

In Conversation with Mark Bittman



By Mairead Dolan, UCLA Law '16

On April 2nd, the Resnick Program for Food Law and Policy hosted an evening with Mark Bittman, a journalist, food advocate, and the best-selling author of many cookbooks, including *How to Cook Everything*, and *VB6: Eat Vegan Before Six*. At the

event, Kim Kessler, the Policy and Special Programs Director for the Resnick Program, interviewed Bittman about his work, his life, and his ideas for the future of our food system. Bittman's philosophy on healthy eating is simple: eat real food. Bittman recommends we should eat more plants and less junk. This, he suggests, has nothing to do with buying organic, or shopping exclusively at Whole Foods. It really is as simple as it sounds: more plants and less junk.

Bittman also described his experiences writing and adhering to the principles laid out in *VB6*, his thoughts on advocating for a more sustainable food system, and he even discussed the merits and shortfalls of the term "foodie." Perhaps most surprising was Bittman's response to an audience member's question regarding GMOs. Here, Bittman admitted that there may indeed be a place for GMOs in our global food system. Unfortunately though, as Bittman pointed out, GMOs have largely been used by corporations for the sole purpose of maximizing profits. Instead of advancing sustainable agriculture, the companies' use of GMO technology has accelerated industrial agriculture and its corresponding problems.

Following the conversation, audience members attended a networking reception. There, students bumped elbows with professors, alumni, journalists, and some of the foremost food advocates and food thinkers in Los Angeles. Attendees included environmentalists, health care workers, and curious students. The reception arguably could be better described as an impromptu think tank, which was an excellent conclusion to the evening.

2014 UCLA-Harvard Conference "Transparency In The Global Food System: What Information And To What Ends?"

Last October the Resnick Program for Food Law and Policy and The Food Law Lab at Harvard Law School held their first annual joint conference at the UCLA Faculty Center. The sold-out conference was attended by 160 people, including many academics, students, and practitioners.

We were honored to have Dr. David A. Kessler, former United States FDA Commissioner and current professor at UC San Francisco School of Medicine, deliver the keynote address. Three conference panels addressed issues of insufficient transparency in areas ranging from food labeling to safety and inquiring if transparency changes behavior, influences social norms, or provides consumers with what they need. The panelists also discussed how transparency intersects with issues ranging from compelled speech to consent to regulation of advertising.

Video recordings of Dr. Kessler's keynote and the panels, as well as the written articles from each of our panelists, are available on our website: www.law.ucla.edu/Resnick.

Following the conference, the Resnick Program co-sponsored and hosted a special screening and panel discussion of the acclaimed farm labor documentary *Food Chains*, as part of both UCLA's Food Day events and University of California's Global Food Initiative Food Equity Lecture Series. At the conclusion of the screening, Sanjay Rawal, Director and Producer of *Food Chains*, was joined by Alegria De La Cruz of the Salinas Regional Office of the CA Agricultural Labor Relations Board, Jon Esformes of Pacific Tomato Growers, and Stephen Lee, a professor at UC Irvine School of Law, for a panel discussion and Q&A about American agriculture and the problems workers face.



On Saturday, October 25, to close the conference, 30 faculty members from across the country gathered for an academic workshop to discuss the future of food law teaching and scholarship.



The Resnick Program thanks our friends, students, alumni, and community for their ongoing support and interest in our work. Your investment in the Resnick Program plays an important role in our continued success.

To make a gift online, please visit www.law.ucla.edu/giving and in the comments, please state that your gift is for The Resnick Program for Food Law and Policy. For questions or more information about giving to UCLA School of Law, please contact our Director of Annual Giving at (310) 206-1781 or visit www.law.ucla.edu/waystogive.

***Pigford v. Glickman*: Addressing USDA Racial Discrimination with One of the Largest Civil Rights Settlements in History**

By Giovanni Saarman, *UCLA Law '15*

On January 28, the law school welcomed Anurag Varma and Professor Angela Harris to discuss two class action cases against the USDA: *Pigford v. Glickman* and *Keepseagle v. Vilsack*. Both cases involved allegations of racially discriminatory practices by the USDA in administering its farm loans and assistance programs; *Pigford* focuses on a class of black farmers, and *Keepseagle* on a class of American Indian farmers. In many ways, the suits were predicated on a 1997 internal review of the USDA by the Civil Rights Action Team that documented continued and persistent discrimination in program delivery and employment. In fact, strong evidence suggests that the USDA essentially eliminated its Office of Civil Rights in the early 1980s, storing the complaints it received in a room until the office was refunded in 1998. Mr. Varma oriented these cases as more than just legal issues, rather, they were as a part of a mobilized political movement. Ultimately, the *Pigford* consent decree stipulated payouts of \$50,000 per plaintiff, totaling over \$1 billion in recovery. *Keepseagle*, filed after *Pigford*, presented a somewhat more difficult process to resolve, requiring over 100 depositions, 3 million pages of documents during discovery, and 11 years to bring the litigation to a close with the same dollar award per plaintiff as *Pigford*. It also included non-monetary relief such as bilingual forms and other requirements crucial for ensuring access to USDA programs, especially on reservations. Professor Harris thoughtfully highlighted the larger context of these cases, noting that 83% of farmers in 2007 were white men, black farmers have decreased by 98% since 1920 and the vast majority of American Indian and black farms are classified as very small. While *Pigford* and *Keepseagle* sought to remedy past wrongs and alter the behavior of the USDA underlying its characterization as “the last plantation,” the discussion strongly emphasized that further improvement is necessary to ensure equal access to USDA programs, and the continued economic viability of minority farmers.



JILFA Symposium: The Right to Food

By Emily Chen, *Resnick Program*

On March 6, the Resnick Program co-sponsored the UCLA Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs 2015 Symposium, which featured Dr. Hilal Elver, the recently-appointed United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, as the keynote speaker. The symposium focused on three issues Dr. Elver identified as priorities for her mandate to promote awareness of right to food issues: the impact of global trade of agricultural products on the right to food, the threat of climate change and environmental degradation on the right to food, and mechanisms and tools to enhance implementation, enforcement and accountability of the right to food.



Bringing together leading academics and practitioners in the fields of international food and agricultural policy, international trade, environmental law, and right to food, the symposium was a day-long discussion that included a call for justiciable socioeconomic rights, and sharing of effective strategies for advocates. Smita Narula, legal advisor to Dr. Elver's predecessor Olivier De Schutter, captured the nature of the discussion in her introductory remarks, stating:

“A conversation about the right to food is at its heart, a conversation about power; it is a conversation about discrimination and deprivation. In turn, the demand for the right to food is a demand for dignity and for agency over resources and decision-making. It is a demand for social and economic justice, for climate consciousness, and for a fundamental paradigm shift and reimagining of our current food systems to fit a more equitable and sustainable frame. That's a tall order. But it is a task that is supported immensely by grassroots movements, civil society members, academics, and UN experts alike, including by those present in the symposium.”

Nora McKeon Discusses Food Security Governance

By Randi Kusumi, *Resnick Program*

The Resnick Program for Food Law and Policy, along with the International and Comparative Law Program at UCLA School of Law, hosted author Nora McKeon as she spoke about her newly published book, *Food Security Governance: Empowering Communities, Regulating Corporations*. Nora studied history at Harvard University and political science at Sorbonne before joining the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, where she directed the FAO's relations with civil society. In her new book, she draws upon her past 40 years of experience in the food realm and her work with the FAO, as she raises concerns about our current global food system and suggests possible changes and solutions for improvement. Nora notes that our food system is one that oddly creates issues of hunger alongside concerns of obesity, climate change, and food waste. In her view, responsibility for the public's food security is in the hands of markets and corporations, while families, communities, and small-scale producers are disempowered by the process. Her book focuses on the events that led to this and what the world can do to mitigate its negative effects.



Past Speaking Engagements

December 15-17, 2014

Renmin University School of Law

Beijing, China

Michael Roberts, guest lecturer for series on Food Safety Law

January 23, 2015

Duke Environmental Law & Policy Forum, “Carrots and Sticks: Moving the U.S. National Food System Toward a Sustainable Future.”

Durham, NC

Michael Roberts, panelist on “U.S. Food Law and Policy.”

February 23, 2015

Food and Drug Law Institute Food Week Conference

Washington, DC

Michael Roberts, panelist on “Impact of Globalization on US Food Safety and Nutrition Policy.”

March 6, 2015

UCLA School of Law Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs 2015 Symposium “Realizing the Right to Food: Challenges and Opportunities in the 21st Century”

Los Angeles, CA

Michael Roberts, panelist on “The Impact of Trade Liberalization, GMOs, and Biofuel Production on the Right to Food”

Margot Pollans, moderator on “Environmental Threats to the Right to Food and International Legal Responses”

Kim Kessler, moderator on “Enhancing Implementation, Enforcement and Accountability.”

March 19, 2015

China Food Law Symposium

Park City, UT

Michael Roberts, presenter on “The Influence of Chinese Culture on Food Laws and Regulations.”

March 20, 2015

University of Arkansas School of Law Journal of Food Law and Policy 10th Anniversary Symposium

Fayetteville, AR

Michael Roberts, guest speaker on “Beginnings of the Journal”

April 9, 2015

UCLA School of Law Health Law Society “Fitting Square Pegs into Round Holes: Regulatory and Policy Issues Surrounding Genetically Engineered Foods,”

Los Angeles, CA

Michael Roberts, moderator

April 15, 2015

NYU Master's Program in Food Studies Course, “Food Laws, Regulations, and Enforcement”

New York, NY

Kim Kessler, guest lecturer on city food policy and urban-rural linkages

May 11, 2015

East China University of Science and Technology Law School, Annual Food Safety Seminar

Shanghai, China

Michael Roberts, lecturer on “Food Law: Past, Present, and Future.”

May 21, 2015

The Sabin Colloquium on Innovative Environmental Law Scholarship

New York, NY

Margot Pollans, presenting paper on “Regulating Farming”

Teaching Fellow Margot Pollans Joins Pace Law School Faculty



The Resnick Program is excited to announce that our inaugural teaching fellow, Margot Pollans, has accepted a tenure-track teaching position at Pace Law School, where she will teach courses in environmental law and food law, and continue her research on environmental regulation of food production. Professor Pollans joined the Resnick Program in the summer of 2013. She was previously a clinical teaching fellow and staff attorney in the environmental law section of Georgetown University Law Center's Institute for Public Representation. Her work has appeared in the *Harvard Environmental Law*

Review, the *Urban Lawyer*, and the *New York University Law Review*, and she is coauthoring a casebook on Food Law and Policy with Michael Roberts, the Resnick Program Executive Director, and Jacob Gersen, a Law Professor at Harvard Law School. Professor Pollans graduated magna cum laude from NYU School of Law in 2010 and, following law school, served as a law clerk to the Honorable David S. Tatel of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. She also earned an LLM with distinction from Georgetown University Law Center in 2013.

She will begin her position at Pace during the summer of 2015.

Alumni Spotlight Q&A with Lauren Bernadett

Name: Lauren Bernadett

Class: 2013

Food Law & Policy courses taken: Professor Roberts' Food Law and Policy seminar.

How did your interest in food law begin? My interest in food law stemmed from my focus on environmental law. I find that food, agriculture, and the environment are inextricably linked and create a fascinating realm of under-analyzed yet immediately relevant legal issues.

Can you tell us about your career path after UCLA Law? Professor Roberts' class and mentorship motivated me to get my LL.M. in agricultural and food law from the University of Arkansas. While in Arkansas, I published multiple law journal and news articles on food law and policy topics, including aquaculture, fisheries, GMO labeling, and a proposed Farm Bill amendment. After earning my LL.M., I moved back to California for a fellowship with California Sea Grant, where I focused on California Environmental Quality Act issues, sea level rise policy, and aquaculture. While a fellow for Sea Grant, I proposed, received funding for, and began to develop plans for a symposium on aquaculture law and regulation in California. It was an honor to return to UCLA on March 13th to host the California Aquaculture Law Symposium, which I planned with the co-sponsorship of the Resnick Program for Food Law and Policy, the Emmett Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, California Sea Grant, and the National Sea Grant Law Center.

What are you currently working on? I am currently an attorney with Somach Simmons & Dunn, a Sacramento-based law firm that does environmental and agricultural law work with a focus on water law. I'm also working on a few articles about aquaculture law and policy.

Do you have any advice for current law students seeking a career in food law? As a law student, I always wanted someone to just tell me what to do to get a job. Unless you want to do big law, it doesn't work like that. You really have to create your own path, and there are no clear steps to do that. My best suggestions are to be authentic, be an entrepreneur, master networking, be your own marketing department, and figure out how you add value. I didn't develop these skills until I moved to Arkansas and became bolder about pursuing and making opportunities. I published articles, co-founded a webpage on agricultural and food law, presented at conferences, and constantly connected with people in the field (lawyers and non-lawyers alike) to partner on projects or chat about their work. Very few of these opportunities were advertised or presented to me. I spent time figuring out how I could contribute, reaching out to people, and convincing them that they needed what I could provide. When a classmate and I couldn't figure out where to publish, we started our own blog. I was always busy, but I was having fun and felt good about these efforts to promote and educate myself. Getting to your dream job might not be about one monumental, well-planned career move that sets you up perfectly. For me, it was a series of small projects, introductions, conversations, connections, and temporary jobs driven by my interests that, in the aggregate, helped me stand out when my current job became available. Your path doesn't have to be clean or even planned out, but try to be passionate and happy.

What's your favorite food? Any food that I can share with a loved one. Just kidding, sharing food is not my strong suit. I love Indian and Thai food.



Eating Matters Radio Show & Podcast

Kim Kessler, Policy and Special Programs Director of the Resnick Program, recently completed the second season of Eating Matters, a podcast focused on how food policy impacts all of us, on Heritage Radio Network. The program features weekly conversations with food policy



experts, leaders, writers, and advocates. Prior guests include Ricardo Salvador, director of the Food & Environment Program of the Union of Concerned Scientists; John Gussow, author, professor, and groundbreaking food policy thinker; and Paula Daniels, founder of the Los Angeles Food Policy Council. Previous topics discussed include food fraud, the role of chefs in food policy, social justice and food trucks, and the reality of hunger in Brooklyn. The show takes a thoughtful look at the intersection between food, health, and sustainability, while gaining insight on what the guests like to eat, and how they view their own relationships to food. Eating Matters is available for streaming on Heritage Radio Network's website - heritageradionetwork.org - and can be downloaded as a podcast on iTunes or Stitcher.

UCLA Law Students Food Law Society Spotlight

By Scarlett Schaefer, UCLA Law '15



The Food Law Society at UCLA (FLS) has continued to engage and support students in our second year. We saw the unveiling of four new food stations at Lu Valle Commons, the law school adjacent food court – the culmination of last year's successful FLS-led campaign for the university food services organization to offer healthier, more diverse food options to law students.

The fall semester included not only the return of FLS's weekly CSA produce delivery, but also several co-sponsored and co-hosted events, including a practical nutrition series to help students learn to eat for energy, focus, and health while juggling a full schedule. Other co-hosted events included a discussion on the sustainability of the food movement and a talk on sustainable fishery management.

We began the spring semester with a field trip to Bruin Plate, UCLA's newest dining hall and among the first health- and sustainability-themed dining halls in the country. Bruin Plate's sustainability manager presented the considerations and challenges involved in sourcing and waste management. In early March we partnered with nine other UCLA organizations and the Social Justice Leaning Institute to participate in a service day. We built and planted a community garden that will provide free, fresh, and organic produce to an LA neighborhood in Inglewood. Capping off the year was a 2-event series on wine law — the first introducing students to a client's perspective, and the second surrounding issues of sustainability in wine production.

Amidst this activity, FLS has also received increased interest from admitted students and has elected next year's board (pictured, right), promising continued growth for the organization.



Resnick Program Note: The Food Law Society was recognized by the Student Bar Association and received the 2014-2015 "Student Organization Award for Outstanding Contributions." FLS President, Scarlett Schaefer, earned the "UCLA Law Enhancement Award," presented to graduating students selected by the Office for Student Affairs. Congratulations to FLS & Scarlett for your accomplishments & we look forward to seeing the organization continue to grow.



California Aquaculture Law Symposium

By Sofia Beltran, UCLA Law '17

The California Law Aquaculture Symposium, hosted at the UCLA School of Law and co-sponsored by the Resnick Program for Food Law and Policy, brought together a lively group of attorneys, policy makers, industry producers, environmentalists, academics, and students to discuss the far-reaching effects of seafood consumption and production. The United States ranks as the second largest consumer of seafood, yet 91% of the seafood we eat is imported. Half of this imported seafood comes from aquaculture, which has increasing demand both domestically and internationally. Aquaculture has gained attention from food advocacy groups, environmental groups, and scientists regarding its significant potential as a domestic source of seafood. Interestingly, though, aquaculture has gained relatively little attention from the legal field. This symposium served as an effort to initiate a broader discussion regarding aquaculture law, its regulatory framework, and its regulatory constraints, in California.

Following welcoming remarks by Professor Michael Roberts, and Catherine Janasie, Research Counsel for the National Sea Grant Law Center, guests were presented with a panel discussion led by scientists and industry producers. The introductory panel demonstrated the impact of aquaculture on both the global market, and on production in California. Later, a second panel moderated by Paula Daniels, founder of the LA Food Policy Council and member of the National Organics Standards Board, discussed sustainability issues and environmental concerns in reference to aquaculture production methods, aquafeed ingredients, and sustainability ratings and certifications. Guests and participants also enjoyed an outdoor lunch while listening to keynote speaker Helene York, Global Director of Responsible Business for the Compass Group at Google. The event concluded with a two-part discussion on Aquaculture Opportunities, moderated by Annalisa Betanides, the California Sea Grant State Fellow with the NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region Aquaculture Program. The event served as an impactful forum for members of varying perspectives to both discuss the growing aquaculture industry, and develop connections for improvement and dialogue in the aquaculture space.

Aquaculture: It's What's for Lunch

Keynote Address for California Aquaculture Law Symposium by Helene York, Global Director, Responsible Business, Compass Group@Google

It's fitting that I'm speaking at lunch because lunch is what I intend to talk about.

Aquaculture, as you know, is the name of a set of production systems that have environmental implications, require regulatory oversight, and need scientists and especially entrepreneurs to be realized. But in the end, the purpose of all this activity is to produce food.

For years, environmental activists blamed aquaculture for its negative impacts on ocean and river habitats and marine biomass depletion. In many cases, they were right to call attention to problems and raise important questions. But production activities have grown more mature in a remarkably quick period of time, and conversations have shifted to improving aquaculture. NGOs and producers have created alliances and developed scientific certification and assessment programs. We now recognize that aquaculture has, in fact, become half the world's supply of seafood. Many producers - in what is still a very new industry - have adopted very responsible production practices. This evolution was needed and is welcomed. But we've yet to really begin the real conversation.

The real conversation isn't a debate about what species and what production systems can be deemed "sustainable" species. While important, those conversations are inside baseball discussions, and few people outside our circle care. Let's elevate the debate. In my view, only an entire food system can be sustainable, and we are far from that goal. I'm not arguing we stop holding producers accountable, promoting greater responsibility, or menuing smaller portions in the case of restaurant companies.

I'm suggesting that the real conversation shift to a bigger, more fundamental question, which is "what's for lunch?" We need to face the fact that ALL food is produced and or prepared with environmental impacts. Producing food for 7 or 9 billion people - not to mention billions of pets - has enormous environmental impacts. This is especially true if we want sufficient calories, balanced nutrition, flavor, culturally appropriate options, and occasional indulgences ... instead of choosing between blue pills and red pills. Our job as stewards of a responsible society is to feed everyone sufficiently, while minimizing the impacts of producing food, and to support the development and continued evolution of production systems that can feed everyone in perpetuity.

Today, the answer to my question of "what's for lunch" is typically meat, accompanied by cheese, wheat-based bread with a tiny helping of veg for garnish, and a sugary drink and dessert. Most of these items are commodity-produced items with high environmental impacts. The sad thing is that the typical vegetarian meal is pretty much the same - only more cheese. Increasingly this is now a global standard, not only a North American anomaly. We all know the direction we need to move in.

- 1) The description of lunch I gave has to go from "the everyday norm" to a "special day indulgence."
- 2) The trophic levels of the proteins we consume has to drop, dramatically, on average, and outrageously delicious plants have to become center of our smaller plates.
- 3) And the regulatory framework, activists' suspicions, and institutional buyers' reticence have got to become more sympathetic to adventures in aquaculture production because we fundamentally need a lot more fish protein on our plates.

Pristine and perfect systems, in short, can't be our goal. Over the past 15 years, we who have been concerned with building a sustainable food system tried an earnest approach to assess and label some production practices and systems as "sustainable food." Attempts were applied - and are still being applied -

in seafood, animal agriculture, vegetables, fruit, and even snacks. Give consumers information, the argument goes, and they will choose the right option.

So what happened? The best producers opted for assessment and affixed a label to their products that allowed them a small price premium. Affluent consumers were happy to pay more. The rest of the producers created alternative labels and simply marketed themselves as sustainable. Buyers fragmented along the lines of their value systems and now we've got at least a dozen labels that grace packaged goods from certified GMO-free to cruelty free to the latest health-sounding attribute. Institutional buyers have taken mixed approaches. Some have opted for green-list only type purchasing commitments, others have purchased a range of products. Few have done more than a tiny amount to encourage better production systems overall.

The result of the certification proliferation has been to raise popular consciousness but provide little additional supply of food from improved production systems. No certification system anywhere covers even 10% of the world's supply. The rich, it seems, can buy sustainability, but the rest of us aren't as lucky.

Let me say that I am not opposed to independent scientific assessment. I just don't have the faith that labels will drive purchasing behavior in a significant enough way. The food writer and historian Mark Kurlansky argues persuasively in his wonderful book, *The Great Oyster*, that turkeys were probably a novelty item at the first Thanksgiving and that wild oysters were likely the main protein (along with cod). How ironic it is that oysters - the bread and butter of the 1600s - have become an expensive luxury, enjoyed by the rich as an appetizer. The same can be said for lobster. Four hundred years later, oysters are smaller and mostly farmed but little production occurs in the US. China produces 84% of the world's 4.4 million tonnes of farmed oysters, according to the UN FAO. By contrast, 63 million tonnes of beef are produced globally.

As a food lover, this imbalance makes me sad. As an environmentalist, it makes me angry. Why do we farm fifteen times more beef than oysters, especially when beef production systems have such a larger negative impact on air, soil, and water quality? Beef has a far greater global warming potential than shellfish and nearly all farmed fish, and beef is a significant part of the livestock sector that generates one-sixth of the world's greenhouse gases. Oysters and other responsibly farmed shellfish and finfish produce almost none.

According to a recent study published in the journal *Ecology*, oysters seeded on a very large scale in the Chesapeake Bay may even be able to stem the localized impacts of ocean acidification. Why shouldn't we be doing the same in other parts of the US? Globally, aquaculture now produces more tonnes of protein than beef even though the commercialization of aquaculture is only about three decades old. Not true in the US. It seems a shame to me that we're so behind because there is no protein with a lower total environmental impact than shellfish AND a positive effect on water filtration.

As we concern ourselves with feeding nine billion people on a warming planet, responsible aquaculture has a really important role to play. Professor Daniel Pauly, a lifelong student of global fisheries and aquaculture, a dean in his field, has repeatedly said that mariculture has the capacity to feed humanity. I am reminded of a photo of activists at a global convention on climate change a few years ago. The activists were dressed as polar bears - the iconic symbol of a species that will be extinct if dire global warming forecasts hold true - and they carried signs that said "Save the Humans."

That's the point isn't it? We want to preserve ecosystems to let humans thrive, not to preserve our environment for its own sake. As procurement officers, environmentalists, students, government representatives - representing society at large - we need to ask the question: what should we be eating for lunch? Our environment is changing and indeed has always evolved. But change is happening faster. Perhaps our way of thinking about food and production systems has to speed up as well.

As an institutional buyer, I get daily announcements about weather conditions and product availability from several sources. In just the past six months, the normally robust lettuce crop nearly failed due to warm weather in California and Arizona. The freeze in Texas killed most of the grapefruit crop this year. The California drought followed nearly a million acres in 2014 and fresh asparagus, the highlight of mid-March, will have a very short-lived season. I have so many more examples over the last four years. Where is our food going to come from?

I pose this question especially to you who regulate production processes or who lobby regulators. If we effectively prevent aquaculture operations from experimenting and thriving, we are doing nothing to prevent the growth of intensive or extensive beef cattle production in Colorado or the Amazon basin of Brazil. We are doing nothing to make aquaculture cost-competitive. Shellfish will remain expensive and out of reach for most, but beef and truly awful aquaculture is still relatively cheap and accessible. The goal for all of us should be to create healthy food in resilient food systems - not perfect food from either a health or environmental standpoint. Shellfish, the lowest environmental impact protein source on the planet, and responsible aquaculture has to be much better represented among our choices, but not only for rich people.

Each of you will have a different answer to the question, "What's for lunch?" Let's remember this isn't a trivial question, especially when it is asked by 300 million Americans, and more than seven billion global citizens every day. It is not sufficient if we make lower impact choice just for ourselves. We have to make lower impact options the easy, and available, choice for everyone.