About this document

Despite the similarity of land use issues across states in the region, there has been insufficient sharing and communication among the states about land use extension programs, particularly by county-level extension staff. On May 5-6, 2003, The Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development hosted a multi-state workshop for extension faculty and staff working on land use issues, to nurture such sharing and communication. At the workshop, participants shared program ideas, learned more about the land use educational programming in other northeast States, identified common programming needs, and outlined ways of supporting each other and working together more effectively in the future.
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Introduction

Land use issues are among the most important concerns affecting Northeastern states, and they are the focus of a variety of Cooperative Extension programs. Despite the similarity of land use issues across states in the region, however, there has not been enough sharing and communication among the states about land use extension programs, particularly by county-level extension staff.

On May 5 and 6, 2003, The Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development hosted a regional hands-on workshop for extension faculty and staff working on land use issues, to nurture such sharing and communication. At the workshop, participants identified common programming needs, shared program ideas, learned more about the land use educational programming in other Northeast states, and found ways of supporting each other and working together. This was an opportunity to get to know extension faculty and staff in nearby states who are working on land use issues, what is working for them (and what is not), and to identify opportunities to improve Extension agents’ and specialists’ own programming. The workshop was designed to encourage discussion, program sharing, and planning, with much time spent in small group work and discussion. A poster session with resource sharing tables provided a direct opportunity to highlight programs in individual states.

One concrete outcome of the workshop is the creation of several regional working groups focused on specific land use programs, as identified by workshop participants. The workshop results and working group foci also will be used to develop regionally-supported, multi-state land use programs, and a follow-up train-the-trainer regional conference in 2004.

1. Background on Land Use Issues

Issues surrounding how land is being – and should be – used are at the center of public debate in more and more places in the Northeast US. To illustrate, the Harrisburg, PA newspaper contained several stories involving explicit or implicit conflict over land use on the days leading up to the workshop (see the adjacent box). In fact, local newspapers are a good source for understanding how conflicts over land are being played out locally, as well as the issues involved.

Recent Newspaper Examples

The Patriot-News, Harrisburg, PA

Shippensburg Twp. approves permit for Wal-Mart site (May 4, 2003)

Commissioners weigh plan: 94-home development proposed for Hampden Twp. Site: Charter Homes wants to build The Preserve, a 94-home, open space development, on approximately 90 acres... (May 4, 2003)

Residents split over Linglestown Road commercial plan: Property values, traffic discussed (May 1, 2003)

Central Dauphin School District moves to claim site adjacent to high school (April 30, 2003)
Maps prepared by the Natural Resource and Conservation Service show disproportionately high rates of land development in the Northeast corridor between 1982 and 1997, especially around the rapidly merging cities of Boston, New York and Washington, DC (see top figure). Likewise, a map prepared by the American Farmland Trust shows large areas in the Northeast US in which high-quality farmland is being subjected to high rates of development (see adjacent figure).

Seven of the top ten states in terms of the percent of Non-Federal Land that was Developed Land in 1997 are in the Northeast: New Jersey, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, Delaware and Pennsylvania, according to the National Resource Conservation Service. Furthermore, the Northeast US led the nation in terms of the amount of land converted to accommodate growth in population between 1982 and 1997 (Fulton et al. 2001). Within the Northeast, Pennsylvania was the clear leader in terms of this criterion. The US West, often thought of as sprawling (e.g., Los Angeles), was in fact the most efficient region in terms of the amount of land used to provide housing for newcomers to the region.

At the same time, the supply of new housing units during the 1990s has lagged behind that of earlier decades. In the 1990s, when population expanded at an unprecedented rate, only 41 new homes were built for every 100 new residents of the nation. This compares with 75 and 65 new homes per 100 residents, respectively, during the 1970s and 1980s. Thus, the problem is less one of how many new homes are being built than one of how and where the new homes are being built in terms of the amount of land that is being consumed. This in turn has implications for educational opportunities facing Cooperative Extension.

Large amounts of data and information are becoming available through space-age technologies such as remote sensing and web-enabled Geographic Information System.
A challenge for the research and Extension community is, how do we integrate and package these to make them readily available to communities and individual decision-makers at the local level?

Finally, we need to address the question, What are our land use policy goals? Is it to preserve farmland (acres); maintain family farms (number of farms); protect farm income ($ total, per farm); preserve natural landscapes and scenic vistas; retain/expand (rural) employment (jobs); expand homeownership (% of homes); or to enhance the health of the population in general? What are the costs and benefits of each of these goals?

2. Workshop Procedures and Initial Priorities Identified

At the beginning of the workshop, participants were assigned into one of five groups for the purpose of brainstorming about priority issues. A total of 85 issues were listed (see the Appendix). From this list, a dozen aggregated issues were compiled and participants asked to vote on each one. The following six priorities emerged:

1. Local decision maker education; data needs, multi-municipality planning.

2. Community capacity building. How do citizens effectively engage land use issues?

3. Understanding planning and land use tools, technical topics


5. Protecting or enhancing community quality of life

6. Agricultural economic development and farmland preservation (including forestland, open space)

In addition, priorities related to process skills and needs were identified. They are listed here separately from the content or subject matter issues:

A. Using distance education/technology

B. Addressing apathy/increasing involvement

C. Providing written materials, data, web resources

D. Collaborating on- and off-campus

See, for example, terraserver.microsoft.com
E. Evaluating and assessing (Extension)

F. Measuring multiple impacts (environmental, social, economic, wildlife)

G. Achieving stakeholders/balance, Public Issues Education

H. Engaging local officials and/or the public

I. Distinguishing between advocacy and education (mission statement)

Before they broke out into the small groups that were self-organized around each priority content issue, participants were given the following discussion guidelines:

1. Audience: who is it?

2. What needs exist for extension programming for this priority?

3. What are the educational objectives?

4. What are the research needs?

5. List “Project” Ideas

3. Top Priorities Identified

The discussions held by each group are summarized in the following sections.

Priority 1: Local Decision-Maker Education
by Michael Dougherty, West Virginia University

Little can be accomplished in the area of land use without getting onboard those who make or influence the major decisions in a community. To that end, we feel that one of the most important steps that must be taken is to develop educational programming that is targeted toward these individuals so that they understand what planning is, why it is important, and why they should support such activities in their communities, as well as on a regional (multiple community) or statewide basis.
The target audience for such education includes both formal and informal leaders in the community. These are elected officials at all levels - local, county, regional (sub-state), state, multi-state (regional), and national; land use or planning and zoning boards; hired planning staffs; legislative staffs; school boards and other school officials; associated agencies that have authority over areas such as water, sewer, solid waste, economic development, and regional cooperation; prominent business persons; and the heads of civic, social, and church-based organizations.

The program needs to cover topics such as standard (boilerplate) planning regulations, the value and need for planning, planning tools and design standards, and the utility of regional efforts. The explanation of planning regulations covers questions of meaning and effect (or effect of not taking action) of regulation. The need and value of planning expands on this by examining different scenarios and options.

The discussion of planning tools and design standards shows how upfront review and analysis can make a difference. And, the discussion on regionalism demonstrates how actions in one place can and do impact other communities (i.e., externalities).

Several research needs have been identified to enhance this effort. One area of inquiry involves an investigation of the various incentive programs as well as tax structures that impact land use. Farmland preservation, efforts at maintaining open space, and other innovative mechanisms for directing land use rely on non-traditional methods for guiding (or confining) development. However, the effectiveness and results of these actions over the long-term still must be determined. Related to this, tax systems that differentiate between land uses similarly impact development and also need to be examined.

Along those lines, another set of research topics includes the various laws and rules that affect land use decision-making. These range from federal environmental regulation to state planning statutes to economic development programs at both levels of government. Each affects land use. However, in most cases, these impacts have not been studied, documented, or even defined. Thus, an analysis of relevant laws would have great merit. Finally, there needs to be an identification of information needs for local decision-makers related to planning that are not being met by current sources. This includes direct and indirect planning issues and topics such as water (quality and quantity), waste water, solid waste, and general infrastructure and transportation matters.

Two projects are associated with this effort. The first is the creation of a curriculum that offers an easily understood introduction for new officials, but is part of a
system that has advanced topics courses for more experienced officials and community leaders. Advanced topics may include developing new ways to effectively handle input, especially from those who seek to sabotage or subjugate the planning process, as well as examining the specialized case of development at the rural-urban interface (fringe).

The initial step is to catalog available resources on these subjects, such as Pennsylvania Municipal Planning Education Institute as well as American Planning Association and International City/Council Management Association resources. This curriculum also has state-specific modules to provide the additional local knowledge needed by decision-makers, in addition to providing them with the basics about the planning process. This effort can be considered a success if those who complete the course use their knowledge to improve their decision-making. Resources to do this need to be made available to the group of State Specialists who would take the lead, consulting with and being assisted by County Agents throughout the process.

The second project is the development of a scenario analysis process. This involves build-out analysis as well as a consideration of various alternatives using a cost-benefit analysis mechanism. The results would be based upon regulatory options and include an explanation of the various standards used in the decision-making algorithm. As part of this, the cost and consequences of various actions and reactions as well as inaction are considered. This effort would be considered a success if it was adopted by local and state governments or used to revise or confirm existing regulations. Specialists and university faculty from across a variety of disciplines throughout the region need to work together to create the program. This needs to be coordinated with appropriate state agencies and professional associations. County agents would be used to review and test the validity of the program before its final dissemination.

Topic Leader: Michael Dougherty, West Virginia University

Priority 2: Community Capacity Building
by Alyssa Dodd, Penn State University

The group began with members introducing themselves and sharing why they had chosen this group discussion. Interests were diverse and included communications tools; concern that the public is losing a connection with farming; how educators address conflict and public issues; planning; public participation; local decision-making; indicators of sustainable land use; and distance education. The group discussed why community capacity building is important. Two major themes emerged: the
democratization of education and the belief that public involvement in the decision-making process leads to better choices and outcomes.

Community capacity programs have multiple audiences. The group initially defined the audience as the “community” and then later expanded this to include: county/community based leaders, the media, extension educators, planners, public health officials, business/civic leaders, state agencies, non-governmental organizations, stakeholder groups, watershed groups, agricultural leaders, land trusts, religious/ethnic organizations, real estate agents. One idea that emerged from this discussion was the importance of identifying opportunities where stakeholders may be identified and organized to make specific decisions.

The group discussion of programming needs was broad. It began with identifying the need to document and evaluate the impact of relationship building and all “efforts” that go into community capacity building. Demonstrating why participation is important was also identified as a programming need. This led to questions about the meaning of “public participation” and how to do it “well.” Land use “turf” issues among various agencies and groups were acknowledged by the group to be important. The question of extension’s role in this context was raised, but not explored.

Finally, research needs were explored. There is a need for better understanding of how national policy affects local decisions. The group acknowledged that research is being conducted, but there is a need to compile it. The identification of critical community indicators (including land use, health and environment) was discussed. Another important question raised early in the group discussion was “Are there best land use practices to promote?”

Topic Leader: Mary Beth Bennett, West Virginia University.

**Priority 3: Understanding and Using Land Use Toolkit**
*by Lori Lynch, University of Maryland*

We began our discussion with a go-around in which everyone talked about their role in the area of land-use, their thoughts on land use needs, and tools we might share.³ Participants have current experience in developing and promoting enabling

³The Good Neighbor Toolkit of Orange County, NY is one example.
legislation to be able to implement tools, in comprehensive planning, in flood plain management, in zoning and subdivisions, in farmland preservation, in using GIS to achieve a baseline measure to aid planning, in the difficulties of implementing state regulations at a local level, in assessing how effective land-use tools were once implemented, in using computer programs and other techniques to visualize an outcome, such as the PA Blueprint, and in experimenting with educational delivery mechanisms.

Given that most members of the group were from different states, our situations varied considerably. For example, should an emphasis of the group be building capacity in extension when some states (such as Massachusetts) have limited extension personnel now to work on this issue? A train-the-trainer approach and increasing access to educational materials remained in the forefront of our discussions. Several members of the group had found that web-based dissemination, organizing, and classes achieved effective educational delivery to many types of audiences, so we discussed developing this type of curriculum and dissemination strategy. Our most complete project proposal includes developing a Northeast website along the lines of the EDEN model so that land-use specialists can post educational materials and have a bulletin board to disseminate news for both extension educators and the general public. Tim Collins (PSU) and Peter Marshall (WVU) agreed to lead this effort. The draft of the proposal was circulated to the project members for comment. We plan to solicit the Northeast Extension Directors for support for such a website so that all states participate in the development and use of this tool. We will also seek funding for initial web development and on-going servicing thereafter.

Another need in addition to sharing information among states was a user-friendly procedure to evaluate one’s community. This might include scenarios of what could happen if the community approved one type of policy over another. Some materials are available but we thought some evaluation or research into how they might best be used or not used was needed. In addition, research could document gaps in this area and other materials that need to be created. A consistent set of community indicators might be useful for citizens to have. Many communities would benefit from the visualization of good land use planning. Thus, a research and education project that resulted in a video or other type of visual aid based on real cities, towns and resource areas that have achieved a desirable outcome – and how they got there – would be excellent.
Tim Collins provided a diagram of how we could use a train-the-trainer approach to build our extension (and other possible trainers’) infrastructure to reach the various audiences and stakeholder groups.

As mentioned above, our first project was to develop a website. We also would like to work together to inventory and collect already-produced land use and farmland preservation curriculum material. This will ensure there is material to post on the web. Maryland hopes to build on the current Pennsylvania activity of adapting the business retention and expansion model to the agricultural sector. The agricultural sector could complete a business plan and then work to have county officials recognize and incorporate it into the county economic development plan. Once Maryland and Pennsylvania have some experience with this model, they can develop materials and evaluation tools to help other states that would like to use this approach. In addition, the group discussed developing curriculum for train-the-trainer programs and GIS trainings. New resource materials are required to help train local citizens in GIS techniques. We need to develop educational materials that discuss issues and opportunities, the various options open to communities and the trade-offs they need to consider when making planning decisions. We did not get as far on this project in terms of developing clear steps to implementation. One of the members intends to inquire if PA Blueprint could be expanded to be useful in all the Northeast states. Another possible project includes compiling educational materials on farmland preservation from existing materials.

Topic Leader: Lori Lynch, University of Maryland

**Priority 4: Understanding Land Use Impacts**

*by Kathy Brasier and Charles Abdalla, Penn State University*

The group that formed around this topic had an interest in improving awareness of the social, economic and environmental effects of land use decisions at the local and regional levels. Our main concern was with identifying these impacts and effectively communicating them to local officials, interest groups, policy makers, and citizens. In so doing, we hope to increase the range of individuals and groups
who become involved in these decisions, and to equip them with more knowledge about the consequences of local land use choices. We think it is particularly important to personalize the message – that land use decisions affect me – in order to increase the involvement of people who are affected but have not been involved. Involvement prior to the development of a crisis or discussion of a ‘hot-button’ issue might prevent or reduce conflict.

In discussing these concerns, we identified two main educational projects for the group, with different audiences. The goal of the first project is to increase awareness and understanding of the personal effects of different types of land uses, with the result that a broader group of citizens might become involved in the decision-making process. Project 1 involves creating a sequential set of Awareness & Involvement Tools. The first piece is a short brochure; How Land Use Decisions Affect Me, My Family, My Community, and Future Generations, which will be available at county Extension offices, local government offices, community centers and libraries. The intent of this brochure is to motivate involvement by local citizens with a simple message – land use decisions affect them, and if they do not get involved, someone else will make decisions for them. The brochure would provide a small amount of information about the personal effects of land use decisions (drawn from the second piece, described below). These might include commute times, traffic patterns, safety concerns, taxes, water and air quality. The brochure will also describe the process through which land use decisions are made locally. It will emphasize how citizens can become involved and provide a list of contacts for more information about land use decisions in their community.

The second part of the first project is a checklist of the ways in which people are personally affected by land uses. Research needs to be conducted to develop this list, based on credible sources of information. Further, these impacts need to be translated into measurable indicators. We envision this list to be a worksheet, so that citizens can enter their own information and calculate a score, which characterizes their personal effects of land use decisions. This publication would also provide contact information and suggestions for how to become involved in the decision process at various levels. This checklist could become part of a program, so agents could stimulate discussion in their counties.

---

4 A credible and measurable list for personal and regional impacts includes commute times; taxes; schools (number of schools, SAT scores); property values (affordability, maintaining values); water and air quality; access/proximity to recreation; balance of land uses (risk spreading); dynamic, vibrant and diverse communities; and services (compare “desired” vs. actually provided and their costs); traffic and safety.
The goal of the second project is to improve local planners’ knowledge of existing land use decision tools. The means by which to accomplish this goal is to develop materials with assessments of land use tools which indicate the impacts of different land use options (such as Community-VIZ, GIS programs, build-out analyses, etc.) The assessment would describe and evaluate the tools in regard to the technical requirements and the degree of difficulty of using them.

Additionally, two other projects were discussed briefly, with the intent that a few group members (and possibly members of other groups) consider each of them further. One of these projects is to further investigate the legal aspects of land use, particularly related to private property rights. The group members involved are interested in developing a way to share information about breaking legal decisions and legislative actions that affect land use. The other project focuses on a survey to measure citizen preferences for community design and land uses. It would identify the key elements people think about when choosing where they live. The survey would also measure the trade-offs people are willing to consider. An example of such a tradeoff is increasing the ‘walkability’ of neighborhoods, which decreases the distance to shopping and cultural centers but may also decrease average property sizes and available parking.

Topic Leader: Charlie Abdalla, Penn State

Priority 5: Community Quality of Life

by Rod Howe, Cornell University

Quality of life offers an umbrella term under which the other five themes discussed at this workshop fit. But, quality of life has become an oft-used phrase to describe a number of characteristics that are not well defined. In terms of the relationship between quality of life and land use issues we suggest that there are a number of issues, questions or strategies. Many of these issues relate to personal choices, public policy, and commonly held mind-sets about land as a commodity. Quality of life is often described as the outcome of a desirable interplay between economic considerations, environmental health, and equity issues. Land Grant Universities and Extension can articulate strategies related to education, research, coordination
and communication and public policy by striving for abundance (variation on community sustainability as not limiting but enriching); encouraging holistic thinking (connections between economic, environmental, social and health factors and consideration of what will the impact be on all of these of a specific change in the community); promoting a wide range of choices for living abundantly and in a sustainable manner, recognizing that in different phases in one’s life there are differing needs and responsibilities; and by helping people develop connections and a sense of place, through forums for articulating what that looks and feels like.

Education/Process

- Helping elected officials, planners, planning board members see how innovative land use tools can help accomplish “quality of life”
- Educating community leaders and elected officials about how to negotiate with any entity that wants to come into the community to build, change or enlarge.
- Providing forums for visioning and strategic planning with broad community involvement
- Education focused on primary/secondary levels (holistic place-based curriculum and experiences)

Research Needs

- Develop a set of quality of life preference questions over a multi-year period to create datasets (encourage Northeast States to participate)
  1. general issue: what does the public want in terms of “abundant life.” Home in relationship to social networks, recreation, work, school, shopping, spiritual, cultural factors
  2. from research identify which variables are the most important or critical
- Analysis of existing research and surveys to develop a base or foundation

Coordination/Communication

- Land Grant Universities and Extension have a role to play in both coordina-
  tion and communication.
- Case studies of how tools have been utilized to meet a more expansive and rich list of preferences.
- Communication networks around regional (within states and multi-state) planning and coordination
  1. making connections
  2. fostering dialogue and innovation
3. multi-agency collaborations
4. dealing with state agencies (such as the Department of Transportation)

Public Policy
• From research, identify strategies for impacting policy at national and state levels:
  1. Transportation
  2. Health
  3. Education

Topic Leader: Rod Howe, Cornell University

Priority 6: Agricultural Economic Development and Farmland Preservation
by Bryan Butler, Maryland Cooperative Extension and Nelson Bills, Cornell University

Although this topic only barely made it through the initial selection process, the group had seven members from three states with a keen desire to find practical solutions for issues that varied from intensive development pressure encouraging producers to sell their land to reducing the amount of land that is abandoned and goes without any management at all. There is clear recognition that the future of Northeast agriculture is not only tied to land management issues but also to the economic vibrancy of farm businesses. Our discussion was directed at the interplay between farmland protection and fostering healthy farm and food businesses.

Much time was spent on questions pertaining to the prospect that agricultural land preservation programs are going to provide any real long term benefits in the Northeast and, if so, how the recipients of these benefits can be clearly identified. Because of its longevity and scope, it was determined that a study of the Maryland easement acquisition program may provide insightful information to the other NE states as well as Maryland. While much literature describes the Maryland program and the attributes affecting enrollment, the study we envision focuses on program impact. Namely, such a study would consider the program’s contribution to continued agricultural viability, effects on patterns of land ownership, and the capacity to
keep enrolled property in active farm use. We also see the need for more information on the views of the current owners. Do they want to opt out of the program? Finally we discussed the need to learn more about how the local community is affected by the preserved land.

We noted continuing interest in donated farmland easements. The suggestion was made to survey this group and pursue educational opportunities to make landowners aware of possible long-term benefits afforded them by making that type of donation.

Much time was also devoted to the concept of “working lands” (the terminology in some quarters is “working landscape”). We struggled with today’s definition of the rural scene and the components that need to be incorporated into a comprehensive assessment of working land. It was stressed that forest as well as farmland must be considered when evaluating the financial impacts of these working lands.

Attention was also given to data and definitions. One domain is the inclusiveness of current farm definitions. On the one hand, defining a farm place requires an extraordinarily low farm sales threshold ($1,000). But on the other, it was pointed out that definitions of farm are centered on commodity agriculture, and that other service-related elements of the working lands concept are falling out of current definitions. A key example is the equine industry, which appears to be counted in farm statistics in an overly selective way. Yet, we recognize that this term must be clearly defined and the concept needs to be made clear to the decision makers.

It was noted that maps are extremely effective educational tools; more study designated to overlay, past, present, and future resource inventories and commodity production would be valuable to educators. There also appears to be a minimum size for these working lands and a method to calculate this minimum needs to be determined. The shrinking size of wood lots, and their fragmentation, leads to the loss of the forestry industry and in turn the reduction in value of the forest products because of logistics. This, of course, leads to the overall lack of concern for management and preservation of this land as working lands.

Another topic is the question of consumers’ desire for local products. Researchable questions included: do people really understand the benefits of local food production to society -- i.e., reduced shipping and thus less pollution and fuel use, lower taxes and better schools due to reduced sprawl, preservation of rural land and
vistas though profitable agriculture instead of development rights purchased with public money? Discussion followed on the need for incentives for local stores and restaurants to use local products and develop consistent profitable markets for producers as well as education for consumers and decision makers regarding the overall societal benefits of a sustainable agricultural system.

Farm to Firm was another topic that was coined to describe the transition of an operation to either a value-added marketing component or a farm that branches into off farm work that is based on the farm, such as a trucking company or construction business. Issues such as zoning, neighbor relations, and dealing with planners will need to be considered and explored prior to launching such a venture. Opportunities abound regarding research and educational efforts when the impacts on the overall community may prove to be detrimental to the overall quality of life for local residents. In other words, could some of our efforts to save agricultural land actually harm communities or work at cross purposes with working lands objectives?
4. The Next Steps: Where we go from here (Projects)

Workshop participants in the different groups agreed to implementing the following projects as a follow-up to the workshop.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 – Local Decision Maker Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Educational Curricula for decision-makers</td>
<td>Mike Dougherty</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scenario development/“build-out,” rules</td>
<td>Mike Dougherty</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neal Fogle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 – Community Capacity Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good Neighbor Toolbox</td>
<td>Alyssa Dodd</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Guiding Principles”</td>
<td>David Kay</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 – Understanding and Using Land Use Tool Kit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Network for the Northeast</td>
<td>Tim Collins</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Marshall</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4 – Understanding Land Use Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ag Sector participating in planning</td>
<td>Tim Collins</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Motivational Brochure</td>
<td>Judy Essex</td>
<td>June 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Westa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Westa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Develop an impact list</td>
<td>Charles Abdalla</td>
<td>June 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy Brasier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Westa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How to participate in land use decision (state level)</td>
<td>Charles Abdalla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Reidy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Education specific to state</td>
<td>Charles Abdalla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Evaluation</td>
<td>Dan Reidy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Legal aspects of land use</td>
<td>Charles Abdalla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Reidy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Preference Survey</td>
<td>Kathy Brasier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Westa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 6 – Agricultural Economic Development and Farmland Preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “Farm to Firm”</td>
<td>Nelson Bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process Issues That Cut Across these Projects**

1. Application of GIS
2. What are the “Best Practices,” and sharing with other states

*Group 5 – Community Quality of Life was merged into the other groups.*
## Members of Working Groups by Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 – Local Decisionmaker Education</strong></td>
<td>Mike Dougherty, WV (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Culik, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neal Fogle, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Larson, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 – Community Capacity Building</strong></td>
<td>Mary Beth Bennett, WV (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Almquist, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alyssa Dodd, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Kay, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lois Levitan, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andy Turner, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 – Understanding and Using Land Use Tools</strong></td>
<td>Lori Lynch, MD (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Collins, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Marshall, WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Remcheck, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gisela Walker, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4 – Land Use Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Charlie Abdalla, PA (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy Brasier, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judy Essex, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Reidy, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Westa, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 5 – Quality of Life</strong></td>
<td>Rod Howe, NY (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Westa, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 6 – Agricultural Economic Development and Farmland Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Brian Butler, MD (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shannon Potter, MD (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson Bills, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl Brown, WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bobbie Harrison, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Kays, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Yohn, WV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: Detailed issues/topics identified on Day 1:

Group 1

1. Land use pattern people seem to buy but no one likes (short run/long run)
2. Acceptance vs. controls; trade-off: regulation vs. private property rights; land ethic/stewardship; inter-locality communication/programming
3. Role of Regional Planning Commissions
4. Holistic/Sustainability Issues
5. Lack of power & influence; (externalities/priority set externally); i.e., transportation, federal regulations
6. Community capacity building; (getting people involved) from the beginning
7. Build out scenarios (taxes other factors, cost of services)
8. Environmental impacts (pollution, waste, traffic)
9. Transportation
10. Infrastructure (transportation, water/sewer/solid waste, schools)
11. Fragmentation (farms, forests, habitat)
12. Housing Affordability-modify market outcomes
13. Downtown viability
14. Education vs. incentives
15. Private property rights/discussion in social perspective; what is valued and why?
16. Focus on youth programming = place in/for future; deal with Population/Demographic Change
17. Growth and decline; crime and school quality
18. Drive where people want to live; broadening role community groups/churches, etc. in planning and provision of public space
20. Watershed Programs
21. Impact if not connected to land use; (avoiding tough issues/passing the buck); vegetation change (related to global climate change)
22. Invasive species (“walking fish”)
23. Wildlife/human interaction
24. Preservation vs. open space (locally grown food - urban/rural agricultural interface)
25. Issue frames; impact on audience and perception (built-in bias being Extension)
26. Community-Based Agricultural Extension
27. Multifunctionality (Landscapes do more, avoid trade restrictions)

Group 2

28. Educate general public, farm population about smart growth
29. Establish characteristics of smart growth – so what, how it impacts individuals, communities
30. Addressing apathy
31. Address long-term impacts of land use; visual – build-out analysis
32. Implications of land use decisions
33. List of requirements for land use and reasons for these requirements
34. Implications of the requirements
35. Collaborative education of planning and zoning officials
36. Need for fact sheets, written materials
37. List of farmland protection success stories
38. National extension land use initiative – lacking?
39. Collaboration on-campus, inter-departmental planning/landscape architecture, etc.
40. Resource inventory – examples, case studies, etc.
41. Energy policy (national), cheap food, education, tax policy: how they impact land use
Group 3

42. Public policy education; little core capacity at state-level; low statewide emphasis/need for
guidance at state-level
43. Core data for land use decisions; GIS/mapping; building resources, keeping track of what’s
happening; transformation to useful formats for local use
44. Rural community development; loss of small town/sprawl; training and technical assistance
needs; need for longer planning horizons
45. Farmland preservation; tools (continuing education need); need to evaluate -- what works?
Local property taxes; more people further away from agriculture and how the food system
works; equine operations missing from agricultural statistics; local food systems – farm
profitability
46. Open space preservation
47. Flooding; flood plain management; not building in floodplains/marshy areas
48. Forest assets; tourism vs. harvesting; public use issues, environmental issues
49. Economic Development Decisions; employment
50. Watershed organization and water quality
51. Transportation; cost of importing commodities/Wal-Marts/implications for communities
52. Direct marking – local production/consumption
53. Ag-Based economic development; ex. processing

Group 4

54. Education for land trust and forestry/agriculture to develop working relationships where
land remains in production (working lands concept, donated vs. purchased)
55. What percent of land in preservation is in production? (vs. open space; land price after 5-
10 years)
56. Research (qualitative) on value of forested land – value to society of forested land
57. How do we manage growth to best manage what is already developed? Across a geo-
graphic area
58. Re-educate people about higher density housing as a way to maintain open space; cost of
services
59. Community capacity building education for local extension educators; education for local
economic development
60. Land use planning across state/county/township lines
61. How do you measure impact of training? On communities?
62. How do you deal with the two sides – supporters of agriculture versus developers? How
do we train people to be responsible for their actions; agriculture and forestry community
speaking as one voice.

Group 5

63. Political fragmentation; intergovernmental cooperation; pinelands region
64. Power of money, uneven resources
65. Lack of regulatory teeth
66. Encourage municipalities to decide what land uses to discourage
67. Multi municipal planning
68. Legal defense funds
69. Biosphere planning
70. Access/equity to land
71. Who is our audience; Local Governments or grassroots?
72. Government change; consistency
73. Nothing stops development
74. Housing affordability
75. Smart growth
76. Agricultural economic development
77. Differing land pressure; approaches/legal issues?
78. Focus of farmland preservation programs
79. Consistency among programs e.g., Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program vs. agricultural land
80. Consistency among priorities
81. Property rights
82. Types of development/priorities
83. Moratoriums?
84. A tool of planning sustainability
85. Development incentives are “big”
Poster Abstracts

Leadership for Sustainability: Local Extension and Land Use
Tim Collins, Extension Agent for Community and Economic Development, Penn State University Cooperative Extension Service, Adams County

Building processes to support dialogue and deliberation over land use presents a challenge in a rapidly growing county on the rural-urban interface. My presentation shows how I have tried to develop a holistic approach to community development education to engage and empower citizens to become leaders interested in a sustainable community. The presentation suggests the basic problem with the quest for sustainability, lists program assumptions and strategies, discusses goals, and outlines the programs and partnerships I have launched in about two years as an Extension agent.

Extension’s Role in Community Planning: Agriculture, Land, and Water
Martin N. Culik, Executive Director, Cornell Coop. Ext. of Genesee Co.

Genesee County is in upstate New York and is bordered on either side by the two major metropolitan areas of Buffalo and Rochester. Agriculture is the leading industry in the county, which is ranked as the third highest for agricultural production in the state. The county legislature recently developed and implemented three management plans focused on future land-use decisions: a water resource management plan, an agricultural and farmland protection plan, and a Smart Growth plan.

The three management plans are linked in many ways. Also of note is the fact that the county legislature must provide leadership for and administer these plans in a “home-rule” state. Cornell Cooperative Extension’s public policy education efforts working with county government to develop and implement these plans will be presented.

Community Appearance and Planning Activities
West Virginia University Extension Service
Michael John Dougherty, Extension Specialist, WVU Extension Service

The West Virginia University Extension Service has numerous programs to help communities work toward a better future. These programs generally break down into two broad categories: community appearance and planning.

Activities related to community appearance include the “Community Design Team” (CDT), the “First Impressions” program, and efforts related to “Abandoned and Dilapidated Housing.” The CDT brings volunteer professionals into a community for a 48-hour visit. It utilizes a charrette process and deals with aesthetics and other issues the community defines. The result is a series of suggestions that can be implemented over the short-, medium-, and long-term. First Impressions provides a perspective of persons coming to a place for the first time. As part of this program, communities receive a report with recommendations that include areas to emphasize and things to improve. The Abandoned and Dilapidated Housing program provides advice, instruction, and consultation to localities seeking to implement state-permitted building commissions for the purpose of removing problem structures.
Meanwhile, activities related to planning are more diverse. These include assistance with Land Use Planning, Strategic Planning for Development, and Emergency Planning and Management. Land Use Planning includes working with a Planning Commission on the development of a comprehensive plan in accordance with state codes or advising a local body (either a planning commission, a city/town council, or a county commission) with respect to the planning process. Strategic Planning for Development involves working with development authorities to create a strategic plan, consulting with such bodies about how to implement their strategic plan, or some combination of the two. Emergency Planning and Management consists of recent flood recovery undertakings in Southern West Virginia as well as work done to help the state prepare for various emergency contingencies as part of an evolving commitment to disaster preparedness.

**Role of Cornell Cooperative Extension, Onondaga County in Agricultural Land Use**

Roberta Harrison, Cornell Cooperative Extension, Onondaga County

Locally, CCE Onondaga County participates in land use decision-making in a variety of ways. Private and public education meetings are held to help property owners learn about the process in applying for the NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets Purchase of Development Rights Program and to provide information for knowledgeable decision making when considering the sale of development rights. The Syracuse-Onondaga County Planning Agency (SOCPA) contracted with CCE Onondaga Co. to write the Municipal Reference For Agricultural Land Use Planning. Some of the topics included right to farm laws, land use planning tools, environmental considerations, companion animals, farm markets, agri-tourism and seasonal labor housing. The NYSDAM Farmland Protection Unit and a group of farmers, who also serve on local town planning boards, reviewed the document. Extension conducted a survey and with the assistance of the local Farmland Protection Board wrote the County Farmland Protection Plan that was adopted by the County Legislature in 1997. By state law, a CCE educator is a member of the County Farmland Protection Board. The local Extension Association is responsible for collection of data when the state-certified agricultural districts are to be renewed within the county. CCE has a contractual arrangement with the City of Syracuse to assist in the planning and implementation of whole farm nutrient management plans in a 3-county area in the Skaneateles Lake Watershed in order to comply with the NYS public health standards for water filtration avoidance.

**Addressing the Problem of Abandoned and Dilapidated Housing in Rural Communities of West Virginia**

Peter Marshall, Extension Specialist and Professor, West Virginia University Extension Center for Agriculture, Natural Resources and Community Development

Unique legislation was passed in 1998 granting West Virginia county governments the authority to regulate abandoned and dilapidated housing and other property. This poster presentation will highlight the accomplishments and successes as well as the challenges and problems associated with the empowerment of local government to address a problem that has been allowed to blight West Virginia’s rural landscape with impunity.
After the Flood – A Case Study on Extension’s Role in the Recovery of McDowell and Wyoming Counties, West Virginia
Peter Marshall, Extension Specialist and Professor, West Virginia University Extension Center for Agriculture, Natural Resources and Community Development; Glenn Runions, WVU Extension Agent, Wyoming and McDowell Counties; Marcus Wilkes, WVU Extension Agent, McDowell County; Jerald Hawkins, WVU Flood Recovery Program Coordinator, Wyoming and McDowell Counties

Many rural West Virginia communities suffered serious flooding after heavy rains in May and July 2001. This poster presentation will highlight the role of local extension agents in the recovery of two of the hardest hit counties, McDowell and Wyoming Counties. Additionally, it will present a set of observations and recommendations that were drawn from the case study on needs and opportunities to strengthen the capacity of the Extension Service to respond to future disaster events.

Massachusetts Citizens Planner Training Collaborative
Gisela Walker, Extension Educator, University of Massachusetts Cooperative Extension

The Citizen Planner Training Collaborative provides local planning and zoning officials with tools to make effective decisions regarding their community’s current and future land use since 1995.

Landuse Training Program Components:

- Evening workshops across the State, spring and fall: Core Curriculum
- Annual Conference: Advanced themes
- On-request training for individual towns
- Internet resources including bylaw collection and job descriptions
1. Overall, how useful was this workshop?
   Based on a scale of 1-9 (1 very useful, 5 somewhat useful, 9 not useful at all)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Should the NERCRD sponsor a similar event next year?

1. Yes = 18 in favor
2. No = 2 opposed

One participant responded with “maybe”, one would like a follow-up workshop, and a third would like to take the workshop one step further.

3. What was the most useful part of this workshop?

- Opportunity to learn what other states are doing
- Find out what other states are doing - successes
- Multi-state input
- The more specific that we got the more useful things were. The real test will be the follow through and implementation.
- Program sharing materials, resources that can be used by others. Very useful
- Interaction with other extension programs. Focus and development of regional programming
- Getting down to the “what and when” was useful. Starting with a few small projects could eventually lead to big things.
- Resources for project, I’m interested in making contacts
- Hearing what other state/agencies are doing.
- Sharing from other colleagues representing other states
- Thinking about potential regional projects-small working groups
- Discussing and working through important issues. Contacts, meeting people
- Small group work-both before and after lunch
- Small group discussion
• The small group work and time set aside for thinking about “where to go from here”
• Sharing ideas between states
• Networking
• Report back and discussion (Q & A) on Tuesday am - small group work
• Ideas from other educators
• Learning about programs in other states & picking up tidbits
• Networking with educators across the region and more insight on typical land use issues in the broader regional context
• Meeting new people/some reuniting with old people who have similar agendas (Food Great)  Good facilitation in large group

4. What was the least useful part of this workshop?

• Poster session due to lack of participants
• Difficulty staying on tasks – group focus
• Cocktail hour – not much mixing
• All components were needed in order to move on. I think we need an overall vision/values statement to site our collective work in this area.
• It was all useful
• None of it
• All parts were useful
• Needed more time at beginning for introductions – posters weak
• Too much discussion on how to “segment” land use needs topics. Not clear on conference outcomes
• Some repetitive discussion (but I don’t know how to fix that)
• Introduction needed to be broader
• Evening poster session might be useful to make part of lunch (more prominent position)
• Free time?
• Too much time spent on getting to specific projects
• Facilitators attempt to try to synthesize the results of the first breakout groups. With greater planning, this could have been done more efficiently and with better results
• Where will we go from here
• A certain level of frustration over the challenges of cross-state work: jurisdictions, levels of staff involvement, state statutes, size and funding of extension programs, “cultures”
• Would have been better if easels/pens had been easier to write on and display/more colors. Designate good facilitators for small groups

5. Please indicate what The Northeast Center can do to help you with your work in the area of land use.

• Continue to support efforts through use of “good offices”
• Hot topics-issues, funding, resources, collaboration, networks
• Funding
• Find resources and incentive to keep this working at the multi-state level
• Keep the issue going. Make effort to get county extension educators involved in this area, not just state specialists. Extension land use education needs to be delivered at the local level. Need to build capacity with county agents who are interested
• Send email to this group of accomplishments of this meeting and changes or additions made to your or other websites. Also, alert us to studies or reports published by northeast or other institutions
• Providing these conferences for networking, providing support for coordinating work across state lines, building links to possible funding opportunities
• Seed dollars for website
• List available data/publications/studies available by subject
• Provide more resources on land use planning—-a primer curriculum on planning—-more awareness of new innovative programs/efforts going on in other states—-provide opportunities for field staff to share program successes (at conferences, on website, in newsletter, etc.)
• Be a resource – provide information – provide connections between states
• Help synthesize big works, issues – support us back to our states, deans, etc. Include expertise planning depts., landscape architecture depts. which have addressed some of these issues
• Be a catalyst for discussions and regular training
• Identify resources
• Is there a “Northeast Land Use” listserve for sharing resources? Another use would be to bring in folks from other groups when developing project/program material (because of overlapping in projects and ideas among groups)
• Provide land use programs that can be adapted to local use
• General: more communication with participants before hand and afterward regarding action steps. Specific: It would have been a good idea to request posters from the registered participants.
• National and Regional and State policies on such things as food-energy-transportation can have an effect on land use. Cause and effect need to be studied. We need to see the whole picture.
• Facilitate information sharing—fund—make extension directors aware of challenges to working across state—build awareness and connections of faculty
• Continue to strengthen the regional “clearinghouse” mission for information on land use issues
• Funding, prompts for continuing exchanges
The Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development
The Pennsylvania State University
7 Armsby Building
University Park, PA 16802-5602

814/863-4656; 814/863-0586 FAX; nercrd@psu.edu; http://www.cas.nercrd.psu.edu