Cooperative Extension Venture Capital Fund Proposal

I. Title of Proposed Project: Optimal Land Use for Long-Term Community Stability

II. Co-PI Names and Contact Information (in alphabetical order)
   1. Craig Bond, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, B312 Clark Building, Dept. of Ag and Resource Economics; 970-491-6951; craig.bond@colostate.edu
   2. Edward B. Page, 1001 N 2nd Street, Montrose, CO 81401; 970-249-3935; Tri River Area Small Acreage and CRD Extension Agent; edward.page@colostate.edu
   3. Andrew F. Seidl, Ph.D., Associate Professor and Extension Specialist --Public Policy, B309 Clark Building, Dept. of Ag and Resource Economics; 970-491-7071; andrew.seidl@colostate.edu
   4. Martha Sullins, Coordinator, County Information Service, CSU -Cooperative Extension C-307 Clark Building, 970.491.5706, sullins@ext.colostate.edu

III. Will this be a statewide project, or have multi-county emphasis? This will be offered statewide.

IV. Indicate which Core Competency Area(s) this work falls under, or if it addresses the Front Door mission of the University.
   - Community Resource Development
   - Natural Resources and the Environment

V. Cooperative Extension Work Team Affiliation
   - Sustainable Community Development
   - Small Acreage Management/Sustaining Local Ag and Environment

VI. Situation Statement

   Land use in Colorado has changed significantly over the last two decades, and the patchwork of management units dotting the state has added complexity to decisions about how Colorado’s land and water should be used and by whom. For example, although 47% of Colorado’s 66.6 million acres are in agricultural uses (31 million acres of irrigated and non-irrigated crop and pasture land, and forested lands according to the 2002 US Census of Agriculture), Colorado lost 7% of its agricultural land to other uses from 1982 to 2002, or a total of nearly 2.5 million acres (about 122,000 acres per year). State estimates disguise potentially more significant impacts at the county level, such as loss of a regional agricultural economy supporting numerous smaller-scale businesses such as input suppliers, processors and marketing entities.

   Forty-two percent of all land in Colorado is under federal or state management, where resource management and access are complicated by efforts to balance multiple uses such as logging, fire fuel reduction, recreation, livestock grazing, and oil and gas extraction with community economic health. The decision-making balance and, therefore, educational needs are different in each locality. Several areas have active groups involved in discussing broad land management issues such as the Public Lands Partnership (PLP) on the West Slope and the Northwest Colorado Stewardship (NWCOS) group. However, similar blended groups of public and private interests need to be cultivated and informed across the state, especially since land use choices can have significant impacts on the types of industries that thrive in the region and the overall health of its economy.

   The decisions made today regarding Colorado’s land use patterns will carve the path for the state’s future agricultural economic viability. The fiscal, social and community health of Colorado’s public and private landscapes depend on citizens and decision-makers who are knowledgeable about the socio-economic implications of land use trade-offs and the range of values imbued in public and private lands. For example, studies have assessed the impacts of land use changes, and it is essential that citizens and local leaders understand the relationships between residential and commercial growth, agricultural land use and open space as they try to optimize land use to increase their community’s fiscal health. An impact study conducted in 2000 in Delta, Mesa, Montrose and Ouray counties projected fiscal savings of up to $82 million for the four-county area over the period 2000-2025 if highly-dispersed, low-density growth were limited through land protection policies such as clustered development or urban growth areas. Developing an economically and culturally healthy balance of private and public benefits from land use (viewsheds, wildlife habitat, improved air and water quality, flood mitigation, among others) hinges on focused educational programs in Colorado communities that will accelerate the transfer of knowledge from CSU Extension and other sources (e.g., PLP, NWCOS, local land trusts, other NGOs, and local government agencies) to those involved in determining how those land use benefits will be distributed.
VII. Project Description

Through this project we will develop, present and distribute educational tools and materials to local and state government officials, private advocacy organizations, agricultural producers, other land use decision-makers and the general public on how to integrate public and private land use management practices and policies for long-term community benefit. Educational materials will be incorporated into a comprehensive land use planning curriculum, specific to Colorado, that the project team will deliver at three to five regional workshops, several other educational events (such as Extension Forum in 2007 and the Colorado Ag Outlook Forum in 2008), and offer online through Colorado State Continuing Education.

We will build the land use planning curriculum from: a) an evaluation and adaptation of existing curricula and other materials (e.g., USDA’s Land Evaluation and Site Assessment, American Farmland Trust’s Cost of Community Services Studies); b) recent CSU research on the economic impact of various forms of land use change driven by economic development (e.g., tourism, rural residential growth, oil and gas) on local and regional economies and the value of agriculture to communities; and c) an evaluation, adaptation, or adoption of widely available software on planning and community economic impact assessment (such as Community Viz and the Sonoran Institute’s Economic Profile System). This curriculum will include Colorado-specific fact sheets, PowerPoint presentations and maps, and will help communities quantitatively and qualitatively evaluate the intended and unintended consequences (economic, environmental and social) of various land use changes so that they can make informed land-use decisions.

Part of the project’s educational process will occur through a series of short outreach meetings designed to discuss the project’s goals and products, and build consensus for addressing key land use planning issues around the state. We will address target groups throughout the state, including realtor groups, appraisers, planning departments, and agricultural producers. These outreach meetings will also serve to promote the regional workshops to be held throughout the project’s second year. We will hold pilot workshops at the end of the first year in Grand Junction and at the 2007 Extension Forum, in order to introduce the curriculum. These day-long workshops will introduce participants to the considerations and methods surrounding land use planning including, for example: “understanding your community with secondary data,” “market and non-market valuation of land use change,” and “regulatory and incentive based tools for land use planning.” This introductory workshop will generate demand for secondary workshops in which one or two of the introductory topics can be explored in greater depth. We anticipate offering several in-depth workshops beginning in the late spring of 2008 and extending into the fall of 2008 as topical demands can be anticipated and addressed by developing modular curricula. In addition, the introductory workshops will continue in strategic, geographically dispersed locations throughout the state through 2008, which will generate demand for secondary workshops in 2009 and beyond. Where possible, these workshops will be linked to other educational events to increase the potential audience and impact (i.e., annual meeting of realtors and appraisers).

Therefore, specific project deliverables will include:

1. A curriculum tailored for Colorado that teaches land use theory and practices, cooperative planning and the concept of landscape-level planning across public and private management units.
2. An operations plan and resource team (comprised of campus-and field-based Extension faculty and staff) that can deliver continuing education courses for community groups and professionals across the state.
3. Three to four regional workshops, developed in conjunction with local Extension staff, that will provide basic and continuing education and greater community visibility and value for Extension.
4. An array of educational materials such as video, audio and other online products that will broaden the impact of the curriculum beyond the formal workshop setting.

VIII. Anticipated Impacts/Outcomes of this Work

1. Short-term:
   • Through approximately 10 outreach meetings and four to five formal workshops, the general public, partners, elected officials, Extension staff and other professionals involved in land use planning and management will learn to identify and quantify the short and long-term costs and benefits of different land use management strategies.
   • Agents and other professionals will learn about and be able to deliver information on the many models and tools available to educate diverse constituents in land use decision-making.
   • Extension staff will become a visible conduit for CSU research, as well as key community resources for building and guiding local land use decision-making processes.
2. **Mid-term:**
   - Facilitated by CSU Cooperative Extension, community groups will use the educational curriculum to improve participatory land use planning and decision-making at the community level.
   - Fee-based educational presentations delivered to professionals such as real estate, appraisal, finance, law, and others required to take continuing education credit hours for continued certification will generate several thousand dollars annually for county Extension offices.

3. **Long-term:**
   - Based on knowledge gained through the curriculum and workshops, land use management and planning in the project’s target communities will reflect greater emphasis on balancing and prioritizing community long-term values with respect to the costs and benefits of public and private land use activities.

IX. **Partnerships:** Those listed support the project and are a sample of those expected to join this process.
1. CSU Cooperative Extension (faculty and staff with Extension appointments will assist in identifying key participants in target communities, developing the curriculum development, and planning and conducting regional workshops)
2. Colorado Conservation Trust (Chris Herrman, help identify key issues & speakers to address them)
3. Western Colorado Congress (Bill Patterson, help identify issues, workshop speakers and participants)
4. Black Canyon and Mesa Land Trusts (Aaron Clay, help identify local issues and workshop participants)
5. Uncompahgre Valley Association (Peter Crowell, help increase participation among West Slope producers)
6. Western Co. Food and Ag Council (Elaine Brett, help identify issues and key workshop participants)
7. Colo. Food and Ag Policy Council (Jim Dyer, help identify critical issues and key workshop participants)
8. Rio Grande Headwaters Land Trust & Los Caminos Antiguos (Nancy Butler, Ann Marie Velasquez: identify workshop participants across San Luis Valley; assist with workshop promotion and planning)
9. Montrose County Planning Department (Steve White, will collaborate in development and implementation)
10. Mesa County Planning Dept. (Linda Dannenberger, will collaborate in development and implementation)
13. Rocky Mt. Farmer’s Union (Dan Hobbs, will generate interest in workshops among small-scale producers)
14. CSU Continuing Education has been contacted to explore ways they may take part to further this project.
15. Western Rural Development Center (John Allen, has previously indicated an interest in this area to a PI and is expected to offer aid in development and implementation of this project)

X. **Action Plan, including a Timeline for the Project**

**Year 1, 2007:**
- Conduct a work session in Fort Collins with key partners listed above to refine project timeline; outline curriculum development; and assess how additional funding might be obtained (beginning in 1st quarter and extending as needed).
- Evaluate existing curricula and analytical tools and develop plan for additional curriculum development specific to Colorado (Complete by early in 2nd quarter).
- Develop marketing materials for the curriculum to begin educating target clientele (1st and 2nd quarters).
- Conduct 10 outreach meetings with target clientele across the state (i.e., realtor groups, appraisers, planning departments, ag producers; focused in 1st and 2nd quarters).
- Keep log of target clientele participation in outreach meetings.
- Complete draft curriculum by September 2007.
- Identify three to four workshop sites (i.e., Front Range, West Slope, and/or the San Luis Valley by 3rd quarter).
- Send curriculum and materials to several key peer reviewers (in 3rd quarter)
- Present several curriculum chapters at CSU Extension 2007 Forum.
- Conduct pilot workshop in Grand Junction (in 4th quarter).

**Year 2, 2008:**
- Conduct a work session in Grand Junction to finalize workshop planning (1st quarter).
- Finalize curriculum; print and assemble notebooks and materials (in 1st quarter).
- Conduct three to four foundational workshops in Colorado (throughout year).
- Analyze post-workshop evaluations (as they occur).
- Prepare for several focused workshops, which address specific questions arising from foundational workshops or other requests, in areas around the state in 2009 (in 3rd and 4th quarter).
- Present at least one widely attended educational event: (e.g., Colorado Ag Outlook Forum in February 2008).
XI. **Evaluation Plan to Document Outcomes/Impacts:** The purpose of the project evaluation is two-fold: 1) provide ongoing analysis of the training events and curriculum to improve their quality; and 2) ensure the project effectively reaches its intended audiences. We will collect the following data:

**Short-term:**
1. Census of number, location and type of partnering organizations, as well as resources committed to planning and implementing the curriculum and workshops (Year 1).
2. Census of number, location, and type of extension personnel involved/trained (Year 1 & 2).
3. Census of participants in outreach/marketing meetings, their affiliations and desired level of involvement (Year 1).
4. Census of the participants trained during workshops and their affiliations (at workshops, Year 2).
5. Follow-up surveys of workshop participants to get feedback on the curriculum and workshop format to help shape future educational events (Post-workshops, Year 2).
6. Funds generated from fee-based training to land use professionals (at educational events, Year 2).

**Mid-term:**
1. Follow-up phone surveys with workshop participants to ascertain how they are using knowledge gained from this project in land use planning efforts in their geographic areas as well as what information would be useful at their current stage of involvement (Year 2 and future years).
2. Production of fact sheets, video units and other distance learning tools; Web-based survey of users accessing these media to determine breadth of access individuals have to the project’s educational products (Year 2).
3. Survey of county agents, regional economic development authorities, and others to gather information on local land use planning efforts stemming from the project’s educational program (assessment in Year 1; post project at end of Year 2).

**Long-term:**
1. Census of new or broadened community-wide planning initiatives, especially in project target areas, and assessment of their effectiveness (post-project, following Year 2).
2. In counties where possible, examine changes in development type and intensity, by conducting in-person and phone interviews with county planning staff and evaluating building permits (post project, following Year 2).

XII. **Sustainability Statement**

**Revenues:** Revenues are estimated based on only four workshop/courses per year, averaging 80 attendees at $10/hr for a seven-hour program. These assumptions are believed to be conservative for two reasons: it is anticipated that smaller, locally organized programs will be offered by interested agents and a second phase of more in-depth, specifically targeted programs should evolve to follow introductory presentations. In addition, course/workshop presenters will offer their time and expertise as an in-kind donation to the program, significantly reducing expenses and increasing net revenues. Break-even revenues require an average of just over 34 attendees per workshop, well below expectations. In addition, the potential exists for revenues from the sale of developed curricula to out-of-state parties, such as state and local governments and extension programs. Furthermore, revenue generation is possible through additional distribution formats, including in-person, web, or a combination of web-facilitated training education modules. Other grant funds may be available and may be sought to expand, diversify, or improve the program, but do not appear to be necessary for the program as it is currently envisioned.

**Course/Workshop Expenses:** Supplies and materials per course offering average $250 for standard copying and material preparation expenses, with additional printing costs of approximately $100 per workshop for marketing and additional program materials. $500 per course is allocated for room rental, and attendee lunch expenses are projected at $10 per person. Presenter travel is allocated at just under $1,200 per course, including per diem, mileage reimbursements, and hotel expenditures. As the subject of optimal land use is broad in scope, associated with a large number of analytical tools, and influenced by constantly evolving institutions, there will be significant opportunities to grow the program in accordance with changing demands. Future program development will be influenced by these conditions and the feedback gained from workshop/course evaluations.

**Disbursement of Net Revenues:** With these conservative figures, net course/workshop revenues average slightly over $2,750 per offering, with approximately 4 offerings anticipated per year. Of this, we anticipate returning 50% to local agents and other extension programs, with the remaining funds used for continuing program and material development and additional presenter/team member travel as warranted. Campus and county-based Extension staff could also generate revenue from sales of the project curriculum. Campus-based staff (i.e., Department of Ag and Resource Economics and others involved in land use issues) will likely generate income from consulting as an outgrowth of this project, furthering extending the visibility of Cooperative Extension and its resources.
### Funding Request and Budget Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yr 1</th>
<th>Yr 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td>(2,800)</td>
<td>(22,400)</td>
<td>(25,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less 50% local share</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student (2 mo 50% + Benefits)</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>6,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan and Team Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Extension Coordinator</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courses/Workshops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Costs</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Rental</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch for Attendees</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>5,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Sessions (Ft. Collins Yr. 1, Grand Junction Yr. 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>2,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-classroom Educational and Promotional Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Costs</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$7,447</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$14,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenues: One pilot workshop will be held in year 1 on the Western Slope (a 7 hour program for 40 attendees at $10/hr) with four additional, larger (80 attendees) courses in year 2. 50% of revenues will be returned locally to county agents and programs.

Curriculum Development: A significant proportion of curriculum development, including literature review, initial development of curriculum components, and extension products, will be done by students in Agricultural and Resource Economics over the course of the first two years of the program.

Plan and Team Development: A small stipend is requested for faculty program coordination and supervision of graduate students, which is a non-standard element of extension funding.

Courses/Workshops: $500 per course is budgeted for room rental, with additional expenses of $10 per attendee for lunch expenses, approximately $250 per workshop for supplies and materials, $750 total for printing costs, and $1,100-$1,300 per workshop for presenter travel.

Team Work Sessions: One four-day work session is scheduled for Ft. Collins for Spring of Year 1, with an additional session scheduled for Grand Junction in Year 2.

Non-classroom Materials: These expenditures include program promotion and education of non-attendees, including in-person, web-based, or combination training materials.