Beyond Housing:
Urban Agriculture and Commercial Development by Community Land Trusts

Greg Rosenberg and Jeffrey Yuen

© 2012 Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
Working Paper

The findings and conclusions of this Working Paper reflect the views of the author(s) and have not been subject to a detailed review by the staff of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Contact the Lincoln Institute with questions or requests for permission to reprint this paper. help@lincolninst.edu

Lincoln Institute Product Code: WP13GR1

Abstract

Community land trusts are flexible organizations that embrace diverse land uses to address various community needs. While the majority of CLTs currently focus on the development and stewardship of owner-occupied housing, some organizations have broadened their focus to emerging opportunities in non-residential development. The study examines non-residential programs and activities implemented by CLTs and focuses on the urban agriculture and commercial development sectors. Based upon case studies of 13 CLTs, this paper presents findings on: (1) the roles of CLTs in non-residential projects; (2) the benefits and challenges of non-residential projects for CLTs; and (3) implications for CLT practice.

The study found that CLTs are increasingly taking on a variety of roles and responsibilities in implementing and supporting non-residential development. In urban agriculture, CLTs have played the following roles:

- Securing access to land through a variety of land tenure arrangements including fee simple ownership, ground leases, deed restrictions and easements;
- Providing agricultural programmatic support;
- Engaging directly in agricultural production.

In commercial development, CLTs have taken on the following roles:

- Engaging in land acquisition, project development, and property management;
- Spearheading community engagement and advocacy efforts;
- Creating new commercial enterprises.

The benefits and challenges associated with these non-residential roles are discussed for urban agriculture and commercial development. Implications for improving non-residential CLT practice are also identified based on findings from the case studies. The study concludes that many opportunities exist for CLTs to expand into non-residential roles and that CLTs should focus on the *management* of land-based resources, rather than solely on the *ownership* of land to advance contributions in comprehensive community development.

About the Authors

Greg Rosenberg is a principal with Rosenberg and Associates, with a consulting practice focusing in the areas of organizational development, affordable and sustainable housing, urban and rural agriculture, software development, research, web development, and community land trusts. Greg was a founding board member of both the National Community Land Trust Network (United States) and the Community Land Trust Academy, and served as the first Academy Director through 2011. He is the former executive director of the Madison Area Community Land Trust (Madison, Wisconsin), where he was the lead developer for Troy Gardens, a nationally award-winning urban ecovillage project featuring a working farm, community gardens, a restored prairie, interpretive nature trails, and a 30-unit mixed-income green built cohousing project. He is licensed to practice law in the state of Wisconsin, and is a LEED Accredited Professional.

Greg Rosenberg
3146 Buena Vista Street
Madison, WI 53704
(608) 245-0746
greg@gregrosenberg.com

Jeffrey Yuen is a community development researcher and practitioner with a master's degree in Urban Planning from Columbia University and a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture from California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo. His research focuses on issues of social justice, land use, and food policy within the context of community development. He currently serves as a research fellow at the National Community Land Trust Network and is the Impact Assessment Coordinator at New Jersey Community Capital, a community development financial institution (CDFI) in New Brunswick, NJ.

Jeffrey Yuen
New Jersey Community Capital
108 Church Street, 2nd Floor
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
858-922-8504
jeffreybyuen@gmail.com

Acknowledgements

We would like to gratefully acknowledge John Emmeus Davis, of Burlington Associates in Community Development, for his invaluable assistance in critiquing and editing this working paper; Emily Thaden, Research and Policy Development Manager for the National Community Land Trust Network, for her leadership and editorial assistance with this study; and the contributions of our editorial board. Thanks to the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy for their ongoing support of the work of community land trusts and urban agriculture. In particular, we acknowledge the inspiring contribution of Jerry Kaufman, whose Lincoln Institute Working Paper entitled "Farming Inside Cities" (co-authored with Martin Bailkey) was a pioneering effort in the field of food security and urban planning. Finally, we gratefully recognize the individuals who took the time to provide extensive information on their organizations and programs.

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures

Beyond Housing: Urban Agriculture and Commercial Development by Community Land Trusts

Introduction

The community land trust (CLT) is a flexible model that embraces diverse land uses to address various community needs. The majority of CLTs currently focus on the development and stewardship of owner-occupied housing, despite the model's historical roots in agriculture and commercial development. However, some CLTs have broadened their focuses in response to the recent housing market downturn and emerging opportunities for non-residential development. A number of interrelated factors are giving rise to a 'fourth wave' of the CLT movement, which is characterized by an increasing emphasis on non-residential community development. These factors include: (1) significant changes in the housing finance industry and local real estate markets following the Great Recession; (2) an increased awareness of sustainable and equitable food systems, which has catalyzed a growth in urban agriculture; and (3) the decline of urban areas as a result of economic stagnation. These factors have created opportunities for community-based organizations, like CLTs, to respond to changing local needs and moving beyond affordable housing to more comprehensive community development strategies.

This paper presents research on non-residential projects of CLTs with a primary focus on urban agriculture and a secondary focus on commercial development. Hereinafter, *non-residential projects* refers to urban agriculture and commercial development projects conducted by CLTs. Based upon case studies of 13 CLTs, this paper presents findings on: (1) the roles of CLTs in non-residential projects; (2) the benefits and challenges of non-residential projects for CLTs; and (3) implications for CLT practice based on the case studies. Implications from the study support that CLTs should focus on the *management* of land-based resources, rather than solely on the *ownership* of land, to advance contributions to comprehensive community development.

1.0 Literature Review

This section first describes the CLT model and the movement's history. Next, conceptual definitions and the existing literature on the benefits and challenges of urban agriculture and commercial development are presented.

1.1 Community Land Trusts

A CLT is a nonprofit, community-based corporation with a place-based membership, a democratically elected board, and a charitable commitment to the use and stewardship of land on behalf of local communities. CLTs typically retain permanent ownership of land, which is then leased to other entities that own the improvements upon the land, such as residential homes, commercial buildings, agriculture or recreational facilities. The conveyance of land through a durable and inheritable ground lease serves five purposes: (1) to secure occupancy rights for

those who use the land for housing or other activities; (2) to preserve affordability by restricting the resale price of improvements; (3) to prevent noxious uses, undesirable improvements, and deferred maintenance on the land; (4) to prohibit predatory lending and reduce foreclosures; and (5) to create a source of income through monthly lease fees to support CLT stewardship activities.

Ralph Borsodi and Robert Swan developed the precursors to the CLT model, drawing upon examples of planned communities on leased land, including the Garden City movement in England, single tax communities in the United States, Gramdan villages in India, and moshav communities in Israel (Davis 2010). The CLT model and movement have never been static. Over the past four decades, CLT practitioners have had to adapt to meet changing social and economic conditions. The history of the CLT movement in the United States is characterized by four distinct 'waves.' The first wave of the CLT movement began in 1969 when New Communities Incorporated was formed out of the civil rights movement in Lee County, Georgia to help rural African-American farmers secure land. New Communities owned over 5,600 acres of cooperatively farmed land for nearly 15 years until the land was lost due to debt burden (Sherrod and Whitney 2012). Despite this setback, the example of New Communities inspired the formation of several early CLTs in the 1970s, mostly on rural land (Davis 2010).

In the second wave of the movement, CLTs expanded rapidly, supported by the Institute for Community Economics. During the 1980s, CLTs were applied to urban settings for the first time, including the Community Land Cooperative of Cincinnati in Ohio, the Burlington CLT (now Champlain Housing Trust) in Vermont, and Dudley Neighbors Incorporated in Roxbury, Massachusetts (the CLT subsidiary of the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative). Further, the authors of the *The Community Land Trust Handbook* (1982) introduced elements emphasizing affordability and long-term stewardship that prompted second wave CLTs to tackle new issues, such as neighborhood revitalization, affordable homeownership, and a grassroots resistance to gentrification (Davis 2010).

The third wave of the movement was marked by the housing boom years of the 1990s, which brought hyperinflation to many real estate markets. The challenge of affordable housing led local government leaders and housing advocates to focus on protecting public sector housing subsidies through inclusionary housing programs, housing trust funds, and partnerships with community development corporations and CLTs (Jacobus and Brown 2007; Davis and Jacobus 2008; Curtin and Bocarsly 2008). The growth in third wave CLTs was also propelled by favorable economic conditions, including increased access to low-interest, fixed-rate mortgages and low unemployment rates that enabled many lower-income and minority individuals to become homeowners. When the real estate market began its downturn in 2007, there were nearly 190 CLTs in the United States (Sungu-Eryilmaz and Greenstein 2007). The vast majority of these were focused primarily on affordable homeownership.

The fourth wave of the CLT movement began in the early 2000s and was further defined by challenges in the housing market during the Great Recession and ensuing opportunities for non-residential development. Even before the crash of the real estate market, CLTs were expanding their vision of stewardship to include the promotion of housing maintenance and foreclosure prevention (Davis 2008). Some CLTs have re-examined the centrality of their homeownership

programs, since tightened underwriting guidelines for mortgage financing and increased unemployment have reduced the pool of potential CLT homebuyers. Declines in market-rate home values have narrowed the gap between the prices of market-rate and affordable homeownership units, reducing the marketability of resale-restricted CLT homes. Given these challenges, some CLTs have looked beyond homeownership (Angotti 2007)—and even beyond housing—to non-residential development. Further, mounting public awareness on the importance of food security and public health is spurring the growth of urban agriculture. In the aftermath of the foreclosure crisis and Great Recession, these local economic development efforts are revitalizing disinvested urban neighborhoods.

1.2 Urban Agriculture

Urban agriculture has generally been defined as an industry located within, or on the fringe of, an urban center which raises, processes and distributes a diversity of food and non-food products serving an urban economic and ecological system (Mougeot 2000, 10). More specifically, in this paper, urban refers to the spatial context of productive cultivation that occurs across urban, suburban and periurban areas. It does not refer exclusively to large cities but widely applies to all agricultural sites proximate to densely settled places. Scholars agree that no clear boundary distinguishes urban from rural. Instead, a wide variety of agricultural practices cross the urban-rural continuum (Mougeot 2000; Stevenson et al. 1996). While this paper focuses on the urban side of this spectrum, cases from more rural contexts are referenced. Nevertheless, examples of large-scale farmland and rural agricultural preservation programs are excluded, as these activities have different goals, challenges, and scales of intervention (Springer 2006).

Agriculture refers to commercial and non-commercial food production but can also encompass animal husbandry, medicinal cultivation, and ornamental production (Jacobi 2000). It can take place on private or public property, including vacant lots, city parks, schoolyards, and rooftops. Urban agriculture land can be owned individually or by a community group, public agency, land trust, or other entity (Policylink n.d.). While urban farms and community gardens are often the public face of urban agriculture, small-scale backyard gardens and edible landscapes also constitute a significant portion of urban agricultural production (Taylor and Lovell 2012).

<u>Benefits and Challenges</u>

Studies have documented the environmental, economic, and social benefits that urban agriculture can bring to communities. These benefits include improved nutrition, heightened food security, ecological restoration, the creation of open spaces, and opportunities for education and job skills training (Bellows, Brown, and Smit 2004; Irvine, Johnson, and Peters 1999; Kaufman and Bailkey 2000; Mendes et al. 2008; Smit, Ratta, and Nasr 1996; Wakefield et al. 2007). Urban agriculture can also serve as a strategic neighborhood development tool. Farms and gardens can be created through quick, highly visible, and inexpensive neighborhood improvements, such as cleaning and beautifying vacant lots (Lawson 2005). Other authors have highlighted urban agriculture's unique ability to bring together diverse populations, build social capital, and promote local empowerment to foster community building (Kurtz 2001; Pudup 2008; Rosenberg 2010; Stahaeli et al. 2002).

However, urban agriculture is not without its challenges, such as environmental safety concerns, prohibitive public policies, and insecure land tenure (Brown et al. 2002; Schmelzkopf 1995). In particular, land insecurity is frequently cited as the greatest barrier to urban agriculture implementation and sustainability (Kaufman and Bailkey 2000; Lawson 2004; Von Hassel 2002; Wakefield et al. 2007; Yuen 2012). The American Community Gardening Association avers that land tenure is the "crux of the future success" of the urban agriculture movement. Indeed, in a national survey of over 6,000 urban agriculture sites, 99.9% of gardeners identified land security as an issue (ACGA 1998, 5).[1]

Urban agriculture land insecurity occurs when the cost of market-rate urban land exceeds the income generated from agricultural activities. In effect, the 'hidden hand' of the market presses for the allocation of land according to its "highest and best use." Due to this conceptualization, planners and city officials have historically viewed urban agriculture as an interim measure to keep a site active until higher and better uses can be constructed. However, scholars note that urban agriculture sites produce many positive externalities relating to public health and community wellness that are difficult to measure financially (Schmelzkopf 1995). Some even propose that the social benefits arising from urban agriculture and traditional exchange valuations are "incommensurable," and consequently, the market's financialization and speculation of property is inherently problematic (Schmelzkopf 2002; Harvey 1973). Due to this economic emphasis used to evaluate land use and value, the literature has focused on the need for alternative strategies for securing urban agriculture land (ACGA 1998; Brown et al. 2002; Kaufman and Bailkey 2000).

CLTs are one such alternative strategy. To date, a handful of case studies have examined individual urban agriculture projects constructed by CLTs (Campbell and Salus 2003; Hersch 2010; Rosenberg 2010). These studies shed light on specific practices but cannot yield trends within the field from cross-case comparison. Yuen (2012) takes a more expansive approach, examining the land tenure methods used by 16 land trust organizations to secure community garden sites. This study contributes to the literature by conducting a comparative analysis on the variety of approaches that CLTs utilize to support urban agriculture projects.

1.3 Commercial Development

Commercial development refers to the construction and rehabilitation of commercial real estate facilities as well as the direct creation of business enterprises. Since CLTs are community-based organizations, the literature reviewed focuses on commercial activities that address neighborhood needs within targeted geographies, such as banks, grocery stores, and community centers.

In the wake of World War II, many urban neighborhoods contained the quantity and variety of retail shops, offices, eateries, and grocery stores that are essential for neighborhood vitality (Sutton 2010). By the 1970s, waves of urban disinvestment, public sector retrenchment, suburbanization, and the rise of auto-centric shopping centers had caused the decline of inner-city commercial life (Sutton 2010). At the same time, urban neighborhoods experienced dramatic

[1] The ACGA study specifically examined land insecurity for community gardens, which are just one of many forms of urban agriculture. Land security is a major issue for other forms of urban agriculture as well.

shifts in residential housing patterns and demographic composition, as middle-income families moved out and left behind swaths of concentrated poverty (Jacobus and Chapple 2010; Wilson 1987). By the 1990s, urban disinvestment was so extreme that some scholars noted affordable opportunities for the return of inner-city retail (HUD 1999; Porter 1995). Yet urban neighborhoods across the nation continue to struggle to reverse the impact of multi-decade commercial decline.

Benefits and Challenges

Neighborhood-based commercial development can help bring private-sector capital to lower-income and underserved neighborhoods. Such development can create local jobs and training, increase entrepreneurial opportunities, provide residents with convenient access to goods and services, and help improve resident self-perceptions and life satisfaction (Jacobus and Hickey n.d.; O'brien and Ayidiya 1991; Seidman 2001). However, critics note that certain forms of commercial development, such as chain retail stores, can also negatively impact lower-income communities and accelerate gentrification[2] (Halebsky 2004; Hess 2009; Mitchell 2006). Sutton suggests that commercial development should not be idealized as a signifier of neighborhood improvement unless the process emphasizes progressive community-based decision-making and distributive justice (2010, 356).

The community development literature extensively outlines the tools, techniques and practices for organizations to engage in successful commercial development (Jacobus and Chapple 2010; Jacobus and Hickey n.d.). However, these studies broadly assess the community development field and do not examine the specific roles of CLTs in commercial development or the associated benefits and challenges. In fact, very few studies have explored the commercial work of CLTs. Brown and Ranney's (2012) study of the financial and legal strategies of 13 CLTs involved in commercial development was done specifically to inform the Atlanta Land Trust Collaborative. In a short article, Axel-Lute (2011) assesses the work of the Japantown Community Land Trust, noting challenges associated with CLT commercial development. Sorce (2012) examines the activities of two CLTs with relatively small commercial portfolios.

This study conducted a broad, systematic examination of non-residential work of CLTs. The research aimed to: (1) examine the role of CLTs in implementing non-residential projects; (2) assess the benefits and challenges of non-residential projects for CLTs; and (3) describe implication for practice that will improve the feasibility and sustainability of future non-residential projects by CLTs.

2.0 Sample and Methods

A web-based survey was sent to 224 organizations in the National Community Land Trust Network's (NCLTN) United States CLT e-mail database as of August 20, 2012. The survey asked organizations to identify if they were previously or currently involved in various forms of non-residential development. Fifty-six organizations responded to the survey, representing a 25%

[2] The relationship between neighborhood amenities, gentrification and displacement are complex and outside the scope of study. For a nuanced discussion, see Freeman (2004) and Freeman (2006).

response rate. Of those, 37 CLTs reported some form of urban or rural agriculture activities, and 30 CLTs reported commercial development. The survey was supplemented by data gathered in the 2010 Comprehensive CLT Survey (Thaden 2012). Appendix A presents the lists of CLTs by non-residential activity type. 13 CLTs were selected for in-depth data collection, which are presented in Table 1. The selection criteria were based on the study goals, which aimed to capture a diversity of programs in various localities with both successful and unsuccessful experiences in non-residential projects. A case study approach was used for data collection, which included gathering organizational documents and secondary sources as well as interviewing CLT staff. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded for qualitative data analysis. Initial analysis identified emerging themes and examples of CLT roles, as well as the benefits and challenges by type of non-residential projects. These results are presented in section 3.0, Non-Residential CLT Roles, Benefits, and Challenges. Comparative analysis was then conducted to synthesize data across the case studies and identify implications for practices; these results are presented in section 4.0, Implications for CLT Practice.

Table 1: Organizations Selected for Study Participation

	Abbreviation	Location	Respondent	Non-Residential Activities
Urban Agriculture				
Athens Land Trust	Athens Land Trust	Athens, GA	Heather Benham	Community Garden, Market Garden, Produce Stand, CSA Program, Farmland Preservation, Agriculture Programming
Church Community Housing Corporation	CCHC	Newport, RI	Brigid Ryan	Community Garden, Orchard, Farmland Preservation, Community Kitchen, Commercial Real Estate
Dudley Neighbors, Incorporated	DNI	Roxbury, MA	Harry Smith	Greenhouse, Community Garden, Orchard, Agriculture Programming
Durham Community Land Trustees	Durham CLT	Durham, NC	Selina Mack	Community Garden
Kulshan Community Land Trust	Kulshan CLT	Bellingham, WA	Dean Fearing	Farmland Preservation
Lopez Community Land Trust	Lopez CLT	Lopez Island, WA	Sandy Bishop, Rhea Miller, Chom Greacen	Mobile Processing Unit, Seed Library, Commercial Real Estate
Madison Area Community Land Trust	Madison Area CLT	Madison, WI	Greg Rosenberg	Community Garden, Commercial CSA Farm, Restored Conservation Area
Sawmill Community Land Trust	Sawmill CLT	Albuquerque, NM	Connie Chavez	(Future) Community Garden

Southside CLT	Southside CLT	Providence, RI	Margaret DeVos	Community Garden, Commercial Farm, Farmland Preservation, Agriculture Programming
Commercial Development				
Anchorage Community Land Trust	Anchorage CLT	Anchorage, AK	Jewel Jones, Stuart Bannan	Commercial Real Estate, (Future) Community Garden
Champlain Housing Trust	CHT	Burlington, VT	Michael Monte	Mixed Use & Commercial Real Estate
One Roof Community Housing	One Roof	Duluth, MN	Jeff Corey	Housing Construction, Real Estate Brokerage
Urban Land Conservancy	ULC	Denver, CO	Aaron Miripol	Mixed Use & Commercial Real Estate

3.0 Non-Residential Roles, Benefits and Challenges

This section presents results from the first round of qualitative analysis on the case study data. The roles, benefits, and challenges of urban agriculture by CLTs are first presented followed by the roles, benefits, and challenges of commercial development by CLTs.

3.1 CLT Roles in Urban Agriculture Projects

CLTs have taken on three distinct roles in the implementation of urban agriculture projects. First, CLTs secure a stable and affordable supply of land to house urban agriculture projects. A number of tenure arrangements for the provision of land may be used by CLTs, including fee simple ownership, ground leases, deed restrictions, and easements. Second, CLTs provide programmatic support, including program management, technical assistance, and other agricultural services. Third, CLTs directly engage in agricultural production. At times, CLTs take on more than one of these roles, such as securing land through fee-simple ownership, managing farming operations, and hiring staff to till the soil.

Role 1: Secure Land for Urban Agriculture

Of the three urban agriculture roles, securing land fits most neatly within the core competencies of the classic CLT organization. Addressing land insecurity is commonplace for CLTs, as CLTs typically secure land for affordable housing. CLTs have utilized diverse tenure arrangements to carry out their role in procuring land, including fee simple ownership, ground leases, deed restrictions, and easements. These arrangements are not mutually exclusive and an organization can employ multiple techniques within and across projects. Table 2 presents the tenure arrangements utilized by various CLTs and summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

Table 2: Tenure Arrangements for Securing Agricultural Land

Tenure Arrangement	Example Organizations	Advantages	Disadvantages
Fee Simple	CCHC DNI Durham CLT Kulshan CLT (Proposed) Madison Area CLT Sawmill CLT Southside CLT	Long-Term Security High Level of Control	Cost to Acquire Property Taxation Management Obligations
Ground Lease	Athens Land Trust Madison Area CLT Southside CLT	Low-Cost High Level of Control	Legal Complexity Transaction Costs
Deed Restriction	Madison Area CLT	Low-Cost Ensures Agricultural Use	Enforceability
Easement	Madison Area CLT	Low-Cost Ensures Agricultural Use	Transaction Costs

A. Fee simple ownership: Fee simple ownership allows a CLT to hold the greatest number of "sticks" in the bundle of ownership rights and provides a high level of land security, as long as all mortgage payments and tax obligations are met.[3] In urban areas, agriculture sites are often located on vacant lots, where ownership responsibilities may be contested and long-term security can be uncertain. In such circumstances, fee simple ownership is often considered the most durable way to insulate land from the speculative forces of real estate markets and secure property for community use (Yuen 2012).

Some CLTs choose to focus on acquiring land through fee simple ownership but decide not to develop in-house agricultural expertise for programmatic support or direct agricultural production. For example, in the early 1990s, the Durham Community Land Trustees in Durham, North Carolina purchased a property that included a small, non-conforming lot that the local neighborhood association advocated to become a community garden. Today, the Durham CLT continues to hold title to the community garden site, but the neighborhood association manages all programmatic and growing responsibilities, including paying utility fees.

A similar arrangement is seen at the Dudley Greenhouse in Roxbury, MA. Guided by community input, Dudley Neighbors, Incorporated (DNI) redeveloped the contaminated site of a former auto garage into a 10,000 square foot greenhouse that functions both as a commercial farm and a community growing space. DNI secured the land through fee simple ownership and leases the greenhouse for a nominal amount to a food-based nonprofit that handles agricultural

[3] Fee simple ownership can still be limited or encumbered in a variety of ways, see Penner (1996).

programming and maintenance of the greenhouse structure. Harry Smith, Director of Sustainability and Economic Development at DNI, noted the benefits of this arrangement, "Growing food is a whole different thing, and we are not looking to take that role. This goes along with our belief that we should do the things we are good at, and do them well. And we shouldn't do the things we are not good at."

Urban agriculture sites can be expensive to acquire and hold in fee simple ownership. Some CLTs have reduced their costs by integrating urban agriculture into larger development projects. The Madison Area Community Land Trust utilized this strategy at the Troy Gardens project in Madison, Wisconsin.[4] Troy Gardens incorporates diverse land uses on its 31-acre site. Five acres contain mixed-income cohousing, while 26 acres are set aside for a community garden, community-supported agriculture farm, and conservation areas. The Madison Area CLT structured the project so that the entire site (including the agricultural land) was eligible for federal HUD subsidy funding.[5] Thus, by combining housing, agriculture and conservation goals, the Madison Area CLT was able to purchase a large tract of land in an expensive urban market and secure over 75% of the land for agricultural and conservation purposes.

Church Community Housing Corporation (CCHC) utilized a similar approach in developing Sandywoods Farms in Tiverton, Rhode Island. In 2004, the owner of a 174-acre low-intensity farm approached the Town of Tiverton with the vision of developing the site into a rural arts community. The town brought the project to CCHC, who agreed to develop the site to achieve the town's comprehensive planning goals of preserving open space, maintaining rural character, creating affordable housing, and supporting the local arts community. Brigid Ryan, Senior Project Manager at CCHC noted, "We didn't want to only do housing if housing is not [the] best use for the community in this location. So we took a broader view and said this is an opportunity. This is a huge parcel of land; what can we do with it?" Sandywoods Farms utilizes a clustered development approach, with 24 market-rate homeownership lots, along with 50 units of affordable homeownership and rental housing on 26 acres. Another 97 acres were transferred to a conservation land trust for ecological conservation. The remaining acreage went towards preserving farmland and creating a community garden, orchard, art galleries, and a commercial kitchen.

The Sawmill Community Land Trust in Albuquerque, New Mexico illustrates another example of an integrated development approach. In 1999, the Sawmill CLT won a development bid from the city of Albuquerque to plan and redevelop a 27-acre site, which includes affordable housing, economic development, and a forthcoming community garden. The Sawmill CLT's ability to secure urban agriculture land through fee simple ownership was strengthened by government support for the comprehensive development project. In this case, the city has retained ownership of the future community garden parcel until the CLT is ready to develop.

[4] One of the authors of this study, Greg Rosenberg, served as the Executive Director of MACLT from 2001- 2009, and was the lead developer of the Troy Gardens project. For a detailed examination of Troy Gardens see Rosenberg (2010) and Campbell and Salus (2003).

[5] Madison Area CLT utilized HUD Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Economic Development Initiative (EDI) funds to cover the entire cost of acquiring the land at Troy Gardens.

While a CLT can use fee simple ownership to secure access to land, the continued use of the land for agricultural purposes is not guaranteed. Presuming that external restrictions on the use of the land are not imposed, a CLT can change the programming of fee simple land from urban agriculture to other uses, such as housing. In such situations, the CLT's process for community-based decision-making is critical. Even where land is restricted to agricultural uses, such as through deed restrictions, secure tenure for the growers is not assured. The individual grower's right to farm a plot year after year is not ensured through the CLT's fee simple ownership of the land but depends on the informal and contractual relations between the CLT and the grower. Nevertheless, fee simple ownership can be an effective tenure arrangement for CLTs to secure land, but this arrangement may be impractical given the acquisition costs of urban land and the holding costs (depending on local property taxation). For these reasons, alternative tenure arrangements have also been used by CLTs seeking to secure land.

B. Ground lease: Ground leases are a second tenure arrangement used by CLTs to secure land. A CLT can be the lessor or lessee under an agricultural ground lease. At times, the CLT can be the landowner, leasing land to an external entity to manage agricultural programming, as illustrated by the Madison Area CLT's Troy Gardens project. Upon purchasing the land, the Madison Area CLT entered into a short-term ground lease with a newly formed nonprofit, the Friends of Troy Gardens (now Community GroundWorks or CGW), for the 26 acres of conservation and agricultural land. However, both organizations were unable to agree on a long-term ground lease. The Madison Area CLT desired a longer lease because stipulations attached to the development funds made the CLT accountable for long-term agricultural land management, even though the organization lacked the capacity and expertise to handle agricultural programming. Similarly, CGW wanted assurance of secure land for food production and educational programming. The dual issues of length of lease and the definition of performance standards[6] proved to be obstacles. The Madison Area CLT was reluctant to commit to a long-term ground lease with a newly established entity that lacked a demonstrable track record. Further, the Madison Area CLT was unable to implement its typical 98-year ground lease framework due to state regulations that prohibited agricultural leases in excess of 15 years. A possible solution is currently under consideration in the form of a self-renewing five-year ground lease.

Alternatively, the CLT can lease land from an external title-holding entity. The Southside Community Land Trust, for example, serves as both lessor and lessee on a 20-acre rural farm in Cranston, Rhode Island. The State of Rhode Island entered into 10-year ground lease with the Southside CLT at the rate of one dollar per year. In turn, the Southside CLT manages the farm as the landlord, subleasing to seven new farmers at nominal rates, with each sublease lasting up to 5 years. The affordability and security of the lease creates opportunities for young farmers to incubate new businesses and participate in the local food system. The small amount of rent revenue helps defray property management costs.

A ground lease can provide agricultural land security comparable to fee simple ownership, though it is dependent on the length and terms of the lease. For example, a 99-year lease with unclear performance standards can put the tenant at risk of arbitrary termination. Similarly, the lack of clarity can put the lessor at risk of being unable to retake the property if the land is taken

[6] Ground lease performance standards include: keeping the land under active production, maintenance of trail, fence and water systems, and providing support to community gardeners.

out of agricultural use. As is the case with the National Community Land Trust Network Model Ground Lease for housing (CLT Network 2011), longer-term agricultural leases are considerably more complex than short-term leases. These should include rigorous terms for standards of performance, conditions for renewal, lessor succession and assignment, and the setting of a lease fee that balances the interests of the lessor and tenant. Therefore, long-term ground leases can be challenging to draft and implement, particularly in the absence of a model CLT urban agricultural lease.

C. Deed restriction: Deed restrictions (also known as "deed covenants" or "restrictive covenants") are a common tool for placing limitations on the uses of land and are frequently required by grant funders.[7] Funders are motivated to monitor these restrictions in order to protect their investments, and funding recipients are motivated to comply with restrictions in order to avoid repaying grants or loans. Recipients also want to maintain good standing for future funding opportunities. For instance, the Madison Area CLT was required to grant a deed restriction to the City as a condition for funding the 26-acre conservancy parcel at Troy Gardens, restricting uses of the land solely for conservation and agriculture. Failure to abide by the terms of the deed restriction would trigger immediate repayment of all subsidy funds provided by the City of Madison.

While a deed restriction can be effective in ensuring that land is restricted to certain (in this case, agricultural) uses, it does not necessarily offer security of tenure for the grower or farmer. Further, the efficacy of deed restrictions is contingent upon their enforcement by the stewarding agent. Risks of noncompliance with restrictions are highest at the point of transfer of title, either due to inattentiveness by the title company or disregard by the buyer and seller.

D. Easements: Conservation easements are voluntary restrictions that permanently limit types of allowable uses on land. They are held by entities external to the titleholder (Land Trust Alliance 2012). These agreements are frequently used as a tax-planning tool. A landowner grants an easement to a public or private nonprofit entity and commits to conserving land in exchange for a tax deduction commensurate with the diminution of property value.[8] These arrangements can offer a similar level of land security as deed restrictions, and in some cases, can approach the security of fee simple ownership. While conservation easements are more common in rural settings, urban applications exist as well. In Baltimore, Maryland, a private landowner granted a conservation easement to Neighborspace (a land trust) on the site of an existing community garden in exchange for federal tax deductions (Yuen 2012). Arrangements such as these can also reduce the management burden on the titleholder, as the recipient of the easement often provides land stewardship services as part of the exchange.

The Madison Area CLT granted an easement to a conservation land trust, the Urban Open Space Foundation (now the Center for Resilient Cities or CRC), for the 26-acre conservancy parcel at Troy Gardens. This easement has provided an additional layer of protection for the conservancy spaces at Troy Gardens and an ongoing role for CRC. However, it also complicates the process

[7] For a detailed examination of deed restrictions and CLT ground leases see Abromowitz and White (2006).
[8] There is a high amount of local variability in the diminution of property value. However, Wright and Czerniak (2000) note that easements resulted in a 50% reduction in the 'paper value' of a given property.

of installing agricultural infrastructure improvements, which must be approved by all three groups involved (the Madison Area CLT, the CRC, and CGW) prior to construction.

In summary, CLTs have utilized a number of tenure arrangements to secure urban agriculture land. More broadly, fulfilling the CLT role of securing land requires considerations beyond tenure arrangements, such as trust-based relationships with agricultural communities. In one case, the Kulshan Community Land Trust in Bellingham, Washington tried to move beyond its traditional focus on green-rated urban housing development by launching the Access to Land for Farming (ALF) program. Under ALF, the CLT sought to secure affordable rural agriculture land in Whatcom County by retaining title to the land and offering ground leases to local farmers. However, the organization found that it did not possess the requisite expertise in agricultural real estate transactions or sufficiently strong relationships with the rural farming community. After the two year pilot phase, the Kulshan CLT reframed the program from rural to urban agriculture to better leverage existing skills and relationships within their target urban neighborhoods. The role of securing land can be very challenging, and is not always the best fit for a given organization or community.

Role 2: Provide Programmatic Support

CLTs have filled a second urban agriculture role by providing programmatic support. This includes program management, technical assistance and other agricultural services. The Athens Land Trust, for example, is a dual-mission housing and open space land trust, which has engaged in urban agriculture exclusively through program assistance. Athens Land Trust chose to take on this role because of the high holding costs associated with Georgia's property taxation policies, which assesses land owned by the CLT at its unrestricted market value. The Athens Land Trust partners with public and private sector landowners to provide support for local agricultural projects. For example, when a new pastor arrived at Hill Chapel Baptist Church in Athens, he was concerned about the health issues affecting the African American community, including hypertension, diabetes, and obesity. He became an advocate for more nutritious food opportunities and a healthier food culture. The Athens Land Trust's staff worked with the church to design a community garden located on church-owned land and lent programmatic support, such as testing and tilling the soil, organizing workdays, providing plant materials and teaching gardening workshops.

Similarly, at the West Broad Market Garden, the Athens Land Trust designed and constructed a community garden on the site of a former elementary school. Today, the site houses several programs managed by the Athens Land Trust, including a commercial agricultural garden, a produce stand, and a community-supported agriculture program. The Athens Land Trust plans to add a farmer's market component in the near future. As a dual-purpose land trust, the Athens Land Trust is particularly well qualified to conduct agricultural projects. They have also secured funding necessary to advance their urban agricultural program by partnering with a local university to create, maintain, and expand a total of 15 community gardens and 20 school gardens.

The Southside CLT also provides programmatic support by delivering compost, garden supplies, and technical training for the 16 properties it owns and for the 25 gardens owned by other

organizations in its partnership network. Margaret Devos, Executive Director of the Southside CLT explained, "One of the deals with doing chemical free gardening in an urban neighborhood is that compost, natural fish fertilizers, and cover crops are really important for making your soil rich, but these things are usually sold in great quantities. So it's difficult for people with a four by twelve foot plot or a backyard garden to get these supplies, especially for low-income people in the inner city." The Southside CLT is highly experienced and uniquely situated to take on this role, as it is the only CLT in the county with a sole focus on urban agriculture.

The Lopez Community Land Trust, located on rural Lopez Island in Washington, plays an innovative programmatic role in supporting local agriculture. In 1996, the Lopez CLT launched the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARD) initiative and helped create the Island Grown Farmer's Cooperative. Because it was prohibitively expensive to ship livestock to the nearest USDA processing facility located on the mainland, local farmers had identified the need for a mobile meat-processing unit. Over the span of several years, the Lopez CLT conducted feasibility studies and developed partnerships at the USDA, eventually designing and purchasing the first mobile meat-processing unit in the United States.[9] Financed by a $150,000 low-interest loan from the Institute for Community Economics, the mobile processing unit was subsequently leased to the Island Grown Farmer's Cooperative for one dollar per year, with the long-term plan of eventually transferring ownership. Sandy Bishop, Executive Director of the Lopez CLT noted, "It's really changed the face of our local food scene to have the mobile processing unit and it is a key element that helps us to thrive locally. The only reason you can buy meat from your neighbor or buy Lopez Island meat at the grocery store is because of the this mobile processing unit." The Lopez CLT also manages another agricultural program through the operation of an open-pollinated seed library. The CLT houses the library in an existing CLT-owned structure and hires a part-time seed librarian to run the program. The project benefits from its small scale and narrow focus. As Sandy Bishop commented, "The seed library takes minimal staff time, it doesn't take much capital. We had the land and the structure, and it's easy to coordinate."

CLTs have provided programmatic support to a diversity of innovative agricultural projects. While these activities often require significant in-house agricultural experience, smaller scale interventions can also be a part of this role, such as providing CLT-owned space for a seed library or community garden meetings.

Role 3: Direct Agricultural Production

Some CLTs have adopted the third role of agricultural production, where the CLT itself is directly and actively involved in farming land. For example, the Southside CLT operates a three-quarter-acre commercial farm in Providence, Rhode Island, growing greens and selling produce directly to local restaurants. The CLT also provides agricultural training to local university students. Additionally, several CLTs have programs where residents and neighbors grow food on CLT-owned community gardens, including the Sawmill CLT, DNI, the Madison Area CLT, the Southside CLT, and CCHC.

[9] The mobile processing unit has served as a national model, with 13 such units now in existence. Lopez CLT has consulted nationally to help groups develop similar units.

Many CLTs indirectly support urban agriculture by providing residential properties where the residents grow food in backyard gardens. Hence, many CLTs have unknowingly supported urban agriculture for years, simply by offering affordable and secure access to tillable land. DNI, for example, specifically designs large homeownership lots to enable opportunities for backyard gardening. Harry Smith, Director of Sustainability and Economic Development at DNI explained, "As we did our community planning, people were very clear that they wanted to see open spaces and attention paid to the quality of life of the residents. We are trying to build [agriculture] into the housing itself, and we think that's an important concept." Opportunities for urban agriculture are in high demand, particularly among DNI's foreign-born populations, who often have considerable agricultural knowledge and backgrounds.

The scope of CLT agricultural production can also include innovative design features, such as edible landscapes, food forests, and other permaculture[10] concepts that are intentionally and systematically incorporated into a development plan. For example, the site of the Sawmill CLT once housed a large apple orchard. The community wanted to celebrate this agricultural history, so the development team incorporated a small orchard as a landscape feature outside a senior housing complex. Connie Chavez, Executive Director of the Sawmill CLT commented, "It's really cool. You see the seniors out there picking apples and eating. But its also part of the landscape maintenance, so they don't really have to maintain it."

In summary, CLTs have played a diversity of roles in supporting urban agriculture. The effectiveness of each role is dependent on a number of factors, including community needs, financial resources, property taxation, local land markets, organizational capacity, and the presence of other organizations filling complementary roles. CLTs are often best suited for the role of securing agricultural land, and have utilized a number of tenure arrangements to accomplish land security. In addition, some CLTs have provided programmatic support for urban agriculture through a variety of innovative activities. Finally, CLTs are taking a more direct role in food production, which often requires significant in-house agricultural expertise. However, CLTs also provide opportunities for CLT residents and neighbors to directly engage in agricultural production. Some CLTs have done so by integrating agricultural production into a project's overall development plan.

3.2 Organizational Benefits of Urban Agriculture Projects

Data analysis revealed the following thematic benefits from CLT involvement in urban agriculture: (a) complementing existing programs; (b) increasing organizational visibility; (c) diversifying the CLT social base; (d) building new partnerships; and (e) promoting organizational resilience. Each will be explained in this section.

A. Complementing Existing Programs

Urban agricultural projects can be seen as amenities that increase demand for nearby CLT ownership and rental properties. For example, the Madison Area CLT, attributed the marketing

[10] Permaculture, or permanent agriculture, refers to consciously designed landscapes that mimic the patterns found in nature through an "integrated, evolving system of perennial or self-perpetuating plants and animals species useful to man" (Holmgren, 2007).

and sales success of Troy Gardens to the complementary mix of urban agriculture, conservation and green universal design. Resident turnover at Troy Gardens has been 50% lower than conventional condominiums developed by Madison Area CLT (Greg Rosenberg, personal communication, February 1, 2013). The organization attributes residential retention at Troy Gardens to social cohesion resulting from cohousing and urban agriculture engagement.

Agricultural projects also enhanced demand for rental units at CCHC's Sandywoods Farm, which leased up quickly and developed a long waiting list. The development was initially marketed solely as an arts community, but prospective renters expressed interest in agricultural elements. Consequently, CCHC rebranded the project as an 'Art and Agriculture' development. Brigid Ryan of CCHC explained, "The agriculture has taken off much more than we ever thought it would.... It's actually drawing some people [to the rental housing units] who want to be there because of the garden…They never thought their kids would be able to grow their own food." CCHC also noted that agricultural elements have helped, "create a strong community group that's locally involved. That's not something we've had happen in our other communities." Other practitioners affirmed the beneficial connections between their agriculture and housing, as Harry Smith from DNI explained, "[The Dudley greenhouse] certainly helps the marketability of our homes in the sense that people are not just getting a house, they are getting a community, and it's based on fresh locally grown food."

B. Increasing CLT Visibility

Urban agriculture can also help CLTs attract positive attention from neighborhood residents by providing highly visible neighborhood elements that offer tangible evidence of community improvement. For example, the Athens Land Trust's role in creating the Hill Chapel Baptist Church community garden helped increase the profile of the organization. Heather Benham of the Athens Land Trust noted, "[The community garden] made us much more visible in the community to a lot of people that might not have had experiences with us before. The church congregation has 200 people, and maybe 20 people knew about us before through our housing program. We are now seen as a larger resource in the community... and you start building alliances on a different level with the [local] leadership." The high visibility of urban agriculture contrasts with traditional CLT housing, which tends to be blend into the surrounding neighborhood. Many of the important features of CLT housing, such as long-term affordability, are embedded in the ownership structure and not the physical design or outward appearance of the home.

Urban agriculture projects can even play a role in illustrating the complex structure of CLT land ownership. The shared ownership structure of the classic CLT can be difficult to understand in the housing context, but it is often more intuitive in agriculture projects, where the need for long-term land security may be easier to grasp. For example, the Madison Area CLT used agricultural projects to illustrate the importance of long-term CLT land ownership. This helped prospective homebuyers understand the parallel need for resale-restricted homes on CLT-owned land, and ultimately, increased the market of interested residents.

C. Expanding the CLT Service Base

Urban agriculture projects have also helped CLTs to expand the reach of their programs and services. For instance, at Troy Gardens, the Madison Area CLT serves five times more households per acre through urban agriculture than its homeownership program.[11] Its urban agriculture project also reaches a more economically and ethnically diverse population; 40% of the community garden plots are leased to Southeast Asian households, and a third of the plots are leased to low-income residents earning below 60% of the area median income. In contrast, Southeast Asian households and low-income households respectively occupy only 7% and 10% of the housing units.

Similarly, the Athens Land Trust has expanded its relationship to the local African American community through its partnership with the Hill Chapel Baptist Church and its management of the West Broad Market Garden. As Heather Benham of the Athens Land Trust reported, "Some people who were not involved [before] have become huge supporters. Food is an issue that a greater diversity of types of people get behind than affordable housing. It just seems less stigmatized." While the depth of impact may not be as great, "You serve a lot more people through gardening than through housing programs and with a lot less money" (Benham, Athens Land Trust).

D. Building New Partnerships

Agricultural activities can also create opportunities for new partnerships. The Athens Land Trust worked with the University of Georgia's Horticulture Department to access technical agricultural support, student interns and volunteers. The University also helped the Athens Land Trust secure a major USDA grant that significantly expanded the land trust's agriculture programs. Similarly, agricultural activities at Troy Gardens helped Madison Area CLT develop close working relationships with a number of new partners, including the University of Wisconsin, the Madison Community Foundation, the Northside Planning Council, and the Center for Resilient Cities. These partnerships have led to opportunities for future collaboration on agricultural and non-agricultural projects.

E. Promoting Organizational Resilience

Finally, urban agriculture projects can promote organizational resiliency during challenging financial periods. Some CLTs have struggled to stay active and financially viable given the uncertain development climate in local housing markets. While urban agriculture is unlikely to generate significant revenues, it can catalyze positive energy within the organization, engender community goodwill, and provide modest amounts of grant funding from previously untapped sources. For example, Madison Area CLT's work at Troy Gardens generated new sources of local and national foundation support for both agricultural and affordable housing programs. Heather Benham of the Athens Land Trust noted, "Food insecurity is a growing issue right now. There seems to be more funding opportunities available there, while some of the housing stuff is

[11] At Troy Gardens, approximately 150 households grow food on five acres of land, compared to the 30 households served through 5 acres of housing development.

being cut. There is a lot of growth potential." Recent research confirms that impact investors and philanthropic foundations are increasingly focused on food security issues (Saltuk, 2013).

3.3 Organizational Challenges of Urban Agriculture Projects

Data analysis revealed several risks or challenges faced by CLTs embarking on urban agriculture activities, which include: (a) low potential for financial gains; (b) potential gaps in the organization's core competencies; (c) unpredictable funding and production; and (d) organizational inertia.

A. Low Potential for Financial Gain

Urban agriculture projects are unlikely to generate significant financial gains for CLTs. The for-profit sector has also struggled to find profitable business models for urban agriculture, although innovative practices may enable revenue generation. The primary barrier to profitability in urban agriculture is the relatively low revenue from produce sales. The Southside CLT only covers 8% of its operating expenses through produce sold to local restaurants. Other sources of revenue, such as membership fees and seedling sales, bring the Southside CLT's earned income to only 20% of its operating expenses. They rely on grants to cover the remaining shortfall.

Similarly, the Athens Land Trust has generated only modest revenues through its recently launched community-supported agriculture program, which incorporates a sliding scale membership fee to subsidize low-income members. The Athens Land Trust has also explored 'value-added' commercial agriculture products, such as honey and marinara sauce, to increase revenue and mitigate seasonal fluctuations. However, it has not yet implemented a successful business model. Even Growing Power, a high profile urban agriculture organization, has not generated significant income from produce sales; it depends on a mix of grants, donations, fee-for-service training and consulting, and nominal produce sales to cover its expenses. Notably, the fee-for service activities account for half of its operating budget (Growing Power 2012). Among CLTs, outside grants remain the dominant source of funding for urban agriculture, subsidizing both capital expenses and ongoing operational costs.

Some forms of urban agriculture projects can be highly complicated and require a significant expenditure of staff time, thereby reducing the potential for net financial gain. For example, both the Madison Area CLT and CCHC worked to incorporate agriculture into complex, large-scale development projects that were enormously time and resource intensive. Brigid Ryan of CCHC noted, "If you look at the finances, the [Sandywoods Farms] project has taken seven years to do, and we are still investing a huge amount of time into it. Dollar for dollar, in terms of our developer fee, we might have been paid ten dollars an hour. So I wouldn't want to do these projects all the time." Similarly, at the Lopez CLT, so much of the CLT's time was devoted to the mobile processing unit project that the staff was unable to focus on housing activities during the time of its development.

B. Potential Gaps in Organizational Core Competencies

Projects that require a higher level of agricultural knowledge and experience can expose gaps in a CLT's core competencies. As Brigid Ryan of CCHC noted, "To think that agriculture is just something easy and simple – it's not. There was a lot about farming that we had no idea about and here we were trying to develop a farm and farm programs." For example, CCHC initially planned to use preserved farmland for livestock and cattle grazing but discovered that the last Rhode Island butchering facility had closed. The nearest facility was located across the state line in Massachusetts, making it prohibitively expensive to process the meat. Ryan added, "So now we can't really raise any kind of animal for meat because there aren't any butchering facilities. You don't know that stuff! And when you end up having to learn these specialty niches, it becomes so important that you partner with somebody who really knows what they are talking about." CCHC was fortunate to connect with strong partners, including members of the Eastern Rhode Island Conservation District. However, Ryan cautions, "But if you don't find somebody like that, you have to proceed with caution, because there is so much that you don't know you don't know, and that's when a person is dangerous.... So partnerships are really important if you are venturing into something that is highly specialized like farming. It's not just putting seed in the ground. It's pretty high tech stuff."

Even the Athens Land Trust, which has staff with experience in agricultural land preservation and growing techniques, acknowledged the initial difficulties in learning the local zoning codes related to commercial agriculture. Heather Benham recalled, "It's not something we have tons of experience in, so we were learning and adjusting as we went along." As a result, progress on the West Broad Market Garden was delayed for a full year until a workable solution could be found.[12]

C. Unpredictability in Agricultural Funding and Production

A third challenge of urban agriculture projects stems from a high level of unpredictability. The availability of urban agriculture grant funding is closely tied to the philanthropic community's continued interest in food security issues. It is difficult for CLTs to rely on grants for long-term operating unless food security remains a long-term funding priority. Despite this unpredictability, most urban agriculture programs are still heavily reliant on grant opportunities. Additionally, agricultural production is highly unpredictable due to variability in climate, soils, pests, and disease. The uncertainty of crop yields adds to the difficulty of realizing net revenue from produce sales.

D. Organizational Inertia

A final challenge facing CLTs is organizational inertia. A CLT's staff can face difficulties in persuading its board of directors to expand activities beyond an organization's historic niche. For example, the governing board of the Madison Area CLT was divided about further expanding the organization into agricultural activities following the completion of Troy Gardens. The timing of this pending decision coincided with a sharp decline in the local housing market, prompting some board members to suggest that housing development was too risky and engagement in urban agriculture should be expanded. However, the majority of board members believed that the

[12] In the end, the community garden was located on the site of a former elementary school. As the land was owned by the school district, it was not subject to the same zoning restrictions as privately held land.

organization should retain its focus on affordable housing despite market conditions. Ultimately, the board opted to reject a proposal to be the lead developer for an urban agriculture education center.

3.4 CLT Roles in Commercial Development

Analysis identified that CLTs tend to play three roles in commercial development projects, which are: (1) securing land and developing commercial property; (2) spearheading community engagement and neighborhood advocacy efforts; and (3) creating new commercial enterprises. Each role is explained below.

Role 1: Securing Land and Developing Commercial Property

The most common role that CLTs have played to date in promoting commercial projects has been the dual task of securing land and engaging in property development. While these are two conceptually distinct roles, results indicate that CLTs nearly always combine both tasks within a single commercial project.

CLTs have purchased land and constructed or rehabilitated commercial buildings to lease to nonprofit and for-profit tenants. This commercial work has typically aimed to contribute to neighborhood revitalization, where for-profit developers are not adequately addressing local community needs. For instance, the Anchorage Community Land Trust, an organization devoted exclusively to commercial development, has focused its efforts on the revitalization of the Mountain View neighborhood in Anchorage, Alaska. Years of disinvestment left this densely populated neighborhood heavily blighted with a high number of vacant lots, pawnshops, and used car lots. The neighborhood was already well served by several nonprofits developing affordable housing, so the Anchorage CLT decided to focus on commercial development.

Jewel Jones, Executive Director of the Anchorage CLT, noted, “We understood that in order to have a successful community where people moved in and thrived and built their families, you had to have a viable business corridor that served the needs of the community.” Since its inception in 2003, the Anchorage CLT has developed and holds title to 9 commercial properties with a total of 24 commercial tenants. For example, it rehabilitated the site of an abandoned gas station located at a critical intersection on the main commercial corridor and leased the site to a local credit union, which provided the only full-service bank in this underserved neighborhood. Within two months, Jones recalls, the credit union enrolled 350 formerly “unbankable” members who had previously relied on pawnshops for check cashing services.

The Urban Land Conservancy (ULC) in Denver, Colorado also played the role of commercial developer and property manager for neighborhood revitalization, utilizing the CLT model as one element of their real estate business since 2007. In 2008, the ULC was asked by the City of Denver to intervene at the Holly Square shopping center in the North East Park Hill neighborhood after the 2.6-acre property burned down in an act of gang retaliation. Most developers were unwilling to rehabilitate the property due to the economic downturn as well as lingering concerns over the neighborhood’s history of gang activity. In 2009, the ULC purchased the site and immediately engaged the local community, the City of Denver, and the Denver

Foundation to develop grassroots neighborhood organizing capacity to guide a neighborhood planning process. This initiative led to the creation of the Holly Square Redevelopment Plan (HARP) Vision Plan. The ULC has since partnered with local nonprofits to develop interim and long-term uses on the site. One portion of the site has been ground leased to the Boys and Girls Club of Denver, which is constructing a 28,000 square foot community center. While long-term uses on the remainder of the site are still being developed, another nonprofit, the Prodigal Son Initiative, is managing interim site uses, which include a temporary playground, basketball and futsal courts, and public art installations.

The Champlain Housing Trust (CHT) in Burlington, Vermont provides another example of CLT involvement in commercial development. In the 1980s, the organization led redevelopment efforts in Burlington's Old North End, a community that had long suffered from empty storefronts, abandoned commercial buildings, and a deteriorating housing stock. According to Michael Monte, the Chief Operations and Financial Officer of CHT, the neighborhood had been "disinvested going back 20 years.… We realized that the whole neighborhood wasn't going to lift itself up if we didn't get some of this [commercial development] done." CHT has developed and managed 14 commercial units on six properties in the Old North End for community-oriented tenants, such as a food pantry, community health center, multigenerational center, and a nonprofit car donation organization.

CLTs have also taken on commercial development and management in mixed-use districts, where zoning restrictions require ground floor commercial spaces. For instance, CHT's Park Place Apartments in downtown Burlington combines two floors of affordable rental housing above ground floor commercial units. Similarly, CHT developed its own office building as part of a mixed-use project that combines two floors of CHT office space with twenty units of affordable rental housing.

Types of Commercial Leases

CLTs involved in commercial property development and management have utilized two types of leases to define and allocate rights and responsibilities between the CLT and its commercial tenants. First, ground leases can be used in commercial development, although they are more commonly used in a housing context where long-term security is prioritized. At the Holly Square redevelopment project, for example, the ULC has entered into a long-term ground lease with the Boys & Girls Club of Denver. At the request of the community, the ULC has retained ownership of the land under the building in order to safeguard the community's long-term use. The Boys & Girls Club of Denver has brought $5 million in equity to the project in exchange for a below-market ground lease, a financial agreement that resulted in substantial long-term savings for the tenant and upfront debt reduction for the ULC. While CHT has not utilized ground leases to date, many of its commercial tenants have an option to purchase their building at a future date, with the stipulation that CHT would continue to own the underlying land.

The predominant commercial lease used by CLTs is the conventional, space-only, landlord-tenant agreement, where the tenant has no ownership stake in the property. For instance, the Anchorage CLT owns both the land and building at the Mountain View Service Center and manages the property through conventional leases with seven nonprofit tenants. CHT has done

the same in its commercial buildings. In CHT's experience, conventional leases are preferable to ground leases in commercial projects, as they expand the pool of potential commercial tenants by reducing upfront tenant costs and minimizing tenant commitments to property management. In commercial settings, many tenants may prioritize flexibility and low entry costs over long-term security. Whether utilizing ground leases or conventional leases, CLT developers tend to maintain long-term commitments for their commercial properties to serve the community's interests.

Role 2: Advocate for Commercial Development

CLTs have played a second role in commercial development by organizing community engagement and spearheading advocacy efforts on behalf of neighborhood residents. For instance, the Anchorage CLT has been an outspoken advocate for comprehensive neighborhood revitalization in the Mountain View community, campaigning for retail stores to open in this underserved area. Jewel Jones of the Anchorage CLT emphasized the importance of this strategy, "We engage in the community and connect with residents to look for things that we can support… so we are community advocates, not for, but with the people that live here… and I think that is the most important element. Because without having that connection, [a developer] could go in and do what [they] want, rather than working with the community to bring the kinds of opportunities [that the community] wants and needs." Anchorage CLT's advocacy efforts have helped secure a new public library as well as convenient neighborhood resources, such as local branches of mobile phone and cable television providers.

The ULC also incorporated extensive community engagement into its Holly Square redevelopment project through its partnership with the Denver Foundation's Strengthening Neighborhood's grassroots organizing program. The ULC recognized the need to involve the community in developing a unified vision for the property, but also acknowledged a potential conflict of interest in directly organizing community support for its own project. The ULC subsequently devolved some decision-making authority, along with veto power over potential developments, to the newly formed neighborhood steering committee. By emphasizing community engagement, the ULC gained the trust of neighborhood stakeholders and enabled a collaborative planning process.

Role 3: Commercial Entrepreneur

The third role CLTs have played in commercial development involves the direct creation of commercial enterprises by the CLT. Typically, these commercial enterprises are closely related to existing CLT affordable housing work. For instance, some CLTs[13] have launched their own real estate brokerage services, with the goal of retaining sales commissions as well as providing specialized CLT marketing services.

One Roof Community Housing in Duluth, Minnesota offers an example of a CLT-created commercial enterprise. One Roof initially launched Common Ground as a wholly-owned subsidiary that was focused on housing deconstruction and demolition materials recovery. After

[13] Such organizations include: One Roof Community Housing in Duluth, Minnesota, Proud Ground in Portland, Oregon, and Madison Area CLT.

initial difficulties in the deconstruction market, Common Ground evolved into a full-service construction company that constructs and rehabilitates One Roof's housing projects. Common Ground's construction work has greatly benefited One Roof, as the Duluth market has very few contractors specializing in moderate-income construction and rehabilitation work. Further, Common Ground enables One Roof to diversify its property development risk. According to Jeff Corey, Executive Director of One Roof, "If we do guess wrong [in developing rehabilitation budgets], we can make it right over multiple properties." In this way, commercial enterprises have the potential to increase organizational revenue and strengthen existing CLT housing programs by providing specialized CLT services, keeping sales commissions in-house, and mitigating risk.

CLTs can utilize multiple roles in supporting neighborhood commercial development efforts. For instance, Anchorage CLT takes on two commercial development roles: property development and community engagement and advocacy. Jewel Jones explained, "Hopefully one [role] doesn't get out in front of the other, and they have equal balance in terms of what we do in the community."

3.5 Organizational Benefits of Commercial Development

In the cases we studied, CLTs gained two types of benefits from their involvement in commercial development: (a) support for the CLT's comprehensive community development efforts; and (b) control over office space occupied by the CLT.

A. Comprehensive Community Development

Commercial development can positively impact CLTs by bringing public and private capital investments into marginalized communities to address local commercial needs and support comprehensive community development efforts. Michael Monte of the CHT explained that disinvested neighborhoods often require comprehensive revitalization strategies beyond affordable housing for meaningful change to occur. Further, community-based organizations are often better informed of local needs and are more willing to shoulder the risks associated with community development projects than for-profit developers. Stuart Bannan of the Anchorage CLT commented on the reluctance of for-profit developers to invest in the Mountain View neighborhood, "It's a risk thing of course. If you can invest your money and build in the nicer commercial part of town, why would you go somewhere that you aren't sure about? But by being a nonprofit, we have the ability to get out there in front of the market in a sense." In effect, CLTs can catalyze community revitalization and commercial investments by the private market through illustrating the viability of commercial ventures in disenfranchised neighborhoods through their own development projects. Additionally, working with organized residential groups on commercial development planning may positively affect the types of commercial businesses that enter the neighborhood in the future.

Commercial development can also drive economic development by supporting the local employment base and increasing the ability of neighborhood residents to qualify for CLT housing purchases. Jewel Jones of the Anchorage CLT explained, "One thing we understand is

that it's great to have affordable, quality housing. But affordable doesn't mean free. So the people in those houses have to have jobs."

B. Control Over Organizational Office Space

CLTs, such as CHT, the Durham Community Land Trustees, and the Sawmill CLT have utilized commercial development activities to develop and control their own office spaces. This strategy has allowed these CLTs to customize office configurations to meet organizational needs and provide greater security of tenure and predictability of operational expenses. As Michael Monte of the CHT noted, "We have control of our space now and we are very kind to ourselves in terms of rent increases." CLTs can also help increase their organizational presence and affirm a long-term community commitment by locating new office developments within their targeted service area.

3.6 Organizational Challenges of Commercial Development

Balanced against the potential benefits, our analysis also revealed several challenges faced by CLTs engaged in commercial development projects. These include: (1) financial risk; (2) uncertain financial gain; and (3) the potential need for new core competencies. The challenges highlighted in this section are mostly drawn from research findings for CHT, a 28-year- old CLT that has extensive experience with commercial projects, managing the largest commercial portfolio in the CLT field.

A. Financial Risk

Financial risk is a major challenge for CLTs engaged in certain commercial property development and management. This is especially true for organizations that lack commercial real estate expertise. Market demand for commercial space can be highly unpredictable, particularly in a depressed economic climate. Even when a prospective commercial tenant is identified, a CLT may need to remodel the commercial space to meet specific tenant requirements. Michael Monte of CHT explained, "There are literally a hundred different reasons why things have to be different for a particular tenant. A pet shop is different from a therapist office, which is different from a retail shop, which is way different from a Laundromat. So when you change tenants, you have to reconfigure to meet the needs of each tenant. And who pays for that and what does it entail?" The complexity and risks of commercial property management stand in stark contrast to residential development. Monte adds, "Nobody goes into a one-bedroom apartment and says, this place is 700 square feet, but I really need 800. Could we tear down a wall? There is none of that stuff. So [commercial] is just more difficult."

Further, the financial risk per unit of commercial space can be quite significant, especially for CLTs that tend to have a small number of larger-scale commercial spaces in their portfolio. The potential vacancy and collection loss associated with a single commercial property can place a major strain on an organization. By contrast, a single vacant housing unit is unlikely to overwhelm a CLT's balance sheet. When considering commercial vacancy risks, Michael Monte of CHT noted, "No matter how good you are, you can still get hurt, and you can get hurt worse on these [commercial] deals than on the residential side." The greater vacancy risks are

particularly problematic when a CLT loses a major anchor tenant, a situation that arises most frequently during the start-up phase of projects. For example, the initial commercial agriculture tenant of DNI's Dudley Greenhouse was ultimately unable to take occupancy, leaving the structure vacant for several years. Similarly, Jewel Jones of Anchorage CLT explained their financial difficulties after an initial anchor tenants backed out, "We had a rough patch for a good year and a half where we didn't have a positive cash-flow. It was very difficult to make our [HUD] 108 loan payments. We are just about done and [are] thankful that we survived."

B. Uncertain Financial Gain

Commercial development is rarely a highly profitable venture, even for CLTs with significant experience. For instance, CHT noted that none of its commercial projects have generated significant revenue for the organization. Realizing profit from commercial projects is especially difficult in lower-income neighborhoods. While neighborhood revitalization efforts can 'lead the market' to invest in distressed communities, the low potential for profit is precisely the barrier that prevents the for-profit sector from pursuing such projects. The problem is compounded when neighborhood projects require affordable (below-market rate) commercial rents to incubate small businesses and local entrepreneurs, making it difficult for CLTs to build up long-term operating reserves. Michael Monte of CHT noted, "[When a CLT] is working in areas with disinvestment in their communities…the notion that the land trust will build it, and therefore it will be successful is problematic." Among the CLTs studied, the ULC is a rare exception, realizing modest but positive financial returns on most of its commercial development portfolio, though the Holly Square redevelopment project has yet to generate profits.

In addition, federal tax credit programs, such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit and New Markets Tax Credit, are not ideal solutions for CLT commercial projects, as they can be time intensive, complicated, and poorly suited for smaller scale projects. Highlighting these difficulties, Michael Monte of CHT stated, "[Commercial development] doesn't build itself without cash and money, and I don't think the [Low Income Housing] Tax Credit by itself generates enough money to do the commercial well, not by itself." Similarly, Stuart Bannan of the Anchorage CLT found that, "A New Markets Tax Credit project needs to be between $4 - 5 million to be worth the fees and time you pay for it."

C. Potential Need for New Core Competencies

Certain commercial development roles require significant experience and specialized core competencies that housing-oriented CLTs are unlikely to possess. An organization's first attempt at commercial development is likely to exceed existing competencies and require new skills, relationships, or personnel. For example, the Anchorage CLT took on its largest and most ambitious project, the Mountain View Service Center, as its very first project, and it experienced early financial distress when the CLT was unable to secure firm commitments from anchor tenants prior to development. Another example was illustrated by Jeff Corey of One Roof who described the challenges in creating Common Ground, their subsidiary construction company, "Construction is totally different from running a typical nonprofit…. it's just a whole different industry. It takes a herculean effort to start a construction company and most nonprofits are already topped out trying to do what they do... if you really can't get [housing work] done any

other way then it makes some sense to do it. But otherwise, it really doesn't." Further, the vast differences between One Roof's core development business and the construction business necessitated the creation of a subsidiary organization with different personnel and insurance policies.

4.0 Implications for CLT Practice

The following section presents a synthesis of findings from across the case studies for assessing the feasibility and improving the sustainability of non-residential projects conducted by CLTs. These implications for practice are reviewed below for both urban agriculture and commercial development projects.

4.1 Engage the Community

As community-based organizations, CLT activities should be driven by a community's preferences and needs. Many CLTs stressed the importance of local engagement from the earliest stages of non-residential projects. Harry Smith of Dudley Neighbors, Incorporated emphasized, "I would say the work of a CLT is not just to manage the properties and get more land into the land trust, but to really engage the community in what they want to see besides housing on the land trust, whether that's commercial, or a greenhouse or agricultural land."

A. Urban Agriculture

Community engagement is particularly important in the urban agriculture setting, where CLTs often rely on local residents to carry out agricultural production. Harry Smith of DNI explained, "We were not going to [the residents] and saying, 'you should be growing your own food,' They came to us saying, 'we want to have a garden, we want land to grow on.' So I wouldn't advise building a greenhouse without having it be part of a larger [community] vision process." Similarly, Heather Benham of the Athens Land Trust noted, "It's good when the community reaches out to us and asks for the help instead of us going in and trying to sell our services."

By incorporating community involvement into the earliest stages of planning and developing agricultural projects or programs, a CLT can tailor them to fit the specific needs of local users. A cautionary example is illustrated by the Kulshan Community Land Trust, which launched its Access to Land for Farming (ALF) program prior to engaging with local farmers or conducting a thorough community needs assessment. The Kulshan CLT discovered that suitable agricultural land was much more expensive than originally anticipated. Further, the ALF program utilized a ground lease model that did not account for the farmers' need to use fee simple land as collateral for seed and equipment loans. After an unsuccessful two-year pilot, the Kulshan CLT engaged key community stakeholders in a full program assessment and eventually refocused the program around urban agriculture to better address community needs within its established service area.

B. Commercial Development

Community engagement can also enhance the prospects for success in commercial development. For example, the Urban Land Conservancy engaged the community in the Holly Square project by partnering with a local nonprofit. The ULC helped with community organizing and delegated decision-making authority to a community-based leadership committee. These measures helped the ULC to build trust with local residents, promoted a sense of community ownership in the project, and generated valuable ideas for community-driven development and programming (such as an interim sports facility). Community engagement can also help a CLT to develop a better understanding of the neighborhoods it serves. As Jewel Jones of the Anchorage Community Land Trust noted, "You've got to know the neighborhood. You've got to know the needs and desires… and you've got to have a respect for the community and a real relationship."

4.2 Consider Organizational Capacity When Selecting Non-Residential Roles

As CLTs can play a variety of roles in supporting non-residential projects, it is important to select the approach that best aligns with internal and external organizational capacities. CLTs should carefully assess systems, skills, and resources that are already a part of their organizational make-up and then evaluate the capacity of other organizations within the CLT's service area that could serve as potential partners and help address the CLT's limitations. In this way, CLTs can develop complementary collaborations and build on existing community strengths. When external partnerships are limited, CLTs should critically consider the feasibility of scaling up internal capacity in order to engage new areas of business. For example, the Anchorage CLT determined that other nonprofits were adequately addressing local affordable housing needs, but identified a gap in commercial development services. The Anchorage CLT focused, therefore, on building the latter expertise into its own organizational capacity.

A. Urban Agriculture

CLTs with in-house agricultural expertise may choose to engage in urban agriculture projects by providing programmatic support or even technical growing assistance. For instance, Sawmill Community Land Trust had in-house staff with extensive experience in running a community garden program, which enabled the organization to directly handle the development of a future community garden site. Other organizations, like the Durham Community Land Trustee, have chosen not to take on this programmatic role, focusing instead on securing land for agriculture projects. As Selina Mack of the Durham CLT stated, "We don't have the organizational capacity to take on [the operation of] a garden. It is just not what we do." Harry Smith of DNI echoed this sentiment: "We believe that we should do the things we are good at, and do them well... like serving as the vehicle to ensure community oversight and control... and we shouldn't do the things we are not good at." A CLT that lacks growing experience can support urban agriculture in alternate ways that may better suit its organizational capacities, such as securing land, helping to develop urban agriculture zoning codes, or serving as a fiscal agent for grant funding.

CLTs should also assess their capacity for handling stewardship responsibilities associated with certain agricultural roles and find strong partners to shore up organizational weaknesses. For instance, DNI currently owns several small urban agriculture sites, including an outdoor

community garden and an orchard space. While community gardeners handle the actual food production, DNI's staff has been responsible for other maintenance duties, such as shoveling snow from surrounding sidewalks. DNI has recently partnered with a youth training program to provide landscape services (including snow removal) and is structuring future ground lease agreements to protect itself from stewardship responsibilities that exceed DNI's capacity. Similarly, Church Community Housing Corporation partnered with members of the Eastern Rhode Island Conservation District to develop the agricultural programming at Sandywoods Farm. Acknowledging the importance of this arrangement, Brigid Ryan stated, "There is so much that you don't know you don't know.... So partnerships are really important if you are venturing into something that is highly specialized."

Many urban agriculture partnerships require strong communication of expectations and mutual understanding of challenges. For example, Selina Mack of the Durham CLT noted, "The activity and the use of the [community] garden varies from year to year. Usually there has to be someone in the neighborhood who has to champion the garden. Like right now… somebody is leading the charge, and there is a very strong leader. But there have been years when we didn't have that in the community." Both the Durham CLT and the Athens Land Trust have experienced a steep decline in community garden use, productivity, and maintenance following a transition in garden leadership. Both organizations considered intervening to ensure the productive use of their sites. After meeting with the gardeners, however, Durham CLT allowed stakeholders to formulate workable solutions, or as Mack explained, "New leaders just rose to the top." The Athens Land Trust took a similar tack. As Heather Benham said, "It's important to have patience; these things will keep living and keep going." Thus, strong working partnerships and open lines of communication are important for long-term programmatic success.

B. Commercial Development

CLT commercial development involves roles that require varying levels of commercial expertise. Organizations with significant in-house commercial real estate experience and expertise are likely to be well positioned to tackle the development and management of commercial projects. However, CLTs lacking such experience may be better suited to community engagement and advocacy roles. CLTs can also separate the roles of land acquisition and property development, assigning the latter role to another entity, while reserving for itself a stewardship role similar to that played by many CLTs in urban agriculture (see section 3.1). While such a strategy could better fit the capacities of many CLTs, it also requires identifying strong partners to take on property development.

Some organizations have utilized fee-for-service contractors to overcome gaps in organizational capacity. For instance, One Roof Community Housing's construction subsidiary, Common Ground, found new opportunities to develop multifamily housing, an area where they lacked experience. One Roof hired an outside consultant to support staff learning. As Jeff Corey of One Roof explained, "We paid [the consultant] about 20% of our developer fee to give us chops on [activities] we didn't know how to do, and that was money well spent… because you don't know what you don't know and bringing something internally in-house sounds nice, but there are implications to that."

4.3 Minimize Financial Risk

CLTs should strive to minimize their financial risk when structuring non-residential projects, especially given the uncertain income potential of urban agriculture and commercial development projects.

A. Urban Agriculture

CLTs should minimize exposure to financial risks, given the weak revenue potential of urban agriculture projects and the uncertain future of food-related funding. CLTs have pursued a variety of methods to reduce their exposure and manage risk. First, CLTs have front-loaded the anticipated capital expenses associated with agriculture projects, since long-term funding streams can be difficult to predict. In addition, some urban agriculture projects such as community gardens do not require large operating budgets for ongoing stewardship services.

CLTs can also decrease financial risk by avoiding long-term debt. It is difficult to cover debt service with modest agricultural revenue and the nominal lease fees that CLTs typically charge for agricultural land. For example, DNI had the foresight to acquire land and to construct the Dudley Greenhouse without incurring debt. Its tax-exempt status allowed for minimal holding costs. The resulting low-risk financial structure became critically important when DNI was unable to secure its initial greenhouse tenant. Even though the greenhouse sat vacant for nearly five years, DNI was well positioned to absorb the unexpected vacancy loss.

A cautionary example of excessive debt-burden can be seen at the Lopez Community Land Trust's mobile meat-processing unit project. Although the Lopez CLT was successful in piloting a national model for sustainable livestock processing, the initial financial structure was not ideal. The organization took on $150,000 in debt to develop the unit, which was subsequently leased to the local farmers co-op for only nominal fees. The Lopez CLT eventually retired the long-term debt and is now preparing to transfer ownership of the unit to a local farmers co-op. However, Sandy Bishop of the Lopez CLT articulated a critical lesson from the experience, "I think we all agreed that we wouldn't structure a deal like that again ever. It's got to be more of a symbiotic relationship, where all parties feel equally taken care of. A project needs to be beneficial not only in terms of our mission, but it also needs to be beneficial financially."

Finally, CLTs should structure agricultural projects to align stewardship obligations with expected revenue streams. CLTs need to be especially attentive in projecting for anticipated potential income sources, including revenue from produce sales, grant funding, lease fees on agricultural land, and internal subsidies generated by the other CLT lines of business.

B. Commercial Development

Some commercial development roles such as property development and commercial enterprise creation carry a high level of financial risk. For instance, Michael Monte of the Champlain Housing Trust found that commercial development that occurred in a neighborhood revitalization context to be "the riskiest, trickiest and toughest [form of development].... As much as it's filled with opportunity, it's filled with [lawsuits] and difficulties…I think the most

important thing that could be said to folks is don't do it lightly." Still, CLTs may decide to tackle higher-risk projects in order to meet pressing community needs. In such cases, CLTs should identify additional sources of subsidy (such as external funding or an internal cross-subsidy from other program areas) to cover potential financial losses. This is particularly important for smaller CLTs, which may be less able to absorb major financial shortfalls.

Some CLTs have minimized financial risks by reducing long-term holding costs. For instance, at the Holly Square redevelopment project, the ULC executed a long-term ground lease with the Boys & Girls Club of Denver that assigned most building maintenance duties to the tenant, while sharing responsibility for the fire-lane and water detention systems. Similarly, Michael Monte of CHT acknowledged that mixed-use development projects have a lower risk because rental income from the project's housing component can subsidize the budget in the event of long-term commercial vacancies, "I think you can structure anything you want to be economically successful if you have enough cash or equity, and you can afford it."

These three considerations, community engagement, assessment of organizational capacity, and minimizing risks, were found to be critical elements of sustainable non-residential projects. By applying these lessons, CLTs can be successful in developing non-residential programs that address critical community needs and support comprehensive development efforts.

5.0 Conclusion

This study has found that CLTs are increasingly taking on a variety of roles and responsibilities in implementing and supporting non-residential development. In urban agriculture, CLTs have secured access to land, provided programmatic support and engaged directly in agricultural production. In commercial development, CLTs have engaged in land acquisition, project development, property management, and community engagement and advocacy. They have also, on occasion, created new commercial enterprises.

This study is a preliminary exploration of CLT non-residential activities. Further research is needed to examine more deeply various factors relating to such non-residential projects, including: (a) equitable property taxation of urban agriculture land; (b) model zoning practices for urban agriculture land; (c) model language for urban agriculture ground leases (both commercial and noncommercial); and (d) sustainable, non-profit financial models for urban agriculture and commercial development activities. Additional research is also needed to examine other non-residential land uses such as rural agriculture, ecological conservation, and recreational spaces.

This study does *not* suggest that CLTs should shift their focus away from the provision of permanently affordable housing, nor does it imply that non-residential projects are appropriate in all contexts or for all organizations. Rather, this study highlights that CLTs are already playing an important role in non-residential development and stewardship.

Based upon the success of many CLTs reviewed in this study, we do believe that more CLTs should consider pursuing non-residential projects in order to contribute to comprehensive

community development and neighborhood revitalization. After all, communities have a variety of needs beyond affordable housing and non-residential projects provide opportunities to increase access to neighborhood resources. In order to fully capitalize on these opportunities, CLTs need to expand their focus from the ownership of land to a broader notion of stewardship over community-based resources.

As CLTs move into these less traditional roles, however, the conception and definition of the CLT model can become less clear. For instance, can a CLT eschew land ownership altogether and solely focus on stewardship over community agricultural sites, and how would that role be unique from other community-based nonprofits? Is the tripartite board structure and self-identification of the 'classic' CLT sufficient to define the model, as it is applied to non-residential projects? The emerging trend of non-residential activities raises many questions like these, which challenge our understanding of what it means to be a 'community land trust.' These challenges will need to be addressed by CLT stakeholders and leaders, as the 'fourth wave' of the CLT movement gathers momentum.

References

Abromowitz, D. and K. White. 2010. Deed restrictions and community land trust ground leases. In *The Community Land Trust Reader,* J.E. Davis (ed.), 327–334. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

American Community Gardening Association. 1998. National community gardening survey: 1996. http://www.communitygarden.org/docs/learn/cgsurvey96part1.pdf

Angotti, T. 2007. *Community land trusts and low-income multifamily rental housing: The case of Cooper Square, New York City*. Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Axel-Lute, M. 2011. CLTs go commercial. *Shelterforce*. no. 166: 32–35 (Summer).

Bellows, A., K. Brown, and J. Smit. 2004. Health benefits of urban agriculture. Community Food Security Coalition's North American Initiative on Urban Agriculture. http://www.foodsecurity.org/UAHealthArticle.pdf

Brown, E. and T. Ranney. 2012. Community land trust and commercial properties. Social Justice Committee Report. Georgia Institute of Technology. http://www.planning.gatech.edu/sites/files/crp/Commercial%20Community%20Land%20Trust.pdf

Brown, K., M. Bailkey, A. Meares-Cohen, J. Nasr, and P. Mann, (ed.) 2002. Urban agriculture and community food security in the United States: Farming from the city center to the urban fringe. Urban Agriculture Committee of the Community Food Security Coalition.

Campbell, M.C. and D. Salus. 2003. Community and conservation land trusts as unlikely partners? The case of Troy Gardens, Madison, Wisconsin. *Land Use Policy*. 20:169–180.

Department of Housing and Urban Development. 1999. *New markets: the untapped retail buying power in America's inner cities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

Davis, J.E. 2010. Origins and evolution of the community land trust in the United States. In *The Community Land Trust Reader,* J.E. Davis (ed.), 3–47. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Davis, J.E. and R. Jacobus. 2008. *The City-CLT partnership, municipal support for community Land Trusts*. Policy Focus Report. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Halebsky, S. 2004. Superstores and the politics of retail development. *City and Community*. 3: 115–134.

Harvey, D. 1973. *Social justice and the city*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hersch, R. 2010. Taking root: Land tenure and community gardens in Providence, Rhode Island. http://www.cpeo.org/pubs/TakingRoot.pdf

Hess, D. J. 2009. *Localist movements in a global economy: Sustainability, justice and urban development in the United States*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Holmgren, D. 2007. Essence of permaculture. http://permacultureprinciples.com/freedownloads_essence.php

Institute for Community Economics. 1982. *The community land trust handbook*. Emmaus, PA: Rodale Press.

Irvine, S., L. Johnson, and K. Peters 1999. Community gardens and sustainable land use planning: A case study of the Alex Wilson Community Garden. *Local Environment*, 4(1): 33–46.

Jacobi, P. 2000. Urban agriculture: justification and planning guidelines. http://www.cityfarmer.org/uajustification.html

Jacobus, R. and M. Brown. 2010. City hall steps in: Local governments embrace community land trusts. In *The Community Land Trust Reader,* J.E. Davis (ed.), 335–342. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Jacobus, R. and K. Chapple. 2010. *What a difference a few stores can make, retail and neighborhood revitalization*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Community Innovation.

Jacobus, R. and M. Hickey (n.d.) *Commercial revitalization planning guide, a toolkit for community based organizations*. New York, NY: Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

Kaufman, J. and M. Bailkey. 2000. *Farming inside cities: entrepreneurial urban agriculture in the United States*. Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Kurtz, H. 2001. Differentiating multiple meanings of garden and community. *Urban Geography*. 22(7): 656–670.

Lawson, L. 2004. The planner in the garden: a historical view of the relationship of planning to community garden programs. *Journal of Planning History*. 3(2): 151–176.

——. 2005. *City bountiful: A century of community gardening in America*. University of California Press. Berkeley, CA.

Mendes, W., K. Balmer, T. Kaethler, and A. Rhoads. 2008. Using land inventories to plan for urban agriculture experiences from Portland and Vancouver. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 74(4): 435–449.

Mitchell, S. 2006. *Big-box swindle: The true cost of mega-retailers and the fight for America's independent business*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Mougeot, L. 2000. Urban agriculture: definition, presence, potentials and risks. In *Growing cities, growing food, urban agriculture on the policy agenda*, eds. N. Bakker, M. Dubbeling, S. Guendel, U. Sabel Koschella and H. de Zeeuw. DSE, Feldafing.

National Community Land Trust Network. 2011. 2011 CLT Network Model Ground Lease. http://www.cltnetwork.org/index.php?fuseaction=Blog.dspBlogPost&postID=2631

O'brien, D. and S. Ayidiya. 1991. Neighborhood community and life satisfaction. *Community Development*. 22(1): 21–37.

Penner, J.R. 1996. The "bundle of rights" picture of property. *UCLA Law Review*. 43: 71–820.

Policylink (n.d.) Urban agriculture and community garden toolkit. http://www.policylink.org/site/c.lkIXLbMNJrE/b.7634055/k.102B/Urban_Agriculture_and_Community_Gardens.htm

Porter, M. E. 1995. The competitive advantage of the inner city. *Harvard Business Review.* 73(3): 55-71.

Pudup, M.B. 2008. It takes a garden: Cultivating citizen-subjects in organized garden projects. *Geoforum* 39: 1228–40.

Rosenberg, G. 2010. Troy Gardens: The accidental ecovillage. In *The Community Land Trust Reader,* J.E. Davis (ed.), 420–431. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Saltuk, Y. 2013. *Perspective on progress: The impact investor survey*. Global Impact Investing Survey.

Schmelzkopf, K. 1995. Urban community gardens as contested space. *Geographical Review*. 85(3): 364–381.

Seidman, K.F. 2002. Urban inner city commercial revitalization: A literature review. Unpublished Paper. http://jpkc.hebtu.edu.cn/NR/rdonlyres/Urban-Studies-and-Planning/11-439Spring-2005/BAFBC134-3457-41A5-ACF9-2E5880567575/0/seidman4.pdf

Sherrod, S. 2012. *The courage to hope: How I stood up to the politics of fear*. New York, NY: Atria Books.

Smit, J., A. Ratta. and J. Nasr. 1996. Urban agriculture: food, jobs and sustainable cities. New York: United Nations Development Programme. http://www.jacsmit.com/book/AppC.pdf

Sorce, E. 2012. The role of community land trusts in preserving and creating Commercial assets: A dual case study of Rondo CLT in St. Paul, Minnesota and Crescent City CLT in New Orleans, Louisiana. Masters Thesis, University of New Orleans. Paper 1501.

Springer, C. 2006. Urban land trusts: Connecting communities through shared spaces. *Exchange*. 14–18 (Winter).

Staeheli, L., D. Mitchell, and K. Gibson. 2002. Conflicting rights to the city in New York's community gardens. *Geojournal*. 58(2–3): 197–205.

Sungu-Erylmaz, Y. and R. Greenstein. 2007. *A national study of community land trusts. Working Paper*. Working Paper. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Sutton, S. 2010. Rethinking commercial revitalization: A neighborhood small business perspective. *Economic Development Quarterly*. 24: 352

Taylor, J.R. and S.T. Lovell. 2012. Mapping public and private spaces of urban agriculture in Chicago through the analysis of high-resolution aerial images in Google Earth. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 108 (1): 57–70.

Thaden, E. 2012. *Results of the 2011 Comprehensive CLT Survey.* National Community Land Trust Network and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Von Hassell, M. 2002. *The struggle for Eden*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Wakefield, S., F. Yeudall, C. Taron, J. Reynolds, and A. Skinner. 2007. Growing urban health: Community gardening in South-East Toronto. *Health Promotion International*. 22(2): 92–101.

Wilson, W.J. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Wright, J.B. and R.J. Czerniak. 2000. The rising importance of voluntary methods of land use control in planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research.* 19: 419–423.

Yuen, J. 2012. *Hybrid vigor: An analysis of land tenure arrangements in addressing land security for urban community gardens*. Masters Thesis, Columbia University. http://academiccommons.columbia.edu/catalog/ac:147036

Appendix A: Survey Results

Organization	City/Town	State	Urban Agriculture	Green Spaces	Rural Agriculture	Commercial Development	Land Conservation	Other
24:1 Community Land Trust	St Louis	MO	X				X	
Addison County Community Trust	Vergennes	VT	X	X		X	X	
Albany CLT	Albany	NY						X
Andover Community Trust	Andover	MA						
Athens Land Trust	Athens	GA	X	X			X	
Atlanta Land Trust Collaborative	Atlanta	GA	X	X		X		
Champlain Housing Trust	Burlington	VT		X		X		X
Chicago CLT	Chicago	IL						
Church Community Housing Corporation	Newport	RI		X	X	X	X	
City of Flagstaff	Flagstaff	AZ	X	X		X	X	
City of Lakes CLT	Minneapolis	MN	X			X		
Clark Mountain CLT	Greene	ME			X		X	X
Colorado CLT	Denver	CO						
Columbia Valley Housing Association	Wenatchee	WA						X
Community Development & Improvement Corporation	Graniteville	SC						X
Community Foundation Land Trust	Los Angeles	CA						
Community Home Trust	Chapel Hill	NC						
Community Housing Land Trust	Pawtucket	RI						X
Community Housing Trust of Sarasota	Sarasota	FL						
Community Land Trust of Schenectady	Schenectady	NY						
Coulee CLT	La Crosse	WI		X		X		

Durham Community Land Trustees	Durham	NC	X			X		
Equity CLT/Austin Affordable Housing Corporation	Austin	TX				X		
Evergreen Land Trust	Mount Vernon	WA	X		X	X	X	
First Community Land Trust of Chicago	Chicago	IL				X		X
First Homes Properties	Rochester	MN	X					
Florida Low Income Housing	Inverness	FL		X				
Habitat for Humanity of South Palm Beach County	Delray Beach	FL	X					X
Hannibal Square CLT	Winter Park	FL						
Harborlight Community Partners	Beverly	MA						X
Home Trust of Skagit	Burlington	WA						
Homestead CLT	Seattle	WA						
Housing Land Trust of Sonoma County	Petaluma	CA						
Humboldt Bay Housing and Development Corporation	Arcata	CA						
Independence Heights Redevelopment Council	Houston	TX	X	X				X
Irvine CLT	Irvine	CA						X
Island Housing Trust	Mount Desert	ME						
Island Housing Trust	Vineyard Haven	MA			X	X	X	X
Islanders Secure Land Association	Hornby Island	British Columbia	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kitsap-Pierce CLT	Gig Harbor	WA				X		
Kittitas Yakima Valley CLT	Ellensburg	WA						
Kulshan CLT	Bellingham	WA	X		X			
Laconia Area CLT	Laconia	NH		X		X		
Lakes CLT	Spirit Lake	IA	X	X	X		X	X
Lehigh Valley CLT	Bethlehem	PA						

Lexington CLT	Lexington	KY	X			X		
Lopez CLT	Lopez Island	WA			X	X		X
Madison Area CLT	Madison	WI	X	X			X	X
Madison Area CLT	Madison	WI	X				X	
Mason Thurston CLT	Belfair	WA	X					X
Monadnock CLT	Wilton	NH			X		X	
Mosaic CLT	Pottstown	PA	X	X				
Mountainlands CLT	Park City	UT						
Neighborhood Housing Services of Greater Cleveland	Cleveland	OH						
NeighborWorks Blackstone River Valley	Woonsocket	RI	X	X		X		
NeighborWorks Montana	Great Falls	MT	X					
Newtown CDC	Tempe	AZ						
Northern California Land Trust	Berkeley	CA	X			X		
One Roof Community Housing	Duluth	MN				X		
OPAL CLT	Eastsound	WA	X			X		
RAIN Community Land Trust	New York	NY	X	X				
Resources for Residents and Communities of Georgia	Atlanta	GA						
Rocky Mountain CLT	Colorado Springs	CO				X		
San Juan Community Home Trust	Friday Harbor	WA						X
Sawmill CLT	Albuquerque	NM	X	X		X		
Sitka Community Development Corporation	Sitka	AK				X		
South Country CLT	Brookhaven	NY	X	X		X		X
South County Housing	Gilroy	CA		X		X		
South Florida CLT	Fort Lauderdale	FL						
Southwest Atlanta Neighborhood Collaborative	Atlanta	GA	X	X		X	X	

Southwest Minnesota Housing Partnership	Slayton	MN	X			X		
T.R.U.S.T. South LA	Los Angeles	CA	X	X		X		X
Tenants to Homeowners	Lawrence	KS		X				
Twin Pines Housing Trust	White River Junction	VT						X
Urban Land Conservancy	Denver	CO				X		X
Valley Community Land Trust	Greenfield	MA			X			