

## West Virginia County Commissioners' Perceptions of the Farmland Preservation Program

*Deborah A. Boone  
Tina Wickline  
Harry N. Boone, Jr.  
Stacy Gartin  
West Virginia University*

*The purpose of the study was to determine county commissioners' knowledge and perceptions of the farmland preservation program in West Virginia. The mailed census survey also sought to identify the barriers and benefits perceived by county commissioners toward farmland preservation. The target population consisted of 165 county commissioners. Slightly less than three fourths of the county commissioners (73.1%) were familiar with the Voluntary Farmland Protection Act. A majority of respondents (93.0%) moderately agree that citizens should be educated on farmland preservation. More than one half of the county commissioners (57.7%) perceive that small family farms would be maintained as an impact of the farmland preservation program within 10 years. Greater than half of the participants (56.3%) indicated that limited funding for the program is a barrier. Newspaper was ranked first among commissioners as being the most effective educational method to inform the public about farmland preservation, followed by public meetings and on-on-one conversations.*

### Introduction/ Theoretical Framework

Nationwide, America is losing substantial amounts of farmland to urban sprawl. According to the American Farmland Trust (as cited in West Virginia Farmland Protection, 2003), the United States is losing 2.2 million acres of rural lands to urban sprawl every year. "This means that across the United States over 4 acres of rural lands are consumed every second" (West Virginia Farmland Protection, 2003, background section, ¶ 1).

It is reported that West Virginia is losing farmland at a substantial rate, due to urbanization. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) reported that West Virginia lost 17,732 farms and 1,823,060 acres of farmland within a 33 year time span (1964-1997) according to the West Virginia Farmland Protection website, (2003). Regardless of the pressure from urban growth and sprawl, West Virginia is still striving to keep the agricultural industry operational. Due to the loss of green space, scenic beauty, historical resources, low taxes, local sources of agricultural products and tourism opportunities there has been incentives for counties to consider the adoption of a farmland protection program in order to protect farmland. According to the West Virginia Farmland Protection website (2003), farmland loss is an important issue for all county residents. According to the West Virginia Farmland Protection website (2003), sixteen counties within the state have already implemented a program or are in the process of developing a farmland preservation program. According to McQueen and McMahan (2005), nationwide 42 states have adopted a farmland protection program. In 1996, USDA provided funds for farmland protection efforts and had a goal of protecting between 170,000 and 340,000 acres of farmland.

On March 10, 2000, the West Virginia State Legislature unanimously passed into law State Code § 8-24-72 through § 8-24-84 (2000) and later revised to State Code §8A-12-1 through §8A-12-20, known as the Voluntary Farmland Protection

Act. The Act went into effect on June 8, 2000 and amended a 1982 statute of similar code location (sic) that once allowed the creation of Farmland Preservation Committees. (West Virginia Farmland Protection, 2003, acts section, ¶ 1).

The Act “declares that agriculture is a unique “life support” industry and that a need exists to assist those agricultural areas of the state which are experiencing the irreversible loss of agricultural land” (West Virginia Farmland Protection, 2003, acts section, ¶ 2). The Voluntary Farmland Protection Act also authorized county farmland protection boards for each county and the county commissioners were given the authority to approve the purchase of farmland easements according to the West Virginia Farmland Protection (2003) website.

Each county must have a Farmland Preservation Board before the program can even be implemented. The board “shall be composed of seven members, each serving without compensation” (West Virginia Farmland Protection, 2003, act section, ¶ 4). According to Craig (n.d.), by law the farmland preservation board must consist of the following members: one county commissioner, the executive director of the county development authority, one farmer who is a county resident and a member of the county Farm Bureau, one farmer who is a county resident and a member of a Soil Conversation District, one farmer who is a county resident, and two county residents who are not members of any of the above organizations.

According to the West Virginia Farmland Protection (2003) website, the board has the ability to sue, enter into contract and eliminate all instruments necessary to carry out its purpose, restrict use of land, implement rules, seek funding and disseminate information throughout the county. The duties of each Farmland Protection Board consists of reporting to the county commission about acquisitions of easements by the board and to acquire approval of any or all easement purchases, advise and promote the protection of farmland through providing assistance and information during acquisitions of easements, search for and apply funds available from the federal, state, county and private sources to achieve the function of the farmland protection programs. The board also carries out additional duties that may be assigned by the commission.

The eligibility of a landowner to acquire protection under the Farmland Protection Program is based on a point system that is categorized on the land characteristics and is then placed in a conservation easement. In order for a landowner within a county to be eligible to participate in the program they must meet the following minimum criteria in order to be considered for either a purchased or donated conservation easement:

1. The property must be located in the county in which the Farmland Protection Board operates or application must be made to the State Authority.
2. The property shall be land which meets one or more of the following criteria, as defined by the Voluntary Farmland Protection Act:
  - a. used or usable for agriculture, horticulture or grazing (qualifying property)
  - b. wetlands that are part of the qualifying property
  - c. woodlands that are part of or appurtenant (whether a legal right or privilege and inherited with it) to a qualifying property tract; or held by common ownership of a person or entity owning qualifying property

3. No commercial or industrial structure shall be located on the parcel
4. Clear title to the property must be established and the application must be signed by the property owner(s). (West Virginia Farmland Protection, 2003, background section, 4).

To be eligible for the program:

the property shall not have any current or past uses that would render the establishment of a conservation easement inconsistent with the intent of the Act or this Program. Such determination is typically made by the county Farmland Protection Board after consideration of all facts and circumstances (West Virginia Farmland Protection, 2003, background section, ¶ 5).

The northern regions of the United States have been experiencing agricultural land pressures due to two reasons: 1) shifts in cost/price relationships resulting in reduced net return for agriculture products which causes farmers to terminate their operations, due to the low net returns they receive, and 2) rising land values due to increased amounts of development which encourage land owners to sell for larger capital gains which could be financially beneficial to the landowner. The northern region also has been a leader in developing, implementing policies, and designs to overcome agricultural pressures. "Several of these programs have been costly in terms of the public sector resources but have received broad public support including bond issues and taxes to defray their costs" (Colyer, 1998, p. 2). Though preserving farmland seems costly in regards to the public sector, there has been a wide range of support in terms of their willingness to generate tax base finances to support the program.

Many agricultural districts, land use commissions, informational and educational activities are used to help achieve the goal of farmland retention. Development rights appear to be "the most effective long-term approach, but it is also the most expensive and current programs are constrained by limited funds despite the willingness of the public to support such activities" (Colyer, 1998, p. 24).

According to Lembeck, Willits and Crider (1991), research has shown that residents' views on land use issues vary from community to community. The educational program that was launched by The Ohio State University Extension Service found that hosting local round tables gave residents the opportunity to exchange concerns about land use trends. According to Hudkins and Blaine (1999) the results from this study were extremely beneficial to Extension educators involved in land use issues and helped to lay the foundation for land use educational programming that was developed and presented throughout the state of Ohio.

The North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service (NCCES) conducted a study on professional attitudes toward building a stronger sustainable agricultural program. A majority of the residents were "unsure about the meaning, while others adapted a meaning that supported their own belief about what constitutes sustainable agriculture" (Minarovic & Mueller, 2000, Conclusion section, ¶ 2). According to the State of the South Project (Worstell, 1994), a lack of a clear definition of sustainable agriculture was one of the main barriers to implementation. The study also suggested, "that more work can be done among agriculture professionals to understand the philosophy of sustainability" (Minarovic & Mueller, 2000, Conclusion section, ¶ 5), to better their state's agricultural industry.

According to the Michigan State University study, the equity insurance programs could possibly cost “40 percent less than conventional purchase of development rights programs, and equity mortgage programs could save 47 percent” (Schneider, 2006, ¶ 29). Dr. Adelaja stated that, “In order to be successful, in order to protect our farmland, we have to change and we have to think big” (Schneider, 2006, ¶ 31). The insurance and mortgage proposals are getting people to think about the big picture of the agricultural industry in the state.

Ohio is also faced with concerns of preserving farmland within the state. Staley (2000), stated that state and local policymakers should avoid looking to expensive efforts to conserve farmland and go to the roots of growth-management problems. The most important source of inefficiency in the real estate market is at the local level. Zoning codes would generate the conservation of land from rural to urban uses. Cluster housing is one method used to preserve open space but is virtually impossible to implement in many cases because of antiquate zoning codes, misinformed citizen opposition, and approval processes that wipe out revenues. According to Staley (2000) the answers to conserving farmland lie within the counties and communities in order to help protect farmland from being used commercially.

Preservation farmland issues are becoming headlines in numerous newspapers and articles across the nation and there have been many suggestions of how these issues could be resolved but vary among communities due to demographical differences. Some studies have shown that education, beliefs, demographics of the communities, funding and alternative techniques (mortgage and insurance programs) are some of the barriers and alternatives that other states have faced in order to preserve farmland.

In West Virginia the law specifically authorizes local County Commissioners with the creation of county farmland protection boards in each county, to serve as members of that board and the authority to approve the purchase of farmland easements according to the West Virginia Farmland Protection (2003) website. Given that county commissioners by law control the destiny of farmland protection boards in their counties, it is important to ascertain their knowledge and attitudes toward farmland preservation in West Virginia.

### Purpose and Objective

The purpose of the study was to determine county commissioner’s knowledge and perceptions of the Farmland Preservation Program within West Virginia. Information obtained from this study will be used to establish or document commissioners’ perceptions and knowledge toward the implementation of the program.

The objectives of the study were to determine the level of knowledge county commissioners have about Farmland Preservation, identify barriers to implementing the Farmland Preservation Program as perceived by county commissioners and identify the benefits of the Farmland Preservation Program as perceived by county commissioners.

## Methods

Using a descriptive research design, data were collected from the target population by means of a four part mailed survey. A questionnaire was designed specifically for this study to collect information on county commissioners' knowledge and perceptions of the Farmland Preservation Program in West Virginia. The target population consisted of all County commissioners in West Virginia (N=165). A list of county commissioners was obtained from an official state web site. The researcher called each county office to verify the accuracy of the names and addresses, thus avoiding frame error. Selection error was avoided by scanning the list for duplicates and using a census of the target population. Of the 165 distributed questionnaires, 71 were returned for a response rate of 43%.

The instrument used for this study was a four-part mail questionnaire developed by the researcher based on the review of literature. Part I consisted of one "yes" or "no" question regarding their knowledge about the state law that was enacted. Part II of the questionnaire consisted of twelve Likert scaled attitudinal items relating to the commissioners' toward farmland preservation programs in the counties. Part III of the questionnaire consisted of ten questions relating to the implementation of the farmland preservation program in the commissioners' county. Part IV of the instrument requested demographic information about the population. Content and face validity was established by University faculty in Agricultural Education. Using the split-half statistical procedure, the instrument was determined to have extensive reliability with a Pearson's  $r$  of .895 (Robinson, Shaver, Wrightsman, 1991).

Surveys were distributed via the United States Postal Service to each member of the population. Each survey was accompanied by a hand-signed cover letter which explained the purpose of the study and provided directions for completion and return of the questionnaire (Dillman, 2000). Respondents were provided with self-addressed stamped envelopes and the questionnaires were numbered to identify non-respondents. Two weeks after the initial mailing, a second mailing of the instrument was sent to non-respondents, accompanied by a new cover letter.

The researchers compared early respondents to late respondents and found no significant differences ( $\alpha \leq .05$ ) between the groups, therefore the respondents' responses could be generalized to the entire population; however, with a 42% response rate the findings will only be generalized to county commissioners that responded to the survey. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data collected from the surveys in the form of frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency.

## Findings

Respondents were asked to complete four closed-ended questions that related to the respondent's gender, agricultural experience, owner of farmland and whether or not they were familiar with the Voluntary Farmland Protection Act. Respondents could skip any question they did not feel comfortable answering. Fifty-nine respondents (85.5%) were male and 10 respondents (14.5%) were female (see Table 1).

Fifteen respondents (22.7%) indicated they had no agricultural experience, 16 respondents (24.2%) had some knowledge about agriculture, 10 respondents (15.2%) had limited agricultural experience and 25 respondents (37.9%) had experience in the agricultural field (see Table 1). When asked if they owned farmland, 34 respondents (50.0%) indicated that they did own farmland (see Table 1). Sixty-five respondents (100%) indicated that their own land was not preserved under the farmland preservation program (see Table 1).

The respondents were asked if he/she was “familiar with the voluntary Farmland Preservation Act (2000) (WV Code 8-24-72)”. Nineteen respondents (73.1%) indicated that they were familiar with the Farmland Preservation Act, while seven respondents indicated that they were not familiar with the Act (see Table 1). Comments on the surveys indicated limited knowledge of the nuisances of the law and its implications.

Table 1  
*Gender, Experience in the Field of Agriculture, Own Farmland and Familiar with the Voluntary Farmland Protection Act*<sup>1</sup>

	<i>f</i>	%
Gender		
Male	59	85.5
Female	10	14.5
Experience		
No experience	15	22.7
Some knowledge about agriculture	16	24.2
Limited experience in agriculture	10	15.2
Experienced in the field of agriculture	25	37.9
Own farmland		
Yes	34	50.0
No	34	50.0
Familiar with the Voluntary Farmland Protection Act		
Yes	19	73.1
No	7	26.9

<sup>1</sup> Respondents could omit any question

Using a six point Likert scale, respondents were asked to respond to 12 statement concerning farmland preservation. The scale consisted of the following six levels of measurement: 6-“Strongly Agree”, 5-“Moderately Agree”, 4- “Slightly Agree” 3- “Slightly Disagree”, 2- “Moderately Disagree”, 4-“Slightly Agree”, and 1-“Strongly disagree.” The number and percentage of respondents marking each choice to each item and the item mean and standard deviation were calculated (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006). The items were grouped into categories based on their average composite score using the following scale: 5.51-6.00 “Strongly Agree”, 4.51-5.50 “Moderately Agree” 3.51 – 4.50 “Slightly Agree”, 2.51 – 3.50 “Slightly Disagree”, 1.51 – 2.50 “Moderately Disagree”, and 0.00-1.50 “Strongly Disagree.”

Table 2  
*Attitudes of Respondents About Farmland Preservation*

	Strongly disagree		Moderately disagree		Slightly disagree		Slightly agree		Moderately agree		Strongly agree		<i>M</i>
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	
Citizens should be educated on farmland preservation	0	0	3	4.5	2	3.0	14	20.9	16	23.9	32	47.8	5.07
Real estate transfer tax is beneficial	3	4.7	2	3.1	1	1.6	13	20.3	15	23.4	30	46.9	4.95
Preservation of farmland is important	2	3.0	4	6.0	4	6.0	12	17.9	14	20.9	31	46.3	4.87
Support the concept of farmland preservation	3	4.7	3	4.7	6	9.4	13	20.3	11	17.2	28	43.8	4.72
Loss of farmland is a concern	3	4.4	7	10.3	4	5.9	14	20.6	17	25.0	23	33.8	4.53
Farmland preservation program will decrease the loss of farmland	3	4.6	5	7.7	3	4.6	17	26.2	18	27.7	19	29.2	4.52
Farmland preservation will provide opportunities for landowners	3	4.8	1	1.6	7	11.1	15	23.8	24	38.1	13	20.6	4.51
Farmland preservation should be perpetual	11	16.9	2	3.1	10	15.4	14	21.5	9	13.8	19	29.2	4.00
Real estate transfer tax should be used to fund farmland preservation	10	15.6	3	4.7	12	18.8	12	18.8	6	9.4	21	32.8	4.00
Farmland preservation will not affect the overall tax base	8	12.7	5	7.9	21	33.3	7	11.1	17	27.0	5	7.9	3.56
Include personal land in farmland preservation	16	29.1	3	5.5	7	12.7	12	21.8	8	14.5	9	16.4	3.36
Farmland preservation will have a negative impact	18	27.7	12	18.5	19	29.2	9	13.8	5	7.7	2	3.1	2.65

Participants moderately agreed that “all citizens of my county should be educated on the benefits of the farmland preservation program” (M= 5.07), “the real estate transfer tax is beneficial to my county” (M= 4.95), “preservation of farmland is important in my county” (M= 4.87), “I support the concept of a farmland preservation program in my county” (M= 4.72), “the loss of farmland in my county is a concern” (M= 4.53), “a farmland preservation program will decrease the loss of farmland in my county” (M= 4.52), and “a farmland preservation program will provide a good opportunity for landowners in my county” (M= 4.51) (see Table 2) Respondents expressed “slight agreement” on three items. Respondents slightly agreed that “farmland preservation should be perpetual (forever)” (M= 4.00), “real estate transfer tax should be used to fund the farmland preservation program” (M= 4.00), and “if a farmland preservation program is implemented in my county, the overall tax base will not be affected” (M= 3.56)(see Table 2).

On two of the items, the respondents expressed “slight disagreement.” Respondents slightly disagreed with the statements “I would consider including my personal land in farmland preservation program” (M= 2.65) and “farmland preservation will have a negative impact on my county” (M= 2.65) (see Table 2).

Table 3  
*Perceived Impacts and Barriers of the Farmland Preservation Program (N=71)*

	Yes	
	<i>f</i>	%
<b>Barriers of Farmland Preservation Programs</b>		
Funding for the program is limited	40	56.3
Program is perpetual (forever)	30	42.3
Increases real estate transfer tax	27	38.0
Participation for the program is limited	15	21.1
Increases in property taxes	11	15.5
Application process is time consuming	10	14.1
Other	7	9.9
<b>Impacts of Farmland Preservation Programs</b>		
The small family farms will be maintained	41	57.7
Decreases in farmland loss	38	53.5
Control urban expansion	26	36.6
The agricultural industry will be stronger	23	32.4
Increases in real estate transfer taxes	19	26.8
Increases in tourism	13	18.3
Increases in property taxes	11	15.5
Other	4	5.6
Decreases in tourism	0	0.0

County commissioners were asked to identify perceived barriers to the farmland preservation program. Of the respondents, 40 county commissioners (56.3%) indicated that limited funding for the program was a barrier, while 30 respondents (42.3%) indicated the fact that the program

is perpetual (forever) was a barrier (see Table 3). Increased real estate transfer taxes were indicated by 27 respondents (38.0%) as a barrier to the farmland preservation program. Limited participation for the program was indicated by 15 respondents (21.1%) as a barrier to the program. An increase in property taxes was indicated by 11 county commissioners (15.5%) as a barrier to the farmland preservation program. The application process is time consuming was listed by ten respondents (14.1%) as a barrier, while seven respondents (9.9%) indicated there were other barriers to the program (see Table 3).

County commissioners were asked to identify perceived impacts of the farmland preservation program. An increase in property taxes was indicated by 11 respondents (15.5%) as a perceived impact to the farmland preservation program, while 19 respondents (26.8%) indicated an increase in real estate transfer taxes as an impact. A decrease in farmland loss was reported as an impact to the farmland preservation program by 38 respondents (53.5%), while 23 respondents (32.4%) indicated that the agricultural industry will be stronger as an impact of the farmland preservation program. Small family farms will be maintained was perceived by 41 respondents (57.7%) as an impact of the farmland preservation program. Thirteen respondents (18.3%) indicated an increase in tourism as an impact of the farmland preservation program, while 71 county commissioners (100.0%) indicated a decrease in tourism was not a perceived impact of the farmland preservation program. Control of urban sprawl was perceived by 26 respondents (36.6%) as an impact of farmland preservation, while four respondents (5.6%) indicated other impacts of the farmland preservation program. Seventy-one respondents (100.0%) indicated a decrease in tourism was not an impact of the farmland preservation program (see Table 3).

County commissioners were asked to rank the five most effective methods to educate constituents about the disadvantages and advantages of the farmland preservation program. Newspapers were ranked first as being the most effective educational method to inform the public about the farmland preservation. Public meetings were ranked second, one-on-one conversations were ranked third, radio was ranked fourth and mail was ranked fifth (see Table 4).

Table 4  
*Ranking of Educational Methods by Effectiveness to Inform the Public about Farmland Preservation*

	Ranking										Overall Ranking
	Fifth		Fourth		Third		Second		First		
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	
Newspaper	1	1.4	1	1.4	11	15.5	15	21.1	16	22.5	1
Public Meetings	4	5.6	3	4.2	13	18.3	8	11.3	15	21.1	2
One on One Conversations	9	12.7	5	7.0	4	5.6	3	4.2	8	11.3	3
Radio	5	7.0	8	11.3	6	8.5	8	11.3	0	0.0	4
Mail	3	4.2	11	15.5	9	12.7	2	2.8	2	2.8	5
Newsletter	9	12.7	9	12.7	3	4.2	5	7.0	2	2.8	6
Television	8	11.3	0	0.0	1	1.4	3	4.2	4	5.6	7
Internet	3	4.2	4	5.6	0	0.0	2	2.8	0	0.0	8
Email	0	0.0	2	2.8	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	9
Other	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	10

## Conclusions, Implications & Recommendations

The following conclusions are based on the interpretations of the data collected in this study. The majority of county commissioners who responded were male. More than half of the respondents indicated they had limited or no agriculture experience, while half indicated they owned farmland. All of the respondents indicated their own land was not preserved under the farmland preservation program. A majority of the respondents moderately agreed that citizens should be educated on farmland preservation and that real estate transfer tax was beneficial for the program.

More than one-half (54.5%) of the respondents have had the farmland preservation program proposed for their county, while slightly less than half (40.7%) of respondents have had a farmland preservation program implemented in their county for less than one year. More than half (56.3%) of the respondents indicated funding for the program as a major barrier to implementing the program. More than half of the respondents indicated maintaining small family farms and a decrease in farmland loss as a major impact after the program has been implemented for ten years.

The future of agriculture and a need for high school agriculture education programs may be at stake with the decline of available farm land. This situation can be exacerbated when elected officials who have been empowered to implement or block programs to protect farmland have limited or no agriculture background and limited knowledge of the laws they control. As agricultural and Extension educators work with youth, landowners, county and community leaders to preserve farmland, they must be aware of the laws and how county leaders perceive those laws. Furthermore, it is important for educators to have a working knowledge of the factors which may impact farmland preservation, and ultimately the agriculture industry, in their communities.

The following recommendations are based on the results of this study with regard to the knowledge and perceptions of county commissioners in West Virginia toward the farmland preservation program.

1. It is recommended that educational articles be placed in newspapers state wide to inform county commissioners and landowners about the Voluntary Farmland Preservation Act.
2. It is recommended that public meetings be held in West Virginia to educate county commissioners and landowners about the provisions of the Voluntary Farmland Preservation Act.
3. It is recommended that additional research be conducted to determine the attitudes of county commissioners toward the farmland preservation program in West Virginia in 3-5 years.
4. It is recommended that additional research be conducted on farmland preservation programs in other states.
5. It is recommended that effective methods of educating the public about the farmland preservation program be explored.
6. It is recommended that additional research be conducted to determine other barriers that may affect the implementation of the farmland preservation program.

## References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Colyer, D. (1998). *Farmland Preservation Programs*. Retrieved November 10, 2005, from [http://www.ext.wvu.edu/jefferson/wv\\_farmland\\_protection/Fact\\_Sheets/Colyer\\_farmland.pdf](http://www.ext.wvu.edu/jefferson/wv_farmland_protection/Fact_Sheets/Colyer_farmland.pdf)
- Craig, W. (n.d.). *The Voluntary Farmland Protection Act-County farmland protection program*. Retrieved March 15, 2006, from [http://www.ext.wvu.edu/jefferson/WV\\_farmland\\_protection/Fact\\_Sheets/Farmland%20Protection%20County.doc](http://www.ext.wvu.edu/jefferson/WV_farmland_protection/Fact_Sheets/Farmland%20Protection%20County.doc)
- Hudkins, S., & Blaine, T. (1999). Research Based Approach to the Development of Educational Programs for Extension Clientele: A Case Study on Land Use Issues in Ohio [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Extension*, 37(4). Retrieved March 2, 2006, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1999august/ent-a.html>
- Lembeck, S. M., Willits, F. K., & Crider, D. M. (1991). *Public attitudes toward farmland preservation in Pennsylvania: Analysis of a statewide survey*. University Park: Report 226, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Pennsylvania State University.
- Minarovic, R., & Mueller, J. (2000). North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service Professionals' Attitudes Toward Sustainable Agriculture [Electronic Version]. *Journal of Extension*, 38(1). Retrieved March 3, 2006, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2000february/a1.html>
- McQueen, M., & McMahon E. (2005). Briefing Paper: Dedicated Funding Sources For Land Protection. Retrieved March 22, 2006 from [http://www.farmland.org/northeast/CT\\_brief\\_fund\\_sources.pdf](http://www.farmland.org/northeast/CT_brief_fund_sources.pdf)
- Schneider, K. (January 1, 2006). An inheritance neglected farmland: farm economy merit higher state priority. *Michigan Land Use Institute*. Retrieved February 27, 2006, from <http://www.mlui.org/growthmanagement/fullarticle.asp?fileid=16982>
- Staley, P. (2000). Ohio farmland preservation efforts trivial, off target, and may encourage urban sprawl [Quality Growth]. Message posted to <http://www.buckeyeinstitute.org/article/254>
- West Virginia Farmland Protection (2003). *Welcome to the West Virginia Farmland Protection Website*. Retrieved November 4, 2005 from <http://www.wvfarmlandprotection.org/>
- Worstell, J. (1995). *Southern futures: Opportunities for sustainable agricultural systems*. A Report of the State of the South Project. Frankfort, KY: Community Farm Alliance.