

Land Access Models for Immigrant and Refugee Farmers

Department of Urban and Regional Planning | University of Wisconsin-Madison

Professional Project | Ian Aley | April 3, 2017

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to the farmers and staff of the Linda and Gene Farley Center for Peace, Justice, and Sustainability. The ideas presented here grew out of many conversations within this community and with additional supporters, including Brian Ohm, Steve Ventura, Margaret Krome, Carrie Edgar, Anne Reynolds, and the Dane County Food Policy Council Land Access Working Group members. Thank you to Megan Bjella for her feedback and partnership. I am grateful to Alfonso Morales for his curiosity and ongoing support. I would like to extend a particular thank you to Harvey Jacobs for his mentorship during this research process and his advising over the last two years.

I am grateful to the farm incubator communities who participated in this study for sharing feedback on these ideas: Nathan Harkleroad of ALBA, Meredith Walrafen of New Roots for Refugees, Aaron Newton of the Elma C. Lomax Farm Incubator, Stephen Petro of the Fondy Food Center, Molly Schaus of the Minnesota Food Association, Janet Wright of the New Entry Sustainable Farming Project, Ali Nichols of Seattle Tilth Farm Works, Maggie Donin of the Intervale Center, Jonah Fertig of the Cooperative Development Institute, Robin Chanin of Global Growers, and the Making Allies for Healthy Communities partners.

Table of Contents

Background	1
Land Access Models	3
Methodology	4
Discussions and Findings	5
Conclusions	12
Next Steps	13
Works Cited	14
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Land Tenure Arrangements	16
Appendix 2: Study Participant	18
Appendix 3: Interview Questions	19

Background

Many farm incubators struggle with how to graduate farmers. Non-profit organizations commonly run farm incubators and rely heavily on grants that measure success and determine eligibility for future funds based on the quantity of farmers served and graduation rates (Overton, 2013; USDA, 2016b). Post-graduation success can be mixed at best, especially for immigrant and minority farmers who, in addition to financial barriers, may face cultural misunderstandings and prejudices as they seek land (Calo and De Master, 2016; Ruhf, 2013). A farmer's greatest wealth is in the soil she or he tends. Secure land tenure allows farmers to benefit from their investments.

Some farmers aspire to owning a large parcel of land by themselves, but incubators also draw farmers who appreciate the benefits of colocation: for instance, the ability to share investments in infrastructure and equipment, the potential for collaborative marketing and distribution, formal and informal mentorship, bulk administrative processes like organic certification, opportunity to speak your first language with other farmers, and shared childcare. Some would like to continue to farm with close neighbors for their whole farming careers.

Just west of Madison, Wisconsin, the Farley Center runs a farm incubator serving multicultural farmers. For the last five seasons, I have run a farm business at the Farley Center. Farmers are welcome to purchase or rent land on their own after graduating from the program. Given the many barriers farmers face to securing long-term land tenure, we are developing an alternative: graduating cohorts of farmers to a network of satellite locations. Each site would have the basics for the enterprises of the farmers at the site: for instance, a tractor, cooler, shed, and well. We started a tool lending library for specialized, less frequently used

implements to be shared between sites. We imagine some sites in the network acting as aggregation point for processing, storage, and distribution. Our current site would continue to play an incubator role, allowing farmers to build not only production and marketing skills but also relationships and trust before choosing if they wish to invest with others.

This experience led to the question that initiated this project: if an incubator wanted to set up a network of collaborative sites, what ownership, governance, and funding models could best support this arrangement? A couple potential models were developed with input from farmers, legal experts, extension agents, elected officials, and the local food policy council.

The goal of this project is not to propose a rigid universal solution but rather to explore models that could be adapted to the preferences and assets of specific groups of farmers. This exploration led to a series of questions: Is co-location desirable? Do farmers wish to own land or would a long-term renewable lease be preferable? How involved do farmers want to be in administration and governance? How would the farmers, staff, board, funders, and regulators of incubator farms react to these models? What training or information would be helpful if a community wished to implement a model? What examples of these models already exist?

For my professional project, I solicited feedback from incubator staff from across the country on alternative land access models. This report summarizes the findings of these conversations. I was not surprised to find that many other communities were actively puzzling through similar questions and models. I offer this research to the Farley Center and other farm incubator communities as a way of connecting these many conversations so that there can be mutual learning about this issue.

Land Access Models

Farm land access can take many forms, with varying degrees of tenure security.¹

Farmers graduating from incubators typically rent land. Some make a fee simple land purchase. Others may form a cooperative and hold land collectively. This study explores two models that would provide long-term land tenure security, co-location benefits, and the autonomy of an individually held plot of land. The following provides a brief sketch of the two models:

Condominium or "Co-farming:"

Farmers own their plots. An association, composed of and elected by those farmers, owns and manage all common spaces: access roads, infrastructure, large equipment, and conservation lands. Farmers pay an annual association fee to help cover these costs.

Farmers can sell their plots at market rate (Ohm, 2016; Wis § 703).

Community Land Trust (CLT)

A non-profit entity owns the land. Farmers have a long-term renewable lease on plots that can be passed along to future generations. Farmers own and can sell anything they plant or construct on their leased plots (i.e. perennials or a hoop house) (Davis, 1984, 2010; Rosenberg and Yuen, 2012).

Common Features of Both Models

The organization could hire a farm manager to facilitate the maintenance of the commons and communication between farmers. To reduce initial purchase costs, the farmers could place a conservation easement on some portions of the land or transfer

¹ See Appendix 1 for a thorough list of the possibilities.

the development rights in partnership with a conservation land trust (Campbell and Salus, 2003; Daniels and Bowers, 1997). To reduce operating costs, the organization could incorporate as a non-profit or partner with one to receive grants and donations.

Methodology

Phone interviews were conducted with incubator staff across the country, soliciting feedback on these land access models. An introductory email was sent along with a one-page description of the models to twelve incubators in February 2017 with the goal of interviewing eight to ten incubators.² Nine 30-60 minute interviews were conducted.

The selection process for study participants was not exhaustive. There is no attempt here to make claims about generalizability to all incubators across the country. The goal was to engage enough participants to hear diverse insights and opinions related to the feasibility of these land access models. Study participants were recruited for their regional diversity, with the idea that land access constraints and farming practices vary by region. The focus was on incubators with rural rather than urban land bases, but most participants were located close to cities. Priority was given to incubators that appeared from their websites to serve immigrant and refugee farmers.

Interviews were conducted with farm incubator staff, not farmers. Nearly every interviewee noted that it was problematic for them to speak on behalf of the farmers with

² The one-page description shared with participants used much of the same language as the Background section of this report. See Appendix 2 for a list of participants in the study.

whom they work. Interviewees were invited to share observations and speak from their experience rather than trying to generalize or represent their entire community.

The interview questions provided a consistent framework for discussion even as each interview was adapted to the experiences of the subject.³ Ideas that emerged in successive interviews were tested either by explicitly asking for feedback on an idea from a previous interview or by waiting to see if a similar idea would arise independent to its suggestion. Participants offered grant reports and other data that complemented the interview transcripts.

Audio recordings and written notes were collected during the phone interviews. Analysis was undertaken by first reviewing the notes to draw out themes and then by listening back to the recordings to organize quotes and observations under these headings.

Discussions and Findings

An Active Conversation

“The co-location conversation has been happening with increased frequency at the national level with incubator farms,” Aaron Newton from Lomax noted. Last year the National Incubator Farm Training Initiative (NIFTI) hosted a panel at its national conference on this topic. Experimentation is happening locally too.

Intervale wrote a grant a few years ago to study local examples of colocation because available parcels of land in Vermont tend to be larger than any one farmer needs or can afford. This grant asked, “is there a way for our services to move around but not have the farmers

³ See Appendix 3 for interview questions used in this study.

move around? Set up the shared infrastructure, support the early days, then we would transition off and do that all over again.”

New Roots for Refugees (NRR) is currently partnering with, Cultivating Kansas City another non-profit, on a feasibility study for a collaborative farming site. Many graduates from the NRR program purchase affordable vacant urban land. Despite this easy access to individual ownership, Molly Keenan from NRR explained that she sees the value in and desire for shared equipment and the sense of community of a collaborative site.

New Entry typically graduates farmers to small geographically dispersed parcels of land without equipment or infrastructure. This poses major challenges for the farmers and the staff that support them. Janel Wright from New Entry told me, “We talk about this a lot: this is not very sustainable for these folks. They are still renting and don’t have the things they need to fully farm; wouldn’t it be so much better if they could co-locate somewhere together. I think there would be separate new challenges with that model, but it seems, from our perspective, that that would be really great.”

Twelve years ago, ALBA purchased a 200-acre satellite site. Advanced growers had the option to graduate from their incubator and lease land at this site where they received less staff support. While not formally organized as a CLT, the arrangement resembled this model. Last year, ALBA sold the land to a single graduate from their incubator. This farmer now leases land to other farmers who currently grow on that site. Nathan Harkleroad, the farm coordinator, shared, “it was a model that was working for the farmers. But for us, it wasn’t working because our resources were spread thinner.” The initial purchase price was not an issue: a foundation provided the funds and placed a conservation easement on the land to reduce the cost.

Ongoing staffing costs motivated ALBA's recent sale of the property: the distance between sites and the work to administer the conservation easement depleted their limited staff resources. ALBA has moved toward focusing on incubation while connecting graduates with other local organizations to provide land link and other services.

The Cooperative Development Institute (CDI) supported a group of Somali refugees in starting New Roots Cooperative Farm in Lewiston, Maine after graduating from Cultivating Community, the local incubator. A conservation land trust currently owns the land. The cooperative has a lease with the option to purchase agreement with the trust.

No one seems to have figured everything out, but there is a great deal of innovation underway.

Broadly Applicable, Particularly Relevant

One interviewee argued that focusing on immigrants and refugees could distract from the conversation about collocation models. These models are indeed broadly applicable to immigrants and non-immigrants alike. The default expectation from incubators: individual graduation, poses distinctive challenges to marginalized groups. The interviews indicate that collaborative land access, more specifically the CLT model, is especially culturally appropriate and desirable for many immigrant groups seeking farmland.

In February of 2017, Fondy surveyed their farmers, 92% of whom are immigrant or refugees, and found that of those who rent, 33% had a written agreement. This was a stark contrast to the 78% of a group they surveyed of primarily non-immigrants (9%) (Fondy and UWMCED, 2017). Echoing the Calo and De Master study, Fondy related stories of cultural

misunderstandings pushing farmers to marginal land and leading to lease agreements falling through (2016). New Entry pointed out that traditional Land Link programs do not work for immigrants because of language and cultural barriers, but that they have found programs that provide more culturally appropriate support to be difficult to fund.

Incubators working with immigrants and refugees indicated a cultural preference toward farming in community. Molly Schaus from the Minnesota Food Association (MFA) pointed out that “the traditional white American dream is to own your own farm, live in the country, be self-sufficient, but that’s not necessarily what people want.” She indicated that a long-term renewable lease would provide a desirable flexibility and lower bar for entry and exit for immigrants who “whose lives are more unpredictable and respond to a lot more variables than I would have imagined [...] particularly with the political situation now being so uncertain.”

Land Ownership

In the CLT model, farmers hold a long-term renewable lease to land, whereas in the condominium model, farmers own their plot. Janel Wright from New Entry noted that “most farmers are less interested in ownership than I would have originally thought.” With some exceptions, the incubator staff interviewed favored the CLT model.

Molly Schaus from MFA questioned the condominium model: “When you add individual ownership to a community space it could get really tricky. [...] If someone owns a piece of land, shouldn’t they be able to do what they want?” Aaron Newton from Lomax shared, “I think you need more control than easements and restrictions, but depending on your community, they might not tolerate that control.”

Stephen Petro from Fondy theorized that the younger farmers in their program may be more interested in ownership because they would have more time to pay off a loan and enjoy the equity accrued. He related a story of introducing farmers to irrigation systems. Once the farmers had had a chance to see the system in action, they wanted to set them up on their plots. He thought it may be the same with land ownership: once exposed, there may be increased interest.

Aaron Newton from Lomax favored the CLT model because of the flexibility it gives to farmer and the way it retains the value of the land in the community. The romantic ideal of farming for 50 years is rarely realized. The ongoing involvement by a non-profit on a site could facilitate smooth entries and exits of generations of farmers. Shared infrastructure and a lease take much of the financial risk out of such a transition for a farmer. The value of the land, in the form of improved soil or shared infrastructure, stays with the community rather than being a windfall to an individual seller.

Ali Nichols from Seattle Tilth preferred the condominium model exactly because of the ability to use the land as an investment, accruing equity and then selling for financial gain if farming, a risky low-margin business, does not work out.

Maggie Donin from Intervale noted that, while they have been exploring colocation models, "If a farmer has the potential of taking on a farm property themselves, we wouldn't want to stand in the way and overcomplicate things." Intervale's study of colocation models pointed to the significant amount of patience and communication required to set up and maintain a collaborative site (Burnstein, 2014).

Funding to Sustain the Models

As Molly Schaus at MFA put it, “An organization needs to graduate farmers to have a quote, unquote successful program that you can write about in grant applications, but I would say that most farmers are like, ‘why would I ever leave? Everything I need is here.’” Without prompting, four incubators shared that in the early days of their program they put off the graduation conversation, because they had enough available land on their incubator site to accommodate established growers even as they served new farmers to satisfy funders.

Most incubators are relatively young organizations whose start and/or growth parallels the emergence of key USDA grant streams. As of 2013, there were 111 known farm incubators in 38 states and 4 provinces in the US and Canada. Roughly half of all incubators had operated for three or less years, while only 8% had existed for 10 or more years (Overton, 2013). This timeline is in sync with the USDA Beginning Farmer and Rancher Program, which began to support projects such as farm incubator programs in 2008. BFRP will disburse \$17.7 million to farm incubators and similar programs across the US during the 2017 grant cycle (USDA, 2016b). The USDA has offered over \$83.8 million since 2010 through the Outreach and Assistance for Socially Disadvantaged and Veteran Farmers and Ranchers Program, one target group being immigrant and refugee farmers (USDA, 2016a).

It appears that we are in a particularly interesting moment where, one-by-one across the country, incubators are bumping up against the dual reality of constraints of their existing land base to accommodate additional farmers and the desire from many farmers for ongoing co-location and culturally appropriate support.

Interview questions raised the idea of adjusting grant expectations so that what gets measured is not only graduation rates, number of farmers served, and economic impacts, but also other indicators of community development. This resonated for Nathan Harkleroad from ALBA. He shared that “a lot of these grants are focused on the hard outcomes but we can weave those narratives [of non-monetary benefits] into reports and conversations with funders. [...] We only see small increases in the economic outcomes. A lot of people mention the emotional benefits. [...] I was talking to someone yesterday, he said, ‘being a farmer here has allowed me to be more involved in my kid’s education. This has made a difference for my kid.’”

Janel Wright from New Entry related a story of being asked why they graduate so few farmers by a representative from a local foundation. She explained what all is involved in this process. She said the funder responded, “‘This is valuable! [...] We don’t know from our perspective what it takes because we don’t do your work.’” Janel Wright shared with me, “I think the model you are proposing could gain some traction with [funders], it’s just a matter of how much time you get to explain yourself.”

The metric driving Fondy are different from many incubators. It began as a market to provide healthy food access to a marginalized neighborhood of Milwaukee. Years ago, they realized that some established farmers had stopped selling at the market. They talked to the farmers and realized that long-term secure land tenure was a major issue. They started a collaborative farm site so that they could maintain vendors at their market so that their neighborhood could access healthy food. They do not actively graduate farmers. They have been successful in communicating these holistic goals to funders.

Aaron Newton from Lomax pointed out that user fees can only pay for so much of the staff and infrastructure cost of a site. He offered some creative ways to raise additional funds. He said Headwaters Incubator Farm outside of Portland receives a portion of a property tax raised when a developer turns agricultural land into housing. The Village of Blume in North Carolina left a parcel of agricultural land as an amenity in a housing subdivision. Rather than paying for the maintenance of a golf course or other green space, Homeowner Association Fees could subsidize the farm operations. He suggested large commercial or industrial campuses could offer similar subsidy rather than paying to maintain landscaping. Intervale builds farm management staff time into agreements with conservation land trusts.

Conclusions

A collation that included Fondy, conservation land trusts, and the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewage District invited me to facilitate a workshop on land access models for refugee farmers. After a presentation, the group turned to a discussion on the relative benefits of the options. Fondy's executive director observed that the CLT model is "Fondy 2.0 or 10.0. I could see us moving that way." Others pointed out that it had a good balance of non-profit and farmer self-determination. None present spoke in favor of the Condo model. Many favored the cooperative model, citing Wisconsin's strong history and support system for cooperatives. Others expressed concerns that developing a cooperative would require too much time given the coalition's year and half timeline before needing to purchase land. A few thought traditional ownership would be "clean, possible, and straight forward." Two farmers involved in the project are interested in buying land. They could do so and then sublet to the other

farmers. Funders understand this model. This could streamline the process, but it creates an inherent power imbalance between farmers. Most of all, the group committed to bringing these options to the farmers and then listening to their ideas and preferences.

The assets, needs, and interests of each group will be different. The hope with this research is not to prescribe collocation generally or condominium or CLT specifically as appropriate for all groups at all times, but rather to facilitate a conversation so that these alternative models can be legitimate options for incubator communities to consider.

Next Steps

The collocation conversation and experimentation is active and thriving but these models are still relatively marginal, in large part because major funding streams do not yet easily accommodate them. This could be an important moment for incubators to organize through NIFTI to provide feedback to funders of incubators programs about a need to adapt funding streams to accommodate these models. The 2017 NIFTI Field School could include:

1. A strategy session on how NIFTI could advocate for funding streams that support culturally appropriate incubator graduation
2. A workshop on how to communicate non-monetary benefits to funders
3. A discussion about pursuing a joint grant proposal to create a collocation toolkit

Works Cited

- Burnstein, Stacy. (2014). Collaborative Land Access Project The Intervale Center. December 17, 2014.
- Calo, Adam and Kathryn T. De Master. (2016). "After the incubator: Factors impeding land access along the path from farmworker to proprietor." *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 6(2), 111-127.
- Campbell, Marcia C. and D.M. Salus. (2003). "Community and Conservation Land Trusts as Unlikely Partners? The Case of Troy Gardens, Madison, Wisconsin." *Land Use Policy* 20, 2: 209-232.
- Daniels, Tom and Deborah Bowers. (1997). "Land trusts: private-sector land conservation." *Holding Our Ground: Protecting America's Farms and Farmland*. Washington, DC: Island Press, pp. 193-216.
- Davis, John E. (1984). "Reallocating Equity: A Land Trust Model of Land Reform." *Land Reform, American Style*. C.C. Geisler and F.J. Popper eds. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld, pp. 209-232.
- . (2010). "Origins and evolution of the community land trust in the United States." *Community Land Trust Reader*. John E. David ed. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, pp. 3-47.
- Ohm, B. (2016) "Agricultural Condominiums." Working Paper to Dane County Food Policy Council Land Access Working Group. June 7, 2016.
- Overton, Meaghan. (2013). "An Overview of Farm Incubator Programs." New Entry National Incubator Farm Initiative. Accessed: http://nesfp.org/sites/default/files/uploads/farm_incubator_infographic_2013.pdf
- Rosenberg, Greg and Jeffrey Yuen. (2012). "Beyond Housing: Urban Agriculture and Commercial Development by Community Land Trusts." Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Working Paper. Accessed: <http://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/paper-rosenburg-yuen.pdf>
- Ruhf, Kathryn Z. (2013). "Access to farmland: a systems change perspective." *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*. 4(1), 51-60.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). (2016a). "USDA Announces \$8.4 Million to Support Minority and Veteran Farmers and Ranchers." USDA News Release. Release No. 0207.16. September 29, 2016. Accessed: www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdamediafb?contentid=2016/09/0207.xml&printable=true&contentidonly=true

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). (2016b). Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program Fiscal Year 2017 Request for Applications. November 22, 2016. <https://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/rfa/FY%2017%20BFRDP%20RFA%20-%20REVISED%20by%20NPL%20%20%26%20PS%20%20-%20FINAL%20-%20November%2022%20%202016.pdf>

Fondy Food Center and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Center for Economic Development (Fondy and UWCED). (2017). Fondy Farmer Survey Draft. February 27, 2017.

Wisconsin State Statue Chapter 703 "Condominiums."

Appendices

Appendix 1: Land Tenure Arrangements

This table was adapted and extended by Steve Ventura from Greg Rosenberg and Jeffrey Yuen (2012) “Beyond Housing: Urban Agriculture and Commercial Development by Community Land Trusts.” *Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Working Paper*. Further extended by Ian Aley.

Tenure Arrangement	Mechanism	Advantages	Disadvantages	Ownership and Labor Considerations	Examples, More Information
Fee Simple	Purchase of title to land	Long-Term security is high; complete level of control	Cost to acquire; property taxation; management obligations and liabilities	Standard owner-operator arrangements, including hired help; land could also be owned as a coop	USDA FSA Farm Loan Guide
Land Contract, Purchase Lease	Installment contract for fee simple transfer	Allows new farmers to acquire land; may have FSA backing	Land not transferred until payments completed, lost with default	Similar to owner - operator if contract is sound	USDA FSA Land Contract Guarantee Program
Ground Lease	Short or long-term contractual relation	Low-cost High level of control	Legal complexity; transaction costs; contracting organization stability and longevity	No incentive for investment in land and facilities	NIFTI Farm Incubator Toolkit
Community or Agricultural Land Trust	Land is owned by trust, managed by board with input from farmers	Long term security, high level of control; users can sell improvements (perennials or hoophouse) but not land	High initial cost (though may be by dedication of public land); third party stability	Long term stability provides incentive for investment in land and facilities	Troy Community Farm Neighbor Space
Condominium “Co-Farming”	Group of farmers buy land together, each own a plot, an association elected by and composed of the farmers owns and maintains commons	Shared infrastructure; neighbors; Potential affordability (a farmer only buys his or her own plot)	Coordination and governance; local land use laws prohibiting subdivision may be a barrier	Farmers pay an association fee for maintenance of the commons; they can sell individual plots (units) on the market and recoup investment; association could hire a farm manager to coordinate maintenance and communication	Many states have laws outlining the legal requirements of real estate ownership via a condominium for instance, Wisconsin Statute 703

Tenure Arrangement	Mechanism	Advantages	Disadvantages	Ownership and Labor Considerations	Examples, More Information
Crop Share, Access Grant	Short or long-term contract based on non-monetary exchange	Low-cost	Low stability, easy to change	Labor is the primary basis for exchange between owner and operator	North Central Extension Committee Resource on Crop Sharing
Guerrilla Gardening, Grafting	Occupation of unused land	No cost; making use of underused spaces	No tenure stability; no legal recourse; legal liability	Only cost of production is labor, but no ownership rights	On Guerrilla Gardening Guerrilla Grafters
Deed Restriction, Restrictive Covenant	Stipulation of grant, mortgage, or zoning variance	Low-cost Ensures agricultural use	Enforceability	May restrict kinds of production or activities	Land Stewardship Project: Farm Transition Toolkit
Conservation Easement	Transfer of specific rights to third party	Low-cost; ensures agricultural use; extensive use in land conservation	Transaction costs; third party stability and longevity	May restrict kinds of production or activities	Land Trust Alliance
Purchase or Transfer of Development Rights	Transfer of specific rights to third party to facilitate greater development density in other areas	Win/win for all parties: protection and development	Complicated process, typically requiring facilitation by government	Development rights transferred/sold independent to other rights in the “bundle”	Conservation Tools TDR Tools
Zoning	Specific land use designation by jurisdiction, official map	Permits agriculture use; encourages multiple initiatives in area	Relatively easy to change as land markets change	Zoning authority typically rests with local government	Indiana Model Agricultural Zoning Ordinances
Farmland Preservation, Ag Enterprise Area, Other Special Districts	Specific land use designation; works in conjunction with tax mechanisms	Addresses cost of holding land	Relatively easy to change	Often requires government intervention for designation	Wisconsin DATCAP Ag Enterprise Area Program
Current Agricultural Use Value Taxation	Farm property taxed based on current ag use rather than “highest and best” use	Addresses cost of holding land	Unintended consequences, especially in woodlands; insufficient penalties for conversion	Requires taxing entity to support such a policy	Ohio Department of Taxation Current Ag Use Value

Appendix 2: Study Participants

Organization Name	Abbreviated Name for Report	City	State	Region	Interviewee	Organizational Position	Interview Date
Fondy Food Center	Fondy	Milwaukee	WI	Midwest	Stephen Petro	Chief Operating Officer & Farm Director	2/22/17
Minnesota Food Association	MFA	Marine on St. Croix	MN	Midwest	Molly Schaus	Farm Director	2/22/17
Catholic Charities of Northeast Kansas - New Roots for Refugees	NRR	Kansas City	KS	Midwest	Molly Keenan	Program Coordinator	2/28/17
The Intervale Center	Intervale	Burlington	VT	Northeast	Maggie Donin	Beginning Farmer Specialist	2/28/17
New Entry Sustainable Farming Project	New Entry	Lowell	MA	Northeast	Janel Wright	Beginning Farmer Resources Coordinator	3/8/17
Cooperative Development Institute (partner of Cultivating Community, an incubator)	CDI	Lewiston/Portland	ME	Northeast	Jonah Fertig	Director of Cooperative Food Systems	3/21/17
Elma C Lomax Farm Incubator	Lomax	Concord	NC	South	Aaron Newton	Farm Coordinator	3/1/17
Global Growers Network	Global Growers	Avondale Estates	GA	South	Robin Chanin	Executive Director	4/12/17
Seattle Tilth Farm Works	Seattle Tilth	Seattle	WA	West	Ali Nichols	Farm Manager	2/28/17
Agriculture and Land Based Training Association (ALBA)	ALBA	Salinas	CA	West	Nathan Harkleroad	Education Program Manager	3/16/17

Appendix 3: Interview Questions

Introduction

- [Have audio recorder ready]
- Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on these ideas. This interview-discussion will take about 30-45 minutes.
- To remind you of my background: I am a farmer at the Farley Center farm incubator just west of Madison, Wisconsin. I am currently completing a master's degree in urban and regional planning at the UW-Madison. As part of this program, I am conducting interviews with incubator staff across the country. I will write up these findings into a short report and then share this with everyone who participated, my academic department, and other interested groups.
- Do I have your permission to record the audio of our interview? [if yes, turn on audio recorder]
- Do I have your permission to include your name and the name of your organization in the report? At any point in the interview if something sensitive comes up, feel free to ask for me to include that information anonymously and I will do so.

General Background

[I will answer as many of these as I can through online research]

1. Where is your incubator located? (Town/City and State)
2. How many acres do you have in production?
3. How many farm businesses are at your site currently?
4. How long have you been running your incubator?
5. The organization that operates the incubator a non-profit or another type of organization?
6. What types of enterprises operate out of your incubator? (fruit, vegetables, eggs, grazing, grain, etc)

Graduation Background

1. Does your incubator graduate farm businesses?
2. If so, what is your process?
 - a. Do you specify how long until graduation?
 - b. How do you help farmers find land?

Alternative Models

1. I shared with you some background information on Community Land Trust or Condominium; do you have any questions about how these two models could work?
2. In what ways do you believe permanent co-location to be desirable or undesirable to your farmers?
3. Do you believe outright ownership is a priority for your farmers or, alternately, would a long term renewable lease that could be passed along to future generations more desirable? Or is long-term land tenure security not a concern?

4. Do you believe the ability to sell land for full market value is a priority for your farmers or would the ability to sell individually planted crops and built infrastructure be more desirable?
5. How involved do your farmers want to be in land use and operations decisions?
6. How interested are your farmers in ensuring that the land they farm is affordable for future generations of farmers?
7. How interested are your farmers in ensuring the land they farm continues to be used for farming for future generations?
8. What are your reactions to how the condominium/"co-farming" model and the Community Land Trust model would be received by...
 - a. Your farmers
 - b. Your funders (who are your funders?)
 - c. Your board
 - d. Your staff
 - e. Government officials that would need to approve your regulatory compliance (town board etc)
9. Can you identify ways to improve these models reflective of your particular locale or the types of farming engaged in by your farmers?
10. Do you believe your incubator community (staff, board, and farmers) might pursue one of these alternatives in the future? If so which one?
11. What training or information would be needed for your incubator community to pursue one of these in the future?
12. Do you know of any other incubators who are doing this already?