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INTRODUCTION

During the summer of 2015, I will be engaged in a 12 week internship with the University of Wisconsin Extension (UW Extension) for St. Croix County in Baldwin, Wisconsin. My engagement as the Local Foods Intern will serve as the capstone to my Environmental Studies degree and will be my first dip into a post-graduation career possibility. Throughout this internship, I will primarily be working on supporting the Horticulture Educator for St. Croix County on assessing and promoting a local food system in the greater St. Croix County region of Western Wisconsin. With a full-time position as the Local Foods Intern, I will be able to concentrate on several aspects of this community’s goals for creating a stronger local food system. My primary responsibility as a member of the St. Croix County Extension team is to help local agricultural producers and consumers develop connections, which will ultimately lead to greater market opportunities and exposure for the county’s farmers and increased local food accessibility opportunities for consumers.

Interning with UW Extension this summer is my first chance to apply my academic concentration in food, land and community to a situation where my skills are highly valued and utilized in the workforce. I look forward to developing many working skills in community organizing, website building, development of educational materials, fundraising and event organizing, and community engagement. I’m looking forward to feeling empowered by my existing skills from both academia and personal life, and actively applying them to an organization that appreciates them. The academic courses that I anticipate I’ll draw from most during this internship are ENVS 295 Real Cost of Food, PSS 295 Organic Grain Production and ENVS 197 Positive Resistance skills.

In Eric Garza’s Real Cost of Food, I gained a more methodical understanding of the way the food system works in regard to energy and economy, rather than social and political. It was in Real Cost of Food that I first learned about the offerings of the university extension system. From Real Cost of Food, I gathered information on how producers perceive energy use on farms, and how economic decisions are made with or without regard to environmental costs. This is an important concept to keep in mind as I
work with producers in St. Croix County whom are both small scale organic farmers and large scale crop farmers that make farm decisions based on different sets of economic and ethical values.

In PSS 295, Organic Grain Production, with Jack Lazor, I was exposed to technical agricultural jargon and agricultural mechanization. Having a basic understanding on agricultural equipment is necessary for my internship this summer, as I will be interacting with many farmers who use these implements. Academics aside, I learned invaluable lessons by interacting with a passionate farmer such as Jack, and by attending the UVM Extension Organic Grain Conference as his guest. I was able to talk to many grain farmers about their experiences, challenges, and hopes and will be able to apply the social interactive skills with this group of people and the information I gleaned from them to the Wisconsin farmers that I work for this summer. I will be able to offer small scale Wisconsin farmers the advice and resources that are available to many of Vermont’s farmers who operate on a nationally smaller scale and who are widely supported by Extension on that scale. Whereas in Wisconsin, support for small scale farmers is not mainstream, and is in growing demand.

My STS course, Positive Resistance, has helped me to better understand the injustices and inequalities related to food production, access, and politics. From this experiential course, I was able to develop my skills in facilitating difficult and sensitive discussions around race, class, gender and privilege as well as to reflect on my own position in regards to these things. I will utilize this skill when addressing some of the challenging topics in agriculture today. My position as local foods intern will lead me to address these topics as I make decisions for the county on how to move forward with their local foods movement. Equally, I will have to facilitate similar discussions with both community members and my UW Extension team. I will keep my knowledge on race, class, gender and privilege at hand when working on promoting local food consumption in a rural community. I foresee using my ability to facilitate challenging discussion while working with the highly polarized groups of organic farmers and conventional farmers in this region of Wisconsin when appropriate.

While not strictly an academic experience, I would consider my involvement in the greater Burlington area’s local food system a large part of the skills I bring to this
internship. The combination of both being a consumer and working with producers in Burlington area has allowed me to appreciate the strong local foods model that exists in the state. I am looking forward to sharing examples of Burlington’s food system with my new Wisconsin community. When considering the projects I will be working on this summer to promote local foods in the county, I will draw on the community events that I felt were successful in cultivating community around local foods in Burlington.

**Personal Objectives:**
- Fulfill my ENVS 202 requirements so that this internship may serve as my Environmental Studies Senior Capstone
- Gain experience working for an organization that is actively working to preserve rural lives, livelihoods, and communities
- Practice integrating myself into a community that I am working to accurately represent
- Building communication and outreach skills
- Experience the ways in which multi-stakeholder projects involving government, institution, and non-governmental groups work to achieve the same goal
- Understand barriers to food access for consumers and barriers to food marketing for producers in a geographic region where local and organic food production (direct-to-consumer marketing) is still very much an “alternative” option.
- Promote race-class-gender equity in my approach to creating projects/programs/events
- Create projects, events, programs that encourage the growth of local food movement in the county
- Set up a system of continuity for these projects, events, and programs so that they may be continued into the future

**Organizational Objectives:**
- Help build connections between local food producers and consumers
- Facilitate food preservation educational opportunities
- Assess educational needs of farmers market vendors and market managers in terms of local food promotion
• Coordinate activities that help all types of farmers communicate their story to the non-agricultural public

BACKGROUND

Overview of the Environmental Field

Agriculture in the United States is dominated by large scale, industrialized farms that are highly dependent on non-renewable carbon emitting fossil fuels (Tilman, 1999). The rise of industrial agriculture in the mid twentieth century in the United States was considered a success based on profits and calorie productivity, but reaps extreme long term and complex environmental impacts such as soil erosion, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, water use and contamination. Today’s dominant industrialized agriculture system has serious impacts on both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and human health. These impacts extend past field borders and trickle down to create far-reaching marginal conditions for the environment and society (Schaible & Aillery, 2013; Union of Concerned Scientists, 2014).

The agriculture sector’s affect on water use and quality is complex. Eighty-percent of available water in the US is used on 300 million acres of agricultural lands (Environmental Protection Agency, 2012). The intensity of water use in agriculture is difficult both on the ecosystem and on the farmers that are attempting to maintain profitability while paying more for a limited supply of water.

The National Water Quality Inventory in the United States reported that nonpoint source pollution (NPS) from agriculture is the biggest threat to water quality of rivers and lakes, is the third most impactful source of pollution to estuaries and wetlands, and is a major contributor to the contamination of ground and surface water (Environmental Protection Agency, 2012). Common practice in industrialized agriculture systems that cause NPS include confined animal feeding operations, over-grazing, intensification and homogenization of cropping systems, plowing, pesticide and herbicide spraying, and fertilizing. The main NPS pollutants are sedimentation, nutrient, pathogen, pesticide and salt runoff (Schaible & Aillery, 2013).
Agriculture both affects and is effected by our changing climate. Agriculture is a major contributor to global GHG emissions, both in crop and livestock production. Some of the direct emissions from agriculture include nitrous oxide from synthetic and manure fertilizers and methane from enteric fermentation of livestock. The indirect emissions include fossil fuel use in farm machinery, the production of agrochemicals and the disruption of carbon sinks. In total, the agricultural sector represents between 17 and 32% of all global anthropocentric GHG emissions (Bellarby, Foereid, Hastings, & Smith, 2008).

If the current system of industrialized agriculture continues to expand as rapidly, the composition, diversity and functionality of the landscape will be significantly compromised. These changes will reduce the availability of life-supporting ecosystem services that society as a whole relies on. A response to the current industrialized agriculture system has been a recent shift towards ecological farming practices in the United States. These practices aim at improving soil organic matter, improving cropland management, reducing dependency on non-renewable energy, and maintaining natural ecosystems in order to decrease the contribution to global climate change, as well as to increase resiliency to climate changes that are currently effecting agriculture already (Bellarby et al., 2008).

**Key Concepts**

**Agricultural Extension Services**

The establishment of public land grant universities and state agricultural schools began with the passing of the Morrill Act in 1862 (Bidwell & Falconer, 1941). Years after the creation of these schools, a missing link was beginning to form between the professors of agricultural colleges and working farmers in their respective states (Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant System, 1995). The 1914 Smith-Lever Act was a federal mandate that established agricultural extension services, which were created to fill this gap. Scientific research and outreach staff were employed as part of the extension team at land grant universities. Extension employees or “agents” serve the agricultural community by “extending” or communicating knowledge and services to producers. Extension is a multidisciplinary
network that acts in accordance with and separately from land grant universities. Agricultural extension is a way to provide support, advice, and educational experiences to agricultural producers throughout each state (Kumar Das & Tripathi, 2014).

**Food System**

A food system is defined as all of the processes involved in providing human nourishment and health from food production, processing, packaging, transportation, marketing, consuming, and waste or disposal of food and byproducts of food (Chase & Grubinger, 2014; Cornell University, 2014). However, a food system is not as linear as the process from start-to-finish products, it is a complex web of interactions of people, resources, and behaviors (Chase & Grubinger, 2014). Additionally, it is influenced by social, political, economic and environmental resources (Cornell University, 2014). The dominant food system model in the US and throughout the world is the global food system model, although a food system can function at individual, household, local, regional, or national levels (Chase & Grubinger, 2014). Our dominant food system has many negative social, economic and environmental externalities that are not included in the market value of food products. Some of these externalities include compromised human health from consumption of nutrient deficient foods, vast amounts of food waste, unequal food distribution and hunger, and labor injustices to name a few (Oxfam International, 2014). An example of the complexity of the global food system can be seen in the way that cheap food prices have negative externalities. Mainstream American interactions with the food system occur at the consumer level, where a person will spend on average 10% or less of their disposable income (relatively very small compared to American wealth) on food products. What is expressed as cheap food prices in the United States may be directly tied with unequal labor practices or unsustainable agricultural production in other intersections of the food system. Inexpensive food prices do not accurately reflect the external costs of the globalized food system on economy, society, and the environment. When both human and environmental (external) costs are accounted for in the food system, the economic results are greater than the market value of the food on the shelf (Chase & Grubinger, 2014).
A response to the globalization and inherent nature of the current dominant food system has been to transition to a more holistic assessment of the system through local, regional, or community based food systems. A local food system model differs from a global food system model in that it tends towards incorporating holistic social and environmental equity as main objectives. Four categories that differentiate local food systems from a global food system are food security, proximity, self-sufficiency, and sustainability (Cornell University, 2014). An over-arching goal of a more localized food system is to attempt to bridge the growing gap between consumers and their food sources.

**Family Farms**

Defining a family farm can be complex and based on both qualitative and quantitative features. The most current USDA definition of a family farm is one in which the majority of the business is owned by the operator and relatives of the operator by blood, marriage, or adoption (Economic Research Service, 2014a). Although the definition of a family farm has changed somewhat over time, the share of American farms classified as family farms has changed little since 1996, ranging from 97.1 to 98.3 percent of all farms (Economic Research Service, 2014b). In Wisconsin, over 80 percent of farm operators refer to their farms as “family farms (Slesinger & Whitaker, 1995; University of Wisconsin - Extension, 2014).” According to rural sociologists Wilkening (1981), Garkovitch, Bokemeir and Foote (1995), family farms have a few defining characteristics including:

- Reliance on family labor
- Ownership of land
- Identification with being self employed
- Combination of economic enterprise with “a way of life”

Family farms have remained the dominant agricultural production type over agribusiness since the mid twentieth century. However, family farms don’t carry the same economic power and stability as agribusiness. In general throughout the United States, a trend in agriculture has been the decline in number of farms and increase in farm size (Economic Research Service, 2014b).
In the last decade, there has been a movement to support family farms with the renewed interest in local food production. There is however some level of deceit in the term “family farm,” especially as it’s associated with other non-inherent concepts such as “local” or “organic.” While family farms may be small scale, organic, and keep distribution local, these traits are not inherent to a family farm. Just the same, a local farm may be an agribusiness operation, and can’t be inherently associated with family farming, small scale or organic certifications.

**Current Trends**

**Local Food**

As a reaction to anti-globalization activism of the late 1990s, “locavores” (consumers who support the revival of small scale, local, and sustainable or ecologically minded farms) have generated demand for a new and vibrant food economy in the United States in the last five years (Rudy, 2012). These consumers are willing to pay more for local or organic foods, as compared to conventionally grown foods. The market sectors for local, ecologically grown and USDA certified organic agricultural products are seeing growth with the locavore movement across the nation. Yet, this interest is not equally felt across the United States, with local food sales tending to be stronger in the Northeast and Northwest and weaker in the South and Midwest (Chase & Grubinger, 2014). With this interest, brings attractive opportunities for producers to fill these consumer-desired niches. It is important to understand what characterizes “local” food and organic food so that producers can capitalize on the economic benefits, and so that consumers can easily identify and access producers with a level of transparency.

Defining “local” can be both in terms of physical distance traveled between production and consumption and can be based on the market arrangement of produce sales such as in direct-to-consumer strategies like community supported agriculture (CSA). The 2008 Congressional Food, Conservation and Energy Act defined local food as a classification that can only be given when a product is, “…less than 400 miles from its origin, or within the state in which it is produced (Martinez et al., 2010).” The federal statutory definition of local is not the same definition that all states subscribe to, let alone individual local food advocates, but is one that fits a broader context. Individual states
like Vermont and Illinois have created their own criteria for local food regulation. On an even smaller scale, individual advocates for local food consumption and production typically create personal boundaries of “local food,” including the “100-mile diet” (Chase & Grubinger, 2014). Local food is a subjective concept, and can vary greatly depending on the food production and access opportunities in a specific household, community or region.

Local food is a small but growing trend. The rise in this trend is clearly seen when considering several statistics. The number of farmers’ markets in the country rose from 1,755 in 1994, to over 5,700 in 2009. Additionally, direct-to-consumer marketing sales went from $551 million to $1.2 billion in the last decade, and CSA operations increased from just 400 documented farms in 2005, to estimates exceeding 1,400 in 2009. Locally marketed food is more popular among producers who are located near metropolitan areas. In addition to location, farms that market their food as local are typically smaller (with less than $50,000 in total farm sales), have diversified production, and actively perform each step of the marketing process from packing to distribution (Martinez et al., 2010).

**Demand For Organic**

As compared to local food, organic food is a separate, yet oftentimes overlapping trend that many consumers and producers are attracted to. Both ethical and economic incentives drive this form of production, which seeks to maintain the integrity of the environment, public health, human communities, and animal welfare through sustainable agricultural practices (National Young Farmers Coalition, 2014). Following the Organic Foods Production Act of the 1990 Farm Bill, the USDA set national standards for the production of organically grown agricultural products, the National Organic Program, for which organic is defined as a production system that promotes and improves biodiversity, biological cycles, soil biological activity and uses minimal off-farm inputs (Gold, 2007). Upon the creation of this national standard for organic certification, producers who fit into this category of production are to go through the certification process in order to be legally allowed to market their product as “organic”. The process of certification works well for some producers, but has proven to be very timely and costly for others. As a reaction to the barriers that the USDA certification process poses to many producers,
grassroots certification programs have been created in order to allow farmers whose practices meet or exceed organic certification standards to participate in the alternative market (GRACE Communications Foundation, 2015).

Some level of confusion has been introduced at the consumer level on the legitimacy of organic food production. The issue of consumer misinformation or confusion about source and quality of food products, is currently being met by another growing movement—"know your farmer," where consumers are encouraged to meet their producers to learn first-hand about their production methods.

**Farm Succession/Transfer Planning**

In the United States, the average age of farmers hovers at around 57 years old. The aging farmer population has many implications for both the individual farmers and greater national food security. Trends suggest that the age of farm operators will continue to increase, while the young farmer population will steadily fall. In 1950, there were 956,318 young farm operators in the country, but by 2007 there were only 118,613 farmers under the age of 36. Farmland ownership is highly concentrated in the hands of an older generation of farmers with 40 percent of the farmland owners over the age of 70.18, and less than 2 percent under the age of 35 (Shute, 2011).

Planning for farm business succession or farm transfer is a growing and time-sensitive trend in agricultural communities across the nation. "Farm succession" and "farm transfer" both address the passing of the farm business down to a new generation. Farm succession typically refers to the interfamilial passing down of the farm, while farm transfer typically refers to the passing down of the management to another party. Succession planning and transfer planning differ slightly in connotation as succession planning is more socially oriented and transfer planning is more oriented towards legal and economic decision making (Chase & Grubinger, 2014).

Some of the challenges of farm succession: Planning for farm succession can take a number of years (Hachfeld, Bau, & Holcomb, 2014) and many if not most farms do not have an already identified successor to inherit the farm (Chase & Grubinger, 2014). The consequences of not having a farm succession plan can cause a farm family to parcel out the land, sell the farm or parts of it, pay inheritance taxes, or cause financial instability in
old age (Chase & Grubinger, 2014). There is a substantial amount of wealth embedded in a farm operation that needs to be appropriately dealt with during the transition to the next generation. A 2001 survey determined that on average farm households had net worth of $545,869 compared to non-farm households at $395,500 (Shute, 2011). Financial challenges are not the only implications of lack of farm transfer planning. Making decisions about the future use or selling of farmland or business operation can be emotionally influenced by family members, long-term attachment to land, and financial security of the operators (Mishra, Johnson, & Morehart, 2003). According to Mishra, Johnson & Morehart (2003), there are four factors that have the most significant effect on farm succession/transfer:

- Farm operator/owner’s age
- Farm size
- Net worth
- Successor’s ability to farm successfully

The options for farm succession/transfer can be generally categorized as:

- Rent the farm
- Sell the farm
- Management turnover
- Make another use of farmland

A 1995 survey concluded that nationally, only 27 percent of farmers identified with having a succession plan. Of this small sect, 87 percent of them indicated that a farm successor has been determined, and many of the successors were family members (Mishra et al., 2003). Historically, the viability of a family farm was reliant on intergenerational familial succession. However in more recent study done by National Young Farmers’ Coalition, about 78 percent, of today’s beginning farmers are first generation (Shute, 2011). Therefore, the system of familial succession is becoming less relevant, and new methods of farm transition are in need of creation and standardization. Farm transfer planning requires a team of professionals to aid in the process. These team members include an attorney, an accountant, a financial planner and an Extension farm management specialist. The most important factor at this time is to begin the conversation
and process of farm transfer if farms want to continue to be viable. Some of the negative far-reaching impacts of not prioritizing farm succession plans include:

- Consolidation of land
- Atrophying of rural culture, communities, and economies
- Further development of urban and suburban sprawl
- Decrease in food security
- Increase susceptibility to wildlife habitats

THE SPONSORING ORGANIZATION

Project Place and Purpose

St. Croix County – University of Wisconsin Extension is one of 72 extension offices in the state of Wisconsin. The University of Wisconsin Extension (UWEX) system provides access to university resources and research for statewide residents in six areas of concentration: 4-H Youth Development, Agriculture, Family Living, Community Development, Horticulture and Nutrition Education. The St. Croix County UWEX office is located in Baldwin, Wisconsin and represents St. Croix County and works with agricultural producers and residents. St. Croix County is located along the western border of the state of Wisconsin, adjacent to the St. Croix River, which separates Wisconsin from the Minnesota border. Twenty-one towns are incorporated into St. Croix County (see appendix for map and town list).

Agriculture has a very large presence in the county in the forms of cropland, rangeland, pastureland, tree farms, and forest products. According to the 2012 Agricultural Census, there are 1, 417 documented farms in the county, with an average farm size of 189 acres. The agricultural industry accounts for 58 percent (267,685 acres) of land ownership and use, employs 8.6% of the workforce, and generates $551 million in annual economic activity in St. Croix County. Historically, the dominant agricultural industry in the county been in dairy farming, and this trend maintains its dominance and importance for the county today. Although the county had a 22 percent loss of its farms between 2007 and 2012 (a very typical trend among agricultural landscapes nation-wide) there has been relative expansion in beef production, cash grain crops, diversified vegetable production, and direct farm-to-market produce sales. The county is in close
proximity to Minneapolis and St. Paul, which offers growing urban market opportunities for diversified producers who do direct farm-market or CSA sales (University of Wisconsin-Extension, 2014).

The mission of Extension in each county is to develop practical educational resources that specifically address local interest:

"We teach, learn, lead and serve, connecting people with the University of Wisconsin, and engaging with them in transforming lives and communities."

Structure & Staff

St. Croix County Extension employees are academic staff of the University of Wisconsin and are county-based educators who live within the communities they serve. These academic staff members are experts in agriculture, agribusiness, horticulture, economic development, natural resources and family and youth services. They seek to extend their knowledge to the community in these areas of concentration. Traditionally in the past, Extension staff have been referred to as “agents.” While some Extension staff prefer this term, others have adopted the title of “educator” instead. It is important to note that both terms describe the same position within Extension. St. Croix County Extension employees are well-integrated into the community and are generally very well trusted by the producers to work to benefit their lives and livelihoods. St. Croix County Extension and local businesses, interest groups, institutions, and government organizations collaborate in planning and implementing programs and events in the county ("County Offices," 2015).

The programs run by UW-Extension are state-wide, although there are specific projects that each county may concentrate on. The main programs offered in St. Croix County include:

- Agriculture
- 4-H Youth Development
- Community Development
- Family Living
- Nutrition Education
- Horticulture
St. Croix County Extension in Baldwin is just one of 71 county extension offices in the state. The Extension team consists of seven educators and two administrative assistants. There is an educator for each program offered by Extension. The educator whom I’ll be working most closely with during my internship is Heidi Doering, the Commercial Horticulture Educator. However, I will also be working with Ryan Sterry, the Agriculture Agent and Joan Sprain, the Family Living Agent on various projects.

The Agricultural agent for the county, Ryan Sterry, and works specifically with dairy, livestock, and crop producers on farm viability and profitability. The Commercial Horticulture Educator, Heidi Doering, works to support profitable horticultural businesses through education in local foods marketing, small business management, and greenhouse & nursery management. Joan Sprain, the Family Living Agent, works to support strong and functional families through education in finance management, responsible citizenry and community service opportunities. Family Living has two additional team members, Mary Lestrud and Sarah Johnson, the Nutrition Educators who work on issues such as food accessibility, preservation, and healthy eating. The Community, Natural Resource and Economic Development Agent, Eric Biltonen, works on addressing challenges that the community or organizations face economically or developmentally. Heather Vierling is the 4-H Youth Development Agent who works with the youth in the county on 4-H project training and leadership training (St. Croix County University of Wisconsin Extension, 2015).

METHODS

Objective 1: Coordinate activities that help develop connections between local food producers and consumers in St. Croix County, which ultimately lead to greater market access for producers and equal food accessibility opportunities for consumers.

1) Create local food access map and website for St. Croix County residents so that they may easily locate local producers and markets for local products.
   a. Conduct an informal feasibility study to collect information on best-use options for our organization’s needs for a map through review of similar materials that other organizations have created.
b. Survey community members to determine what information to include on the webpage/map that would be most useful to them.

c. Compile a document of elements to include on our webpage/map.

d. Work with a staff member competent in GIS or cartography and a webmaster of UWEX website or webpage creator to blend the map with an interactive website that includes relevant local food systems information.

2) Coordinate and manage farm tour and bike event, 1st Annual Farm Pedal

a. Communicate with local cyclists from the county and from the Twin Cities area to determine interest in cycling event participation and expected size of event.

b. Call and email local farmers to determine interest, commitment, compensation, infrastructure, farm tour plan, lunch and snacks etc.

c. Contact local vendors (brewery, musicians, chefs) for the final ‘celebration.’

d. Determine cycling route, date of event, and funding (sponsors)/registration.

e. Advertise throughout St. Croix, Pierce, Dunn, Polk counties and Twin Cities (postering, phone calls, farmers’ markets).

f. Hold 2 meetings with all involved stakeholders prior to mid-August event.

Objective 2: Organize activities and provide resources for local farmers that help them communicate their stories to the community

1) Feature local St. Croix County producers in a short-film video series.

a. Send out listserv email and make phone calls to producers to determine the interest in participating.

b. If time, do an initial meeting with the producers to determine availability and interests for interview/filming.

c. Visit each farm to film and informally interview

d. Edit videos, share with producers
e. Post videos to Facebook pages of producers, Extension website, local food
access website, play while tabling at farmers’ markets.

2) Site visits to several area farms
   a. Meet with primary farm operators on their farms
   b. Tour farms to understand production and methods of production
   c. Inquire about any problems they may face as small farmers, and what
      (if any) resources they would like to receive from UW Extension
   d. Relay that information back to Heidi at the office for future follow up
      with these farmers

Objective 3: Visit local farmers’ markets to understand the educational needs of market
vendors, managers and consumers.

1) Site visits to many if not all markets in the area at least once, and determine
   which market(s) to target for future activities.
   a. Survey vendors, consumers and interview managers (see appendix for
      example of interview questions).
   b. Observe the market environment through watching, listening and interacting
      with consumers and vendors

2) Table at county area farmers’ markets to promote Extension events and
   initiatives pertaining to local food promotion, food accessibility, and SNAP
   benefits usage.

PROJECT TIMELINE

The majority of my internship hours will be carried out in the St. Croix County
Extension office in Baldwin, Wisconsin during normal business hours. However, I will
be taking time for various field days and farm visits during these hours as well as some
independent work out of the office. Additionally, I will log hours for various weekend
events such as farmers’ market tabling, Farm City Day, and the county fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly (12 weeks from May 26- August 17)</th>
<th>Total Hours Worked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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