

**MINUTES**  
**2012 PLN-CRD Committee Meeting**  
**August 20-23, 2012 - Orlando, Florida**

**Tuesday, August 21: Program Committee Meetings (includes Administrative Advisors)**

1:30-1:45pm Welcome and Introductions of Committee Members  
Approval of Minutes  
Agenda and Membership Lists Review and Revisions

1:45 – 2:30pm Updates from Administrative Advisors  
Regional Update (Bo)

2:30 – 3:00pm National Update (NIFA Advisor, Brent Elrod)

Jenny asked everyone to introduce themselves and we also went over the agenda items – (1) Updates from Administrative Advisors and SRDC (2) opportunity to talk with NIFA (on a teleconference); (3) upcoming meeting with MMs; and (4) 2013 plan of work and report of accomplishments

National/Regional Update from Administrative Advisors – Joe Zublena reported that they are some personnel changes. Nick Place is coming in as the new Extension director at University of Florida. Nick came from University of Maryland and he is outgoing chair for the Excellence in Extension Implementation Team. Joe will be replacing him on that team. Doug Steele was named sole finalist for the Texas AgriLife Extension Service director position. Gary Lemme has been named as the executive director of the Alabama Cooperative Extension System (in Oct. 2011). Our ASRED officers will be: Jimmy Henning (KY) will serve as chair, Beverly Sparks (GA) will be the chair elect, Karen Ramage (KY) will serve as secretary and Gaines Smith (AL) will serve as past chair. For ECOP committee, we have Paul Coreil (LA), James Trapp (OK), and Jimmy ?? (will replace Ed Smith (who recently retired). Jimmy will replace Ed. Paul Coreil will be ECOP chair in 2013-14. Paul will replace Ed on the policy committee. Some of the big things on federal side are the formula funding. With new proposed farm bill, much of the budget increases are going into competitive funding. Extension Directors across the United States are working really hard to keep the formula funding intact – e.g., Hatch-Lever (for 1862s) and Evans-Allen (for 1890s). Extension director are interested in keeping that capacity funding in there because it gives us flexibility to do our work at the local level. As you consider emerging issues, like disasters, NIFA is “pre-determined” in terms of where they want to the money and the funding goes to a limited people who apply. *eXtension* is still alive and growing. We presently have 70 communities of practice (CoP), 450 learning lessons, and “ask an expert” pages are going well with 5,000 questions reported each month. We have done 400 webinars. There have been 76 competitive grants (totaling \$15 million) awarded to support CoPs. There is an effort at the national level involving *Strategic Opportunities* – the ECOP study education committee – and *Excellence in Extension Implementation Team* – both teams met by conference call. Both teams are looking at success stories and they are trying to put some stories together behind the impacts. They are interested in pulling these efforts together – the stories, matrices, and pulling together an *excellence in Extension* database. The database was started 5 years ago for the purpose of documenting institutional-level indicators of Extension’s success. The database is also useful in that it allows the Extension system to compare and benchmark each of our organizations with others (who are considered to our peers). Extension directors have access to the database and they find information on fiscal, personnel, programmatic, and demographic matters. The southern region reviewed the Batelle study that was completed for No. Central Region Association of State Ag. Experimental Station Directors and No. Central Cooperative Extension Association

and liked what was prepared. The southern region is still interested in having a similar study to expand beyond traditional agriculture and include local foods, forestry, youth development, FCS, and CRD. The southern region has submitted their data to Batelle and this study will be done jointly with research as well as extension. Teams will be sent to Atlanta for the Integrated Grantmanship workshop. Teams will consist of both research and extension personnel.

Jenny asked if there was a way to marry the work that is currently being done to come up with the indicators and national plan. Joe responded that it is more important to identify key indicators that every state can do and he felt our group was going in that direction. Jenny recognized Susan Jakes for her overall effort in drafting program indicators. She has had conversations with our counterparts in other regions, like No. Central & Northeast, to uncover the matrices that truly highlight our work nationwide. Joe also responded that they are things we are important to us (as specialists) at the state level but may be as important for state level marketing so it is important to prioritize the state and national level marketing matrices for the database. Jenny asked Joe how he sees CRD using the information from the Batelle study. Joe said that it is hard to say at this point but the report will be a “third-party analysis” of our regional strengths. He hopes that it will show how the competitiveness of the agricultural sector as an example in NC and it fares in comparison to other places in the South as an economic driver. Joe thinks that we will have this work done in about a year. There was a lengthy discussion on where the data would be derived (county or state level) and whether they will be able to know the different nuances that exist within our states that the data will not explain. Joe mentioned that they will be meeting in November to discuss how the study will be carried for our region. Some of the members of the group were not sure how much they could contribute since they didn’t know what the study will unveil. Sandra made report for Lawrence Carter (FAMU) who serve as the 1890 Administrative Advisor. The Association of Extension Administrators (AEA) held their system-wide conference in Memphis, Tennessee in June. More than 500 people attended the meeting. She reported that 1890 RBS funding has ended unless some changes come about in a year or so. This funding was vital for about 15 or 16 institutions in that it provided support for them develop programs for future entrepreneurs and businesses in rural communities that have the most economic need. South Carolina State is developing an online program for family and consumer sciences and potentially extension education.

Regional Update (Bo Beaulieu) – Bo provided updates for the following things – Strong Economies Together (SET); Ready Communities, Turning the Tide on Poverty, Extension Broadband Education, and National Agricultural and Rural Development Policy Center. 26 states have participated in SET. There are about 40+ hours training. SRDC are now in the program’s fourth iteration (due to participant feedback). We have 9 modules (for SET) with 3 more added. The program provides economic data for the participating cluster teams. Participants have asked for the elements that are critically important to build a “high quality” regional plan. SRDC has sent a letter to all Extension directors, announcing that there will be fourth phase of SET. We would be interested in working with states (like FL and TN) that have not participated in SET before, but states that were in earlier phases in SET can participate again. They have an external third party evaluation team from University of Cincinnati and they have visited several sites and they will be preparing a special report. Rachel and Bo have been collecting impact data for SET. SET has helped to strengthen relationship between RD and extension programs. Also, the capacity of regional groups working together have increased and SET has played a part for generating \$5.1 million by initial investments made by RD (at about \$2 mil) and additional dollars captured by states. Ready Communities (RC) is a program that helps build the capacity of communities to be prepared for and respond to disaster issues. FEMA put together a book called Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG). Although the guide has a good community development process, there is some substance (or detail) still lacking. SRDC decided to take the CPG guide and some depth to it with the creation of the *Ready Community* guide. Bo presented the steps emphasized in the RC guide. Texas and Montana was part of the pilot effort. They just completed training in Memphis. Allison (KY) is received a support through Smith-Lever funds to expand training to 10 states for a national training next fall. Bo shared some of the data collected from states that participated in the *Turning the Tide of Poverty* program. They found five major benefits to the program – some of benefits mentioned: (1) some people felt this is reminiscent to

what Extension was before in having a larger community development role; (2) others said that the program allowed them to reach out to new audiences and reach out to diverse groups of people; (3) there was a change in mindset where people feel empowered and have equal points to understanding their community. Program participant surveyed also felt that they should play a role in helping communities weigh through controversial issues. Bo also provided information about the *Extension Broadband Education and Adoption Team (e-BEAT)*, which was created as part of a grant from the governor's office to help Mississippi participate in a digital economy by using broadband and information technology to further community and economic development opportunities. SRDC have also put a national team on broadband education and he identified the states that are part of broadband extension initiative. Lastly, the regional rural development centers (RRDCs) were recently chosen by NIFA/USDA to establish the National Agricultural and Rural Development Policy Center (or NARDeP). The purpose of the center is to provide unbiased information on rural and agricultural policy issues. They are soliciting people to prepare policy briefs. SRDC has also announced a second year of funding for its *Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant Program*. The program is intended to invest in graduate students (in the U.S.) pursuing doctoral research in areas that closely align with the research priorities of the RIDGE Center (e.g., child nutrition, food security, food choices, household economic instability, food/nutrition assistance, and other related topics). SRDC has taken a hit in funding – and that has resulted in some staffing changes.

National Update (NIFA Advisor – Brent Elrod) – The conference call was with Brent Elrod who serves as the National Program Leader (NPL) - Extension Military Support Programs at USDA, Alishia Shipley who is serving as a program specialist providing support for the entire center and other program staff. Question 1 (by Jenny): Can you speak about what is happening in NIFA that may impact CRD work? Brent talked briefly about the *Virtual Center for Rural America*. In response to the retirement of Sally Maggard who served as the NPL for Regional Rural Development, program leaders were told that they needed to come up with an effective way to provide assistance to that portfolio. They have come up with this virtual center idea and their coordinator is Pat Hipple is the NPL for Sustainable Farm Enterprises and Rural Development and the designated personnel providing support for this team include Brent E. (who serving as a liaison to WRDC); Cindy Reeves, the NPL for Nutrition and Health (and a liaison to NERC RD), Beverly Samuel, the NPL for Family and Consumer Sciences (and a liaison to SRDC), and Suzanne LeMenestrei, NPL for youth development programs (and a liaison to NCR CRD). NIFA support CRD activities through the four rural development centers, Farm Bill research, and special partnerships (like SET). Other key initiatives include the StrikeForce Community Initiative. StrikeForce communities are those with 45 percent or more children received free or reduced school meals. Three pilot states are AK, GA, and MS. The program is designed to help relieve persistent poverty in high poverty counties by accelerating USDA assistance while working closely with community based organizations. NIFA recently renewed a MOU with National Endowment of Financial Education (NEFI). A series of webinars are planned – with the first one scheduled for Nov. 27<sup>th</sup> from 2 to 3:30pm. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is trying to get information out to Native American tribes about personal finances and consumer fraud. He also announced about there will receive some additional dollars to support a collaboration between USDA and HUD called the *National Healthy Homes partnership* which is designed to help families learn about the risks they face at home and how to reduce them. Another federal partnership underway is the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. This program provides education for people who benefit from services covered under Affordable Care Act and this also includes businesses – with special emphasis on AL, AK, FL, GA, LA, and MS. NIFA also have some special initiatives to support veterans. Brent is leading a taskforce that has been chartered to strengthen and coordinate programmatic and outreach efforts across the department to better serve military and veteran families. Proposed work plans to support this effort will be drafted by Rural Development (housing), Farm Service Agency (credit & business planning), Nat. Resource Conservation Service (green jobs), Economic Research Service with support from NASS (research and data collection). Question 2: Can you address NIFA's entrepreneurship effort – he re-emphasized about the work about the military family taskforce. He felt that we would have an opportunity to provide input, engage veterans in these programs, determine opportunities to pilot these initiatives. Bo posed a question for Brent – Will the program be expanded to provide business planning support to veterans who are interested in creating a business (that is not ag. related)? For that to

happen, it would include bringing in more federal partners, like to Dept of Commerce and Dept of Labor, who can handle potential opportunities (being described). Jenny asked how we can help NIFA in their effort – Brent said that they would like to solicit our ideas, identify places with a sizeable military population, and identify other federal partners that can support this effort. Brent said he will send some information to Rachel (see page 8-9) for more information). Bonnie (WV) announced that each state should have a Military One Source (MOS) Representative. So we should contact them and they can disclose the greatest needs for military personnel and veterans in your respective state. Contact information for MOS representative can be found online.

**Wednesday, August 22nd: Program Committee Meetings (without Administrative Advisors)**

- 8:00am     Finalize and approve 2011-2012 Plan of Work Report  
              Finalize CRD Program Night Out Plans
  
- 8:30am     Review of Issues and Opportunities  
              NACDEP  
              1890 participation  
              National Indicators Update  
              Cross Committee Discussion / reports  
              Staffing / Financial Cuts – updates for MM Meeting
  
- 9:30am     Begin Plan of Work in Response to Issues and Opportunities
  
- 10:30am    Middle Managers Meeting

Jenny asked Rod Clouser to provide some background about working with middle managers (MMs). Three years ago, it was brought to our attention that programming priorities had changed in terms of needs but staffing patterns had not. Michael Wilcox drafted a regional survey for the southern region to find out the needs in CRD which later turned into a national survey. The surveyed revealed that CRD is the lowest funded program. Response rate (overall) was at 36 percent, but regionally, the response rate was higher in the south. 60 percent of the southern institutions provide less than 5 percent of their institutional budget to CRED area. Two-thirds of those who responded nationwide reported that less than 5 percent of their budget support CRD area. North Central region has become a benchmark so they may be a possibility to partner with them on a future proposal as we consider the next steps for moving forward in addressing some of these staffing and funding issues. If the response is positive at our meeting, the North Central middle managers will be meeting in Lexington next year and they would be willing to meet with representatives from the southern region at that time to discuss this matter further.

A considerable amount of time was spent discussing who would attend the middle managers meeting. So we ultimately decided to have a small delegation (about 6 to 8 people) attend the middle managers meeting and everyone else would stay to work on the 2013 plan of work. Jenny asked that what will be message will be bringing forward to MMs. Rod said that our initial thought was to propose that every district region in the south has at least one (1) FTE on the county operations end and an appropriate staff member at the state level to support them. We would be talking about middle management and not district directors. Rod echoed that although every state is different, the regional/district directors that work with those county governments have some ability to influence how they refilled positions. Rod reported a statement that shared by Joe Summers and he observed that Extension Directors are beginning to understand that agriculture has an economic development component – so the timing may be right to have this discussion. Bo met with representatives from NACo (Nat'l Association of Counties) and they had a recent meeting with Extension leadership. Their message to us is to Extension needs to change. They are not interested in putting money into programs that don't have any major benefit to the counties. They support the investments made in youth development (4-H) but they are interested in seeing Extension doing things that improve the economy or quality of life of our communities. This would put community development at the center of these

activities. Bo felt that it is important to emphasize to middle managers that NACo is requesting that Extension, in some sense, takes a look at itself and how we can position our self to invest activities or programs that benefit communities. Michael perceives that middle managers are standing in the way in some instances with respect to our work by bringing in grants and disallowing field faculty to work with campus faculty. Michael has had this to happen on several occasions. Rod said that it is important to note that Extension Directors felt CRD is a vital component of their overall Extension program. They are very neutral in their response when asked if this work could be done by someone working in agriculture, family and consumer science or another program area in Extension – so it is important to look at the staffing patterns.

Michael and Rod did a “trial-run” of their presentation for MMs (see if the presentation can be archived in the minutes). They answered some questions that members had about the presentation.

NACo Discussion – The program leader representative from GA reported that this year, NACo’s Board made a decision to not fund the *Ralph L. Tabor Extension fellow* position, 2012-13. The position has been in place since 1985 and a fellow (typically a mid- or late- Extension professional) was offered an opportunity to live and work in Washington, D.C., and learn first-hand about the workings of the U.S. Congress and federal agencies. The program has helped to enhanced the national partnership between NACo, the Cooperative Extension Service and the nation’s land-grant universities. This action raised some questions among Extension faculty. Counties realize that Extension is struggling to be timely and relevant and counties are hesitant to commit scarce resources to Extension if we are not going to be cutting edge. The report outlined eight topics they wanted county government and Extension could come together on – rural/urban interdependence, civic engagement (especially with youth), agriculture, food systems and safety, health living, nutrition, and combating obesity, regionalism, economic development (in general as well as agriculture). It seems that we are doing these things but we are not communicating how well we are doing well (like leveraging partnerships). NACo would like for us to be catalysts instead of conveners. It also means that we need to take credit for the things we are doing. Bo felt this is also a response to our organization becoming more marginalized.

Jenny said that our work with coming up a common matrix to report our impacts would help. Susan felt that it was relevant but separate issues – there is an issue of defining the indicators, making sure the indicators are good enough to report against, and communicating those impacts to the public. Michelle said that it would be helpful to work with communication team to market or publicize our work. Sandra was concern that it would be difficult to ask the communication team to focus on the issues faced by specific institutions. She felt this needs to be something that we can take on. Bo mentioned that he felt that southern institutions do a good job working across state lines. He suggested that we could highlight what we are doing well across state boundaries – but also highlight programs that particular states are doing well. It could follow a certain style – something that would be too long (possibly 1 or 2 pages) but captures our relevance as a program area but highlights the impacts being made. Jenny raised the idea of having listening sessions to gather stakeholder input. Deborah cautioned that we need to show people what we have done with the information they initially provided – because we go and ask same people for their input without telling them how we utilize their information than it doesn’t put us in a favorable light. Brian reported that we could host meetings for county commissioners to report that we are doing in Extension.

We talked that drafting a one-pager which highlights our regional efforts and follow a similar format if we wanted to market our program initiatives statewide. It was recommended that the statewide program initiatives could fall under three broad themes defined on the SRDC webpage.

Program Indicators Report – Deborah Tootle and Susan Jakes

Deborah and Susan passed out two hand-outs for our review – e.g., Proposed CRED Indicators (for more information can be found at [http://srdc.msstate.edu/crd\\_indicators/index.html](http://srdc.msstate.edu/crd_indicators/index.html) and logic model (highlighting the

priorities, strategy, and short, intermediate, and long term outcomes). The logic model information is located on the PLN website. Susan updated us on how they pulled the list of indicators together. She said that she had conversations with members in North Central and Northeast regions. All four regions also met in NACDEP (last May) and there, each group reported where they were in respect to indicators. After that discussion, they mutually agreed to use North Central list of indicators and discuss the things that were not covered. Susan thought it would be important to come up a short list of indicators (no more than 5 that resonates mostly with our stakeholders). Some of the states do not collect data on all of the indicators presented on the handout. We have not begun to collect data yet. Deborah and Susan have volunteered to serve on the core indicators team for the national group. So it seems the next task will be to operationalize some of these indicators and coming up with a matrix. To provide background information, we need to give thought to how the indicators were operationalized in the state, how it was measured, and what the data source was so it can trace our work backwards.

**For 2013 Plan of Work & Action Items (see attachments – CRD plan of work 2012-13.doc and crd\_pptemp\_12-13.ppt)**

**Thursday, August 23rd: Program Committee Meetings (without Administrative Advisors)**

- 8:00 – 8:30am PLC Report
- 8:30 – 9:15am State Reports
- 9:15 – 10:00am New Business

Michelle Eley presided over the session (since Brian had to leave for OK on Wednesday afternoon).

PLC report – Rod and Joy provided us with an update.

IT had a long list of action items. The committee will try to assure follow-up on action items. Minutes will be posted on the PLN website along with all the committee PowerPoint files. There was a move to change a “subcommittee” language to “task force” in the CRD action items. Need to make sure Directors know about the NACo report. It is on the agenda today. Need to figure out who the NACo state rep is (probably will be the state director).

There is a need that we have a consistent message from CRD about what we want in terms of strengthening CRD.MM may need a proposal from us. We may need to resurrect some really good training for educators, to help folks already on the ground more ramped up with good CD practice. MM committee wanted other programs to be involved and not seeing us as grabbing positions. Need to go to the April mtg with a plan to reflect.

State Reports will be posted on the web

ASRED/AEA added to action A that we want NIFA to reply back to our request for a dedicated CRD person and on the MM task that that task force take charge of making a report back to AEA/ ASRED.

New business topic:

Training plan for CRD – with SRDC – Bo – Foundations of Community Development – this was given to the states to train their people. So a couple options – should we resurrect a multi-state training program? This could be a combination of face to face and webinar? We also want to build social capital across state networks. We can explore on the next conference call. Combining mentorship, dual face to face with webinars in between, exploring certification, certificates, need to explore this more. Need whatever we do to be legitimate. The NERCARD currently

administers the Foundations of Practice online for all 4 regions. Maybe we can use the core list from the institute action item with the addition of Bruce, Deborah, Susan, Michelle to be discussed on the next conference call for PLN.

Community Dev. Society – call for papers coming soon. It meeting will be in Charleston, SC in July 2013.

Rod Clouser – Southern Economics Extension Committee – issues in programming. This year they proposed an idea to organize a symposium at the Southern Agriculture Symposium (SAS) on the huge economic growth that is coming to the south. The resource issues, rural/urban interface, natural resources, infrastructure, competition, land use, impacts on rural areas and communities. Will THIS group be a sponsor/ collaborator on this project? Will we endorse – to give it more weight when it is sent in? This will provide something for the social scientists who come and give it some CRD tie and weight. April proposed that this be cross listed with the rural soc conference mtg together at this conference.

A question was raised about water and waste water issues common across states? It is a big issue in Arkansas. For example a levee in AR was used as fill dirt.

## **Sample Projects To Be Authorized Under A Joint MOU**

### **Examples of Joint DOD/VA USDA Partnerships that could be developed within existing USDA capacities and authorities if authorized or funded under a joint MOU:**

- 1) The Beginning Farmer Rancher Development Program already funds projects that train returning Veterans. Additional funds could be designated to fund more Veteran-serving projects within the existing program authorities and administrative capacities.
- 2) The 2008 Farm Bill authorized an individual development account program for beginning farmers and ranchers, however funds were not appropriated. The Farm Service Agency has a draft rule in place to administer the program should it be funded. Military money could fund a Beginning Farmer and Rancher Individual Development Account program that would be limited to Veterans.
- 3) The AgrAbility program funds services to disabled farmers and ranchers or farmers and ranchers who want to hire disabled employees but need financial assistance with equipment modification and training. This program is already serving Veterans and could serve more Veterans entering careers in agriculture with additional funds.
- 4) USDA has physical infrastructure in all rural counties, and through the Forest Service has facilities in remote rural places. These offices could host mobile health clinics, job fairs and other activities.

### **Examples of Joint DOD/VA/Labor/USDA Partnerships that could be developed within existing USDA capacities if authorized or funded under a joint MOU:**

- 1) Training center in conjunction with housing development. USDA has housing and infrastructure development authority as well as authority to fund farm training centers. A properly situated farm training center could also have a USDA funded food hub which would aggregate products from surrounding farms. With Department of Labor funding the food hub could be a training center. Examples of skilled jobs needed at a food hub are: produce broker, institutional sales manager, butcher, chef, institutional chef's consultant, forklift operator, cooler operator, logistics manager, truck driver, bookkeeper.
- 2) Cross promoting the USDA funded, Farmer-Veteran Coalition produced Resource Guide for Veteran Careers in Agriculture which will be published in September. This guide will cross reference military job codes with careers in agriculture. Agricultural jobs can range from the independent small farmer and large scale farm managers to engineers and mechanics that maintain very specialized equipment. Many of these jobs involve high level logistics, leading large teams, working with heavy equipment and dangerous chemicals. In hot climates all of that can take place at night. Agriculture jobs also exist in suburban and urban areas and include the nursery and landscape industry, agro-forestry (orchards, trees and tree crops), biofuels, and a range of other green energy jobs.



## Veterans Farm Training Center Discussion Points

*Summary:* USDA has housing and infrastructure development authority as well as authority to fund farm training centers. A properly situated farm training center could also serve as a research and teaching facility, utilizing the expertise of the state land-grant university and Cooperative Extension System, in conjunction with other public and private partners that may include land-trusts, foundations, and community-based organizations. Veterans Farm Training Centers could range from garden to mid-sized commercial to large scale commodity with integrated housing and environmental remediation, conservation, and habitat restoration.

*Rationale:* Three concurrent issues provide the rationale for Veterans Farm Training Centers. First, the aging farming population; second, the need for more training and employment opportunities for veterans; and third, the availability of land through trusts and endowments. Each of these issues is particularly salient in rural areas (see <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-22.pdf>).

*Potential Partners:* The **Farmer Veteran Coalition** ([www.farmvetco.org](http://www.farmvetco.org)) provides information, mentoring, training, and placements for veterans to encourage employment and entrepreneurship in agriculture. **Combat Boots to Cowboy Boots** (<http://liferaydemo.unl.edu/web/ncta/combatacowboyboots>) assists military personnel, their families and veterans to become Farmers, Ranchers, and Entrepreneurs in their next careers. The **American Farmland Trust** ([www.farmland.org](http://www.farmland.org)) works to protect the nation's farm and ranch land, keeping it healthy and improving the economic viability of agriculture.

### *Considerations:*

- *Physical resources.* Condition of the soils and the source and quality of water. Capacity of the land?
- *Type of trust.* Land trust should be at the table very early on. Ideally an agricultural-based land trust not just an open space land trust (e.g., American Farmland Trust).
- *Sustainability and profitability.* The products that get grown and sold typically just cover the direct input and marketing costs. Land should not be donated in a restricted way so that some can get sold to provide capital.
- *Oversight, accountability, and partners:* Who manages the site? Who are partner agencies in the agricultural, military and philanthropic community at a local, regional, state and national level?
- *Location and production:* What is available/needed size - total and useable for production? Proximity to farmers and markets? What are the market opportunities?
- *Safety, security, and liability.* Neighborhood safety, animals, theft, physical (rocks, slopes)?
- *Participants.* Eligibility? Number? What size plots? Equipment sharing? Tenure? Fees?

### *Spectrum examples:*

Demonstration garden for kids and others (i.e., Peoples Garden, Stone Barns)

Demonstration habitat restoration projects

Teaching nursery for native plants to be used in restoration projects

Teaching farm for serious apprenticeships (i.e., UCSC CASFS)

Farm incubator for farmers in initial years with some support services such as group classes and shared equipment and marketing infrastructure (i.e., ALBA, New Entry Sustainable Farming Project)

Low-cost leases for established farmers (i.e., Prairie Crossing) with the possibility of additional lease incentives for restorative farming to build soils.

Possible role for long term research on commodity crops (i.e., UC Davis Russell Ranch)

Possible role for demonstrations of restorative grazing (i.e., The Land Institute)

Possible role for demonstration of conservation farming and ranching practices