

Discussion Points

1. According to the Food Research and Action Center (FRAC), for the 2011-2012 school year, New Jersey ranked 46th nationwide for its participation rate of low-income students in the School Breakfast Program. FRAC estimates that school districts would collect approximately \$21.7 million more annually in federal reimbursement grants if schools increase student participation to the extent that 60 percent of students who receive school lunch also receive breakfast at school. According to the key performance indicators, the department's target was for six percent growth in the breakfast program for FY 2013 and another two percent growth in FY 2014.

Question: *What actions did the department undertake to increase the number of school breakfasts served by six percent in FY 2013? Is that goal being met? What is the long-term goal? Why is the target only increasing by two percent for FY 2014?*

Response: In the state of New Jersey, we provide guidance to schools and encourage them to participate in the Breakfast Program. We have materials with sample menus, the menu pattern, and we provide various options on how schools can serve breakfast. In New Jersey, we have joined efforts with the Department of Education to count the time dedicated to serve breakfast as instructional.

In doing so, New Jersey has become one of only five states nationally to revise its regulations to allow for breakfast in the classroom to count as instructional time.

“Breakfast After the Bell” is one of the most successful options in use and has facilitated increased participation in the program. There was an increase from 48th to 46th on the FRAC report, we will continue efforts to increase program participation and welcome your support.

There are a number of factors why there is not an expectation that the increase will be more significant in FY14. USDA's HHHKA (Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act) requires schools to make changes in the SBP beginning FY14. Local level support is a key factor in driving up participation in the program.

Question: *Does the department consider the current participation rate a problem? If so, what additional measures is the department considering to help school districts increase the participation of low-income students in the School Breakfast Program and in prompting more schools to participate in the program?*

Response: Though we have seen significant increases in program participation, the Department strives for even greater participation in the upcoming years. We are currently revising the initial letter sent at the beginning of the school year to schools that have reached 20-percent free and

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

reduced participation in their lunch programs in an effort to help them better develop plans for introducing a school breakfast program. Schools should indicate how they plan to implement breakfast and the NJDA will provide assistance toward the development of those programs.

In addition, we are going to be focusing on schools that are currently in the SBP and have low participation. We will request that they provide corrective action plans, describing how they will modify current operations to increase participation. We will provide guidance and best practices from districts that have succeeded with breakfast after the bell serving options.

Lastly, New Jersey was selected as one of 10 states eligible for the School Breakfast Program Expansion Grants. This is for a school or group of schools to apply to establish or expand school breakfast opportunities. This is a great opportunity for us to continue with breakfast expansion initiatives. We will be applying for this grant. Congress appropriated \$1 million for these grants.

2. The New Jersey Fresh Mobiles Pilot Program Act was enacted on January 17, 2012 to provide improved access to fresh produce for residents of urban "food desert" communities in the State – i.e., communities in which residents have little or no access to fresh produce or other nutritious foods, due to an absence of supermarkets, grocery stores, and farmers' markets. Last year the City of Camden was selected to participate in the pilot program.

Question: *Please provide an update on how the implementation is proceeding and what has been accomplished thus far. Are there any funding concerns with the program?*

Response: The Department helped the City of Camden to create and issue an RFP, and to review the responses to it, seeking a non-profit agency to operate the Fresh Mobile. Only one entity, The Camden City Garden Club Inc., responded to the RFP and was chosen by the City of Camden to be the operator of the first Fresh Mobile. Subsequently, the Camden City Garden Club obtained funding through Wal-Mart Inc. for the purchase of a vehicle. The Department of Agriculture aims to help the City and Garden Club have the Fresh Mobile operating for this coming produce season.

Question: *Have other locations been selected to participate in the program yet?*

Response: No. Being a pilot program, the Department's current plan is to review how the non-profit in Camden operates for one year and to evaluate what works and what doesn't in the program and then to determine the prospects for expansion, including which other locations should be selected.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

3. The State is almost out of money to continue the preservation of farmland. Virtually all the funds remaining in the Farmland Preservation Program have been allocated. According to NJ Keep It Green, an advocacy group for establishing a dedicated preservation funding source, New Jersey has at least an additional 350,000 acres of farmland that need to be preserved to maintain a viable agriculture industry in the State.

Question: *What is the current financial status of the Farmland Preservation Program and what are its spending projections during FY 2014?*

Response: The public's investment in the Farmland Preservation Program is currently funded from three State sources: Remaining Garden State Farmland Preservation Trust funds, the 2007 Farmland Preservation Fund and the 2009 Farmland Preservation Fund, in partnership with federal, county, municipal and nonprofit funds. The State resources provide for administration of the Farmland Preservation Program and the preservation of farmland through the following farmland preservation programs: the County Easement Purchase Program, the County Planning Incentive Grant Program, the Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program, the Nonprofit Grant Program and the State Acquisition Program. On average, for every \$1 of State funding spent, another 50 cents is contributed by our county, municipal, federal and nonprofit partners, creating a powerful leveraging opportunity for State dollars.

The Garden State Farmland Preservation Trust Fund has a balance of \$47.3 million with \$26.8 million of that obligated for projects that have been granted final approval by the State Agriculture Development Committee. An estimated \$17.9 million is projected to be expended in the remainder of FY 2013 and \$19 million is projected to be expended in FY 2014.

A total of \$73 million was appropriated from the 2007 Farmland Preservation Fund in August 2009. Of that, \$51 million has been expended, leaving a balance of \$22 million. Now, \$4.6 million of the balance is obligated for projects that have been granted final approval by the State Agriculture Development Committee. The remaining balance will be used to fund active projects and the administration of the Farmland Preservation Program. An estimated \$3.3 million is projected to be expended in the remainder of FY 2013 and \$10.2 million is projected to be expended in FY 2014.

The 2009 Farmland Preservation Fund has had two appropriations of \$73 million each in August 2011 and January 2013. A total of \$9.2 million has been expended, leaving a balance of \$136.8 million; \$16.1 million of the balance is obligated for projects that have received final approval by the State Agriculture Development Committee. The remaining balance will be used to

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

fund active projects and the administration of the Farmland Preservation Program. An estimated \$9 million is projected to be expended in FY 2013, and \$25 million is projected to be expended in FY 2014.

Question: *Does the department agree with the target of 350,000 additional acres?*

Response: Currently, there are an estimated 730,000 acres of farmland in New Jersey, of which approximately 200,000 acres have been permanently protected under the State's Farmland Preservation Program. It is difficult to identify with any level of precision the number of acres that will be needed to support a strong and viable agricultural industry in the future. It is clear, however, that with only about one quarter of our existing farmland base permanently protected, continuing the preservation of farmland through the State's Farmland Preservation Program, in combination with other complementary preservation tools, will continue to be vitally important.

Question: *What is the estimated amount the department believes needs to be appropriated to fund the Farmland Preservation Program over the next five fiscal years? Does the department have a plan for a dedicated funding source for the program?*

Response: The Department believes there are sufficient funds available to sustain current program activity through FY15. From FY1999 thru FY2008, the program received an average of approximately \$84 million per year in new program appropriations through the Garden State Preservation Trust (GSPT) Fund. From FY2009-FY2013, the program has received approximately half (\$44 million) that amount, as GSPT funds were depleted and the State used bond funds approved by the voters in 2007 and 2009 to support the program, which created an every-other-year appropriation cycle (FY09, FY11, FY13). In order to sustain program momentum and meet preservation needs, the program will need an additional infusion of funds.

The Department recognizes that farmland preservation funding needs must be balanced with other State funding needs, particularly given the State's fiscal constraints, and is coordinating with relevant State Offices in the identification of a sustainable funding source for a long term strategy of open space and farmland preservation.

4. In October, Hurricane Sandy caused unprecedented and widespread devastation to the State. Last year in response to questions about storm damage, the department noted particular issues under federal programs for growers of specialty crops and the department highlighted its role intervening with the electric utilities.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

Question: *What financial and operational impacts did the storm and associated flooding have on farms, livestock, and crops in the State? What is the estimated total amount of loss to farmers?*

Response: The timing of Sandy's arrival (late-October), as well as its position traveling up the coastline instead of turning in toward the more agricultural western counties, meant that many of New Jersey's seasonal crops had already been harvested, so there was less crop loss from storm damage than there was under Hurricane Irene, which hit in late-August and made a more-inland track. However, that does not mean New Jersey farmers escaped completely unscathed from Superstorm Sandy.

According to the federal USDA-Farm Service Agency (FSA) New Jersey Office, farmers reported \$5.18 million worth of damage. This included some late-season crops being lost as well as damage to farm structures resulting from falling trees and high winds. Heavy damage was also felt in the aquaculture sector, which was particularly vulnerable due to its position on the coastline. Two shellfish hatcheries experienced near 100-percent damage, and the remaining five were impacted to a lesser degree. This a projected possible loss of 30 percent to 40 percent of plantable clam seed for the 2013 growing season, which will need to be met by out-of-state imports unless temporary production sites can be built in the next few months.

Question: *What federal and State programs are available to help farmers recover from the damage they sustained? How much money is expected to be made available and are those funds sufficient to cover the losses?*

Response: For the farm community, disaster aid would come mainly from the USDA-FSA New Jersey office. Typically, that assistance would come in the form of low-interest loans made through the FSA.

Efforts are ongoing to see if certain USDA practices can be pursued for helping aquaculture operators, especially since their facilities were located in some of the hardest-hit locales. A dollar amount of funds to be made available has not been disclosed at this time. It is known that an earlier exploration of Small Business Administration (SBA) funds potentially available for aquaculture operators showed limited availability of funding at only 1% of the loss sustained due to the SBA's rules and regulations.

Question: *In the wake of Sandy, have the electric utilities sufficiently responded to the needs of the farmers?*

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

Response: As in Hurricane Irene in 2011, farmers in Superstorm Sandy also faced difficulty in having electric power restored in a timely manner. The overwhelming majority of calls received by the NJDA desk at the ROIC in the aftermath of Sandy, as in Irene, were from small family farmers who had livestock on their properties and could not pump water for their animals due to lack of electricity. As in Irene, the Department worked with volunteer fire companies in several areas to deliver large amounts of water to those farms to water their livestock. The nature of how power is restored, with the emphasis of getting the greatest number of customers back on line as quickly as possible, typically means urbanized areas with dense populations will be targeted first, while the sparsely populated agricultural areas will be toward the end of the line. The Department is currently exploring the possibility of using federal funds from USDA or FEMA to purchase emergency generators that could be taken to farms to tide the farmers over until power is restored.

Question: *What steps, if any, is the department taking to help farmers prepare for and deal with future weather-related catastrophes?*

Response: As mentioned above, the Department is exploring emergency power options that could help farmers while they wait for utility power to be restored. Additionally, starting with Superstorm Sandy, the Department established a quick-response process by which the presidents of the 20 county boards of agriculture (Hudson County has no such board), along with leaders of other agricultural groups and Rutgers Extension join on a conference call with the Department to report the major damage they have seen or have been made aware of in their counties. This allowed for a speedier and more targeted response to specific problems on agricultural properties in the wake of Sandy and has become a permanent part of how the Department responds to such emergencies. The Department also collaborated with New Jersey Farm Bureau on the submission of four other proposals to the Food and Agriculture Sector Working Group at OHSP (Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness) that would help farmers affected by storms like Sandy. These proposals range from help in finding markets for farmers if retailers they traditionally sell to sustain severe damage by a disaster to working with Rutgers to determine if saltwater intrusion from a tidal surge may have affected the farmers' soil and/or groundwater.

5. The federal Budget Control Act mandates across-the-board reductions to mandatory and discretionary programs that could affect the department's programs and services, many of which are federally-funded.

Question: *How will the reduction in federal funds affect the department and its constituencies? What measures could and would the department take*

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

to close the funding gap? Would any programs or services be reduced or eliminated?

Response: Although no programs or services will be eliminated, the following programs will see a reduction under these federal across-the-board measures:

Regulatory and Surveillance Programs:

CAPS (Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey) potential reduction of 7.4% of the program or \$8,400. This would provide less funding for the Department to conduct plant, pest and disease control surveys for our agricultural communities.

Promotion of Agriculture Programs:

Specialty Crop Grants potential reduction of 5.1% of the grant program, or \$42,000, which will result in reduced grant awards to our agricultural constituency for research and promotion of specialty crop products. Specialty crops include fruits and vegetables, tree nuts, dried fruits and horticultural and nursery products.

The Department is monitoring the impact of these reductions. To the best of our information, no other programs of the Department will be affected under these stop-gap measures.

6. In January 2012, legislation was adopted that permitted New Jersey wineries to expand sales through direct shipping to New Jersey and out-of-State customers and licensed retailers.

Question: *How much revenue can the State expect to collect from the various taxes and licensure fees from this expansion of sales for FY 2014 and subsequent years? How will this revenue be used?*

Response: The New Jersey Department of Agriculture does not monitor wine sales, or the revenue collected by various taxes and licensure fees. This information is collected by the Department of Treasury.

7. Funding for the Hunger Initiative/Food Assistance Program that provides grants to Emergency Feeding Organizations for food assistance to needy residents has not increased in the last three years, even though the number of needy families and individuals has increased according to those organizations.

- **Question:** *Please provide a list of grants awarded or scheduled to be awarded thus far under the program including the organization name,*

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

location served, and number of clients served each month. Also, please provide a categorical breakdown of the pounds of food purchased and their origins.

Response: These grants are awarded to the six Emergency Feeding Organizations (EFOs) located throughout the State. Please refer to three (3) attached Excel spreadsheets that identify these organizations and the projected State Food Purchase Program payment summaries the Department projects. The charts will also detail the recipient service information by county for SFY 12 and 13 and the total monthly/annual pounds of food purchased by the EFO.

Question: How does the recommended budget amount compare with the increased program need or demand for food assistance?

Response: This year, EFOs received higher than expected generous private food donations due to Superstorm Sandy relief efforts. Additionally, there was a 3% increase in Federal donated TEFAP food commodities made available/received during FFY13.

The reasons behind the reduced SFPP numbers may be as a result of higher than expected generous private food donations received by the EFOs due to Superstorm Sandy relief efforts combined with the 3-percent increase in Federal donated TEFAP food commodities made available or received by the EFOs through the NJDA during FFY13. These food donations have helped the EFOs continue operating within their own financial needs.

8. In the FY 2014 recommended budget, the budgeted amount for the Division of Marketing and Development Services has been reduced by \$50,000 from \$752,000 to \$702,000.

Question: Please explain why this line item was reduced and describe impact the reduction will have on the marketing and regulatory services that the department provides to the agricultural community and the public.

Response: Reduction was made to the Jersey Fresh line item appropriation in the amount of \$50,000. The Department assessed its dedicated and federal funding and felt that this amount could be reasonably reduced to the Direct State Services budget without impacting the program. The Department will use dedicated and federal funding to offset this reduction and will provide the same level of service to our constituency within the new allocation.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

9. The budget proposal increases the total number of funded positions for the department from 207 positions in FY 2013 to 216 positions for FY 2014, an increase of nine additional positions.

Question: *Please explain the need for this staff increase. What are the titles and salary levels of the positions? How will they be funded and where will they be placed within the department? Will they be permanent full-time positions or temporary?*

Response: The question proposed seeks a comparison of Filled positions to those authorized and funded. Positions detailed in the budget document, page D-18, reflect the amount of filled positions in the NJDA as of the printing of the budget document.

The Department is authorized to fill up to 91 state funded positions, a figure that has been consistent since FY12. As a comparison, the Department's state funded positions in FY08 were 135. Since that time, the Department has left some state funded positions unfilled and has shifted others to federal and nonstate funding sources.

In FY14, the Department plans to hire 3 additional state funded positions to replace staff that have retired or transferred from Department service.

In addition, 59 positions paid entirely from federal resources (both salary and fringe benefits) and 66 positions paid from dedicated revenues and grants are included in our target allocation.

The increase of 4 federal positions and 7 dedicated positions are the result of expanded program support on the federal level and the ability of the Department to find alternate funding for increased staffing from dedicated resources.

The four positions hired with federal funds are in response to a federal program audit that determined USDA supported programs were understaffed.

It should be noted that funding for these positions is also inclusive of the correlating fringe benefits associated with these positions, approximately \$30,000 per new hire, that will not be charged to state appropriations.

All will be permanent full-time positions.

By our core mission areas, they will be allocated as follows:

Regulatory and Surveillance:

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

Horticulturist	Plant Industry	\$57,000
Veterinarian	Animal Health	\$72,000
Secretarial Assistant	Animal Health	\$57,000

Feeding the Food Insecure:

Legal Assistant	Food & Nutrition	\$60,000
Nutrition Program Specialist	Food & Nutrition	\$66,000
Grants Manager	Food & Nutrition	\$75,000

Preservation and Conservation:

Agricultural Resource Specialist	SADC	\$65,000
Technician, MIS	Ag & Natural Res	\$56,000

Promotion of Agriculture:

Coordinator of Agricultural Development	Markets	\$75,000
---	---------	----------

BFY 2013 STATE FOOD PURCHASE PROGRAM
EFO RECIPIENT SERVICE \$s BY COUNTY

COUNTY	COMMUNITY FOOD BANK		FOOD BANK OF SJ		FB MONMOUTH & OCEAN		MERCER STREET FRIENDS		NORWESCAP		SOUTHERN REGIONAL FDC		EFO TOTALS	
	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE
Atlantic	852,311	213,078	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18,639	4,660	870,950	217,738
Bergen	80,661	20,165	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,661	20,165
Burlington	245	61	181,062	45,266	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	181,307	45,327
Camden	-	-	351,439	87,860	-	-	-	-	-	-	206,990	51,748	558,429	139,607
Cape May	124,441	31,110	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,561	2,640	135,002	33,751
Cumberland	223,414	55,854	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	115,572	28,893	339,986	84,747
Essex	962,073	240,518	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	962,073	240,518
Gloucester	2,454	614	80,179	20,195	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,029	2,007	91,262	22,816
Hudson	447,065	111,766	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	447,065	111,766
Hunterdon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	116,576	29,144	-	116,576	29,144
Mercer	-	-	-	-	-	-	732,037	183,009	-	-	2,486	622	734,523	183,631
Middlesex	396,688	99,172	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	396,688	99,172
Monmouth	3,311	828	-	-	608,412	152,103	-	-	-	-	-	-	611,723	152,931
Morris	226,611	56,653	-	-	-	-	-	-	325	131	-	-	227,136	56,784
Ocean	-	-	-	-	437,866	109,467	-	-	-	-	-	-	437,866	109,467
Passaic	608,927	152,232	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	608,927	152,232
Salem	16,172	4,043	22,109	5,527	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,518	1,130	42,799	10,700
Somerset	42,360	10,590	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42,360	10,590
Sussex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88,297	22,074	-	-	88,297	22,074
Union	314,036	78,509	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	314,036	78,509
Warren	137,478	34,370	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	137,478	34,370
EFO RECIPIENT SVC #	4,438,247	1,109,562	635,389	158,847	1,046,278	261,570	732,037	183,009	205,398	51,350	366,795	91,699	7,424,144	1,956,036
TOTALS														

BFY 2012 STATE FOOD PURCHASE PROGRAM
EFO RECIPIENT SERVICE \$s BY COUNTY

COUNTY	COMMUNITY FOOD BANK		FOOD BANK OF SJ		FB MONMOUTH & OCEAN		MERCER STREET FRIENDS		NORWESCAP		SOUTHERN REGIONAL FDC		EFO TOTALS	
	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE	ANNUAL	QUARTERLY AVERAGE
Atlantic	919,096	229,774	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18,600	4,650	937,696	234,424
Bergen	66,538	16,635	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66,538	16,635
Burlington	4,226	1,057	303,190	75,798	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	307,416	76,854
Camden	-	-	572,249	143,062	-	-	-	-	-	-	221,203	55,301	793,452	198,363
Cape May	107,473	26,868	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,476	1,869	114,949	28,737
Cumberland	267,120	66,780	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	117,110	29,278	384,230	96,058
Essex	952,922	238,231	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	952,922	238,231
Gloucester	1,062	266	67,959	16,990	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,082	771	72,103	18,026
Hudson	483,908	120,977	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	483,908	120,977
Hunterdon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	129,850	32,463
Mercer	-	-	-	-	-	-	775,279	193,820	-	-	3,346	837	778,625	194,656
Middlesex	418,121	104,530	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	418,121	104,530
Monmouth	34,949	8,737	-	-	678,512	169,628	-	-	-	-	-	-	713,461	178,365
Morris	168,312	42,078	-	-	-	-	-	-	486	122	-	-	168,798	42,200
Ocean	-	-	-	-	472,530	118,133	-	-	-	-	-	-	472,530	118,133
Passaic	583,374	145,844	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	583,374	145,844
Salem	17,886	4,472	46,715	11,679	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,752	1,938	72,353	18,088
Somerset	43,185	10,796	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43,185	10,796
Sussex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94,312	23,578	-	-	94,312	23,578
Union	283,070	70,768	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	283,070	70,768
Warren	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	130,738	32,685	-	-	130,738	32,685
EFO RECIPIENT SVC #	4,351,242	1,087,811	990,113	247,528	1,151,042	287,761	775,279	193,820	355,386	88,847	378,569	94,642	8,001,631	2,000,408

**BFY 2013 STATE FOOD PURCHASE PROGRAM
EFOs LBS OF FOOD PURCHASED BY MONTH**

EFO NAME	JULY 2012 LBS.		AUG 2012 LBS.		SEPT 2012 LBS.		OCT 2012 LBS.		NOV 2012 LBS.		DEC 2012 LBS.		JAN 2013 LBS.		FEB 2013 LBS.		MAR 2013 LBS.		APR 2013 LBS.		MAY 2013 LBS.		JUNE 2013 LBS.		FY13 TOTAL PURCHASED		FY13 TOTAL		
	PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED		PURCHASED				
COMMUNITY FB	309,380	645,943	435,500	194,682	730,806	332,348	320,127	260,096	271,836	511,853	499,629	527,253	5,039,453	419,954															
FB SOUTH JERSEY	14,800	63,585	82,970	4,460	152,968	62,620	36,608	66,379	91,810	30,942	37,900	50,395	695,437	57,953															
FB MONMOUTH & OCEAN	107,674	91,290	86,150	52,530	52,644	22,000	30,500	22,000	29,705	57,003	154,288	79,846	785,630	65,469															
MERCER STREET FRIENDS	42,649	28,913	15,528	42,175	72,200	7,735	8,768	17,205	5,506	10,525	3,718	43,099	298,021	24,835															
NORWESCAP	30,566	26,970	19,290	35,385	13,770		24,300	14,001	13,950	16,200	30,064	26,040	250,536	20,878															
SOUTHERN REGIONAL FDC	24,180	21,515	45,369	33,000	65,244	26,825	3,955	40,000	27,050	1,875	42,235	55,733	386,981	32,248															
TOTAL LBS. PURCHASED (ALL)	529,249	878,216	694,807	362,232	1,087,632	451,528	424,258	419,681	439,857	628,398	767,834	782,366	7,456,058	621,338															
NOTE (*) # OF LBS. PURCHASED LISTED ABOVE FOR MARCH THROUGH JUNE 2013 ARE "ESTIMATED" AS THE EFO MARCH 13 - JUNE 13 MONTHLY SPPP PURCHASE REPORTS ARE NOT YET AVAILABLE																													

BFY 2012 STATE FOOD PURCHASE PROGRAM
EFOs LBS OF FOOD PURCHASED BY MONTH

EFO NAME	JULY '11 LBS. PURCHASED	AUG '11 LBS. PURCHASED	SEPT '11 LBS. PURCHASED	OCT '11 LBS. PURCHASED	NOV '11 LBS. PURCHASED	DEC '11 LBS. PURCHASED	JAN '12 LBS. PURCHASED	FEB '12 LBS. PURCHASED	MAR '12 LBS. PURCHASED	APR '12 LBS. PURCHASED	MAY '12 LBS. PURCHASED	JUNE '12 LBS. PURCHASED	FY12 TOTAL PURCHASED	FY'12 TOTAL	FY'12 TOTAL 12 MO. AVER
COMMUNITY FB	292,173	536,970	688,196	827,587	368,480	362,900	425,950	397,360	271,836	511,853	499,629	527,253	5,710,187	5,710,187	475,849
FB SOUTH JERSEY	121,249	133,405	45,567	35,920	224,419	66,677	-	39,278	91,810	30,942	37,900	50,395	877,562	877,562	73,130
FB MONMOUTH & OCEAN	17,270	83,246	186,101	94,960	158,850	36,500	-	45,857	29,705	57,003	154,288	79,846	943,626	943,626	78,636
MERCER STREET FRIENDS	43,985	16,860	31,323	44,078	51,047	28,720	26,838	60,459	10,525	3,718	43,089	17,442	378,094	378,094	31,508
NORWESCAP	19,107	14,845	12,728	20,352	13,140	8,100	32,190	18,265	13,950	16,200	30,064	26,040	224,981	224,981	18,748
SOUTHERN REGIONAL FDC	-	30,363	36,130	40,815	26,235	23,051	-	19,989	27,050	1,875	42,235	55,733	303,476	303,476	25,290
TOTAL LBS. PURCHASED (ALL)	493,784	815,689	1,000,045	1,063,712	842,171	525,948	484,978	581,208	444,876	621,591	807,215	756,709	8,437,926	8,437,926	703,161

BFY 2012 STATE FOOD PURCHASE PROGRAM
EFO FOOD PURCHASE AND ADMIN PAYMENT SUMMARY BY COUNTY

COUNTY	CFB	FBSJ	FBMOC	MSF	NORWESCAP	SRFDC	COUNTY PAYMENT TOTALS	NOTE
Atlantic	\$ 289,364.28	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,897.73	\$ 295,262.01	
Bergen	\$ 396,133.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 396,133.25	
Burlington	\$ 3,428.09	\$ 245,201.24	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 248,629.33	
Camden	\$ -	\$ 410,933.91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 154,576.70	\$ 565,510.61	
Cape May	\$ 83,726.01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,661.25	\$ 89,387.26	
Cumberland	\$ 164,176.53	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72,304.82	\$ 236,481.35	
Essex	\$ 1,044,200.92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,044,200.92	
Gloucester	\$ 2,495.51	\$ 183,609.93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,741.28	\$ 194,846.72	
Hudson	\$ 806,798.32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 806,798.32	
Hunterdon	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,092.50		\$ 36,092.50	
Mercer	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 294,955.68	\$ -	\$ 1,279.08	\$ 296,234.76	
Middlesex	\$ 452,835.76	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 452,835.76	
Monmouth	\$ 15,712.59	\$ -	\$ 297,305.13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 313,017.72	
Morris	\$ 167,544.15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 545.55	\$ -	\$ 168,089.70	
Ocean	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 416,441.91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 416,441.91	
Passaic	\$ 680,408.27	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 680,408.27	
Salem	\$ 17,269.13	\$ 43,632.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,204.94	\$ 69,106.72	
Somerset	\$ 129,839.34	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 129,839.34	
Sussex	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,713.23	\$ -	\$ 63,713.23	
Union	\$ 202,428.21	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 202,428.21	
Warren	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,153.11	\$ -	\$ 39,153.11	
EFO PYMT TOTALS	\$ 4,456,360.36	\$ 883,377.73	\$ 713,747.04	\$ 294,955.68	\$ 139,504.39	\$ 256,665.80	\$ 6,744,611.00	*
*NOTE - OF THE \$6,818,000 SFPP GRANT AWARD, THE NJDA ISSUED FOOD PURCHASE & ADMIN PAYMENTS TO THE 6 EFOs TOTALING \$6,744,611 WITH \$73,389 AWARDED TO SFPP-GLEANING SUPPORT (FARMERS AGAINST HUNGER & GROW IT GREEN MORRISTOWN)								
EFO NAME ABBREVIATIONS:								
CFB - COMMUNITY FOOD BANK OF NJ								
FBSJ- FOOD BANK OF SOUTH JERSEY								
FBMOC-FOOD BANK OF MONMOUTH & OCEAN COUNTIES								
NORWESCAP -NORTHWEST NJ COMMUNITY ACTION PARTNERSHIP								
SRFDC - SOUTHERN REGIONAL FOOD DISTRIBUTION CENTER								

BFY 2013 STATE FOOD PURCHASE PROGRAM
EFO FOOD PURCHASE/ADMIN PAYMENT SUMMARY BY COUNTY

COUNTY	CFB	FBSJ	FBMOC	MSF	NORWESCAP	SRFDC	COUNTY PAYMENT TOTALS	NOTES
Atlantic	\$ 295,863.54	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,446.46	\$ 302,310.00	
Bergen	\$ 388,300.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 388,300.40	
Burlington	\$ 288.50	\$ 247,269.81	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 247,558.31	
Camden	\$ -	\$ 352,371.38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 212,746.78	\$ 565,118.16	
Cape May	\$ 87,553.72	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,371.62	\$ 94,925.34	
Cumberland	\$ 156,261.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 80,883.41	\$ 237,145.40	
Essex	\$ 1,027,854.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,027,854.00	
Gloucester	\$ 5,579.82	\$ 171,873.23	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,368.94	\$ 194,821.99	
Hudson	\$ 806,160.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 806,160.00	
Hunterdon	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,590.00	\$ -	\$ 33,590.00	
Mercer	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 294,580.74	\$ -	\$ 1,011.26	\$ 295,592.00	
Middlesex	\$ 450,106.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 450,106.00	
Monmouth	\$ 1,673.60	\$ -	\$ 309,369.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 311,043.40	
Morris	\$ 162,815.15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 365.05	\$ -	\$ 163,180.20	
Ocean	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 436,670.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 436,670.00	
Passaic	\$ 684,026.76	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 684,026.76	
Salem	\$ 26,707.35	\$ 35,745.51	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,414.34	\$ 69,867.20	
Somerset	\$ 125,559.44	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125,559.44	
Sussex	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,462.00	\$ -	\$ 60,462.00	
Union	\$ 188,104.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 188,104.00	
Warren	\$ 35,605.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,605.40	
EFO PYMT TOTALS	\$ 4,442,459.67	\$ 807,259.93	\$ 746,039.80	\$ 294,580.74	\$ 94,417.05	\$ 333,242.81	\$ 6,718,000.00	*
*NOTE - OF THE \$6,818,000 SFPP GRANT AWARD, THE NJDA ISSUED FOOD PURCHASE & ADMIN PAYMENTS TO THE 6 EFOs								
TOTALING \$6,718,000 WITH \$100,000 ISSUED FOR SFPP-GLEANING SUPPORT TO FARMERS AGAINST HUNGER								
EFO NAME ABBREVIATIONS:								
CFB - COMMUNITY FOOD BANK OF NJ								
FBSJ- FOOD BANK OF SOUTH JERSEY								
FBMOC-FOOD BANK OF MONMOUTH & OCEAN COUNTIES								
NORWESCAP -NORTHWEST NJ COMMUNITY ACTION PARTNERSHIP								
SRFDC - SOUTHERN REGIONAL FOOD DISTRIBUTION CENTER								