef Commission

Washington Cattlemen's Association

Washinton Cattle Feeders Association

Cattle Producers of Washington

Washington Brewers Guild

Washington Blueberry Commission

Northwest Cider Association

Washington Cranberry Commission

Washington Dairy Products Commission

Washington State Beekeepers Association

Washington State Hay Growers Association

Washington State Hop Commission

Washington State Mint Commission

Washington Oilseeds Commission

Washington Potato and Onion Association

Pacific Northwest Vegetable Association

Pear Bureau Northwest

Washinton Pork Producers

Washinton State Potato Commission

Washington Pulse Crops Commission

Washington Red Raspberry Commission

Washington Seed Potato Commission

Washington State Sheep Producers

Washington State Tree Fruit Association

Washington State Fruit Commission

Washington Turfgrass Seed Commission

Washington Association of Wheat Growers

Washington Grain Commission

Washington State Wine Commission

Washington Wine Institute

Washington Wine Growers Association

USA Pears

USA Pulses

Appendix D — Example Questions for Commodity Commissions and Industry Associations

1. *What is your familiarity with the new WSDA Promotions and Labeling Program?*
2. *How many growers, producers, or members does your organization represent?*
3. *How would you describe the current marketing and advertising of these products within your organization or other organizations? What's working well? Which areas need more support?*
4. *As we are examining eligibility requirements for products that are grown, raised, caught, and produced in Washington, do you have any suggestions or input for these eligibility requirements for your industry's products and other products?*
5. *Any thoughts on how WSDA should monitor and enforce eligibility requirements?*
6. *Any thoughts on cross-border production/processing? (Between other states, other countries?)*
7. *Would your industry support a brand/program if the requirement was 100% grown and processed in Washington?*
8. *What should the application process look like?*
9. *What are some potential benefits of the WSDA Program for your industry group?*
10. *Should this WSDA program charge participants?*
11. *Do you think the new WSDA statewide effort will be helpful for your organization?*
12. *Are there other organizations that cover your industry we should be talking to?*
13. *Is there any other feedback you'd like to share with us related to the new statewide Program?*

Appendix E — Agricultural and Food Promotion Organizations (Interviewed)

AgForestry Leadership Program

Black Food Sovereignty Coalition

Charlie's Produce

Eat Local First Collaborative

Food Northwest

Genine Skagit Valley

Gorge Grown Food Network

Island Grown in the San Juans

Kitsap Fresh

Northwest Agriculture Business Center

Northwest Food Hub Network

Okanogan Conservation District

Pike Place Market

Puget Sound Food Hub

Seattle Good Business Network

Seattle Made

Seattle Neighborhood Farmers Markets

Seattle Wholesale Growers Cooperative

Spokane Conservation District

Spokane Farm Corridor

Southwest Washington Food Hub and Grain Co-op

Thurston Conservation District

Viva Farms

Walla Walla Food Hub

Washington Farm Bureau

Washington Farmer Veteran Coalition

Washington Food Industry Association

Washington State Farmers Market Association

Washington State Department of Veterans Affairs

Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

Whatcom Conservation District

Washington Grown

Washington State Department of Agriculture – Animal Health

Washington State Department of Agriculture – Farm to School

Washington State Department of Agriculture – Hemp Licensing

Washington State Department of Agriculture – International Marketing

Washington State Department of Agriculture – Meat and Poultry Assistance

Washington State Department of Agriculture – Small and Direct Marketing Farm Assistance

We Buy Wa!

Whidbey Island Grown

Appendix F — Seafood Marketing Meeting Participating Organizations

C&H Smoked Fish

Chinook WA Fisherman

Columbia River Crab Fishermen's Association

Deep Sea Fishermen's Union

Drake Teal Fisheries

Gillnet Fisheries

Loki Fish Company

Marine Stewardship Council

Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Pacific Coast Shellfish Growers Association

PCC Markets

Port of Bellingham and Bellingham Dockside Market

Port of Grays Harbor/Westport Marina

Ring Consulting

South Bend Products Retail Market

Sustainable Connections/Eat Local First

The Nature Conservancy

Townsend Fisherman

University of Washington

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Washington Sea Grant

Washington State Department of Agriculture

Whatcom Working Waterfront

West Coast Seafood Processors Association

West Port Seafood

Willapa Grays Harbor Oyster Growers Association