

Urban Growers' Collaborative Project

Phase One Final Report 2017

UC San Diego
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Center for
Community Health



LIVE WELL
SAN DIEGO
COMMUNITY
MARKET
PROGRAM



FARMER D
CONSULTING
LEICHTAG FOUNDATION



Leichtag
Foundation

Urban Growers' Collaborative Project

Phase One Final Report

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Background	4
About the Project.....	4
Understanding Urban Agriculture	6
Methodology	8
Urban Growers' Visioning Session	8
Site Visits and Interviews	9
Product Supply and Needs Assessment Findings	9
About the Farms and Farmers.....	9
Production and Marketing	11
Urban Farm Viability Barriers & Opportunities	13
Potential for Collaboration	16
Analysis & Recommendations	18
Product Supply	18
Technical Assistance Needs	19
Conclusion	21
Glossary	23
Appendices	25
Appendix A: Project Participants	25
Appendix B: Interview Questions.....	26

Executive Summary

This report shares the findings of the first phase of the UC San Diego Center for Community Health's Urban Growers' Collaborative Project, the goal of which was to understand the supply-side barriers and technical assistance needs of small-scale urban growers/farmers in San Diego County, primarily those growing in City Heights, Southeastern San Diego, and the South Bay.

The cornerstone of this research effort was a product supply and needs assessment carried out via an in-person convening of growers, followed by individual site visits and in-depth interviews with a subset of growers. The assessment includes the findings from nine urban growers – four of which are for-profit businesses and five non-profit organizations. These businesses or organizations have been in operation for an average of 4.5 years. Ranging from an eighth of an acre to 3.5 acres, each farm has an average of 0.86 acres in production.

The assessment generated a baseline understanding of the barriers that the participating local urban growers face in achieving or advancing the viability of their urban farming operations. The growers are receptive to and eager for technical assistance and other forms of support. One-on-one coaching in business planning and marketing was found to be the most immediate technical assistance need, followed by training for accessing capital or credit, non-profit fundraising, and production.

On the product supply side, the assessment highlighted that supply is relatively small and inconsistent, an approximate total of \$152,700 in sales in 2016. The top product or crops based on 2016 sales included salad mix, lettuce, amaranth, kale, chard, carrots, and tomatoes. The top three sales outlets were (1) direct to consumer sales via farm stand or farmers' markets, (2) CSA programs, and (3) sales to restaurants.

Additionally, the assessment sought to understand growers' preliminary interest in working with other growers on a collaborative project, including one that would leverage the role of urban farms in increasing food access for low-income residents. The growers expressed unanimous interest in a potential collaborative project with other urban growers, as well as interest in a project that would support urban food access. Individual farm technical assistance will be an important precursor to any collaborative project.

Background

About the Project

UC San Diego Center for Community Health is researching the barriers and opportunities for collaboration among small urban growers to improve their viability and entry into new local markets, particularly markets that serve, or can potentially serve, low-to-moderate income urban residents. The overarching goals of this project are twofold:

1. Support the viability of small urban farms.
2. Increase fresh food access for limited-resource urban residents in San Diego.

To meet these goals, the Center for Community Health has designed a multi-phased research approach; the objectives of each phase are as follows:

Phase One

- Review available research related to urban agriculture viability.
- Assess the product supply of local urban growers in San Diego County.
- Identify opportunities to provide technical assistance to help urban growers access local markets that could increase the viability of their farm operations.
- Understand growers' interest in collaborative projects.

Phase Two

- Assess the local demand for urban-grown produce.
- Provide initial recommendations for a collaborative action among urban growers.
- Provide technical assistance to urban growers to help them access local markets in San Diego County that increase the viability of their farm operations.

Informed by and contingent on the findings from first two phases, there may be a third phase dedicated to understanding the feasibility and next steps for a potential collaborative action among local urban growers.

This report focuses on the findings from phase one, specifically the product supply and needs assessment. The key questions of the assessment were:

Who are the growers?

What are they growing?

What do they need to achieve or advance the viability of their farm operations?

Are they interested in collaborating with other growers?

The product supply and needs assessment included a visioning session among growers, site visits and in-depth interviews with each of the participating urban farm operations in the region. Informed by the findings of this assessment, this report includes recommendations for the short-term technical assistance needs of local urban growers, specifically as it relates to improving business acumen to enter new markets and collaborating together to increase farm revenue.

This project is directed by Elle Mari, Director of Urban Food Environments at UC San Diego Center for Community Health, with support from Kate Mahoney, Community Health Specialist. Phase one was carried out in collaboration with consultants from Farmer D Consulting, Associate Director of Coastal Roots Farm Sona Desai, and independent consultant Niki Mazaroli.

This project is supported in part by the *Live Well Community Market Program*, which is funded by the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency and implemented by UC San Diego Center for Community Health. This work supports the County *Live Well San Diego* vision for a region that is building better health, living safely, and thriving.

Defining Urban Agriculture

The University of California's Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) uses the following definition, adapted from the American Planning Association (2011):

"Urban agriculture includes production (beyond that which is strictly for home consumption or educational purposes), distribution and marketing of food and other products within the cores of metropolitan areas and at their edges. Examples include community, school, backyard, and rooftop gardens with a purpose extending beyond home consumption and education, urban market gardens, innovative food-production methods that maximize production in a small area, community supported agriculture based in urban areas, and family farms located in metropolitan greenbelts."

Understanding Urban Agriculture

In advance of conducting the supply assessment of urban growers in San Diego County, we scanned the available research to understand existing research efforts, initiatives, and methodologies. More specifically, we sought to understand the challenges facing urban farming on a national and regional scale in order to contextualize the unique local barriers. In addition to creating a baseline of understanding, this research looked at the available resources in terms of online technical assistance and programs specifically tailored to urban producers.

"According to the United States Census, California is the most urban state in the nation. Although there are many outstanding examples of urban farms in California, in general, urban agriculture has been slower to gain momentum here than in some other states with large urban populations. Over the past several years, urban agriculture's popularity in California has begun to escalate, with strong emerging interest in San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland, San Diego, Los Angeles, and other metropolitan communities."¹ Urban residents, farmers, nonprofit organizations, and many other entities have engaged in urban farming efforts as a means for realizing the above-listed benefits.

Urban Farming Across the Country

A nationwide survey of urban farms in 2013 revealed that urban farmers across the country are faced with a unique set of challenges, distinctive from traditional farming; these include: a high cost of land, access to capital resources, and limited availability of technical

Potential Benefits of Urban Agriculture¹

Social Impacts

Creating Safe Places & Reducing Blight
Access to Land
Community Development
Building Social Capital
Education & Youth Development Opportunities
Cross-Generational & Cultural Integration

Health Impacts

Food Access & Security
Increased Fruit & Vegetable Consumption
Food & Health Literacy
General Well-Being (Mental Health & Physical Activity)

Economic Impacts

Job Creation, Training, & Business Incubation
Market Expansion for Farmers
Economic Savings on Food
Savings for Municipal Agencies
Increased Home Values

¹ Golden, S. (2013). Urban agriculture impacts: Social, health, and economic: A literature review. Retrieved at <http://asi.ucdavis.edu/programs/sarep/publications/food-and-society/ualitreview-2013.pdf>.

assistance.² The biggest and most fundamental barrier to urban farming has been found to be profitability. In an assessment of urban agriculture projects across California, the most successful projects were found to be products of strong partnerships.³ This assessment also concluded that most urban agriculture projects in the state include a social component and many of the projects are run by non-profits and/or are located in low-income areas.

The State of Urban Farming Nationally

- 68% are structured as for-profit businesses and 32% as non-profits.
- 60% of farmers reported relying on off-farm income.
- 31% reported using grant funding and fundraising.
- Less than 5% are considered mid-sized or large farms, classified by sales over \$350,000.
- Farmers' markets, farm stands, and CSA programs were the top marketing outlets.
- "Business and financial planning" was found to be the number one technical assistance need of growers, followed by "marketing and distribution".

Research Gaps

In 2012, the University of California's Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) began in a needs assessment of urban farming both statewide and nationwide. UC ANR's efforts included an inventory of current literature, a survey of UC ANR and cooperative extension staff involvement with urban agriculture, and series of interviews with urban agriculture practitioners and policy advocates. The literature reviewed identified current research trends, efforts, and gaps related to the social, economic, and health impacts of urban agriculture. One of the gaps in research identified by this literature review is directly related to the major barrier facing urban growers:

*"Most skepticism for urban agriculture in the U.S. is centered around the idea that it can be a profitable and viable economic driver (Cohen & Reynolds, 2012; Kaufman & Bailkey, 2000). Outside of farmers markets, little research is available on economic impacts within the United States. A few reports found for this review synthesize annual report numbers and finances of a handful of urban agriculture projects (Goldstein et al., 2011; Kaufman & Bailkey, 2000; Kobayashi et al., 2010)."*⁴

Additionally, the author found that most studies on urban agriculture are "ethnographic, observational, and case study based", with an overwhelming amount of research on urban agriculture's ecological and sustainability impacts, and little on the social and economic impacts.

² Pressman, A., Oberholtzer, L., & Dimitri, C. (2016). Urban Agriculture in the United States: Baseline Findings of a Nationwide Survey. National Center for Appropriate Technology. Retrieved at <https://attra.ncat.org/attra-pub/summaries/summary.php?pub=558>.

³ Surls, R., Feenstra, G., Golden, S., Galt, R., Hardesty, S., Napawan, C., & Wilen, C. (2015). Gearing up to support urban farming in California: Preliminary results of a needs assessment. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 30(1), 33-42.

⁴ Golden, S. (2013). Urban agriculture impacts: Social, health, and economic: A literature review. Retrieved at <http://asi.ucdavis.edu/programs/sarep/publications/food-and-society/ualitreview-2013.pdf>. Pg. 16.

Technical Assistance and Available Resources

Urban growers are known to face significant knowledge gaps and institutional barriers.⁵ Technical assistance for urban farmers has historically been provided by non-profit organizations, as opposed to cooperative extension agencies that serve the traditional farming community. Limited availability of information relevant to urban agriculture also impacts municipal agencies and policy makers that make decisions that impact the viability of farming in urban areas.⁶ Efforts have been undertaken to address this gap by both producing and aggregating technical resources tailored to the unique needs of urban growers. For example, a component of the previously mentioned UC ANR needs assessment explored how University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE) personnel were engaged with urban agriculture and what tools UCCE staff thought would best serve urban farmers. In their report, the authors provided suggestions for those involved with urban agriculture, including personnel of land-grant universities, local governments, and non-profits seeking to address the needs of urban farmers in an environment of constrained resources.⁶

Methodology

The data for the product supply and needs assessment was collected via an initial convening (“Urban Growers Visioning Session”), followed by individual farm site visits and one-on-one farmer interviews. A list of participating urban growers can be found in Appendix A.

Urban Growers Visioning Session

A convening of urban growers was conducted on July 28th, 2017, at the Second Chance offices in the Southeastern neighborhood of the City of San Diego, with the goal of beginning to build relationships with growers, as well as to ensure that project goals and protocols were on target with the needs and desires of the urban farming community. The objectives of this initial meeting were to:

1. Introduce the UCSD Urban Growers' Collaborative Project.
2. Brainstorm a collective vision of what urban farm viability looks like in San Diego County.
3. Identify existing initiatives in San Diego County that are successfully supporting small urban growers.
4. Share immediate opportunities for technical assistance & collaboration.
5. Strengthen relationships between urban growers in San Diego County.

Notes were taken during the visioning session, capturing the major themes of the discussions. The majority of the discussion centered on the second objective; participants discussed how urban farming viability compares to the traditional definition of farm viability, and brainstormed the opportunities and barriers for urban farm viability in San Diego County. In addition, participants discussed opportunities for collaboration to meet the demand for locally produced food. (The findings from this discussion are

⁵ Pearson, L. J., Pearson, L., & Pearson, C. J. (2010). Sustainable urban agriculture: stocktake and opportunities. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 8(1), 7–19.

⁶ Surls, R., Feenstra, G., Golden, S., Galt, R., Hardesty, S., Napawan, C., & Wilen, C. (2015). Gearing up to support urban farming in California: Preliminary results of a needs assessment. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 30(1), 33-42.

reported in the Assessment Findings sections below.) Growers interested in participating in the assessment (as outlined below) were given an opportunity to indicate their interest (yes, no, or unsure) and provide their contact information.

Site Visits and Interviews

Farm site visits and grower interviews were conducted, the protocols for which are described in the section below. A total of ten individuals were interviewed – nine in-person and one over the phone. One interviewee is not actively farming and instead represents and works with a consortium of urban growers as part of a non-profit program. This particular interview yielded comprehensive data into the barriers and opportunities present for this particular group of growers; however, given that the interview responses represented a group of growers instead of individual growers, we chose to omit this data as not to compromise the ability to conduct comparative analyses. This decision resulted in a final interviewee sample size of nine. The data collected during the interview process was put into a central spreadsheet database, where basic calculations and analyses were conducted. The findings are described in the sub-sections of “Product Supply and Needs Assessment Findings” section.

Site Visit and Interview Protocol

Sona Desai of Farmer D Consulting (“the interviewer”) conducted site visits and interviews of the lead farmers or farm program staff. Site visits and interviews were scheduled for two-hour time slots. All interviewees were provided a copy of the interview questions and background information about the project and researchers at minimum 24 hours in advance of their scheduled interview time. All interviewees were required to review and sign a letter of consent in advance of participation in the interview.

During the interview, the interviewer electronically transcribed answers to interview questions, putting answers directly into a Word document. Interviewees were provided a hardcopy of the interview at the time of interview allowing them to read the questions that were being asked of them. Interviewees were encouraged to skip or omit responses at their discretion; thus, the sample size varies on a per questions basis, and was accounted for in the analyses and reporting of findings. If the discussion strayed beyond the designated interview questions, the interviewer took notes to summarize the discussion, and incorporated this additional information into the interview findings at her discretion.

Product Supply and Needs Assessment Findings

The grower interviews yielded a wealth of information and the bulk of the data behind the supply assessment. Interview findings are summarized in the sections below corresponding to the four main sections of the interview. (See Appendix B for the complete list of interview questions).

About the Farms and Farmers

Farmer Demographic Data

- Five (56%) urban growers interviewed identify as female, and four (44%) as male.
- The age of growers ranged from 26 to 56 years, with an average age of 36 years.

- The large majority (8 out of 9) of urban growers interviewed are white/Caucasian. One grower is Latina.
- Two of the growers (22%) are veterans of the military.

Farming Experience and Organizational Involvement

Farming experience ranged from 2 to 40 years of experience, with an average of 10 years of experience and a median of 5 years. All but one grower (89%) has undergone some formal agricultural education or training, including: Seeds@City (a program of San Diego City College), Wild Willow Farm's Farming 101 program, Archi's Acres VSAT program, University of Vermont Farmer Training Certificate, Cornell Small Farms Program, Mira Costa Crop Production & Management, Permaculture Design Certificate, and various apprenticeships. One grower indicated that they are entirely self-taught.

Ranging from one to eight years, the farms represented in this assessment have been in operation for an average of 4.5 years. Also ranging from one to eight years, the farmers represented in this interview have been involved in the operation of their current farm, or farm program in the case of non-profit organizations, for an average of 3.75 years.

Operations

- **Total area in production** per farm ranges from an eighth of an acre to 3.5 acres. The average area in production is 0.86 acres and the median is a half-acre.
- The growers interviewed described their respective **farming practices** as follows:
 - Organic practices, but not certified: 56%
 - Registered organic: 22%
 - Soil grown: 22%
 - Regenerative agriculture: 22%
 - Additional descriptions of farming practices included: soil building, non-mechanical, 100% heirloom non-GMO, untreated, non-conventional, small-scale intensive, hydroponic, and drought-tolerant.
- **Labor:** Labor varies greatly on each farm, and appears to be a factor of the size of the farm and the extent of other programming offered (i.e., workshops, farm tours, etc.), especially in the case of the non-profit farms. All of the non-profit farms interviewed engage volunteers, including youth or students, with varying degrees of output and responsibility.
- **Sales:** Of the farmers and farm organizations that reported their approximate gross sales for 2016, three growers had gross sales of between \$25,000 to \$49,999 in 2016. The rest of the participating growers had sales of less than \$25,000:
 - Two growers' sales ranged between \$15,000 to \$24,999,
 - One grower between \$5,000 to \$14,999, and
 - One grower between \$2,500 to \$4,999.
- **Farm business structure:** Four (44%) for-profit businesses and five (56%) non-profit organizations. Of the farmers interviewed with for-profit farm operations (n=4):
 - 100% indicated that farm revenue comprised less than 25% of their annual household income.
 - 50% own the land they are farming and 50% lease land. The two farmers that lease land have three and five year land leases.

- One indicated having debt associated with establishing their farm operation; this debt totals \$25,000.

Production and Marketing

Crop Production

All of the urban growers interviewed are growing **vegetables, herbs, and fruits or berries**. In addition to these products, three farmers are growing **ornamental or nursery plants**, two are growing **cut flowers**, one is keeping bees for **honey**, and one is producing **eggs**. Additionally, one of the urban growers interviewed runs a commercial seed business.

The primary products and crops that growers' reported producing in 2016 are outlined in Table 1 below. Salad mix, lettuce, amaranth, kale, chard, carrots, and tomatoes were the top revenue generating products reported.

Table 1. Urban farm products and crops produced in 2016

Vegetables	Amaranth, carrots, chard, cucumbers, eggplant, herbs, kale, potatoes, salad mix (mesclun), Salanova lettuce, summer squash, tomatillos, and tomatoes.
Fruits	Apples, figs, lemons, mulberries.
Grains/legumes	Posole corn (hominy); corn for flour (masa).
Other	Honey, ornamentals (native plants), seeds.

Sales Outlets

The outlets that the urban growers are selling to include:⁷

- **Subscription shares via Community Support Agriculture (CSA):** Five of the growers sold product via CSA shares. Of these growers, they made an average of 63% of their sales via CSA shares.
- **Direct to consumer (farmers' market or farm stand):** Five of the growers sold direct to consumer via farmers' market or farm stands. Of these growers, they made an average of 41% of their total sales direct to consumer in 2016.
- **Direct to restaurants:** Four of the growers sold product direct to restaurants, comprising an average of 46% of their total sales.
- **Wholesale distributor accounts:** Only one grower sold to a wholesale distributor in 2016.

The aforementioned outlets present urban growers with a variety of advantages and disadvantages, unique to the small scale of urban growers and the demands of a particular sales outlet. Growers were asked to describe the benefits and challenges they experience when selling to each of these outlets. Responses are summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Benefits and challenges by current sales outlet

Outlet Type	Benefits	Challenges
-------------	----------	------------

⁷ One of the growers interviewed is not currently, and was not in 2016, selling their produce; one grower began their sales in 2017, and reported on sales thus far.

CSA	Guaranteed sales provide stability, flexible customers, allows for better planning and efficiency. High price point. Easy to start the enterprise. Good for cash flow.	Member recruitment and retention. One-size-fits-all model is difficult to market. Requires crop diversity, thus can limit profitability.
Farm stands	High price points. Direct to consumer. No delivery or transportation necessary. Allows for impulsive, convenient purchases by consumer. Easy to manage on site, short duration. Built-in clientele for farms based at churches, organizations, etc. Can sell surplus or come with whatever product is available.	Getting people to the farm. On-site storage. Harvesting the right amount of product. Labor intensive. Potential to make no sales. Lower volumes. Low price points. Inconsistent customers.
Restaurants	Potential for partnerships. Restaurants often advertise farm/farm product on menu. Larger orders with fewer customer interactions. Reaches greater number of people (eaters at restaurant). Can grow products specifically for restaurants, creating more efficiencies in production and distribution.	Unpredictable and inconsistent. Low price point. Requires making deliveries. Restaurants want more diversity of product. Difficulty in communication and setting expectations, as chefs are notoriously busy.
Wholesale broker	They take what you have, saving time and labor.	Low price points. No connection to consumer or preservation of brand/farm identity.

Potential for Expanding Production

Eight out of the nine growers interviewed expressed having the capacity to expand production of any products if new, profitable markets can be accessed. Two of these growers expressed that, while they cannot increase their overall production due to resource constraints, they can and are willing to shift production to different crops and make sales to different markets.

When asked which outlets they would like to sell to that they are not currently selling to, growers responded as follows:

- The majority of growers (six) expressed interest in expanding their sales to **local restaurants**, as well as selling to local restaurants for the first time. Local restaurants that growers are interested in selling to include: Nate's Garden Grill, Whisknadle, Prep Kitchen, and the Prado at Balboa Park.
- Additionally, four growers expressed interested in selling to **small independent retailers**; two growers mentioned interest in selling to Ocean Beach People's Co-op, one in Stehly's Farm Market, and one in Wrigley's Supermarket.

- All of the growers that currently do not have a **CSA program** (totaling four growers) are interested in creating one. Additionally, one grower that currently operates their own CSA is interested in opportunities to sell product via other farms' CSA programs, a common practice that allows small farm CSA programs to offer a diversity of products to consumers.
- Growers also mentioned interest in the following outlets, ranging in specificity: military food vendors, De Passion (a local juice bar), local coffee shops, an elementary school, Kitchens for Good, farm stand, and farmers' markets (specifically the North Park, Little Italy, and Hillcrest markets).

If new, profitable markets can be accessed, growers reported that they are interested in producing the following new products and crops outlined in Table 3.

Table 3. New Urban Farm Products and Crops Considered for Expansion

Vegetables	Arugula, Salanova lettuce, carrots, onions, lettuce, salad mix, tomatoes, Asian cucumbers, okra, basil, kale, chard, specialty vegetables, and microgreens.
Fruits	Tropical fruits, figs, pomegranate, guava, dragonfruit, passionfruit and kiwana melons.
Grains/legumes	Dry beans and heritage grains.
Other	Hispanic and African American culturally relevant foods. High value rare food crops.

The top three barriers to expanding production across interviewees are:

- #1 **Labor Availability** – 7 out of 9 growers
- #2 (tie) **Production Equipment** – 4 out of 9 growers
- #2 (tie) **Access to Grants, Credit and/or Financing** – 4 out of 9 growers

Urban Farm Viability Barriers & Opportunities

Participants in the Urban Growers Visioning Session discussed how urban farm viability compares to the traditional definition of farm viability (highlighted in blue), as well as the unique components of farm viability for urban growers in San Diego County. The components outlined below are critical factors, parameters, or resources necessary to build viable urban farm operations in San Diego County. Gaps in accessibility of any of these components are opportunities for technical assistance, policy advocacy, and changes to farm practices.

Critical Components of Farm Viability

**Traditional
Farm Viability^a**

1. Access to Capital
2. Access to Land
3. Access to Education & Training
4. Access to Markets

**Urban Farm
Viability^b**

5. Access to Water
6. Supportive Land Use Policies
7. Affordable Licensing/Fees
8. Institutional Support for Urban Farming
9. Access to Urban Ag Expertise
10. Access to Healthy Soils
11. Community Support and Engagement
12. Access to Affordable Housing

Sources:

^a Cocciarelli, S., Smalley, S. and Hamm, M. (2011) Farm Viability and Development: Michigan Good Food Work Group Report No.4 of 5. K. Colasanti (ed.) East Lansing, MI: C.S. Mott Group for Sustainable Food Systems at Michigan State University. Available from www.michiganfood.org.

^b As defined by participating growers at the Urban Growers Visioning Session held in San Diego on July 28, 2017.

In order to achieve urban farm viability, growers face many barriers. The following are the **top three barriers impeding urban farm viability** that the interviewed growers are currently facing:

1. Marketing skills
2. Business planning skills
3. Access to capital, credit, and/or grants

Additionally, growers expressed numerous **benefits or opportunities unique to farming** in an urban area:

- Proximity to markets.
- Proximity to other employment
- Camaraderie with other growers
- Connection to community and potential for greater community support.
- Opportunities for community building, including reconnecting people to where their food comes from.
- Greater creativity in production methods.
- Connecting the community through food; educating people on food and farming.
- Access to communities in need.
- Access to large population centers.
- Opportunities for collaboration.

- Ability to address issues related to health concerns in urban environments and supporting underserved and minority communities.
- Access to diverse markets and diverse communities.

Table 4 is a compilation of the outside resources that growers currently use to meet their information and technical assistance needs.

Table 4: Technical assistance and sources of information currently relied upon

Local organizations	San Diego New Farmers Guild, San Diego Food Systems Alliance, UC Cooperative Extension, San Diego County Farm Bureau, Environmental Health Coalition
Regional or national organizations	Tufts University Friedman School of Nutrition's New Entry Sustainable Farming Project and National Incubator Farm Training Initiative (NIFTI); Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE); Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems (CASFS) at UC Santa Cruz; UC Global TIES program; Cornell Small Farms Programs; Farmers Veteran Coalition; UC Davis; EcoFarm Association
Personal relationships	Local expert farmers and personal support networks
Open source online resources	Google, social media networks, Facebook groups, YouTube, podcasts
Print resources	Various books by farming experts

When asked what they saw as the greatest opportunities to increase the viability of their farm, growers responded as follows:

- Urban agriculture support from the County (urban ag incentive zones, ordinances, etc.); opportunity to simplify & streamline operations (vs. trying to do everything).
- Development of an expansion or growth strategy, financial literacy, online marketing (social media, newsletter, blog, etc.).
- Identifying target audience and tailoring marketing message; reducing hard costs (i.e., insurance, workman's comp, HR management, payroll).
- More efficient production methods; more incentives for landowners to lease to farmers.
- Access to profitable markets, business planning and feasibility for expansion, raising awareness of farm and mission.
- Shifting market from CSA to larger restaurants.
- Accessing funding; increasing collaboration with other growers to co-market; trading product; selling starts/nursery plants; increasing partnerships with schools and community centers. Advocating to the City for urban growers.
- Organization's advisory board; resources at High Tech High.
- Collaboration among farms and small businesses (producer association, marketing, policy change, aggregation, distribution, etc.).

Potential for Collaboration

Two thirds of the farmers interviewed (six growers) indicated that they are currently involved in some type of collaborative effort with other farms. These included namely informal partnerships with other urban growers, including: consultation, knowledge sharing, tool sharing, bulk purchasing, sharing cold storage, and purchasing product for resale. Two of the non-profit growers interviewed previously had a joint CSA program; while this specific partnership has ended and each of the organization has its own CSA program now, the growers continue to collaborate by trading product and sharing cold storage.

The urban growers were asked to describe the existing or potential advantages and disadvantages of collaborating with other urban farms. Table 5 lists the responses provided by growers.

Table 5: The pros, cons, and motivations behind collaboration

(Potential) Advantages	(Potential) Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for better focus and cooperation in terms of crop planning. • Feeling supported, farmer camaraderie. • Increased communication and efficiencies. • Unified group to support the development of the industry, greater marketing visibility. • Risk mitigation in event of crop failure, operational efficiencies, cross-promotion, access to different markets, access to more knowledge/expertise, greater focus for each participating organization. • Access to new skills, access to new markets, access to different crops. • Greater consistency in supplying markets, better customer service, access to greater/shared infrastructure, and bulk order purchasing. • Camaraderie, professional development, and greater produce diversity available. • Increased ability to access new markets and products, and increased efficiencies. • Ability to collaboratively seek grant funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much coordination. • Everyone is selling to the same markets. • Everyone has different standards (i.e., quality) • Consistency among group, quality control, potential co-opting of customers. • Adds a layer of costs (more expensive). • Quality control issues, lack of uniformity, varying expectations among participants, coordination, and varying growing practices. • Fairness and equity among growers, communication challenges, time spent coordinating collaborative efforts. • Feeling cornered to grow specific products for specific markets. • Maintaining fairness and transparency. • Competition for grant funding, disagreements, time & coordination, and quality control. • Potential disagreement.

In addition, the growers indicated **the top two most important criteria in deciding where to sell their produce to be: (1) participation in the local community, and (2) minimizing the time spent in sales.** Additionally, all growers agreed that they could meet their most important sales criteria through collaboration with other growers.

When asked if they saw any collaborative opportunities specifically for urban farms to impact food access for low-income community members, all nine growers interviewed responded positively that they did and suggested potential opportunities. Four growers suggested **collaboration on grants** to support serving socially-disadvantaged urban residents; this would allow urban growers to subsidize sales or the cost of production to serve this population without jeopardizing their farm's thin margins and efforts towards viability.

Two growers suggested that low-income populations could be served through a **"Market Match" program**, a tool that has been used at the City Heights Farmers' Market and other farmers' markets to extend low-income shoppers' purchasing power for fresh produce. This model has been tested in numerous locations across the country⁸, with research suggesting that it is effective in both the short and long-term, leading to changes in behavior and highlighting the demand for farmers' markets' in low-income communities^{9,10}; short-term philanthropic investment is necessary to establish such a program. This model can be applied to farm stands and retailers as well.

Additional collaborative ideas for urban food access expressed by growers include:

- Donation CSA (need to identify who the recipients would be and how to access them).
- Mobile markets.
- Educational food production or edible home gardening workshops.
- Greater support to implement EBT and other food assistance models.
- Selling "seconds", or gleaned, farm products at a lower cost.

In order to get a sense of what collaboration among growers could look like or how it might be constrained, growers were also asked questions about (1) the importance of preserving their farm's identity in their marketing, (2) their ability to share assets, and (3) their interest in investing resources into a potential collaborative project. Responses are summarized below.

Preserving farm identity	Six out of eight farmers indicated that preservation of their farm's identity was essential to meet their current marketing goals. However, 100% of farmers interviewed said they would consider jointly marketing their product with other urban farms to access markets.
---------------------------------	--

⁸ As of 2016, Double Up Food Bucks programs – the market match program pioneered by the Fair Food Network in Michigan – were active in 18 states. Complete list of participating states available online at: <https://www.doubleupfoodbucks.org/national-network/>.

⁹ Market Match – Impact. (2017). MarketMatch.org. Retrieved at <http://marketmatch.org/impact/>.

¹⁰ Fair Food Network. (2016). Double Up Food Bucks: A five-year success story. Retrieved at: https://fairfoodnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/FFN_DoubleUpFoodBucks_5YearReport.pdf

Sharing assets	<p>Growers were also asked if their respective farm has physical assets (equipment, buildings, vehicles, etc.) they would consider contributing (rent, sell, or donate) to a multi-farm project in order to reach new markets. Six growers said yes, one said they were not sure, and one said no. (One grower declined to answer this question.). Of the growers that expressed interest in, the assets they were willing to share include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land • Building space, including dry and cold storage • Delivery vans and trucks • Event space • Small-scale equipment (rototillers, tools, etc)
Making additional investments	<p>When it came to considering the investment of financial resources in order to reach new markets or current markets more effectively, interest was split: four growers (44%) said yes and 5 growers (56%) said they were not sure at the moment.</p>

Analysis & Recommendations

The product supply and needs assessment was successful in illuminating the baseline state and needs of the participating local urban growers. Patterns of need and barriers to local urban farm viability are clear and growers are receptive to and eager for technical assistance and other forms of support. Additionally, there is unanimous interest in a potential collaborative project, including one that would leverage the role of urban farms in increasing food access for low-income residents. The following sections provide the analysis and recommendations of the supply assessment findings related to product supply and technical assistance opportunities.

Product Supply

The table below summarizes the production and sales of the nine local urban growers interviewed.

Table 6. Summary of Urban Farm Supply*	
Average area in production per farm	0.86 acres
Total area in production across all farms	7.00 acres
Total sales	\$152,700
Average sales per farm	\$16,967
Average sales per acre	\$21,814
Top products/crops	Salad mix, lettuce, amaranth, kale, chard, carrots, and tomatoes
Top market outlets	1. Farm stands or Farmers' Markets 2. CSA Program 3. Restaurants

* Using 2016 sales and production data.

While the data obtained provides rough estimates of urban agricultural production across participating farms, the product supply data we received from the growers is limited in detail. Most of these growers do not have strong systems in place for record-keeping and reporting; thus, they were unable to provide details regarding specific crops, varieties, quantities, etc. This observation suggests the need for technical assistance as highlighted in the following section.

Technical Assistance Needs

Profitability is the biggest barrier to urban agriculture in San Diego County; this is consistent with the existing research on urban agriculture nationwide and regionally in California. Additionally, technical assistance targeted to the needs of urban growers is limited in San Diego County, as it is nationwide and statewide.

The primary objective of the product supply and needs assessment was to identify opportunities to provide technical assistance to help urban growers access local markets in San Diego County that can increase the viability of their farm operations. To this end, the second section of the interview was dedicated to understanding urban growers' technical assistance needs with the goal of advancing their farms' overall viability. We asked multiple questions in order to fully understand the barriers facing urban farms and the current and potential resources for addressing them through technical assistance.

[From Interview Section Two: Urban Farm Viability Barriers & Opportunities]

- *What are the top three barriers you face as an urban farm in San Diego County that impact the viability of your farm operation?*
- *What opportunities or unique benefits come from farming in an urban area?*
- *What kinds of technical assistance do you currently rely on? (i.e. sources of information and expertise)*
- *What is already happening in San Diego County that you feel your farm or other urban farms are benefiting from? (i.e. support systems, technical assistance providers, coalitions, etc.)*
- *What do you see as your greatest opportunities to increase the viability of your farm?*
- *What kinds of technical assistance (vs. systemic changes: price of land, water, etc.) could help you capitalize on these opportunities to increase your farms viability in the short term?*

Responses to these questions were consistently organized around and pointed to the need for business planning and marketing skills as drivers of and limiting factors to urban farm profitability. A near unanimous need was expressed for the following technical assistance:

Business planning and coaching: Including the development of a business plan, financial management, recordkeeping and evaluation, specific to small scale, urban farming.

Marketing training: How to determine target market, how to tailor messaging, reading data and analytics, developing consumer profiles, developing a marketing plan, etc.

Additionally, there is a lesser but still prominent need for technical assistance related to:

Accessing capital or credit: Growers often cited access to capital or credit for production equipment as a barrier to expanding production. Knowing what resources are available for farm financing and assistance with applying would be valuable as growers consider their ability to increase production for a collaborative project.

Non-profit fundraising: Many of the nonprofit farms expressed that grant funding was a limiting factor to expanding production. Additionally, all of the farms (non-profit or for-profit) expressed that grant funding, or another form of subsidy, would likely be necessary for their participation in a collaborative project to increase healthy food access for low-income residents.

Production assistance: The majority of the growers interviewed have less than five years of experience. Given the variety of product being produced, size of farms, and other unique production constraints, growers will benefit most from production assistance that is tailored to their specific production methods.

While the viability of individual urban farms can likely be enhanced in the near enough term through a collaborative endeavor, **the assessment findings highlight the need for individual farm viability as a precursor to a collaborative project.** Given the barriers local urban growers face in achieving financial viability, it is recommended that technical assistance opportunities are focused on individual farms' needs in the short term, while simultaneously assessing and advancing the skills necessary for a collaborative project in the mid-term. For example, in the process of providing individual technical assistance, a business planner/coach could assess and vet grower readiness to participate in a collaborative pilot project, as well as what it would take to get them ready for collaboration.

Therefore, **a two-pronged approach to technical assistance is recommended; one that addresses both individual farm assistance needs and the technical assistance needs specific to a collaborative project.** Timing and coordination of technical assistance efforts, as well the planning of a collaborative project, is important to consider. For example, it will be best to engage a grant writer after an individual farm has created or updated its business plan after receiving business coaching. In addition, it is recommended that technical assistance to support the development of a collaborative project is identified and provided after a viable model has been identified.

In terms of the project's next steps, all of the interview participants expressed interest in learning more and participating in urban farming technical assistance opportunities, as well as participating with other local urban farmers on a future collaborative urban farming pilot program.

Topics and Timeline for Technical Assistance

The following lists suggest specific topics and timelines for delivering technical assistance per the recommended two-prong strategy of providing individual farm coaching and group workshops.

One-on-one Technical Assistance:

- **Business Coaching and/or Planning** – farm-specific advising, strategic planning, business plan development and market plan development (Winter 2017-18)
- **Production Assistance** – farm-specific advising (Winter 2017-18)

Group Workshops:

- **Business Planning Fundamentals** – purpose of farm business planning and how to read and understand financial statements (Fall 2017)
- **Business Planning Intensive** – data collection, record-keeping and reporting for successful business management (December 2017)
- **Farm Financing** – overview of farm financing options and applying for loans (December 2017 & Spring 2018)
- **Marketing Fundamentals I & II** – choosing the right products and market channels, determining target market, tailoring messaging, reading data and analytics, pricing and promotion (Winter 2018)
- **Grant Writing** – best practices and tips for writing grants (Spring 2018)
- **Food Safety** – best practices and developing a food safety plan (December 2017)
- **Food Handling** – best practices for harvest and post-harvest (Winter 2017-18)
- **Human Resources and Labor Management** – regulations and best practices for managing farm labor (Spring 2018)

Conclusion

The phase one product supply and needs assessment confirmed that local urban growers in San Diego County are facing many of the same barriers to viability as urban growers statewide and nationwide. Most pronounced is the need for technical assistance related to business planning and marketing. Additionally, local urban growers are seeking new markets and there is strong interest in collaboration, food access, and serving the needs of the community. One-on-one coaching in business planning and marketing will help lay the foundation necessary to pursuing a collaborative project while addressing growers' immediate technical assistance needs in the short term.

On the product supply side, the assessment highlighted that supply is relatively small, and thus it will be important to scale any collaborative project and match growers to markets appropriately (i.e. matching small-scale growers with more forgiving market outlets and/or customers). A deeper analysis of product supply will be required once a collaborative project has been identified.

While they represent a very small subset of farming efforts in San Diego County and have limited production capabilities, the potential benefits to producing food in urban areas are many and the commitment to helping local communities is strong among urban growers. Providing technical assistance and supporting urban growers' ability to collaborate has the potential to amplify the positive impacts of urban farming and may present a significant opportunity to address the food access needs of urban residents.



This report was supported in part by the Live Well Community Market Program, which is funded by the County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency and implemented by UC San Diego, Center for Community Health. This work supports the County Live Well San Diego vision for a region that is building better health, living safely, and thriving.



Glossary

Certified Organic: “Certified organic foods are produced according to federal standards set by the USDA National Organic Program. These standards were implemented in 2002 in the wake of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 and continue to be interpreted and developed by the National Organic Standards Board, a federal advisory committee appointed by the secretary of agriculture. Organic standards address many factors: soil quality, animal raising, pest and weed control, and use of input materials. Materials approved for and prohibited from organic production can be found on the National List.” (Source: <https://www.ccof.org/organic>)

Community Support Agriculture (CSA): “A CSA involves consumers who support a farmer financially by paying for a share of the farm's production prior to each growing season. The arrangement allows farmers to buy the seeds, transplants, and other inputs they need for the growing season, and pay their farm labor without waiting until harvest to generate revenue.” (Source: <http://extension.psu.edu/business/ag-alternatives/marketing/community-supported-agriculture-csa>)

Cooperative: A business or other organization that is owned and run jointly by its members, who share the profits or benefits.

Direct Marketing: The business of selling products or services directly to the public, for example via social media, mailings, or television, rather than through retailers.

Viability: The viability of a business is measured by its long-term survival and its ability to sustain profits over a period of time.

Farm Viability: The viability of a farm business is measured by its long-term survival and its ability to sustain profits over a period of time. According to the Michigan Good Food Work Group, the critical determinants of farm viability include access to capital, land, education, training, and market. (Source: http://www.michiganfood.org/uploads/files/Farm_Viability_Report.pdf)

Food Access: Food access is a subset of food security. Access to food is defined a variety of factors, including:

- Accessibility to sources of healthy food, as measured by distance to a store or by the number of stores in an area.
- Individual-level resources that may affect accessibility, such as family income or vehicle availability.
- Neighborhood-level indicators of resources, such as the average income of the neighborhood and the availability of public transportation.

(Source: <https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-choices-health/food-access/>)

Food Security: According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, “Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.” (Source: <http://www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/en/>)

Food Hub: A food hub is “a centrally located facility with a business management structure facilitating the aggregation, storage, processing, distribution, and/or marketing of locally/regionally produced food products. (Source: <https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2010/12/14/getting-scale-regional-food-hubs>)

Registered Organic: According to the California Department of Food and Agriculture, “[e]very person engaged in the state of California in the production or handling of raw agricultural products sold as organic, and retailers that are engaged in the production of products sold as organic, and retailers that are engaged in the processing, as defined by the NOP, of products sold as organic, shall register with the State Organic Program”. Organic certification is required the organic gross sales are expected to exceed \$5,000. (Source: <https://www.cdffa.ca.gov>)

Urban Agriculture: The University of California’s Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (UC ANR) uses the following definition, adapted from the American Planning Association and Community Food Security Coalition:

“Urban agriculture includes production (beyond that which is strictly for home consumption or educational purposes), distribution and marketing of food and other products within the cores of metropolitan areas and at their edges. Examples include community, school, backyard, and rooftop gardens with a purpose extending beyond home consumption and education, urban market gardens, innovative food-production methods that maximize production in a small area, community supported agriculture based in urban areas, and family farms located in metropolitan greenbelts.”

(Source: http://ucanr.edu/sites/UrbanAg/What_is_Urban_Agriculture/)

Urban Farm: The United States Department of Agriculture defines a farm as “any place from which \$1,000 or more of agricultural products were produced and sold or normally would have been sold during the census year”. Urban farms are places that fit this definition and are located in urban or peri-urban areas.

Appendices

Appendix A: Project Participants

Grower Name	Urban Farm Name	Growers Visioning Session	Site Visit	Interview
Aaron Brinkman	UrbanLife Farms	X	X	X
Amy Zink	Linda Vista Community Garden; Bayside Community Center	X		
Brijette Romstedt	San Diego Seed Company		X	X
Bryce Rauterkus	International Rescue Community		X	X
Cathryn "Cat" Henning	Wild Willow Farm	X	X	X
Chad Morris	The Green Cowboy		X	X
Jacob Brownwood	Earth Lab, Groundworks San Diego	X	X	X
Janice Reynoso	Mundo Gardens		X	X
Kristin "KK" Kvernland	Second Chance	X	X	X
Mindy Swanson	Dig Down Deep	X		
Paul Mashka	Agua Dulce Farm	X		X
Stepheni Norton	Dickinson Farm	X	X	X

Appendix B: Interview Questions

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT YOU & YOUR FARM

1.1. Demographic data

- a. Do you identify as: Male / Female / Other
- b. Age:
- c. Please state your race/ethnicity:
 - White/Caucasian
 - African-American
 - Latino
 - Asian-American
 - Native-American
 - Other:
 - Prefer not to answer
- d. Are you a military veteran? Yes / No

1.2. How many years of farming experience do you have?

1.3. Do you have any agriculture education or training? Yes / No
If so, what program, certificate, or degree did you achieve?

1.4. How many years have you been involved in the operation of this farm?

1.5. How many years has this farm been in operation?

1.6. How many acres is this farm?

- a. Total farm size:
- b. Acres in production:

1.7. What are your farming practices? (i.e. organic practice but not certified, biodynamic, certified organic, conventional)

1.8. How many people work on your farm?

- Family members:
- Year round employees (non-family):
- Seasonal employees (non-family):
- Volunteers (please estimate total volunteer hours/year, if possible):
 - Youth and/or student volunteers: _____

1.9. Please indicate your farm's approximate gross sales for 2016:

- \$0 to \$2,499
 - \$2,500 to \$4,999
 - \$5,000 to \$14,999
 - \$15,000 to \$24,999
 - \$25,000 to \$49,999
 - \$50,000 to \$99,999
 - \$100,000 to \$199,999
 - \$200,000 or greater
- [Exact gross sales if provided:]

1.10. What is the structure of your farm business? For-profit, non-profit, B-corps.

1.11. If the farm is your personal business...

- a. What percentage of your annual household income comes from farm revenue?
 - 0 - 24%
 - 25% - 49%
 - 50% - 74%
 - 75% - 99%
 - 100%

- b. Do you own or lease land?
If you lease, what are the terms of your lease?

- c. Does your farm carry debt, and, if you are comfortable sharing, approximately how much? Yes / No; Amount of debt: \$_____

1.12. If the farm is a program of a nonprofit...

- a. What was the nonprofit organization's annual budget for 2016?

- b. What percentage of the organization's 2016 budget was allocated for the farm?

- c. Please share a little bit about the history of how and why your organization was compelled to start a farm/farm program.

SECTION II: URBAN FARM VIABILITY BARRIERS & OPPORTUNITIES

2.1. What are the top three barriers you face as an urban farm in San Diego County that impact the viability of your farm operation? Please rank.

- Access to affordable land and/or land leases
- Access to capital, credit, and/or grants
- Business planning skills
- Marketing skills
- Education, training, farming experience
- Cost of business
- Lack of profitable markets
- Other (specify) _____

2.2. What opportunities or unique benefits come from farming in an urban area? Please list/describe.

2.3. What kinds of technical assistance do you currently rely on? (i.e. sources of information and expertise)

2.4. What is already happening in San Diego County that you feel your farm or other urban farms are benefiting from? (i.e. support systems, technical assistance providers, coalitions, etc.)

2.5. What do you see as your greatest opportunities to increase the viability of your farm? Please describe.

2.6. What kinds of technical assistance (vs. systemic changes: price of land, water, etc.) could help you capitalize on these opportunities to increase your farms viability in the short term?

SECTION III: OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION

3.1. Are you currently involved in any collaborative efforts with other farms? Yes / No
If yes, please describe.

3.2. Describe the **advantages** (or potential advantages) of collaborating with other urban farms.

3.3. Describe the **disadvantages** (or potential disadvantages) of collaborating with other urban farms.

3.4. Below is a list of goals that many farmers mention as important in deciding where they sell their produce. Of this list, please rank the most important criteria for you in deciding where to sell your produce, starting with the most important?

- Highest average price over the year
- Price stability
- Minimizing the time you spend in sales
- Contact with eaters in direct marketing
- Personal business relations based on
- Participation in the local community
- Flexibility of moving between buyers
- Security of contracts for future production
- Other (specify) _____

3.5. Do you feel you can reach your (aforementioned) most important criteria through collaboration? Yes / No
If yes, which criteria?

3.6. One of the project's goals is to develop the most appropriate technical assistance and infrastructure to help farmers access local markets in San Diego County that are frequented by low income, social-disadvantaged residents. Do you see any collaborative opportunities specifically for urban farms to impact food access for this population?
If yes, please describe any potentially valuable opportunities.

3.7. Is preservation of your farm's identity essential to your marketing goals? Yes / No

3.8. Would you consider jointly marketing your products with other urban farms to access markets? Yes / No

3.9. Would your farm or organization consider investing financial resources in collaboration with other farms in order to reach new markets or reach current markets more effectively?
Yes / No / Not Sure

3.10. Does your farm have physical assets (equipment, buildings, vehicles, etc.) you would consider contributing (rent, sell, or donate) to a multi-farm project in order to reach new markets? Yes / No / Not Sure

If yes, please list shareable assets:

SECTION IV: PRODUCTION & MARKETING

Production:

4.1. From the list below, please check all product categories that your farm currently (2017) produces/sells:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Vegetables | Meats (specify) _____ |
| Herbs | Eggs |
| Fruits & berries | Cheeses |
| Cut Flowers | Other (specify) _____ |
| Ornamental/Nursery Plants | |

4.2. Fill in the table below to describe your major farm products for 2016. You can use general categories like: fruits, berries, vegetables, etc.

Farm Products	Estimated Production (lbs., bushels, etc.)	Estimated Gross Sales (per year)	Primary outlet(s)
<i>Example: Salad Greens</i>	<i>300 lbs</i>	<i>\$1,200</i>	<i>CSA shares</i>
1)			
2)			
3)			
4)			
5)			

Sales outlets:

4.3. In 2016, what percentage of your overall food product sales went to:

- | | |
|---|--|
| % | Direct to Consumer (farmers' market, farm stand, etc.) |
| % | Subscription shares, Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) |
| % | Direct to Retail Market (grocery, co-ops) |
| % | Direct to Restaurants |
| % | Direct to Caterer |
| % | Wholesale distributor accounts |
| % | Farmer-owned cooperative/marketing association |
| % | Processor |
| % | Internet sales |

%	Other: (specify) _____
%	Other: (specify) _____
100%	TOTAL SALES

4.4. List the benefits or challenges you'd like to share associated with any of the outlets mentioned above.

Outlet Type	Benefits	Challenges
1)		
2)		
3)		

4.5. What outlet(s) would you like to sell to that aren't currently selling to?

4.6. If you have shifted your focus away from any outlets in the past 3 years, briefly explain the reasons why your business has moved away from that particular outlet.

Production expansion:

4.7. Does your farm have the capacity to expand production of any products if new, profitable markets can be accessed? Yes / No / Not Sure

If yes, please list which products you are considering.

4.8. If you are considering any production expansion, check the three (3) most important barriers to expanding your on farm production:

- Land (Access or Quality)
- Labor Availability
- Management Capacity
- Production Equipment
- Marketing Capacity (i.e. ordering, delivery, finding new accounts)
- Adequate Market Outlets
- Access to Credit and/or Financing
- Storage
- Other (specify) _____

SECTION V: NEXT STEPS

5.1. Are you interested in learning more about urban farming technical assistance opportunities? Y / N

5.2. Would you like to see the results of this survey when they are available? Y / N

5.3. Do you have any recommendations of other urban farmers that we should speak to? Y / N
If yes, are you able to provide their names? Or better yet, introduce us to them?

5.4. Are you interested in participating with other local urban farmers on a future collaborative urban farming pilot program? Y / N
If yes, please provide or update your contact information. All identifying information will be filed separately from your survey responses to maintain your privacy.