

## Statement of Professional Contributions and Scholarship

Adam A. Hady

Richland County Agriculture Agent UWEX

Richland County is located in southwestern Wisconsin and has strong agricultural and rural lifestyle traditions. The hilly landscape and many streams provide an ideal location for the traditional family farm. Agriculture provides Richland County with 774 million dollars of business sales, and accounts for 68 percent of the total land use within the county (Richland County Agriculture; Value & Economic Impact 2011). Livestock operations in the county are primarily dairy or beef, however, a growing number of farms are becoming more diversified with smaller numbers of livestock. The number of full-time farmers is slowly decreasing. To help address market uncertainties and rising healthcare costs, many farm families now have one or more members working off farm. According to the 2007 United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Agricultural Census, only 37 percent of farms in Richland County had the principal operator working on farm. There are an increasing number of producers who are residential/lifestyle producers and may not fit into a traditional agriculture census data category. Residential/lifestyle producer is a USDA farm classification where a majority of the household income is generated from activities other than agriculture.

In 2005, as the Interim Agriculture Educator, I conducted a county wide needs assessment to better understand the county agricultural picture ([Exhibit 14](#)). I utilized a compilation of producer lists from my predecessor. From that list, surveys were sent to 190 producers, with 53 surveys returned. The initial survey response included 24 producers with beef cattle, 23 producers with dairy cattle, and 12 producers who were utilizing crop acres for cash sales. This survey indicated that an Extension agriculture education program in Richland County should have a major focus on the dairy and livestock production area. Based on survey results, farm management and land use became my second program area. In this program I focused on nutrient management, environmental stewardship, rural life and farm management decision making.

In 2007, as part of a position change (interim to faculty in 2006), I conducted a needs assessment from a subset of the 2005 survey list ([Exhibit 15](#)). This survey focused on educational needs rather than an overview of farms. The response rate was 16 percent of the surveys sent out (n=18). To reach the residential/ lifestyle producers in Richland County I collaborated with one of the feed dealers in Richland Center who caters primarily to this group of producers. I left surveys at the dealer with a drop off box, and had 14 surveys returned ([Exhibit 16](#)). After reviewing these survey sets, I found that farms of differing sizes and commodities had similar needs regarding production and management. The 2007 surveys echoed the findings from the 2005 survey, confirming needs in the areas of programming I had initiated. However, I experienced less demand for nutrient management and land use and a growing interest in sustainable and introductory agricultural practices coming from new landowners and non-traditional producers (producers from a non-agricultural background). With this change in demand, I shifted my educational efforts to two main programs: Dairy and Livestock Production and Addressing the Needs of the Non-Traditional Agricultural Producer.

### Dairy and Livestock Production

Many producers in Richland County are still involved with dairy and livestock production and utilize Extension education to aid production and management decisions. To assess my program impact, I conducted a survey during Private Pesticide Applicator training classes in February of 2011([Exhibit 17](#)) to assess progress of the learning objectives outlined in my multi-year plan of work. This survey showed that 79 percent of the surveyed producers had dairy and livestock enterprises and 70 percent of these dairy and livestock producers indicated they had increased their knowledge of production management through my Extension education materials and programs. Sixty five percent of the dairy and livestock producers

## Statement of Professional Contributions and Scholarship Dairy and Livestock Production (cont.)

indicated they have used information provided by my Extension efforts to make a farm business or marketing decision. Producers received their information during field days, meetings, and through personal contact. The following subprograms have been the major areas of emphasis addressing the educational needs in the area of dairy and livestock production in Richland County.

### ***Dairy Production***

For the Richland County dairy industry, modernization has emerged as an area of need for producers. I conducted modernization tours with cooperation from local producers who have already initiated dairy facility modernization efforts. Since 2006, 140 people have attended tours on five farms. I worked with three individual producers, who have hosted tours, to develop a *Dairy Modernization in Richland County – Producer Profile* factsheet ([Exhibit 7](#)). The profile highlights goals of the modernization projects including project descriptions, timelines, and a comparison of the previous stanchion barn systems that were in place to the milking parlor and loose housing systems that were adopted. This profile is given to tour participants and other clientele as an educational piece to show how the modernization efforts influenced the host farm. The producer profiles allowed me to highlight the long term efficiency and other benefits of a parlor system on a farming operation to other producers who are considering modernizing their milking facilities.

I worked one-on-one with producers on their individual modernization projects. During the one-on-one visits, I help the client identify needs and goals of the operation and provide options to consider that will help meet their objectives. After developing objectives and options an invitation would go to Vance Haugen, Crawford County Agriculture Agent or David Kammel Extension Farm Structures Specialist from the Biological Systems Engineering for a second farm visit. These experts provided technical support for the modernization projects while I worked with producers on follow up questions and concerns. I worked individually with 15 dairy producers over the past four years to help them make decisions on modernization. Seven have moved forward and modernized their operations and six have decided not to move forward or are delaying projects based on the information and resources available to them.

I surveyed five of the dairy farms that I worked with on modernization projects. All five farms modernized their milking facilities, and have shown significant growth in milking efficiencies ([Exhibit 18](#)). Farms surveyed had on average milked 33 cows per hour in their original facilities and by modernizing, were able to increase to 52 cows milked per hour by moving from a stanchion barn to a parlor system. Four of the five farms reported a reduction in total milking time of about 30 minutes. Two farms were able to move from three people milking per shift down to two people per shift, resulting in a sharp increase in the number of cows milked per person per hour, moving from 17 cows per person per hour prior to modernization to 34 cows per person per hour after modernization. With farm labor valued at \$10 per hour, every 30 minute reduction in milking time equates out to a \$3,650 saving per year for the farm. One farm saw a three and a half hour reduction in labor per day as a result of the milking efficiencies from the parlor, which is a potential labor saving of \$25,550 per year.

Three farms also increased the number of cows milked, with one farm expanding from 70 cows to 320 cows. That same farm also reported an increase in milk production from 55 pounds to 72 pounds of milk per cow per day. At a milk price of \$16 per hundredweight, that is an increase in revenue of \$830 per lactation per cow. This farm saw an increase in herd size and overall milk production that helped this family reach a production level which enabled them to hire full time employees and provide themselves with more flexible work schedules, enhancing their quality of family life. Using the UW Department of Agriculture and Applied Economics data of a dairy cow's economic impact contributing \$17,000 per cow, these five farms, added \$5,270,000 in local economic impact as a result of the changes they made under my extension programming.

## Statement of Professional Contributions and Scholarship Dairy and Livestock Production (cont.)

Another modernization effort with a significant impact from my programming was that of a young producer who moved back to the family farm. The farm had been a dairy farm in the past, but was now an organic produce farm and they were raising other livestock. They wanted to return to dairy production but the barn needed significant improvements and updated equipment. I was contacted for information regarding a flat barn parlor. Their initial intentions were to build a flat barn parlor, milk for a few years and then build another parlor system. After working through their goals and determining what resources they had to meet those goals, we visited other farms to view examples of retrofit milking parlors in Richland and Crawford Counties. After the farm visits and determining how to best manage their costs, they retrofitted the existing barn with a low cost swing parlor. They were able to utilize an adjacent open shed area for bedded pack housing for the cows. Through this modernization effort, I was able to help a producer and his family get a start dairying again and he stated, "If it wasn't for Adam's assistance I would probably have spent more money and had less parlor." ([Exhibit 19](#)) If the producers would have followed through with their original plans, they would have spent \$3360<sup>1</sup> per stall on a remodeled flat barn parlor, and then spent the \$3845<sup>2</sup> per stall to get to the current system. By eliminating the flat barn parlor step, the farm saved about \$27,000 on the milking system.

In addition to facilities improvements, I worked with dairy producers in other areas of their business operation. I provided facilitation support for a farm on milk quality as part of the Milk Money Program. This is a program in which Extension acts as a facilitator assisting producers in a team approach to working on milk quality issues. This farm was a 400 cow dairy that was having an issue regarding high somatic cell counts. The team consisted of three members of the farm, their nutritionist, veterinarian, dairy plant field representative, milking equipment consultant and myself. The team identified two objectives to address their goal of reducing somatic cell count: review and improve operating procedures for milking and improve bedding and hygiene in the free stalls. I helped the farm make changes to their standard operating procedures for milking regarding the number of cows prepped at one time and how the teat sanitizer is applied for better coverage and effectiveness. Another major change was the farm moved from several part time employees to fewer full time employees to improve consistency in the milking process. I also conducted a worker training program, and helped the farm develop incentives for the milkers to keep somatic cell counts at the target levels. Freestall management and hygiene problems were addressed by having the farm increase the frequency of adding new sand to the freestall barn and improve stall grooming. As a result of these efforts the farm saw a reduction in somatic cell count from 334,000 to 257,000 in three months. They started receiving a somatic cell count premium of thirteen cents per hundredweight, which added approximately \$1,260 in monthly income to the farm.

I participated in the UW Extension Dairy Team survey, *Intuitive Cost of Production Analysis for Dairy Replacements* (ICPA Report). This survey gathered production information and compared heifer growing systems across Wisconsin providing benchmarks and costs associated with heifer production. I surveyed two producers and collected data that would be used in the final report. This was a rewarding project benefiting my programming efforts. As a newer agent I gained a better understanding of dairy heifer cost of production and was able to utilize this experience when evaluating cost of production in other areas. By being part of the data collection process, I have been able to better serve producers with farm budgeting and had the opportunity to present the survey data at a local feed co-op program titled, Consuming Knowledge. I now collaborate on this annual event to provide an Extension presence to county producers. The ICPA study also enabled me to build a relationship with one of our custom heifer raisers leading to my hosting a custom heifer raising workshop at his facility.

### **Livestock Production**

The Richland County Beef Producers group emerged as one of the strongest producer groups in the county and was a good connection for me as I initiated my early programming. Working with local beef

---

<sup>1</sup> Retrofit construction cost flat barn parlor, 2008 Wisconsin Dairy Modernization Survey, Mayer, Kammel

<sup>2</sup> Retrofit construction cost parabone parlor, 2008 Wisconsin Dairy Modernization Survey, Mayer, Kammel

Statement of Professional Contributions and Scholarship  
Dairy and Livestock Production (cont.)

producers and UW Extension Livestock Team colleagues, I have been able to provide strong programming in beef production. Prior to my work with the Beef Producers, this group was not actively engaged in educational activities for its members. One program I initiated with this group was an annual field day which features an on-farm tour and educational seminars. The program had strong attendance, and addressed many aspects of beef production. I serve on the planning committee and in three of the four years I have been one of the two educational speakers. Topics covered over the past four years include: reproduction, carcass quality and traits, contract grazing/back-grounding, and economics. The program has become popular among county producers drawing 60-80 participants annually. My involvement with the beef producers has helped shape my beef programming and has created strong connections in the community. Through my collaborations I have been able to use these connections in other areas or programs to set up farm tours, speakers, collaborators, and help producers network with one another.

My involvement with the local beef group has spurred me to be a member of the Cattle Feeders Workgroup within the UWEX Livestock Team, where I have been active on the planning team and hosted a location for the statewide cattle feeders program. During the 2008 cattle feeders meetings, I was lead author of a presentation titled: *Economics of Dairy Steer Production* ([Exhibit 13](#)). The presentation focused on the economic impact of steer performance in the feedlot, calculating yardage, and pricing home grown feeds. I presented at five of the nine locations. This program was attended by approximately 170 producers at nine locations around Wisconsin.

Post program surveys (n=100) indicated my presentation resulted in producers increasing their knowledge of how to determine homegrown feed costs, yardage expenses, and how cattle performance impacts production ([Table 1](#)). Fifty-eight participants indicated they would make management changes because of information provided through the program ([Exhibit 20](#)).

**Table 1<sup>3</sup>**

2008 Cattle feeder meetings - Economic Considerations: Dairy Steers (n=100)  
(5 point scale 1=very little knowledge and 5= Extremely Knowledgeable)

	Avg. before workshop	Avg. after workshop
How to determine cost of home grown feed and facilities	2.61	3.85
How to determine yardage	2.21	3.89
How cattle performance impacts production	2.76	4.01

In 2009, the UWRF Survey Research Center conducted a follow up survey on the cattle feeder meetings ([Exhibit 21](#)). This survey indicated 38 percent of respondents (n=85) made management changes as a result of the 2008 cattle feeder clinics. As a follow up to this program, the cattle feeders workgroup of which I am a member, received a risk management grant to survey Wisconsin dairy steer feeders to get benchmark data on yardage costs and labor.

As part of the 2010 statewide cattle feeders program planning team, I developed the presentation *Composting Livestock Mortalities* ([Exhibit 11](#)). I gave this presentation at 11 locations around the state. I developed a fact sheet on composting mortalities as part of the proceedings for this program ([Exhibit 5](#)). To reach a greater number of producers, the fact sheet was condensed as a blog post for the UWEX Beef FYI blog site. The blog post was then picked up by a national blog, Cattle Today ([Exhibit 4](#)), which carries a current circulation of 35,000.

Grazing has been an area of interest to both myself and livestock producers. To address this interest I have collaborated with the NRCS grazing specialist on educational programming and revitalizing the Ocooch Mountain Graziers network. Through collaboration with this group I have been able to plan,

---

<sup>3</sup> Results from the five locations where I presented

## Statement of Professional Contributions and Scholarship Dairy and Livestock Production (cont.)

facilitate, and present at a summer pasture walk series, now in its third year. The walks focus on aspects of grazing including paddock placement, soil fertility and grass and weed species management. Through these pasture walks, I gained insight and knowledge from other grazers and provided technical information from university research. I use the information shared by grazers at the pasture walks to help other producers during one-on-one consultations. This is an area where my programming may increase as livestock farms continue to try to increase production and reduce costs. The main impacts of my grazing program have been a reduction in weeds, better brush management, and an increase of available forage in grazing production. The private pesticide applicator survey showed that 26 percent of survey participants (n=35), who had dairy or livestock felt they had improved the quality of their pastures as a result of the information provided by Extension ([Exhibit 17](#)). Another indicator that focused areas of pasture management practices are being adopted is the number of soil samples that are being brought in through the Extension office. In 2007, only one producer brought in soil samples for pastures. From 2010 to date eight producers have tested pastures through our office. It is too early to measure long term impact, but this increase does indicate producers are adopting nutrient management practices to increase production and improve pasture quality.

### ***Farm Business and Decision Making***

I assisted producers individually as they worked through business decision processes. These have included expansion cost analysis and how to get started in a farming enterprise. I've provided assistance with identifying initial steps for goal setting, decision making, and developing an action plan. FINPACK training allowed me to work through farm budgets with producers as they analyzed modernization projects. A valuable role in this area was helping producers think strategically through a potential change. An example of this process was working with a new beef producer. During initial visits to his property, we assessed the land he had available and through our discussions established areas that would serve as pasture and areas designated for hay production. He purchased a small herd of 12 beef cows. After a year we evaluated the financial performance of the enterprise. Cash flow from the beef cow enterprise was negative. This prompted his desire to expand to 24 head to gain efficiency. I assisted the producer through a simple enterprise budgeting process. Using the UWEX Cow/Calf –Spring Calving Budget, we explored how adding the extra animals would influence his bottom line. The budgeting process showed the addition of the cows would not change or reduce cost of production after subtracting cost of labor, and it would mean adding more debt. Working through the process, the producer, realized that without management changes, expanding herd numbers was not going to result in a positive cash flow. The producer is in the process of keeping better records on cow performance to help make decisions that will improve profitability.

### ***Addressing the Non-Traditional Agricultural Producer***

From 2002 to 2007, Richland County has seen an increase in the number of small acreage farms. US Agricultural Census data indicates Richland County saw an increase in the number of farms less than 100 acres from 540 in 2002 to 758 farms in 2007. As the number of small acreage farms has increased so has the number of rural residential/lifestyle or retirement producers. While their primary income is not from agricultural production, they are still contributing to the nation's food supply. This group has a strong need and desire for education and best management practices. To address educational needs, programs were developed to help this group focus on four main areas: establish husbandry practices needed to support animal agriculture, help them evaluate the production potential of the land they have, evaluate what production system fits them best, and look at ways to enhance revenue on a small scale production system.

## **Beef 101**

The Beef 101 education series started in 2007 as result of a small farm producer survey ([Exhibit 16](#)) and the number of calls I received about general husbandry issues with beef cattle. I taught the basics of beef cattle production in a four part series which I developed. There have been 42 participants since the series started in 2007. Two-thirds of the participants either had no cattle or have had cattle for five years or less. The series generated discussion and was educational for everyone involved, including myself. The first class of the series covered beef enterprises, breeds of beef cattle, and basic enterprise budgeting. Subsequent classes were based on needs of the class (cow/ calf vs. feeders for example) and their specific interests. Topics covered include nutrition, pasture management, health and vaccination, breeding and reproduction, facilities, marketing, and handling.

Through post-class evaluations, participants indicated they would make management changes as a result of the series ([Exhibit 22](#)). The top management change was improving pastures, including incorporation of rotational grazing systems and some form of pasture renovation. Using the post/pre method of evaluation, most producers indicated they had increased their knowledge in the areas of basic business planning, pasture management, feeder and finish cattle marketing, vaccination and calf care, and beef cattle reproduction ([Exhibit 22](#)). Follow up conversations with past participants has shown two producers improved handling facilities for their cattle. Both facility upgrades are the type that will increase safety and animal flow. Another participant indicated he started to rotationally graze his cattle and has implemented a cross breeding program. As a result he feels that his cattle performance has increased significantly. One cow/calf farmer indicated he updated his mission statement for the farm, started to recalculate his cost of production, and increased the number of paddocks in his pasture to move toward a more intense grazing system. Participants indicated topics they would like to see in a Beef 102 class ([Exhibit 22](#)). In addition, participants expressed a desire to have an on farm summer program. This has been a great opportunity for me to expand professionally. The series draws many different opinions on what the beef industry should be and has expanded my way of thinking. The class has given me some valuable insight to alternative marketing, especially grass fed beef markets and direct marketing.

## **Poultry Programs**

With my professional background in poultry production, I have served as a resource on poultry to my Extension colleagues. In 2008, the UW Extension Livestock team initiated a fact sheet series called *Raising Animals-Enriching Life*, with topics designed for rural lifestyle clientele. I was the primary author for the first fact sheet in the series, “Guide to Raising Healthy Chickens” (A3858-01) ([Exhibit 9](#)). The series was printed in both English and Spanish. It has become a popular fact sheet. The Learning Store has had 208 downloads and has sold 256 hard copies of this publication since 2010.

A result of my poultry knowledge is that I have been asked to present on poultry topics outside of the county. The first regional poultry presentation was *Pastured Poultry, Anyone?* which was given as part of the Lancaster Research Station’s Profitable Pastures Field Day in 2008 ([Exhibit 12](#)). In 2010, I was asked to provide a general overview of poultry production in Clark County. I developed a presentation titled *Poultry 101* which addressed breed selection, nutrition, brooding and rearing, poultry housing and systems, general health concerns, biosecurity, and harvesting the birds ([Exhibit 10](#)). Agri-View (a weekly agricultural newspaper) did a three part series on the basics of poultry production based on my presentation. I also presented *Poultry 101* in Sauk County. The two sessions had an attendance of 50 participants. Evaluations from Sauk County (n=28) indicated that there was an increase in knowledge in the subject areas presented ([Exhibit 23](#)). Response to evaluation question number six repeatedly included: “I will either raise more or start raising chickens”. General comments indicated a better understanding of husbandry practices particularly those that relate to space and bedding.

I presented *Poultry 101* at a Southern District Agriculture Agents district meeting as a professional development opportunity for agriculture agents. In an evaluation ([Exhibit 24](#)) of the presentation by other agents, 92 percent of the agents (n=12) who attended the meeting indicated that the material is of value to agents and small flock owners, addressing a need of small poultry producers. As a result of the Southern district agriculture agent meeting, I was asked to develop a series of fact sheets for agents and clientele providing additional information on poultry production.

During the summer of 2010 I started a factsheet series titled *Poultry for Small Farms & Backyards*. Factsheets developed to date include: *Producing Poultry on Pasture* (A3908-01) ([Exhibit 2](#)), *Pasture Poultry Ark* (A3908-02) ([Exhibit 3](#)), and co-authored with Ron Kean, Extension Poultry Specialist, *Urban Poultry* (A3908-03) ([Exhibit 1](#)). According to UWEX The Learning Store there has been strong demand for the publications, with 409 hard copies sold and 507 downloads from June 2010 through July 2011.

The Pasture Poultry Ark is a housing design I developed to handle small groups of birds and incorporate both the chicken coop and the traditional chicken tractor into a practical daily move pen to aid small producers. I received very positive feedback from producers who utilized the plans provided in the Pasture Poultry Ark publication. I received pictures of arks people have built from Richland County to Liverpool, UK ([Exhibit 25](#)).

Two additional resources that I developed are the *Simple Breakeven Calculator for Poultry* ([Exhibit 8](#)) and an updated list of poultry processors in Wisconsin ([Exhibit, 26](#)). According to Urchin tracking software, the poultry processors document was viewed 285 times in 2010 and the calculator was downloaded 50 times. In addition to local use, *The Simple Breakeven Calculator, for Poultry* has been used by Richard Brzozowski, Extension Educator in Maine, as part of a SARE funded project in poultry science. He has also promoted the calculator in his monthly newsletter that has 1000 readers, and in June of 2011 he indicated that he had directly emailed the spreadsheet to eight of his producers.

Farm Technology Days displays have also been a way to highlight poultry resources in Wisconsin. I developed three different poultry displays. The last poultry display that I developed was for the 2010 show in River Falls, Wisconsin. The rain shortened show had 34,700 paid attendees. The display was designed to show the different aspects of poultry production, and was titled Raising Poultry for Food, Fun and Profit. The display consisted of a smaller version of the pasture poultry ark with live birds, a display board that highlighted the poultry publications that I had written, the poultry calculator, and a Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems (CIAS) research brief on economics of pasture poultry systems. To further highlight the family and social benefits poultry can have, I incorporated my five year old daughter Emma and her birds in the display. This greatly improved my ability to talk with people about the positive aspects of poultry production and how it can be a wonderful family activity.

As I worked with groups on poultry programs and answered questions over the phone, this program has highlighted animal agriculture and food systems. There are many consumers who are concerned about where their food is coming from and poultry is a way for many to experience raising their own food. As a result, many families find that poultry is a great way for children to learn about food and responsibility. This is an area where I have noticed growth; I currently average about four calls a month regarding poultry health and husbandry. I am currently developing an additional fact sheet in the Poultry for Small Farms & Backyards series titled *Selecting and Brooding Chickens*.

### **Rural Life**

Much of my work with the rural lifestyle producers has been with people who are not yet producers, and are looking for a way to utilize their land in an agricultural system. This audience tends to require one-on-one consultations either on their property or in the office. Over the past two years, I conducted 16 on-farm consultations. During these consultations, it became apparent that the producers were not sure what

questions they should be asking about their land. I developed a standard set of questions that allow new landowners to decide what might be the best use of their property. I developed a formal factsheet *Planning Your Rural Property* based on this standard set of questions ([Exhibit 27](#)). Factsheet use has frequently resulted in a strategic thinking process that evaluated client's values, strengths, current resources, and how those met their goals.

I have been one of three lead people in the development of the Extension Small Farms Program Team and co-wrote the first plan of work for the team in 2009. In 2010, as part of the Small Farms Team's display at Farm Technology Days, I distributed approximately 100 *Planning Your Rural Property* factsheets to people considering changes to their property at that show. I also used my experience with this group to co-author a presentation titled: *Beginning from Scratch-Working with Residential/Lifestyle Farmers* ([Exhibit 6](#)). This presentation was given by Diane Mayerfeld, Sustainable Agriculture Curriculum Coordinator from CIAS, at the 2009 National Small Farms Conference in Springfield, IL, to a group of industry and agency professionals. The conference had 583 individuals in attendance.

As a case study example from 2009, I began working with a non-resident landowner couple who were in the latter part of their 'off-farm' careers. They bought a farm and wanted to bring a family friend's son onto the farm as a caretaker to manage the farm. I made an initial visit to the farm with the caretaker and we walked the property to gain an understanding of the goals for the property and their future. The next meeting was with the landowners to discuss their vision for the property, as well as how they felt the caretaker's responsibilities and interests fit into the equation. The first obstacle that emerged was a difference in vision for the farm. The caretaker was looking at this as an opportunity to farm and generate a living wage in the future, possibly even renting the farm. In contrast, the landowners wanted to retire to the farm and generate a small supplemental income, keep taxes down, and help a friend's son build up equity. A second challenge was that the landowners knew they wanted beef cattle, and when asked what type of beef enterprise they wanted, the response was: "Is there more than one type of beef enterprise?" Working with both parties, I helped them outline a plan for the property. The first step was the establishment of a managed grazing area starting with stocker cattle through the summer to gain an understanding of cattle, livestock handling, and grazing. This did not require a large investment and could help determine if this was a route they wanted to go. The next step was to establish a plan for the forested acreage of the farm. On a 2010 follow up visit to the farm, I found that they were incorporating the information that I had provided them, by grazing stockers in a managed grazing system. Through the planning process the caretaker's roles and expectations were clearly defined.

In addition to the one-on-one work, I started an e-newsletter for southwest Wisconsin titled "Weekend Farmer" ([Exhibit 28](#)). The newsletter has three sections: "Livestock Lessons", "Horticulture Hints", and "Money and Markets". The newsletter has a subscription list of 18 producers and the agriculture agents in southwest Wisconsin. In addition to email, a local feed store distributes an additional 50 copies. The Small Farms Team plans to make the Weekend Farmer a monthly blog post with archives on the team web site.

The opportunities and programs reviewed here have enabled me to develop a strong relationship with clientele locally as well as statewide and nationally. This experience helped me develop the programs and relationships needed to bring the resources of the University to the people of Richland County, the state, and national clientele.