2008 Countryside Initiative Request for Proposals

Summary of the Leasing Opportunity

About This Request for Proposals
This Request for Proposals (RFP) is the fourth issued for the Countryside Initiative. Like previous requests it continues the process of introducing and defining Cuyahoga Valley National Park’s innovative program for managing rural landscapes.

The Countryside Initiative challenges strongly entrenched paradigms—assumptions, beliefs, and conventional ways of thinking about how things work. It challenges the common (American) assumption that people don’t live in parks (let alone farm in parks). It denies the assertion that agriculture can’t be environmentally friendly, simply because it often isn’t. It debunks conventional notions that small farms can’t be profitable, that farmers must “get big or get out.” And it adopts an innovative threefold approach to public-private partnerships to implement its key features. Hence, this RFP explores philosophical and conceptual issues more carefully than might be necessary for a more conventional National Park Service leasing opportunity.

This RFP is addressed first to persons who already know (or suspect) they would like to lease one of the farm properties available. For potential proposers, the RFP provides guidelines necessary to prepare a strong proposal. More importantly, it gives them sufficient detail and perspective to understand that taking responsibility for an Initiative farm could significantly change their lives. And for others — interested parties who hope to support and promote the Countryside Initiative in various ways, or who hope to apply its concepts elsewhere — this RFP offers a thorough description of how the program actually works.

The Countryside Initiative
Cuyahoga Valley National Park (CVNP) is responsible “for preserving and protecting for public use and enjoyment, the historic, scenic, natural, and recreational values of the Cuyahoga River and adjacent lands of the Cuyahoga Valley.” Since the park’s establishment in 1974, park managers have understood the above statement, taken from the park’s enabling legislation, to include the rural countryside—the Valley’s working agricultural landscape. Yet despite various attempts to stem the decline of agriculture within park boundaries, most farms continued a century-long slide into disuse and disrepair, until the Countryside Initiative was established.

The Countryside Initiative is an ambitious effort to rehabilitate and revitalize 20 or so of the picturesque old farms that operated in the Valley from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth. These reestablished farms will pursue modern, sustainable farming practices in harmony with the specific purposes for which CVNP was created, and in harmony with long-established cultural and environmental values of the National Park Service (NPS).
Countryside Initiative Farm Sites

This map depicts the distribution of old farms in Cuyahoga Valley National Park which still survive in sufficiently good condition for possible use in the Countryside Initiative.
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2008 Request for Proposals
Appropriate Types of Farming
This RFP offers three farms for leasing, beginning mid-2008. These farms range in size from 10.7 to 26.5 cultivable acres and are suitable for culturally intensive fruit and vegetable production, small intensive grazing operations, and small integrated crop-livestock enterprises. One farm is also well suited as a site for a farmers’ market or a local food co-op store. Certified organic production systems are encouraged, though not required. Non-certified organic production systems are expected to operate in the same general part of the sustainability spectrum. Marketing methods will take forms such as: pick your own, community supported agriculture, roadside stands, local farmers’ markets, and direct sales to individuals and restaurants. Each farming enterprise will reflect the characteristics and capabilities of a particular farm site and the particular knowledge, skills, and preferences of the farm lessee.

Long-term Leases
Countrywide Initiative farm properties may be leased for periods of up to 60 years. Hence, a lessee may make a significant capital investment to establish a particular farming enterprise, and fully amortize the investment over the period of the lease. Long-term leases also allow lessees to pursue land stewardship practices, which may require years to implement – and years to recover one’s costs. Once competitively earned, a leasehold interest is transferable (by gift, sale, or other means) should the lessee need or desire to discontinue active farming before the lease expires – subject to approval by CVNP. By law, all leases must be re-offered competitively at the termination of the lease. And all leases must be made at fair market value rent.

An Innovative & Significant Project
The Countrywide Initiative offers lessees the opportunity to be part of a truly innovative and significant project. Nothing quite like this has previously happened in North America. In other parts of the world, especially in Europe, an appreciation of farming’s potential to create and maintain beauty and ecological health in the countryside is well understood. Farming is often used for such purposes in large regional and national parks, and used to carefully manage non-park landscapes around urban centers. The Countrywide Initiative brings such concepts and practices to America. First, and most specifically, it allows CVNP to better fulfill its preservation and protection functions, while greatly enhancing the Park’s educational and recreational offerings. Secondly, the Initiative serves as a useful model for certain other multi-use parks within NPS and elsewhere. And third, it showcases alternative types of farming which can become important components of smart growth development in urban fringe communities across America.

Pursuit of Enlightened Self-Interest
The Countrywide Initiative offers lessees unusual opportunities to define and pursue satisfying and successful lives, based on enlightened self-interest. The Initiative makes small farms with excellent production and market potential very accessible and affordable – and explicitly encourages the pursuit of personal financial profit. That profit provides the financial basis for supporting quality-of-life goals – such as being able to work closely with family and friends while contributing to the natural beauty and environmental health of one’s locale (in this case CVNP). The Countrywide Initiative seeks farm lessees who see themselves as simultaneously cultivating profit, community, and ecological health.

Threefold Partnerships
CVNP has frequently relied on close working relationships with other governmental agencies and private organizations (both for profit and non-profit) to achieve common goals. In 1999, a new non-profit organization, the Cuyahoga Valley Countryside Conservancy (CVCC), was established to help develop and manage the Countryside Initiative. CVCC provides technical information and guidance on sustainable agriculture, helps prioritize rehabilitation of farm properties, helps recruit and evaluate prospective farm lessees, and helps evaluate and monitor each farm’s annual operating plan. CVCC works closely with each farm lessee to align their private goals and operating plans with the public objectives of the Initiative. This represents an intentional threefold partnership, drawing on the distinctive strengths and resources of the government sector (CVNP), the business sector (lessees), and the cultural sector (CVCC).

Competitive Proposal Process
This RFP is open to all interested parties on a competitive basis. Whoever submits the proposal judged most likely to achieve a particular farm’s best use within the context and purposes of the Countryside Initiative – and demonstrates the capacity to successfully implement the proposal – will be awarded the opportunity to negotiate a lease agreeable to both the proposer and CVNP. The Countryside Initiative needs a few good farmers – farmers committed to the concepts of sustainable agriculture and a vision for sharing those concepts with some of the 3.9 million annual visitors to CVNP.
Historical Context & Future Vision

The National Park Idea

The world’s first national park – Yellowstone – was established by the United States Congress in 1872 as “a public park or pleasing ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.” Since then, the idea of creating nationally significant parks has spread to over 100 countries, and resulted in more than 1,200 parks. The care and management of Yellowstone was placed in the hands of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior. And in 1916, Congress created within the Department of the Interior, a National Park Service to “promote and regulate the use of federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations.” Today, NPS manages some 392 units variously designated as national parks, monuments, preserves, lakeshores, seashores, wild and scenic rivers, national trails, historic sites, military parks, battlefields, historical parks, recreation areas, memorials, and parkways. All protect and oversee public use of some nationally significant aspect of America’s natural or cultural heritage.

Parks to the People

Although several units of the National Park System existed near urban centers prior to the 1960s, few NPS employees regarded the provision of recreation for nearby urban populations to be a function of their agency. However, the social and political turmoil of the 60s caused a profound rethinking of the roles played by many governmental and non-governmental organizations, including NPS. The Park Service was regarded by some as remote, and neglectful of urban citizens. Responding to such criticism, and to other needs, NPS developed a high profile and highly successful Summer in the Parks program in 1965, for federal parks in the Washington, D.C. area. And by 1975, Gateway National Recreation Area (in New York Harbor) and Golden Gate National Recreation Area (in San Francisco) were formally established. These so-called gateways were intended to serve as models for large, multi-use parks near urban centers. As Interior Secretary Rogers Morton said at the time, “We can no longer accept the premise that parks are where you find them, we must identify – and create – parks where people need them.” Thus was formed a new initiative popularly known as Parks to the People. Five national urban parks have been created since 1970, including Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area (CVNRA) – since renamed Cuyahoga Valley National Park.

Cuyahoga Valley National Park

PURPOSE OF THE PARK

In 1974, Congress established CVNRA (renamed a National Park in 2000), “for the purpose of preserving and protecting for public use and enjoyment, the historic, scenic, natural, and recreational values of the Cuyahoga River and the adjacent lands of the Cuyahoga Valley, and for the purpose of providing for the maintenance of needed recreational open space necessary to the urban environment…” Most local park proponents believed that CVNP’s creation occurred just in the nick of time. Although the Cuyahoga Valley, situated between Akron and Cleveland, Ohio, escaped the sort of industrial and commercial growth experienced by these two urban centers, development was creeping into the Valley itself by the 1960s and 70s. Subsequently during the 80s and 90s, suburban sprawl piled up against the eastern and western boundaries of the new park.

By its 25th birthday in 1999, CVNP had an impressive array of achievements to its credit. An extensive infrastructure of improved roads, trails, shelters, and visitor centers were in place. Three major recreational/educational features envisioned for the park have been established: the 20-mile Towpath Trail, the Cuyahoga Valley Scenic Railroad, and the Cuyahoga Valley Environmental Education Center. In short, most of the park’s original management and program goals have been successfully accomplished – with one major, nagging exception. Preserving and protecting the park’s rural countryside for public use and enjoyment had turned out to be an extremely complex and elusive goal.

Looking back, by the 1870s, many Clevelanders and Akronites were already venturing into the Cuyahoga Valley to escape the pressures of urban industrial life. They came for carriage rides down country lanes, boat rides on the canal, and by the 1880s scenic excursions on the Valley Railway. They came for picnicking, hiking, and nature study. They came to enjoy the beauty of the open countryside and to buy fresh produce from Valley farmers. By the beginning of the 20th century, the Cuyahoga Valley was, in effect, an urban recreation area – a country retreat for city folks. CVNP’s Statement for Management (1993) notes that “the Valley’s real magic and magnetism will always be rural charm set in relief against an urban background…” And the official NPS index of national parks says matter-of-factly that CVNP “preserves rural landscapes along the Cuyahoga River between Cleveland and Akron, Ohio.”
LOSS OF RURAL LANDSCAPES

In fact, rural landscapes would become one of CVNP's most "endangered species"—mainly because the activity most responsible for creating and maintaining them had all but disappeared from the Valley by the 1990s. Without a viable community of working farms, the countryside—

that appealing patchwork of pastures, cropland, and woodlots—quickly disappears. Although the old farms within the boundaries of CVNP have been protected from the concrete and asphalt blanket now covering their counterparts in surrounding suburbs, most park farms continued their long slide into disuse and disrepair even after the park was established—and quickly become overgrown with weeds and brush. Prior to the establishment of the Countryside Initiative, the distinctive look and feel of a working agricultural landscape was largely gone, scenic vistas increasingly obscured, and the park as a whole felt more and more closed in.

The Countryside Initiative is an ambitious program to revitalize some or so of the old farms in CVNP—and thereby restore for public use and enjoyment many of the distinctive historical, scenic, natural, and recreational values for which the park was originally established.

The Countryside Initiative

THE COUNTRYSIDE IMAGE

"You know this image: a mix of crops weaves a varied field pattern, livestock graze on the land, woodlands and streams make sensuous borders along the fields, tidy farmsteads dot the landscape. There are fish in the pond, birds in the sky, and wildlife in the woods. The air is clean. There is a small town nearby with a school, stores, and churches. You might not live in this landscape, but you would like to visit it, and when you did, you could stop and enjoy a friendly talk with the farmer and buy fresh produce you couldn't buy in the city."


Visitors venturing into the Cuyahoga Valley in the 1890s no doubt carried a similar image in their minds. And, no doubt, found it reinforced by their experiences there (though the fish, we may be sure, would have been in the canal rather than farm ponds?) Such realities lingered in the Valley through middle 20th century. And so, the image remained strong in the minds of thousands of volunteers who worked to establish a major park.

That image still lingers in the minds of many, though the reality has largely slipped away. Indeed, today the image doesn't fit well with much of rural America, where industrial agriculture predominates. Some would say it is now just generic nostalgia. But it is a strong popular image, widely shared in Western society for hundreds of years. It is what many of us want the countryside to look like, to be like—and most would support efforts to make reality fit the image.

The Countryside Initiative finds its inspiration and its name in that popular image of the countryside so deeply embedded in Western minds. Recent English writers occasionally speak of the middle landscape—a place poised midway between the city and the wild, between civilization and wilderness. Middle landscape is an evocative and appealing term—but for most of us the older term countryside, is the more familiar, and comfortable. It evokes an image of humans working in harmony with one another and with nature. It conjures up a sense of tended, cared for, valued nature. It offers a powerful and appealing vision of what farming could and should be like in the Valley again—especially since it will now be part of a national park.

PARKS AS LIVED IN PLACES

Farming in a national park (or any other park) is a most unconventional idea in America. Americans tend to perceive parks as places to visit, not live in—regardless of whether it is a Yellowstone-like wilderness, or a manicured metropark. That is not the case in many other parts of the world. In Great Britain, for example, over 10% of the English landscape is located within the boundaries of a national park—over 60% of that is privately owned, and most of it is in farms. Not only is it considered natural and normal to live in parks there, farming is considered the only practical way to maintain the openness, beauty, and diversity of the countryside.

CVNP has much in common with English and other European parks, and to a degree can draw on their experiences. Yet many of the cultural assumptions about parks are quite different in North America, and there are few park management traditions to guide a project, such as the Countryside Initiative. Hence, the Initiative is breaking new ground conceptually, philosophically, and legally—in addition to cultivating old farmlands physically.

THE CONCEPT OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

The countryside, the middle landscape, encompasses much more than farming and agriculture. Yet, those are the main forces or processes honing the general look and feel of most countrysides. And the kind of agriculture pursued—the values and assumptions on which it is based, the means it uses, and the ends it seeks—determine the character of the countryside. So, it is critical to ask what kinds of farming would be appropriate for CVNP, what kinds would be compatible with the values, purposes, and traditions of NPS.
There are three points of view worth noting here. First, some environmentalists see agriculture as generally destructive of nature, and therefore better limited to zones which can be isolated and sacrificed for food production. But that is an extreme view even within the environmental movement, and it is not widely held in our society. It is certainly not responsive to the purposes for which CVNP was established. The opposite extreme (which provides considerable justification and fuel for the prior view) is what is often labeled modern, mainstream, conventional, or industrial agriculture. And a third option is generally referred to as alternative, or sustainable, agriculture — a middle way for the middle landscape.

Sustainable agriculture is the generic term now most commonly used to identify those diverse kinds of farming which may be regarded as appropriate for the Initiative. Included under this conceptual umbrella are several discreet schools of thought and practice bearing names like organic, biointensive, biodynamic, permaculture, holistic, crisis, integrated, and low-input. The term sustainable came into widespread use following the 1988 establishment of a small program within the United States Department of Agriculture, named Low Input Sustainable Agriculture (LISA). After several years, that program was renamed the Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program (SARE) — as it became more apparent that sustainability was far more complex than limiting expensive production inputs and avoiding ecologically harmful practices.

Even in its early years, sustainable agriculture explicitly rejected most of the assumptions and practices of industrial agriculture. It advocates more and smaller farms; limited capitalization and limited use of credit; selective appropriate mechanization; replacement of most agricultural chemicals with biological, cultural, and mechanical alternatives; and grass-based, free-range livestock systems. Equally important, sustainable agriculture rejects the assumption that maximizing short-term economic profit is the overriding end which drives all decision-making.

In recent years, as sustainable farming has emerged as a viable alternative in certain contexts to industrialized food production methods, a broad consensus is forming regarding its fundamental nature. To be truly sustainable, practitioners now argue, agriculture must be economically profitable, socially responsible, and ecologically healthy. A box which lacks length, breadth, or depth is not a box. Agriculture which lacks any of these three dimensions is not sustainable over time.

SELF-INTEREST: PERSONAL, SHARED, ALTRUISTIC

Agricultural economist John Ikerd describes the concept of sustainability as being focused on intergenerational equity — meeting the needs of the present while leaving equal or better opportunities for the future. Sustainable farmers, he says, pursue an enlightened self-interest, comprised of personal, shared, and altruistic interests. Personal self-interest is primarily about individual monetary gain and material possessions. Shared interests focus on relationships, community, and social values. Altruistic interests focus on ethics, morality and stewardship — doing what is right with little expectation of direct personal gain.

"These new farmers are a diverse lot, but they share a common pursuit of a higher self-interest. They are not trying to maximize profit, but instead are seeking sufficient profit for a desirable quality of life. They recognize the importance of relationships, of family and community, as well as income, in determining their overall well being. They accept the responsibilities of ethics and stewardship, not as constraints to their selfishness, but instead, as opportunities to lead successful lives."


RETAIL FARMING AND NICHE MARKETS

Many find Ikerd’s words profound and inspiring. Certain economic skeptics suggest they are nice, but naïve — and assert that they cannot be made to work in the real world. In fact, Ikerd is describing what already is working for thousands of individual farmers across America and around the globe. He has identified critical factors that allow such farmers to2

conform the conventional wisdom of conventional agriculture. Many of the contrasting assumptions and practices that distinguish these farmers from their conventional brethren were noted earlier. But Ikerd emphasizes an additional, little understood distinction between conventional and sustainable agriculture. Conventional agriculture is usually a wholesale enterprise, while sustainable farming is typically a retail enterprise. And therein lies the key to economic success for small scale farming — and the answer to economic skeptics.

Industrial agriculture produces generic commodities for mass markets and global trade. Producer and consumer never see one another, know and care little about one another. Sustainable farming usually focuses on high quality specialty products for direct, local, retail sale — to regular customers/friends. Conventional farmers receive approximately 20 cents from each dollar spent by American consumers for food, half of which covers production costs such as equipment, supplies, and labor. The remaining 80 cents goes to middlemen for transportation, storage, processing, distribution, advertising, and retailing. The economic success of farmers using sustainable methods rests in part on eliminating most of these middlemen. More importantly, it rests on niche marketing — marketing directly to people who care about (value), and are willing to pay a premium price for, food that is of higher quality, grown to their specifications, and grown without the social and ecological harm resulting from industrial farming practices.

FARM SIZES AND ENTERPRISES

Initiative farms will range in size from 4 acres or less, to 50 acres or more. The eight farms currently operational are comprised of approximately 2, 12, 12, 28, 26, 30, 30, and 45 usable acres. Most Initiative farms will grow and sell the kind of food and fiber crops which were grown and sold in the Valley from the early 19th Century through the mid 20th Century—even though their methods will be decidedly post-modern (sustainable). Of the current Initiative farms, one focuses on vegetables, three on livestock (meat goats, turkeys, and sheep), one is a vineyard and winery, one a pick-your-own berry operation, one grows culinary and medicinal herbs, and one is a vegetable CSA (see below).

All Initiative farms must utilize production practices which are described in Appendix B as more sustainable. Many Initiative farmers will choose to become certified organic growers, although that is not a requirement of the Initiative. Those who do not must still follow production methods which strictly limit the use of conventional agricultural chemicals. Livestock grazers will use management-intensive grazing systems, moving their animals from paddock to paddock every few days, to enhance rather than degrade pasture health. And all livestock handling systems must respect the animals’ basic physical nature and welfare; close confinement systems are not appropriate. The Initiative has no rigid categorical prohibitions or exclusions for specific crop or livestock species. In general, however, exotic or newly popular livestock enterprises, such as bison, deer, elk, ostriches, emus, rheas, llamas, alpacas, miniatures, and equine boarding are of limited interest to the Initiative.

Initiative farms will use the full range of marketing methods now common in sustainable farming. Some farmers will develop FFO (Pick Your Own) operations for blueberries, raspberries, strawberries, apples, pumpkins, and so on. Some will establish CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) programs in which shares of each season’s production are sold in advance to, say, 50 to 500 families. RSA (Restaurant Supported Agriculture) arrangements will provide dependable outlets for others. Livestock raisers will build strong ties to area ethnic communities providing fresh, high quality, specialty meats for cultural and religious celebrations and traditions. Some farmers will maintain a roadside stand, attend weekly farmers’ markets, deliver direct to customers, or have customers pick up produce at the farm. And most Initiative farmers will probably maintain close communication with their customers via the Internet.

Some 3,500,000 visitors use CVNP facilities annually. And, perhaps two to three times as many residents of nearby communities traverse the park each year. Visitors and local community members offer enormous market potential for Initiative farmers, and farmers have enormous potential to offer them new ways to use and enjoy the park. Marketing success—marketing security—for Initiative farmers will be based on the personal relationships that develop between farmers and their customers.

LANDSCAPE AESTHETICS

Aldo Leopold observed in 1949 that “every farmer’s land is a portrait of himself” – a poetic way to describe an understanding common among farmers and homeowners alike. A simple drive through most middle class American suburbs on a summer weekend reveals an army of turf warriors doing battle with long grass and dandelions. They hold this truth to be self-evident: The way your place looks is a reflection on you. And Initiative farmers may expect that many of the turf warriors living near CVNP will be driving into the Valley to view the farms. What those farms look like will be a reflection on the farm operator, the Initiative, CVCC, CVNP, and NPS. And so, Initiative farmers will need to pay very careful attention to the aesthetics and appearance of their farms— in a sense, they will always be farming in a fishbowl. Initiative farms should be expressive of valued natural beauty in the countryside — tended, cared for.

RECAPITULATING A SENSE OF PLACE

Over the next decade, the Countryside Initiative will continue rehabilitating and revitalizing the old farms in CVNP. It is expected that approximately 20 farms, encompassing nearly 1,330 acres, will eventually be included in the program. Typically, about two farms will be leased every year to private individuals. Collectively, this group of farms will recapture some of the look and feel of the rural countryside, admired by Valley visitors from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth. Of course, these farms represent only a small fraction of the landscape devoted to farming a century ago. Agricultural census reports from the 1890s and 1900s describe the landscape of Valley townships as ranging from 60% to over 90% improved (cleared) for agriculture.

Today, CVNP encompasses some 33,000 acres, 19,000 owned by NPS. Of that, some 4,245 acres (about 2%) were devoted to agricultural purposes in the year 2007, and an even smaller fraction of non-federal land is now in any form of agriculture. It would be optimistic to think that the Initiative could eventually restore even 7% of federal lands to farming. To use a playful analogy, the face of the park will never again sport a full farming tan, but it can, perhaps, regain a special set of green freckles called farms. And, like the bits and pieces of the canal and railroad previously rehabilitated, this smattering of small farms will make the Valley’s recent history and beauty much more imaginable and accessible.
Cultivating the Vision

Early Harvest: The First Farms
Three RFPs to lease Countryside Initiative farms have been issued prior to this 2008 offering. In 2001, 2005 and 2006. Three farm leases resulted from each of the first and second offerings, two from the third. And, one farm was assigned to CVCC for Initiative support in 1999. Thus, a total of nine farms were in various stages of renewal and development by 2007. A brief description of each new farm follows below. Note: Farm families typically move onto their farms sometime during the year following the issuance of an RFP (that is 2001 offerings actually resulted in 2002 start-ups).

SPRING HILL FARM & MARKET (VAUGHN FARM, 2001 RFP)
Spring Hill is a diversified vegetable, cut flower, and poultry farm located in Brecksville, and operated by Alan and Susan Hallo. The Hallos raise over a dozen types of vegetables (including 20+ varieties of tomatoes), and 50+ types of flowers. Their poultry operation (eggs and broilers) is pasture based. They sell at the farm and in the Countryside Farmers’ Market in Peninsula.

SARAH’S VINEYARD (PARRY FARM, 2001 RFP)
Mike and Margaret Lytz have established a vineyard, winery and art gallery at their Initiative farmstead located in Cuyahoga Falls. They raise nine grape varieties, and make nine types of wine (including one estate wine). Margaret conducts art classes at the winery during the winter, and the Vineyard holds an annual Summer Solstice Wine, Art & Blues Festival featuring eight regional wineries, and attended by 3,500+ people.

BLUE HEN FAMILY FARM (LEYSER FARM, 2001 RFP)
Blue Hen, located in Brecksville was operated by Bob and Joan Hall from 2002-2007. They sold eggs directly from the farm, and produced several types of vegetables for the Countryside Farmers’ Market in Peninsula. The Halls had to leave their new farm operation for personal reasons at the close of the 2007 season. The farm is being resettled in this RFP as Farming Unit No. 2.

GOAT FEATHERS POINT FARM (POINT FARM, 2005 RFP)
Goat Feathers Point is a small livestock operation operated by Terry and Cindy Smith in Boston Township. The farm produces meat goats for Northeast Ohio’s numerous ethnic communities, and “heritage” turkeys for the Thanksgiving market. In 2007, their goats numbered 75+ breeding animals and will grow to around 200 in the next few years. Their annual turkey production will increase to about 200 birds as well. The Smiths sell directly from the farm, and occasionally in Countryside Farmers’ Markets.

GREENFIELD BERRY FARM (WELTON FARM, 2005 RFP)
Daniel and Michele Greenfield are developing a PVO (pick-your-own) berry farm in Boston Township. The farm will establish several acres of strawberries, raspberries, blueberries, as well as other fruit and vegetables. The Greenfields produce Hickory Bark Syrup, and “out bites”, a snack food made from locally produced oats, walnuts, and honey. Daniel is also an environmental educator, and will use the farm to host classes from the nearby Cuyahoga Valley Environmental Education Center.

BASKET OF LIFE FARM (DUFFY FARM, 2005 RFP)
Basket of Life is a CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) farm located in Cuyahoga Falls, established by Eric and Heather Walters. Their CSA members pay an annual membership fee for the opportunity to pick-up a big bag of veggies each week throughout the growing season. Basket of Life expects to grow from 25 members in 2007, to around 200 members in three or four years.

SPICY LAMB FARM (GARVEY FARM, 2006 RFP)
Spicy Lamb Farm is being developed by David Wright & Laura DeYoung near Peninsula. As the name suggests, the farm will focus on sheep – primarily gourmet lamb meat. And, the farm’s spice and herb garden will supply a variety of products to complement lamb dishes. Laura and David also expect to develop the farm as a center for agrotourism and environmental education.

NEITENBACH FARM (GREITHER FARM, 2006 RFP)
Af and Pamela Neitenbach moved onto their small Initiative farm (of 2 acres) in late 2007: Located near the southern end of CVNP, in Cuyahoga Falls, their farm business will combine vegetable crops with culinary and medicinal herbs. They will sell their products through an on-farm stand, and at the Countryside Farmers’ Market in nearby Peninsula.

GRAZELAND (SCHMIDT-FOSTER FARM, 1999)
Grazeland is a small farm located near the center of CVNP, in Boston Heights, which was assigned to CVCC at the beginning of the Countryside Initiative. It is cared for and managed by CVCC’s Director, Darwin Kelsey, and his wife Chris. Grazeland is used for small projects and experiments which demonstrate opportunities (or solve problems) for other Initiative farms: Raising meat goats for local ethnic markets, appropriate design and materials for livestock fencing and shelters, or implementing proper wetland and riparian buffers.
To Market, To Market

It’s 9:00 a.m., Saturday Morning. The cowbell rings, and the stampede is on (see the photo at the left). The Countryside Farmers’ Market is open for business – until noon. By 9:02 lines are forming for juicy peaches, fresh-dug fingerling potatoes, grass-fed beef, heritage pork, artisan cheeses, and flaky croissants. There is music in the air. A local chef is getting a cooking demo ready. And, there is a tomato tasting (90 varieties) at 10:00. It’s a community happening.

The Countryside Farmers’ Market at Heritage Farms in Peninsula began in 2004 – the first in a National Park. Heritage Farms is one of the oldest and most picturesque farms still operating in the Cuyahoga Valley. It is privately-owned, and CVNP holds a scenic easement on part of the property; CVCC manages the market to balance the interests and needs of the participating farmers and food vendors, the owners of the market site, the Village, the Park, and the community at large. And, in addition to this “country” market, CVCC operates a weekday “city” market in nearby Akron.

While these markets serve as important sales venues for most Countryside Initiative farms, they could not exist without the participation (for product diversity and volume) of 25-30 other nearby farmers and food producers. Farmers in the Countryside Initiative are linked to and dependent upon peers beyond the park. And, both are utterly dependent upon an informed and supportive community.

Connecting to Larger Worlds

“Countryside Initiative farms do not exist in a vacuum. During the 19th Century, farms spread up and down the Cuyahoga Valley as a result of myriad influences and forces originating regionally, nationally, even globally. Then, during the 20th Century, those farms began disappearing from the Valley – as a result of influences originating regionally, nationally, and globally. Not surprisingly, the farms now being revived through the Countryside Initiative will also prosper or fail in part because of influences emanating beyond CVNP and the Valley.

“Where and how American food is grown has changed radically. At the beginning of the 20th Century most food was grown “nearby”. At the beginning of the 21st century it is grown far away – in places like California, or Chile, or China. Most long distance food is grown on a grand scale – and therefore necessarily grown using industrial production methods. Some say our modern industrial food system provides a food supply that is abundant, cheap, and convenient. Unfortunately, it also comes with an inherent pattern of undesirable side effects: Food of inferior taste and nutrition, environmental pollution, intensive consumption of energy, exacerbation of climate change, depleted aquifers, farm worker abuse, and narrow corporate control of our national food supply. Over 88% of all food consumed in America is now produced by a long distance industrial system – and there are consequences.

“What we do not know about food we can not care about. And today in America, few of us – less than 2% – have any direct connection to the land and people that feed us. Countryside Initiative farms and educational programs offer an unusual array of opportunities to reacquaint modern urbanites with the connections between land, farmers, food, and themselves – so that they can understand, care, and act to help build socially and ecologically responsible local food systems.

“CVCC plays a critical role helping the Countryside Initiative appropriately navigate such complex realities. The Conservancy is a small “think-and-do tank” working to rebuild local farming and food systems across Northeast Ohio. Its four interrelated program centers focus on farmland preservation and farm viability, growing a new generation of sustainable farmers, rebuilding local food systems, and developing citizen/community support for socially and environmentally responsible food economies. Working with and through CVCC’s various programs enables CVNP to greatly enhance its cultural and economic impact on Northeast Ohio.”

Leasing Authority & Conditions

Legislative Authorization
Long-term leasing of federally owned or administered property, for purposes such as the Countryside Initiative, is authorized by Congressional Acts 6 U.S.C. 182-184 and U.S.C. 390 b-3. Associated regulations allow leases of up to 60 years, at fair market value rent. Prior to these authorizations, use of NPS lands for agricultural purposes was limited to Special Use Permits (SUPs) covering periods of one to five years. Although short-term SUPs are intended to prevent or limit serious damage to park lands, they act as a negative incentive to basic land stewardship. It is economically irrational for farmers to undertake costly long-term land care programs, which can take years or decades to implement, since they have little assurance of a reasonable return on their investment. The leasing authority now available for the Countryside Initiative resolves this inherent dilemma.

Duration & Transferability of Leases
The maximum term or duration of any lease will be 60 years, at which point a new open competitive process is once again required by law. Some lessees may prefer a shorter-term lease. However, a competitively earned leasehold interest is transferable (by gift, sale, or other device) to the lessee’s children, or to other persons, subject to approval by CVNP. Any transfer of the right to occupy and operate a Countryside Initiative farm is contingent upon the lessee and transferee satisfactorily demonstrating that such a change will result in equal or superior management of the farm.

Responsibility for Continuous Active Farming
Achieving the purpose and objectives of the Countryside Initiative depends upon all leased farms being actively and continuously operated – as described in lessees’ winning proposals, in their subsequently negotiated leases, and in annually approved operating plans. If a lessee becomes unable to fulfill the obligations of his or her lease, for whatever reason (disease, injury, insolvency, divorce, death, and so on), the lessee (or lessee’s agent) must transfer the remaining leasehold interest as described above, or relinquish the remaining interest directly to CVNP. Either option must be completed within twelve months of the date on which the lessee notifies CVNP of an inability to continue, or of the date that CVNP notifies the lessee that the lessee is in default upon lease requirements.

Fair Market Value Rent

Dual Components of Rent
All Countryside Initiative farms must be leased at fair market value rent. In the marketplace, farm leases are commonly based on two distinct financial factors: the rental value of a residence, and the rental value of agricultural buildings and land (or the productive income from using the buildings and land.) This practice is followed in establishing fair market value rent for Initiative farms.

Residential Component
The residential component of fair market value rent is determined by first obtaining an appraisal, prepared by an independent certified appraiser, which compares Initiative farm residences with similar properties in surrounding communities. This raw number is then adjusted to reflect several limitations, restrictions, and requirements. First, only persons with the knowledge, resources, and willingness to affirmatively farm according to Initiative guidelines are eligible to lease and live in these residences. Lessees must affirmatively comply with all applicable federal regulations and NPS requirements related to archaeological, historical, and natural resources (e.g., National Environmental Policy Act, National Historic Preservation Act, Endangered Species Act). Moreover, lessees will experience a significant loss of privacy due to the residence’s location on a park farm where limited but regular public access is encouraged. For these and other reasons, the raw appraisal will be reduced 10% for all residences, and an additional 10% for all residences listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places.
PRODUCTIVE COMPONENT

The productive component of fair market value rent will be computed as a percentage of gross farm revenue derived from farming and all other sources related to the use of the Initiative property. Other sources of lessee revenue, unrelated to use of the farm site, shall have no bearing on this rental component. This method of determining farm rent is one of several methods commonly referred to in the market place as a flexible cash rent. This particular form of flexible cash rent allows lessors and lessees to share in both the risks of production and in opportunities for profit.

The precise percentage paid by Midwestern farmers for rental of land varies widely by agricultural enterprise: 30% to 40% of gross revenue in conventional corn and soybean operations and 10% to 20% of gross revenue in chemically intensive fruit/vegetable enterprises. While Countryside Initiative farm enterprises will more closely resemble the latter, they carry an additional affirmative responsibility to use only approved sustainable production practices. Hence, the productive component of Initiative farm rent will be benchmarked at 10% of gross farm income. That benchmark will be reduced by 1% of gross income for certified organic producers since verification of sustainable production practices will be largely assumed by the certifying agency.

Initiative farmers are expected to be active land stewards, enhancing soil health and productivity through ecologically natural and beneficial practices which are relatively slow. Such practices often require five to ten years to reach (and stabilize at) optimum levels of production. Similarly, Initiative farmers are expected to create new retail markets where none currently exist – a process which also typically follows a slow growth curve, requiring five to ten years to achieve a high optimum level. Hence, a lessee’s productive component of rent will be discounted during the first ten years of operation: beginning at 5% of gross farm income in year one (4% for certified organic enterprises), and increasing thereafter 5% annually until reaching 10% in year ten (9% for certified organic).
Leasing Opportunities for 2008

This map depicts the location of the three leasing opportunities available for 2008.

**Gleeson Farm**

7243 Tinkers Creek Road
Valley View, Ohio 44125
(Village of Valley View, Cuyahoga Co.)

**Leyser Farm**

9640 Riverview Road
Brecksville, Ohio 44141
(City of Brecksville, Cuyahoga Co.)

**Martin Farm**

2470 Martin Road
Akron, Ohio 44323
(Bath Township, Summit Co.)
Description of Individual Farming Units

Overview of 2008 Offerings

The 2008 round of leasing opportunities for the Countryside Initiative includes three farming units. Each unit consists of a rehabilitated residence, various outbuildings, and various parcels of nearby land. Like farms elsewhere, most Valley farms have passed through a series of ownerships, subdivisions, and modifications. Over time, buildings were added and removed, and field usage changed as circumstances evolved. The farming units offered for lease here attempt to salvage the surviving remnants of these older farms into practical units suited for modern, small-scale, retail farming.

CVNP has undertaken substantial rehabilitation of old farm buildings, and limited clearing of old fields not yet into advanced natural succession. CVNP’s building rehabilitation establishes a minimum benchmark for lessee’s maintenance of farm buildings during the term of their lease. CVNP will retain limited responsibility for the repair and replacement of major structural components and systems. But minor repairs, routine maintenance, and cosmetic changes will be the lessee’s responsibility (see the supplemental Countryside Initiative Model Lease for specific details). CVNP’s removal of weeds and brush from old fields, while eliminating an inconvenience and start-up cost for lessees, does not establish a similar benchmark for land stewardship. The “as is” conditions of farm fields are merely a starting point for the lessee’s long-term improvement of soil health. (See Preferred Production Practices for Sustainable Agriculture, in Appendix B).

Compared to conventional agriculture, most Countryside Initiative farming will require relatively modest capital investment. Still, Initiative enterprises will require most lessees to make some capital investment for additional buildings, fences, ponds, or other needs. Such investments will be entirely the responsibility of the lessee and should be amortized over the duration of the lease—since, by law, ownership of such additions and improvements must revert to NPS upon termination of the lease.

Proposers should be aware that significant changes to existing buildings or landscape features may or may not be possible. Countryside Initiative farms exist in a National Park context—which is to say a special place, with special preservation and protection needs. Some farms are located on archeologically sensitive sites which have been occupied by humans for thousands of years. Several are in the National Register of Historic Places. Others have fragile environmental features, and all farms have strong wildlife pressure. The Initiative is not apt to be a good fit for persons who perceive the realities as insurmountable impediments—rather than cultural and natural features which could make their lives more interesting and enjoyable, and their stewardship more significant. CVCC and CVNP staff are prepared to work closely with proposers/lessees to find workable solutions for legitimate enterprise needs. In most instances, the real issue will be what a building, fence, or pond should look like, or where to locate it, not whether it can happen.

The three farms offered in this RFP have been arbitrarily assigned an offering number and may be identified or referred to in proposals by this number. They are also identified here by the names most commonly used by park managers. National Register properties are usually referred to by the name of the original owner or builder of the residence. Non-Register properties are referred to by the name of the occupant at the time the site was acquired by NPS. Such names will, no doubt, continue to be used as a matter of custom by park resource managers. But it is expected that once these farming units are leased for Countryside Initiative use, they will become known to lessees, and to the general public, by appropriate and distinctive names selected by lessees to help establish clear identities for their new farming enterprises. This has already occurred for currently operational initiative farms.

Farming units offered for lease typically include several fields. These fields were assigned arbitrary numbers in the course of inventorying CVNP’s surviving agricultural resources, and the numbers now appear in the following descriptions of individual farms. They have no significance, other than serving as a simple, convenient means for identifying a particular field. The approximate acreage, soil type, and recent usage of each field is listed.

While the most important general features of each farming unit are described in this RFP document, significant and useful supplemental information is available regarding the farm buildings and fields. These supplemental information sheets will be available on the CVCC and CVNP websites (www.cvcountryside.org and www.nps.gov/cvnp), and at the CVCC office for anyone not having convenient internet access. A formal, group tour of each farmsite will be conducted during the 60 day period between the public release of this document and the due date for the completed proposal. It is recommended that everyone preparing a proposal attend one of the scheduled pre-proposal tour/discussions. See the RFP’s cover letter (accompanying mailed RFPs, and on the above websites) for specific times and locations of each tour.

From time to time, changes in federal regulations can affect park policies and regulations (such as those associated with this RFP). Any such changes, should they occur, will be communicated to proposers in a timely fashion, prior to the signing of any lease documents.
Gleeson Farm

Farming unit No. 1, the Gleeson Farm, is located near the northern end of CVNP in the Village of Valley View, Cuyahoga County. Its mailing address is 7243 Tinkers Creek Road, Valley View, Ohio 44125. The two story farmhouse contains eight rooms including two (or three) bedrooms and two baths, a basement, and a porch. Our buildings include a barn, garage, chicken coop, shed, and two corn cribs.

HISTORICAL SKETCH
Situated at the junction of Canal and Tinkers Creek Roads, overlooking the Ohio & Erie Canal, the Edmond Gleeson farm was well positioned to move crops to nearby markets. The farmhouse built circa 1854, is a fine example of Greek Revival architecture. It is now listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The large 2 1/2 story Wisconsin dairy barn was built in 1909. Two corn cribs and a shed are located near the barn, and a chicken coop near the house. The house sits on a knoll approximately 100 yards northwest of the barn and outbuildings.

The farmhouse was in the Gleeson family for more than 125 years. While dairying was the main enterprise of the farm, the Gleesons raised a variety of other livestock and poultry as well. The farm’s principal field crops were oats, Indian corn, and wheat. Descendants of Edmund Gleeson kept livestock in the barn through the late 1960’s.

In 1969 the property was subdivided and 10 acres were purchased by Clairmont and Barbara Ross. In 1977 Cuyahoga Valley National Park acquired title to the farm buildings, and these 10 acres from the original 40 acre farm. Currently, the farm retains approximately 35 usable acres immediately across the road from the farm buildings. South, along Canal and Valley View Roads, are several additional fields historically associated with other farms which are now included in this lease offering – making a total of 25.9 acres available for a modern farming operation.
**Field System Description – Field Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Approx. Acreage</th>
<th>Soil Types</th>
<th>Current Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curtilage</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>Lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Corn/Pumpkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Corn/Pumpkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.3 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Farmhouse Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (Sq. Ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawlspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Farmstead Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outbuilding Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken Coop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Crib #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Crib #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FWA – Forced Warm Air
Farming Unit No. 2, the Leyser Farm, is located in the north central portion of CVNP, in Cuyahoga County. Its mailing address is 9640 Riverview Road, Brecksville, Ohio 44141. The two story farmhouse contains nine rooms, including three bedrooms and two baths; a basement, and porch. Outbuildings include two barns.

**HISTORICAL SKETCH**

The Leyser Farm is also known historically as the Joseph Gasser Farm. The core of the farmhouse was built in 1890 by Joseph and Josephine Gasser. It is a vernacular, front gabled, upright and wing farm building. The adjacent small barn was built around 1900 and is a good example of the turn-of-theteenth century barns built for farms with few livestock and limited storage needs for hay and grain.

The Gassers operated a small-scale, market gardening farm that focused on cash crops such as butter, eggs, and potatoes. In 1905, the property was sold and subdivided. It ceased functioning as a farm and became increasingly residential. In 1978, Carmen and Mary Leyser sold the property to Cuyahoga Valley National Park. They had resided on the property since 1965 and owned several horses for which they used the barn, and the fields for pasture. They also build a paddock area west of the barn.

The large raised-bank barn located down the street to the southeast was built in 1886. This barn was not originally part of the Gasser Farm. It was owned by Anthony Fabbo in 1968 through 1978 at which time the NPS acquired the property. Fabbo was a small-scale farmer of whom little is known.

Field No. 6 at the intersection of Snowville Road and Riverview Road is owned by Cleveland Metroparks and leased to CVNP for use in the Countryside Initiative with the Leyser Farm. CVNP subleases this field to whomever is selected to operate the Leyser Farm.

From 2002-2007, this farm was leased under the Countryside Initiative program for a small-scale mixed vegetable and livestock operation. The lessees invested in perimeter fencing around barnyard field 57A, as well as, around 57B where they grew a variety of vegetables (the fencing remains). The small barn housed laying chickens. Fields 61, 58A, 58B and 58C to the north and south of the Fabbo Barn were not actively farmed although the barn was used for equipment storage. A portion of field 61 was cultivated for garlic and shallot crops.
**Farmhouse Description**

- **Stories**: 2
- **Rooms**: 9
- **Bedrooms**: 3
- **Baths**: 2
- **Basement Area (Sq. Ft.)**: 600
- **Crawlspace Area**: 75
- **1st Floor Area**: 1050
- **2nd Floor Area**: 855
- **Porch Area**: 100
- **Total Area**: 2680

**Heat Type**: Hot Water

**Fuel**: Propane

**Cooling**: No

**Sanitary**: Septic

**Water**: Cistern

**PMV Rent**: $750/mo

**KEY**

- B: Bathroom
- BR: Bedroom
- BSMT: Basement
- C: Closet
- CRWL: Crawlspace
- D: Den
- DR: Dining Room
- FP: Fireplace
- H: Hall
- K: Kitchen
- LR: Living Room
- P: Porch
- STO: Storage

**Farmstead Description**

**Outbuilding Data**

- **Small Barn**: 24' x 28'
- **Large Barn**: 36' x 46'

**Field System Description – Field Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Approx. Acreage</th>
<th>Soil Types</th>
<th>Current Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curtilage</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Lawns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57A</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Silt/Sandy Loam</td>
<td>Lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57B</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Old Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58A</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Old Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58B</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Old Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58C</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>Old Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td>Old Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong>: 10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CVNP Countryside Initiative 17**
Farming Unit No. 3, the Martin Farm, is located near the southwestern boundary of CVNP in Bath Township, Summit County. Its mailing address is 2470 Martin Road, Akron, Ohio 44323. The two story farmhouse contains eight rooms, including two bedrooms, two baths, a basement, and three porches. Outbuildings include a shed and privy.

**HISTORICAL SKETCH**
The Peter Martin farm is located on the east side of Martin Road. The house is screened from the highway by a line of maple trees. Built circa 1880, the house is now listed in the National Register of Historic Places. South of the house stands a shed. Other nearby structures include a non-functioning privy, as well as the foundation remains of a bank barn and a milk house. A farm pond is located east of the house, and a two-track gravel driveway leads from the main driveway to a natural gas well located near the backside of the farm's main 16 acre field.

In 1884, Peter Martin purchased 47 acres of the original 80 acres associated with the Lutz Farm, which encompassed both east and west sides of Martin Road. The Martin Farm became the dominate feature on the country road that connected it with the nearby hamlet of Ira in Northampton Township. This small farm was characteristic of many others in the Cuyahoga Valley during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It raised wheat, Indian corn, oats, and potatoes, as well as dairy cattle, sheep, and swine.

The farmstead remained in the Martin family until the mid twentieth century although it was subdivided over time. Upon the death of Peter in 1966, it no longer served as the family farm, and it was further subdivided. The parcel east of the house was drilled for natural gas. In 2000, the NPS purchased the property. Currently, the farm consists of approximately 17 acres including 16 acres of usable field area.
### Field System Description – Field Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field #</th>
<th>Approx. Acreage</th>
<th>Soil Types</th>
<th>Current Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curtilage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Silt Loam</td>
<td>Old Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Farmhouse Description

**Residence Data**
- **Stories**: 2
- **Rooms**: 8
- **Bedrooms**: 2
- **Baths**: 2
- **Area (Sq. Ft.)**
  - Basement: 380
  - Crawlspace: 340
  - 1st Floor: 780
  - 2nd Floor: 755
- **Total**: 2485

**Heat**
- Type: FWA
- Fuel: Natural Gas

**Cooling**
- Type: Central

**Sanitary**
- Type: Septic

**Water**
- Cistern

**FMV Rent**: $600/mo

### Farmstead Description

**Outbuilding Data**
- **Shed**: 14' x 20'
- **Porch**: 4' x 6'

### Key
- **B**: Bathroom
- **BR**: Bedroom
- **BSMT**: Basement
- **C**: Closet
- **CRWL**: Crawlspace
- **D**: Den
- **DR**: Dining Room
- **FP**: Fireplace
- **H**: Hall
- **K**: Kitchen
- **LR**: Living Room
- **P**: Porch
- **STO**: Storage

### Key Image
- Panoramic view of Martin farmstead.
- CVNP Photo Collection.
Proposal Development

INVITATION TO COMPETE
As noted earlier, this RFP is, by law, open to all interested parties on a competitive basis. Hence, the three proposals judged most likely to achieve the best use of the three farms in the current offering will be selected for implementation. However, we are encouraging all interested parties to prepare as creative and strong a proposal as their experience and resources allow. Superior ideas may well be proposed by persons having limited experience or resources. Such proposals will receive careful consideration for this and future offerings; promising concepts can be refined and improved for future offerings. And promoting proposers can be helped to improve their knowledge, skills, and resources in order to become more competitive in the future.

FORMAT AND ACCURACY
Proposals submitted in response to this request should follow the simple format suggested below. You are asked to answer questions or supply specific information in fifteen numbered items. Please number your responses correspondingly, from one to fifteen, and respond fully and accurately to all questions/requests. Honest, accurate responses are essential to determining the best match between proposals/proposers and a particular farm. False statements are a basis for disqualifying any proposal, or for voiding a lease if discovered at a later date. Additional penalties for false statements are prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

PURPOSE OF THE INFORMATION REQUESTED
The information requested here will serve as the substance of your proposal. Straightforward and thoughtful responses to the information requested will effectively demonstrate what a proposer would like to accomplish, and why. And thorough responses will give proposal evaluators a good basis for judging whether a proposer has the knowledge, experience, and resources to accomplish their vision.

INQUIRIES & EXPLANATIONS
Any explanation desired by a proposer regarding the meaning or interpretation of the RFP must be submitted in writing and with sufficient time allowed for a reply to reach the proposer before the submission of their proposal. Oral explanations or interpretations given in reply will not be binding. Any information given in writing to a prospective proposer will be furnished to all prospective proposers as Supplemental Information: Questions & Answers (see page 23) if such information is necessary to proposers in submitting a proposal, or if the lack of such information would be prejudicial to uninformed proposers.

Proposal Contents
Please respond thoughtfully, creatively, and accurately when providing the following information. Describe your vision of the farming business you would like to develop on the particular farm you have selected. Your proposal should address all issues raised in the following questions in some manner and detail. Please organize your proposal contents as responses to the fifteen following questions.

PROPOSER IDENTIFICATION
Please provide full identification of the person(s) responsible for the proposal submitted: Name(s), address(es), telephone number(s), fax number(s), or e-mail address(es).
In addition, please supply the name(s), address(es), and phone number(s) of two personal and two professional references.

FARM(S) OF CHOICE
Which of the three farms being offered for lease in this round (year 2008) are you most interested in? Why? Are you interested in the other farms? If you are not selected for the farm representing your first choice do you wish to be considered for the other? Briefly explain. If interested in being considered for other farms, proposers must provide sufficient information about how the farming enterprise would be modified to fit the other properties (vis-à-vis location, acreage, etc.). If no information is provided on how the proposal would be modified for another farm property, the proposal will be evaluated strictly on the basis of the information provided for the first choice property.
FARMING ENTERPRISE

1. Describe your “enterprise” (i.e., pick-your-own strawberries, 57 varieties of veggies, specialty meats for ethnic markets, sheep’s milk cheese, etc.). Explain your choice of this enterprise as opposed to other possibilities.

2. Describe and explain your intended production practices. Do you intend to become a certified organic producer? Why? Explain where you fit on the spectrum of production practices outlined in Appendix B, and the environmental consequences of your practices.

3. Describe and explain your retail and niche marketing philosophy, and some of the specific practices you intend to implement.

4. Develop a timeline and narrative describing what you might expect to accomplish in one year, three years, five years, ten years, beyond. Describe your assumptions and contingencies.

COMPATIBILITY

5. Describe in your own words your understanding or interpretation of the purposes of the Countryside Initiative. What do you see as the Initiative’s most important or useful features? The least important or useful? What would you like to see changed, rethought, or redirected about the purpose, vision, or goals of the Initiative, if possible? Why?

6. Describe ways in which you are a good fit for the Countryside Initiative. What would you, and your farm, contribute to the big picture – to the goals and objectives of the Initiative?

7. Two goals of the Countryside Initiative, described in this RFP, are “reestablishing a working agricultural landscape” in the park and the desire for each farm to be an expression of “beauty in the countryside.” Explain how your enterprise will interpret and contribute to these goals.

8. How will your farm encourage interaction with regular park visitors and residents from surrounding communities?

9. Having read and considered the terms presented in the Countryside Initiative Model Lease (see page 21, Supplemental Information), are you prepared to execute a similar document without substantial modification? Briefly identify any section of the lease you would hope to modify.

RESOURCES

10. Describe your human resources: Explain the knowledge, skills, and experience that you would bring to your proposed enterprise. Please describe your farming experience in some detail. Similarly describe the role you expect hired staff/interns, family members, friends, or other persons to play in the enterprise.

11. Detail your financial resources: Do you have savings, or access to other capital to launch your enterprise? What capital investments will be needed for your particular enterprise, on your particular farm? Where will the capital come from? Will you have non-farm sources of revenue to help support your family/group/organization? Before final selection, proposers will be expected to supply proof of the financial resources describedCLAIMED in their proposal (credit report, list of assets, list of assets for individual lenders, etc.).

12. Other Resources: Describe any other available resources (equipment,...) that will enable you to execute the farm enterprise.

BUSINESS PLAN

13. Prepare a basic three-year start-up budget showing anticipated expected capital expenditures, annual enterprise operating expenses, annual living expenses, and annual revenues sufficient to safely cover all expenditures. (See Appendix C for typical annual enterprise operating budget categories, details, and format.)
Submission of Proposals

ITEMS TO INCLUDE

Proponents are requested to review the preceding general section, Proposal Contents & Evaluation, to be certain that all fifteen questions/requests have been carefully addressed. A transmittal letter (based on the model in Appendix A) will complete the required information. The National Park Service assumes no responsibility for a proposal submitted on the basis of an incomplete package.

NUMBER OF COPIES, METHODS OF TRANSMITTAL

Six (6) copies of the transmittal letter and proposal must be enclosed in a sealed envelope or envelopes, and received at the National Park Service office before the local prevailing time and date stated in the cover letter accompanying this RFP. The face of the sealed envelope(s) shall show the proponent’s name and address, and the receiver’s address as shown here:

Countryside Initiative RFP
Cuyahoga Valley National Park
1960 Vaughn Road
Brecksville, OH 44141

Telephonic proposals, facsimile, e-mail, and other means of transmittal will not be considered. Please note that proposals will not be returned to the proponents and will be retained by the National Park Service.

LATE PROPOSALS, MODIFICATIONS, & WITHDRAW

Any proposal received at the designated location after the time specified for receipt (see the cover letter accompanying this RFP) will not be considered unless: (i) It was sent by registered or certified mail not later than the fifth calendar day prior to the date specified for receipt of offers (e.g., a proposal submitted in response to a solicitation requiring receipt by the 20th of the month must have been mailed by the 15th or earlier); (ii) it was sent by mail and it is determined by the Government that the late receipt was due solely to mishandling by the National Park Service after receipt at the Park Service office, or (iii) It is the only proposal received. Modifications to any proposal are subject to conditions (i) and (ii) above. Proposals may be withdrawn by written notice, signed by the proponent or an authorized representative.

Acceptance and Evaluation of Proposals & Issuance of Leases

PROPOSAL ACCEPTANCE

NPS reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and to waive information and minor irregularities in proposals received. Proposals will be conditionally accepted or rejected within sixty (60) days of the date specified for receipt of proposals. Final acceptance of any proposal will be conditional upon satisfactory negotiation and execution of a lease, and upon the lease’s approval by the Regional Director, Midwest Region, NPS.

Acceptance of a proposal will not create any rights on the proponent’s part including, and without limitation, rights of enforcement, equity or reimbursement, until the lease and all related documents are approved and executed. All obligations of NPS are subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

All proposals will be scored on the quality of their response to the forgoing fifteen questions and requests for information. Each question/request is important, and failure to satisfactorily address any can be disqualifying. Successful proposals will demonstrate a thoughtful and thorough response to the entire set of questions/requests. In brief, proponents must present a clear and appealing vision of what they want to accomplish and why, and they must convincingly demonstrate that they have the knowledge, skills, and resources to effectively implement their vision. We recognize that the skills required to plan and carry out a farming/marketing enterprise are not necessarily the same as those required to prepare an eloquently written or slickly packaged proposal. You may be sure that will be taken into account. However, Initiative farmers will need (and should demonstrate in their proposal) an ability to articulate and communicate the goals of their enterprise – and how those goals support the goals of the Initiative.
Supplemental Information Available

Supplemental information is available to help potential proposers better understand the initiative in general, and the specific farms in the current offering. The following information is available on the CVNP and CVCC websites (www.cvnp.gov/cvnp and www.cvcountryside.org). Hard copies will be available for those without convenient access to the internet at the CVCC office, and at each preproposal farm site tour.

1. Supplemental Farm Site Information
2. Countryside Initiative Model Lease
3. Sustainable Agriculture Select Bibliography
4. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation
5. Supplemental Questions & Answers

Countryside Conservancy
2799 Everett Road
Peninsula, OH 44264
Phone: 330-657-2542
Fax: 330-657-2508
Web: www.cvcountryside.org

*Note: CVCC serves as the primary public contact for the Initiative. CVCC is a non-profit 501(C)(3) corporation chartered in 1999 by the State of Ohio. While, the corporation's full legal name remains Cuyahoga Valley Countryside Conservancy (and is used in this RFP), it now generally “does business as” the Countryside Conservancy.

Appendices
The three appendices referred to in this RFP text, and listed here, are presented on the following pages.
A. Model Transmittal Letter
B. Preferred Production Practices for Sustainable Agriculture
C. Typical Budget Categories, Details, and Format

Appendix A
MODEL TRANSMITTAL LETTER
Countryside Initiative RFP
Cuyahoga Valley National Park
19500 Vaughn Road
Brecksville, OH 44141

Dear Evaluators:

(I/We) hereby propose to lease (name of farm) located in Cuyahoga Valley National Park, in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in your RFP. (I/We) are prepared to execute a lease without substantive modification of the Countryside Initiative Model Lease, except as specifically identified in the enclosed proposal, and as may be agreed to by NPS, or as may be required by NPS pursuant to the terms of the RFP and any governing regulations.

(I/We) certify that the information furnished herewith is true to the best of (my/our) knowledge and beliefs. (I/We) also certify that (I/We) have not been suspended or disbarred from holding a Federal contract.

(I/We) have responded fully and accurately in (my/our) proposal to each of the following questions/requests for information.

1. Proposer identification and references
2. Farm(s) of Choice
3. Description/details of my/our farm’s enterprise
4. Production practices, and their environmental consequences
5. Retail and niche marketing philosophy and practice
6. Development timeline and narrative
7. Understanding of the Countryside Initiative
8. Enterprise's fit/contribution to the Initiative
9. Contribution to CVNP's agricultural landscape
10. Interaction with park visitors and nearby communities
11. Farm lease issues
12. Human resources
13. Financial resources
14. Other resources
15. Business plan

Submitted by: Date
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Appendix B
PREFERRED PRODUCTION PRACTICES FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

Countrywide Initiative farmers will be expected to possess substantial knowledge of sustainable production practices. Proposers must demonstrate awareness of preferred production practices in their RFP submission. Subsequently farm lessees will have to provide greater detail on expected production practices in annual operating proposals.

There are a wide range of practices which are acceptable for most enterprise types, and Initiative farmers will be free to choose whichever practices they prefer, provided they do not violate general principles of sustainability. The charts shown here suggest a spectrum of practices from less sustainable to more sustainable. Farming in the real world is not abstract; it involves specific conflicting circumstances and pressures which are not easy to balance. In general, however, Initiative farms must strike a balance which puts them clearly within the more sustainable parts of the spectrum.

### Mind-set for sustainable Agriculture *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Sustainable Thinking</th>
<th>More Sustainable Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get through this year</td>
<td>Next few years make or break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer farm to kids or to another good farmer</td>
<td>Stewardship for many generations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Production Practices for Sustainable Vegetable/Crop Enterprises *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Sustainable Practices</th>
<th>More Sustainable Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop Rotation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monoculture (same crop in same field each year)</td>
<td>Two years between the same crop planted in the same field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years between the same crop planted in the same field</td>
<td>Three years between the same crop planted in the same field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years between the same crop planted in the same field</td>
<td>Four years between the same crop planted in the same field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Matter Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add crop residues only</td>
<td>Add animal manures + crop residues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add animal manures + crop residues</td>
<td>Add cover crops, animal manures, + crop residues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add cover crops, animal manures, + crop residues</td>
<td>Add compost, cover crops, + crop residues to soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Fertilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast bagged fertilizer in fall</td>
<td>Broadcast bagged fertilizer in spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast bagged fertilizer in spring</td>
<td>Band and side dress fertilizer to match timing of crop uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band and side dress fertilizer to match timing of crop uptake</td>
<td>Rely on N from organic residues, in addition to timely fertilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insect Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar spray insecticides (on predetermined schedule)</td>
<td>Scout for insect pests, then spray non-selective insecticide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scout for insect pests, then spray non-selective insecticide</td>
<td>Scout for insect pests, then spray selective, least-toxic pesticide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scout for insect pests, then spray selective, least-toxic pesticide</td>
<td>Use cultural practices and beneficial insects to control pests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply herbicides as primary weed control tool</td>
<td>Apply reduced rates of herbicide and cultivate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply reduced rates of herbicide and cultivate</td>
<td>Cultivate to remove weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate to remove weeds</td>
<td>Use allelopathy, smother crops, and mulches to suppress weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply fungicide on a pre-determined schedule (e.g., weekly)</td>
<td>Use disease modeling to time fungicide applications as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use disease modeling to time fungicide applications as needed</td>
<td>Employ cultural practices that prevent disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ cultural practices that prevent disease</td>
<td>Plant disease-resistant cultivars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Production Practices for Sustainable Livestock Enterprises

Like sustainable crop production, sustainable livestock production involves a wide range of production practices which are acceptable for Countrywide Initiative farms. Initiative farmers are free to choose among literally hundreds of specific management options related to livestock species, breeds, genetics, facilities, feeds and feeding, grazing systems, health care, butchering and processing, marketing, and so forth – provided those choices result in human care of all farm animals during the course of their lives, and provided that the environmental consequences of the livestock enterprise are positive.

**Animal Welfare**

Countrywide Initiative livestock operations must use what are generally referred to as loose confinement systems. That is, poultry are not caged, swine are not tightly crated, beef cattle are not packed into feedlots, and dairy cattle are not confined to small exercise areas. All livestock must have regular access to open air and pasture. All livestock facilities must be properly ventilated and provide animals with clean, dry rest areas (sheltered from wind during cold weather). Each proposer/lessee is responsible for recommending specific livestock management practices for CVCC/CVNP review and approval.

**Grass-based Livestock Production**

In simplest terms, Countrywide Initiative livestock enterprises are expected to be grass-based. Plant scientist and grazing researcher E. Ann Clark, University of Guelph (Ontario, Canada), describes certain recent concepts of grass-based farming as attempts to mimic or mirror natural processes. In nature, there is no waste, because the output of every process constitutes the inputs for other processes. In contrast, conventional livestock production systems (which depend on specialized crop production to support livestock fed in confinement) break many of the natural cycles that protect ecological systems.
Clark notes that properly managed grass-based livestock production will mimic nature in at least five key ways, which are described below in a simplified form. Fuller, technical discussions by Clark and others are available in publications on sustainable livestock production by the Natural Resource, Agriculture, and Engineering Services (NRAES), a consortium of the Cooperative Extension Services of thirteen eastern land grant universities and the United States Department of Agriculture.

1. Ground Cover. Perennial pastures provide year-round ground cover protecting bare soil from crusting, pored clogging, and the erosive effects of rainfall. Ground cover acts as a mulch, reducing moisture loss, stabilizing daily soil temperatures, and inhibiting weeds and insects associated with annual plowing (which are conventionally treated with herbicides). Note: The sustainable crop production practices described in this appendix also ameliorate many of the problems related to conventional annual plowing.

2. Soil Conservation. Perennial pastures grow and contribute to soil organic matter from early spring to late fall. Moreover, uncultivated land promotes the accumulation of organic matter and nutrients frequently lost during conventional cultivation. This enhances a vigorous soil biotic community and strong plant growth. In turn, that enhances water infiltration and reduces runoff, thereby reducing soil erosion and off-site contamination.

3. Nutrient Cycling. Perennial sods reduce the risk of off-site pollution through efficient nutrient cycling. They provide active nutrient uptake during high precipitation in early spring and late fall (in marked contrast to annual crops). Grassland impedes overland movement of water (hence the use of grass waterways). And deep-rooted pasture plants (like alfalfa) intercept and take up beneficial nutrients (which could become pollutants if they were to percolate past the plant root zone).

4. Manure. Livestock produce manure—a valuable source of nutrients (in limited quantities) on a well-integrated farm. But manure is a huge waste/contamination problem for confined feeding operations. In most large-scale livestock enterprises, where most of the livestock feed comes from off-site, there is little possibility that the site can absorb the manure generated. Initiative livestock enterprises will be expected to match livestock numbers to both the grazing capacity and the manure utilization capacity of a particular farm site. Note: It is also assumed that properly managed grass-based farms do not allow livestock direct access to streams or ponds, thereby avoiding water pollution and bank collapse/erosion.

5. Biocide Independence. Well-managed perennial pastures do not require any type of pesticide or herbicide.

In short, properly managed grass-based livestock production removes several serious environmental harms which frequently result from conventional, grain-based, close-confinement systems. Grass-based systems are well suited to the type of small scale, diversified farming preferred for the Countryside Initiative.

Additionally, proposers should be aware of two specific management practices commonly used in grass-based farming appropriate and preferred for Countryside Initiative enterprises—management intensive grazing and multi-species grazing.

1. Management Intensive Grazing. One of the key tools of grass-based livestock production is commonly termed management intensive grazing (MIG). The key word here is management: MIG is knowledge and labor intensive, not capital, chemical, or technology intensive. Indeed, some of today’s finest graziers describe the management of soil, plants, livestock, weather, market demand, and other factors, as an art. That is an apt term for the depth of understanding, and creative adjustments, required to balance and guide so many subtle factors toward desirable ends.

Traditional/conventional pasture management in America has been anything but management intensive—an art form. Traditional/conventional pasture management is often termed continuous grazing. The basic strategy here is to do nothing: Turn livestock into a pasture for the entire season, letting them pick and choose to eat whatever, and wherever they like. The many economic and ecological drawbacks to this practice need not be detailed here.

MIG systems operate at the opposite end of the sustainable grazing spectrum, using what is usually called rotational grazing or strip grazing. Here livestock are moved from one grazing paddock or area to another every day or so (every few hours in some systems), depending on how a grazier chooses to balance the many factors involved. It is important to note that rotational grazing actually allows animal stocking rates from two to ten times as high per acre as continuous grazing—while avoiding the overgrazing problems commonly associated with continuous grazing.

2. Multi-species Grazing. The Initiative will encourage multi-species grazing in its various forms (grazing sheep, goats, cattle, and poultry sequentially or together). Multi-species grazing pushes pasture ecosystems toward diversity, complexity, and stability—which simultaneously reduce herd/block disease and parasite pressure, and market cycle risks associated with single species production.

In summary, the basic tenet of the Countryside Initiative is that, in addition to the economic viability of good farming, there must be a management-intensive approach to improve the environment so that it can continue to support the successful operation of a viable farm.
Appendix C

TYPICAL BUDGET CATEGORIES, DETAILS, AND FORMAT

The generalized operational budget form/format shown below suggests the kind of financial details proposers should supply to demonstrate a grasp of their enterprise's financial requirements. However, this form presents financial information in a highly summarized way, and greater detail would strengthen a proposal; evaluators need to understand how proposers computed or estimated each line item. Since any proposed budget, at this point, must be quite tentative and speculative, proposal evaluators will want to be certain that proposers know how to generate hard, accurate numbers that they (the proposers) could act on.

This simplified budget form makes no attempt to fit enterprise income and expenses into a larger family/household budget, or vice versa. However, it will be helpful to proposal evaluators to understand what the enterprise will contribute to the financial support of the family/household. Or conversely, what the family/household's other financial resources are expected to contribute to the farming enterprise.

Note: The budget categories shown below are merely intended to represent a plausible mix of activities for a diversified initiative farm. It is assumed that the line items of any budget submitted with an actual proposal will vary considerably from these hypothetical line items.

Capital investments for buildings, ponds, fences, equipment, etc., will be highly individualized. Proposers should provide reasonable cost estimates for expected improvements, and indicate their source of financing. Such improvements should be treated as a brief capital budget, separate from the operating budget. (However, such improvements/investments may result in significant annual fixed expenses, which will appear in the operating budget.)

TYPICAL ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pick Your Own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery/labor hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants/seeds/seed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmstand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeding Stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/fodder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles &amp; equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable sheds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences/pens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Operating Expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/fliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' market fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FARM EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Net Return</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Farm income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farm Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit (loss)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HDA Photo Collection © 2008. Reproduction or use of pictorial content from the HDA Photo Collection in any manner is prohibited without written permission.
Historic photographs provided by Cuyahoga Valley National Park and Peninsula Library & Historical Society.
PURPOSE OF THE RURAL LANDSCAPE MAP

This map, though highly simplified, is intended to convey a fuller sense of the complex mosaic of land ownership and use in Cuyahoga Valley National Park, including specific agricultural usage.

This portion of the Cuyahoga Valley was blanketed by small farms in the early 20th century, covering over 80% of the landscape. This map dramatically identifies how little salvable farmland remains. Roughly 7% of federal property and 4% of the park as a whole.

The Countryside Initiative should be understood as just one of several management tools/programs used by CVNP to manage the diverse rural landscape features of the park.

MAP KEY

CVNP Agricultural Structures *

▲ NP Properties available for RLM use
● Non-NP Properties available for RLM use
* May represent a forested complex

CVNP owned Agricultural Open Space - Current Use

Special Use Permit (SUP)
Other Short Term Agreements (NSA, CA)
Long Term Agreements (LTA, FLA, LA)
Visitors Management (NPS Meeting)
None - Proposed for CPA
None - Proposed for Habitat Management

Other Agricultural Lands in CVNP

NP Agricultural Open Space Elements
Non-NP Agricultural Lands in CVNP

Other Non - Agricultural Lands in CVNP

Federal Land in Park
Non-Federal Land in Park

Explanation of Abbreviations:

CVNP = Cuyahoga Valley National Park
NPS = National Park Service
CI = Countryside Initiative
SUP = Special Use Permit
NSA = Memorandum of Understanding
NP = National Register of Historic Places
CA = Cooperative Agreement
LTA = Historic Properties Leasing Program
MLH = Nonhistoric Lease
RLM = Rural Landscape Management
Back to the Future

"Some folks have a hard time believing that the future can be much different, and possibly much better than the past or the present," observes agricultural economist John Ikerd. "In reality the future is almost never like the past or present. The challenge is to help shape a future that we want...".

In the mid 20th century, humankind (energetically led by Americans) embarked on a radical, grand-scale experiment with food production and distribution—based on concepts and methods derived from the industrial revolution of the 19th century. It seemed like a good idea at the time. In retrospect, it seems less so. Growing food using large-scale industrial production methods, and distributing it over vast distances increasingly appears misguided. In general, it results in generic foods of inferior taste, limited diversity, and lowered nutritional value. More often than not, such production and distribution systems degrade the communities and environment where they occur.

While these might seem like good and sufficient reasons to abandon the grand experiment with industrial food production, our enormous economic and intellectual investment in this paradigm guarantees equally enormous inertia and resistance to charting a different course. Still, change will come. In the near-term, transitioning to ways of food production and distribution which are smaller and more local will be a matter of consumer driven choice—desire for better food, more vibrant communities, a healthier environment. In the not-so-distant future (twenty years or less), rescaling and reorganizing food production and distribution will cease to be a matter of choice. Industrial style food production and distribution cannot exist without massive inputs of cheap fossil fuel energy—and that appears virtually certain to become a memory.

The farms of the Countryside Initiative are, of course, intended to finally achieve the hope and intent of Cuyahoga Valley National Park's founders: Prevent the disappearance of the Cuyahoga Valley's rural landscape and rural character. But they are also part of an emerging national grassroots movement to change the way 21st century America thinks about boys, and uses food. They are an attempt to model a different future—a future possibly much better than the past or present.