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Introduction

Keep Berkshires Farming is a community-driven initiative aimed at supporting and strengthening local agriculture to build a strong and healthy regional food system. This planning process involves engaging a diverse set of stakeholders in gathering and analyzing data about the current state of agriculture in order to better understand existing production conditions, demand dynamics for local agricultural products or commodities, and related barriers or challenges. The data is then used to inform decision-making and prioritize specific strategies the community may undertake to support a vibrant agricultural economy.

This action plan contains key findings from this data gathering process and the resulting strategies for the towns in the North County KBF group: Adams, Cheshire, Clarksburg, Florida, New Ashford, North Adams, Savoy and Williamstown.

Agriculture has a deep history in the Berkshires and is still prominent in the local landscape and culture. In North Berkshire, dairy farms are still a notable presence and there is a growing interest to keep livestock farms viable by adding value-added products such as cheese and meat. Cricket Creek Farm in Williamstown has added in a successful creamery and farm store where other farms can sell their products year-round.

BACKGROUND

The countywide Keep Berkshires Farming initiative began with a phone call. The Great Barrington Agricultural Commission contacted Glynwood to learn about their community-based Keep Farming program as the town sought ways to better support their local food and farming. It was quickly recognized, however, that farm fields don’t start and stop at municipal
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boundaries, and that while markets for farm products may be concentrated in some towns, like Great Barrington, the farms that supply these markets are located in nearby towns. Development of a new regional plan for the Berkshires, Sustainable Berkshires, was just getting underway by the Berkshires Regional Planning Commission (BRPC). The new plan establishes long-range regional goals and strategies in a comprehensive list of topics, including land use, economy, natural resources, social conditions, housing, and infrastructure. One objective of the plan is to better understand local food and agriculture in the Berkshires and how we can best support agricultural profitability and enhanced access to local, healthy food now and in the future.

Since agriculture had already been identified as an important topic for the regional plan, the decision was made to coordinate efforts. In order to include this work in the Sustainable Berkshires plan, the Keep Farming initiative was expanded countywide and Keep Berkshires Farming was born. BRPC and Glynwood worked with communities in three sub regions, as shown on the following map:

Community Working Groups

The 32 communities of Berkshire County were divided into working groups.

1. North
2. Central
3. South

The towns of Adams, Cheshire, Clarksburg, Florida, New Ashford, North Adams, Savoy and Williamstown are in the North group or region.
THE KEEP BERKSHIRES FARMING PROCESS
Keep Berkshires Farming is based on the Keep Farming® process developed by Glynwood, adapted into a regional approach for the Berkshires. The county was divided up into 3 regions, each with a team of representatives from towns within the region.

The process consists of three phases:
Phase I – Mobilize Your Community for Success
Phase II – Data and Analysis
Phase III – Strategies for a Healthy Food System

The Keep Farming methodology is different than other planning processes in the following key ways:
✓ Provides local data to the community that is not otherwise readily available
✓ Involves diverse stakeholders throughout the process, including farmers
✓ Supports the agricultural economy by connecting producers to local markets
✓ Communities develop their own strategies to support farms in their area by choosing tools and actions most appropriate to their situation
✓ Community-based process creates relationships and dialogue that result in implementation

OUR PROCESS
The Keep Berkshires Farming process is based in two main components:

Gathering Original Data
Original data is gathered using a variety of survey, map, and interview tools in order to enhance knowledge of local food production and distribution with the aim of improving market connections. This is achieved through the hard work and dedication of community volunteers working in two teams to gather existing and original data on supply and demand dynamics within the local food system.
Building Community Capital

Building community capital – the connections, relationships, and common understanding among those who use and consume local food is a key attribute of the process. This is achieved through the design of the process itself. At the most basic level, the fact that the work is largely completed by community volunteers means that there is already teamwork and collaboration inherent to the process. Volunteers came to the process with a wide range of interests and backgrounds from farmers to chefs, health professionals to land trusts. Volunteers helped spread the word, tailored the process and events in ways that would resonate with others in their communities and presented at the community events.

Open meetings were held throughout each of the three phases of the planning process – from initial information meetings to gather volunteers and spread the word about the initiative to the final community forum designed to share the draft action plan and strategies.

Volunteer Motivation

At the outset of the project, community conversations focused on the reasons volunteers wanted to contribute their time to the project. Some common motivations, which also help illustrate the range of people involved in the process, included:

- Old and new farmers wanting to ensure conversations on the subject represented their interests in an accurate way
- Old and new farmers who believe in their products and know some of the regulatory, market, and infrastructure challenges facing small farmers
- Desire to see local agriculture better represented in economic development discussions
- Commitment to community health and a belief in slow foods and whole foods
- Businesses that know the market potential of local food and want to see more food available
- A belief that local food is an essential component of long-term local resiliency in the context of climate change and transitioning energy landscape
- An understanding that both hunger and poor nutrition are health challenges in our communities
- A love of the rural landscape and desire to see farms remain a prominent feature of that landscape
- A love of all that is local in the Berkshires, including its yummy food!
Introduction to the North Berkshire Action Plan

The North Berkshire Keep Berkshires Action Plan differs in some respects to the South and Central region action plans. In general, the layout, format and content are uniform to the other sub-regions. In some cases, surveys asked different questions than in other sub-regions, or results were expressed in a different format. The gist is the same, though, and effort has been made to align the North Action plan as much as possible with the other reports. Where content differs, it is explained.

Current State of Agriculture in North Berkshire

The following sections highlight some of the key findings from the agricultural economics (supply) and local foods and health (demand) teams.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The North Berkshire region’s farms are in concentrated areas, especially in Williamstown, and descending along the Hoosic River Valley. The North sub-region differs from the South and Central regions in that it has a greater number of meat and dairy farms. As there is more dairy and beef production in the North region, there is more land devoted to the production of feed crops, especially hay and pasture. Dairy farmers in the North region expressed concern with the dairy market, and express interest in transitioning to more beef, as it is a more profitable enterprise. Farmers in the North are challenged with beef, as well, noting the high cost of feed and services associated with raising livestock. Like the South and Central regions, the North region is underserved by existing commercial USDA meat slaughter and processing facilities, as well as value-added processing facilities equipped with commercial kitchens for volume processing of vegetables, fruit, sauces, etc. Residents in the North region enjoy local food, and in general, want more local food. The same can be said of institutions and restaurants.

Through the Keep Berkshires Farming process, North Berkshire farmers and community members identified the following goals:

- To get more locally grown products to low-income populations
- To get more local produce into institutions, schools and companies
- To increase the amount of land protected for agricultural use
- To improve productivity and profitability of area farms
- To increase the amount of land in production in North County to increase the supply of local produce
- To increase economic development of farms and agriculture related food businesses in North County
- To increase viability and profitability of dairy producers to promote continued dairy farming in Berkshire County
- To increase networking opportunities for North County farmers to connect with one another
- To increase processing capacity for livestock producers
SUPPLY: CURRENT AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

The Agricultural Economics team conducted surveys of farmers to gather local data on what farmers are producing on their land, how much of their land is being actively used, and future business development areas farmers would like to explore. The fifty farmers represented in the survey effort provided important insight into the existing conditions, challenges and opportunities of planning for and maintaining a vibrant food system in both the North Berkshire region as well as the larger Berkshire region as a whole.

Table 1: Profile of Farmers Responding to the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whole life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average # of years farming</td>
<td>3 generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # acres owned</td>
<td>181.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # acres farmed</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Keep Berkshires Farming Forums

North region farms range in size: from less than an acre to 800 acres. In the group of fifty farmers surveyed through Keep Berkshires Farming survey, nine reported farming fifty to 100 acres, while the second largest group reported farming 200 to 500 acres.

In addition to the surveys, farm maps were created for each of the eight towns in collaboration with Berkshire Regional Planning Commission, area farmers, and tax assessors. These maps and associated assessor data provide more insight into the total number of farms in any given community, the size of those farms, protection status, and tax incentive program participation.
Agricultural Land and Farms

Through Keep Berkshires Farming, 117 farms in the north region were identified. The average farm size in the region is 194.5 acres, higher than the entire county average of 127 acres. The Town of Williamstown has the greatest number of acres in agriculture, with 9,009 parcel acres in agriculture. North Adams has the least, with 148 acres in agriculture. Williamstown has the greatest number of farms (fifty-one), while only three were identified in Clarksburg. No farms were identified in North Adams or Savoy.

**Land in Production**

The eight towns in the North region group together represent 22,762.2 acres of agricultural land. Of this land, 2,114.6 acres, or 9.3% is permanently protected through the state’s Agricultural Preservation Restriction (APR) program. While this program specifically targets prime agricultural soils, 32.9 percent of acres of land with prime agricultural soils are currently protected from future development through this program. Adams is the most active of the five towns in participating in both the APR program with 16.8% of its prime agricultural soil acres protected in APR, in contrast to Williamstown, which has only 1.4% of its prime agricultural soils permanently protected via APR. Adams has the largest number of farm acres in APR, with 786.3 acres protected permanently, while Williamstown has the highest number of acres in Chapter 61/61a.
**Table 3: Profile of Agricultural Land by Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Acres in Agriculture</th>
<th>Prime Agriculture Soils in Existing Farmed Properties</th>
<th>Farm Acres in APR</th>
<th>Chapter 61/61A</th>
<th>Percent Agriculture Acres in APR</th>
<th>Percent Prime Ag Soils in APR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>3,900.0</td>
<td>691.2</td>
<td>786.3</td>
<td>3,879.4</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>5,429.3</td>
<td>1,230.4</td>
<td>730.6</td>
<td>2,485.0</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksburg</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1,593.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ashford</td>
<td>2,541.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Adams</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamstown</td>
<td>9,009.0</td>
<td>1,819.1</td>
<td>561.1</td>
<td>3937.71</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,762.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,841.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,114.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,308.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mass GIS, tax assessor parcel records, 2012

**Prime Agricultural Soils**

Six farmers in the North region indicated having farmland in the Massachusetts APR program. Twenty-eight indicating have land in the Chapter 61/61a program.

**Figure 3: Percent of Prime Agricultural Soils in APR Program**

Williamstown has the most acres of prime agricultural soils, with a total of 1,819.1. Cheshire has 1,230.4 acres of prime agricultural soils. North Adams has 24.7 acres of prime agricultural soils; with no farmland listed in APR or in Chapter 61/61a. Williamstown has the greatest number of prime agriculture acres not in agricultural use. It also has the smallest percent of agriculture acres in APR, and the smallest percent of prime agriculture soils in APR.

Williamstown and Cheshire have the greatest number of prime agricultural land not in agricultural use. Noting this abundance of agricultural land not in use, and the challenge young

---

1 The total acres in Chapter 61/61a is in some cases higher than the acres in agriculture. This is due to the fact that Chapter 61 applies to forestry uses which are not necessarily listed as agriculture in the assessors land use data.
or new farmers have in accessing quality farm land, students at Williams College worked with the American Farmland Trust and BRPC to identify privately held prime agricultural lands that could potentially be used by farmers to graze livestock or cultivate for produce or hay. The inset following Figure 4 demonstrates the Williams' students' findings, and demonstrates the potential for developing partnerships between private land owners and farmers to access suitable, productive land.

**Table 4: Prime Agricultural Land Not in Agricultural Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>812.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>1,977.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksburg</td>
<td>325.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ashford</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Adams</td>
<td>419.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoy</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamstown</td>
<td>2,244.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,935.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agricultural Preservation Restriction**
Adams has the greatest quantity of farmland in APR, followed by Cheshire and Williamstown.

**Figure 4: Percent Agricultural Acres in the APR Program**

*Source: Mass GIS, tax assessor parcel records, Berkshire Regional Planning Commission 2012*
Unleashing the Potential for Land Leasing for Farm Creation and Expansion

A 2013 pilot effort in the northern Berkshires explored the potential for land matching between farmers and private land owners in Williamstown and Adams. The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission and American Farmland Trust worked with students at the Williams College Center of Environmental Studies to formulate a methodology to identify land with quality agricultural soils that could be brought into production through lease arrangements.

Maps of residential parcels 4.5 acres or larger with either primary or secondary soils were created and a mailing list generated. Surveys indicated strong interest from private land owners in exploring leasing their land to farmers and strong interest from farmers on starting or expanding land lease options. The full study is available at: [http://ces.williams.edu/publications/student-papers/](http://ces.williams.edu/publications/student-papers/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Williamstown:</th>
<th>In Adams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative Interest in Land Leasing</td>
<td>Relative Interest in Land Leasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Pie chart" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Pie chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of farming landowners were comfortable with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Farming Respondents were Comfortable With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Bar chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these two towns are any indication, there is significant potential in the region to bring more land into production through expanded use of land lease arrangements.
Agricultural Products

Agricultural production in terms of total land devoted to specific crops in the North Berkshire region focuses on raising crops to feed animals: Hay (3,152 acres), pasture (1,332 acres), and corn (940 acres). This high number of acres dedicated to hay, pasture and corn corresponds with the high figure in the North region of beef and dairy cattle.

In total, the responding farmers identified farming 11,614 acres, roughly half of the total number of acres in agricultural use identified in the previous section (22,762.2 acres).

Figure 6: Livestock Count in North Berkshire Towns

According to data provided by the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture, dairy cattle and game birds make up a large proportion of farm animals in the North region. Chicken, beef cattle and horses follow in order of quantity.
Additional farm uses were reported by the number of producers. Twenty seven farmers indicated producing meat, including beef and pork, while twelve indicated growing vegetables. It is interesting to note that two of the farms in the region do some sort of agri-tourism activity for income.

Agricultural Product Challenges
Moving product from farm to market is hindered by the limited availability of processing facilities, and the limited marketing or distribution of products. A dearth of processing facilities is apparent: there are no commercial scale meat processing facilities immediately within the region, nor near the Central region. Processing facilities used by regional farmers include slaughter facilities in Canaan, Eagle Bridge and Hoosick Falls, New York; Athol and Groton, Massachusetts, Westminster Station, Vermont; and Bristol Beef in Connecticut. A farmer in Savoy currently offers custom slaughter and butchering services, and has expressed interest in expanding his operation. Because he has a custom exemption, farmers are limited to whom they can sell meat slaughtered and butchered in Savoy. A Savoy location of a commercial, USDA certified slaughter operation would greatly help North region farmers. Nearby value added processing facilities with commercial kitchens include a processing center in Greenfield, Massachusetts and in Kingston New York. Through the Keep Berkshires farming process, however, farmers became aware of a smaller commercial kitchen opportunity in Lee, which will enhance access. Farmers have anecdotally described waiting lists at slaughter facilities, and noted the substantial travel cost to get to these facilities. A commercial kitchen in North Adams, Adams or Williamstown could better serve the western area of the North region, and these communities have potential in older churches and schools with large kitchen capacity.
There are some local options for the slaughter and butchering of livestock. The issues with these local options is that they are not commercial USDA facilities, so the sale of the final product is limited to the farmer or consumers who bought part of or the whole live animal. For a farmer to be able to sell processed meat or poultry via wholesale or at a retail store, it must have been slaughtered at a commercial USDA facility. Identifying existing custom options in the region, and identifying which custom operations have interest in scaling up will be one part of further identifying opportunity in the Berkshire region for a local slaughter and processing
facility. One custom butcher in the Northern Berkshire region has expressed interest in scaling up, and a facility in the Northern Berkshire region could serve the Central region as well.

*Figure 9: Commercial Kitchens for Value Added Processing*

The North region is underserved by existing commercial value added processing facilities, as is most of Berkshire County. Opportunity to change this is strong in the Central region, with a processing kitchen opening up in Lee. Potential also exists in Dalton and Great Barrington. In the North region, old churches or schools offer kitchen space and potential for commercial processing operations. One processor in Windsor uses a kitchen in Adams to make and can sauce. A small proportion of the North region is within twenty five miles of the Greenfield processing facility, but most of the farms in the North region are in the western half of the county, not the eastern edge that is nearest Greenfield.

Having a nearby and convenient facility for processing farm goods is important in helping farmers profit, and important in making local foods available throughout the year for a number of consumer groups. If farmers have to take time, and spend substantial money on fuel to get to a processing facility, it impacts their profit margin. Residents have expressed desire for local produce all through the year, not just during the growing season, and larger institutions have identified storage and seasonality as barriers to using more local food. School is not in session in the summer, but if a farmer or institution could freeze and store produce, local food could be used in schools in the fall, winter and spring.

Another component of the food and agriculture system is food waste, and the North region has one state permitted food materials processor in Williamstown. This facility is permitted to receive up to fifteen tons of waste per day. The location and capacity of composting facilities is important consider in face of upcoming Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection’s commercial food waste ban.
Farm Business Practices
Twenty six farmers identified farming as their full-time job, while sixteen identified it as part-time. Three indicated that they were retired. More land is farmed than owned, pointing to lease or rental arrangements between farmers and land owners. Seventeen farmers indicated that they may have a succession plan (or a next generation to farm) in place, while fifteen indicated no. Only six indicated a definitive yes. Twenty-one farmers indicated that their farm is financially sustainable, while seventeen indicated no. Those indicating financial sustainability noted additional sources of financial stability and/or income, including full-time or part-time off-farm jobs and benefits; grants. They also noted that financial sustainability varies from year to year. Even if their farm is not considered financially sustainable, farmers identified conditions which allow them to keep farming anyway, such as spouses with off farm, full-time, benefited jobs; part-time jobs held by farmers themselves, and other forms of income, such as income generated from leasing land for a radio tower.

In the South and Central Berkshire farmer surveys, farmers were asked to indicate what percentage of their product they sell locally. In the North region, farmers were not asked this. In terms of local market outlets, the following local outlets were identified:
- Wilde Oats Coop Market (1 farmer)
- Farmers’ Markets (4)
- CSA (2)
- PYO (1)
- Farm Stand/On Farm (5)
- Word of mouth/friends/family (7)
- Public (4)

So while local food is going to local outlets and local residents, it is unclear how much of it is in terms of general farm product. This is known for dairy whereby only one farm reported selling its milk and dairy products locally. Out of the estimated 10,950 total tons of milk produced in the North Berkshire region, only 3.19% is sold locally. The rest is sold to large distributors.

**Table 6: Means to Market for Dairy Milk Produced in North Berkshire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sale</th>
<th>Number of Farms</th>
<th>Estimated amount of milk annually*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgriMark</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9000 tons (660 cows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairylea, DFA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1600 tons (115 cows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Sale of milk and dairy products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>350 tons (25 cows)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Source: KBF: North Berkshire County Farm Survey Results, August 2012 Center for Environmental Studies @ Williams College_

In terms of beef, three out of twenty producers indicated that they sell their beef locally. The smaller beef farmers (of which there are 14) do not do any commercial retail; but for the larger farms, of which there are seven, five sell their beef or beef cattle outside of the Berkshire region.

Farm practices in the Northern Berkshires are limited by the type of farming in the area. While the four vegetable farms in the area are practicing a variety of farming techniques, for example,
integrated pest management (IPM), winter cover crops, and season extension with the help of greenhouses, most farmers do not primarily produce vegetable crops. Beef, dairy, and hay farms rely on healthy, productive grass. Most farms keep their fields productive with the application of chemical fertilizer. With the growing price of fertilizer, and the growing premium for organic products, some farmers are trending towards fertility based only on manure or other organic products.

One dairy farm that could not transition to organic cited the discrepancy in price between conventional grain ($400 a ton) and organic grain ($700 a ton). But, he said, “If there were a program to help us do the 3 year transition to organic, we would do it. We cannot afford to do it on our own.” With the highly volatile costs of conventional fertilizer it seems likely that alternative methods will become more popular. One method already being used is high intensity grazing. We surveyed one farmer who was already using this technique and others who had toyed with it. The benefits are quite real. If done carefully and precisely, such grazing improves the quality of the grass while at the same time allowing the farmer to increase the number of head on the same amount of land. A significant number of farmers named the availability of land as a serious concern, so such innovative techniques as high intensity grazing could be more broadly implemented and encouraged. What both conventional and grass fed farmers agree on is the fact that raising beef animals requires careful management and supervision.

Some farms are earning extra income by diversifying their farms with wind turbines, solar arrays, cell towers and even mobile homes. One farmer said, “I’d be out of business if I wasn’t renting out land for 10 mobile homes and a cell tower...my cell tower lets me keep farming.” Although some farmers are against this form of non-farm product diversification, it is a good way to help farmers earn enough to stay on their land.

**Supplies and Services**

Unlike the South and Central Berkshire farmers, North Berkshire farmers were not asked to indicate how much money they spend on services, equipment and supplies. Nor were they asked to provide their annual farm sales.

Farms did note the following as barriers related to services, equipment and supplies:
- The high cost of shipping equipment from out of the region
- The low level of regional supply in terms of farm related services, equipment and supplies
- The distance and capacity of existing meat and other value added processing facilities

**Sales and Distribution Methods**

In survey responses, farmers indicated the following as their sales/distribution methods: (ranked in descending order):
- Auction
- Local
- Wholesale
- Farm Stand/On Farm

The North Region was the only region to have farmers indicating large processors as market outlets. These processors and distributors included Agri-Mark, DFA, Dairy-Lee and Chobani.
None of the farmers indicated selling to schools or other institutions, and none indicated selling to restaurants, although this could be included in “local” or “public”.

**Farmers and Farm Labor**

Of the land farmed by the fifty North Berkshire farmers, 16% or 3,684 acres is leased. Of the fifty farmers surveyed, twenty-six indicated being full-time farmers. More than half of the farmers (51%) are between the age of forty and sixty, while 39% of North Berkshire farmers are sixty years old or older. The lack of reliable, available farm labor was identified as a major challenge to keeping farming successful in the North Berkshire region.

**Farm Sales**

In the South and Central region surveys, farmers were asked to indicate their annual farm sales. In the North Berkshire region survey, farmers were not.

**Opportunities and Challenges**

Farmers in the North Berkshire region were asked to identify what they viewed as opportunities and challenges of the local food system. Farmers noted increased interest in and demand for locally grown products, as well as interest in land matching programs and greater participation in farmland preservation efforts. Value added opportunities for dairy were also identified.

**Opportunities**

**What has had a positive impact on your farm? (top responses)**

1. Observable increase in demand for local food
2. Rising cost of food make local pricing seem more reasonable
3. CSAs are doing very well.
What would make it easier to continue farming?
1. Technical assistance
2. Access to land
3. Labor
4. Slaughter and processing infrastructure

Challenges

High Costs of Doing Business
1. Reduced availability of farm goods and services (equipment, vet, parts, feed, etc.)

Ability to Create and Sell Products
1. Cost and inconvenience of slaughter facilities

Labor
1. Difficulty in finding skilled labor

Land Access and Availability
1. Access to land
**Local Food Use and Access**

The Local Foods and Health Team conducted a number of surveys to understand the degree to which local food is purchased and consumed locally, whether at home or in a business setting, as well as in-demand products that are not currently available at all or in at volumes or prices to meet demand. This helps identify potential market growth opportunities for local farms.

**LOCAL DEMAND – CURRENT**

**Institutions**

Twelve (12) institutions in the North Berkshire region were surveyed through Keep Berkshires Farming. The institutions ranged in size and function, including institutions of higher education, public and private schools, health care facilities and nursing homes. In farmer surveys, no farmer explicitly indicated schools or institutions as a market outlet for their product. Food service directors indicated that local food makes up between 0 to 40% of the food they use is from local sources.

The institutions include an institute of higher education, school districts and private health/wellness facilities. The most common type of institution surveyed was a school district, with representation also from private health/wellness organizations and an institution of higher education. The educational institutions surveyed and the private organizations differ in important ways. The elementary and high schools have to meet federal nutrition standards in the meals they serve through their cafeterias, and they serve a high volume daily. They face different budget realities and constraints than private health/wellness retreats.

North Berkshire institutions ranged in the number of meals served per days, in the percentage of local food served, and in food budgets. The number of meals prepared daily ranged from 200 to 5,000; many of the schools and healthcare institutions provide snacks in addition to regular meals. The hospital in the North Berkshire region, since closed, provided food for its own cafeteria as well as a Head Start Program and Elder Care services. Food budgets were correlated with the number of meals served each day, so the larger institutions with the greater number of meals, such as Williams College, with 5,000 meals a day, had higher food budgets. A large food budget in the North Berkshire region was indicated to be $100,000 or above. As in the Central region, private institutions tended to have larger operating budgets. The estimated combined annual food budget of institutions in the North Berkshire region is at least $1 million.

In general, local institutions purchase food from large distributors who offer small amounts of local food. North Berkshire institutions identified seven large distributors. A few institutions buy a variety of products from local producers, including local dairy products, local fruit and local vegetables. Nine local farms were identified as local food sources. Private institutions with larger food budgets buy more local food than smaller institutions. This is perhaps due to greater financial flexibility, seasonal flexibility and kitchen capacity.
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For institutions who do purchase from local farmers, the food buyers noted building these connections at farmers’ markets and the Vermont and Massachusetts Farm to School conferences. When purchasing food, the following factors were indicated (listed in descending order):

- Quality
- Freshness
- Price/Budget
- Customers’ Preferences
- Ease of Ordering/Delivery
- Seasonal Availability
- Nutritional Guidelines
- Where Product is From
- Contractual Restrictions
- Convenience
- How Product is Grown

**Restaurants**

Forty restaurants in the North region were surveyed. The North Berkshire region survey differed from other regions in that it analyzed the average price of an adult meal at each restaurant as well as its annual food budget. The key finding from this analysis was that the more a meal costs, the more likely that the restaurant considers where the product is grown, and considers convenience less. The price of food for the restaurants was an important consideration, as were cost implications for residents. A restaurant owner in North Adams, for example, noted it would be difficult to do volume business if he charged extra on menu items because they used local food.

![Figure 11: Local Products Purchased/Served by Local Restaurants](image)

*Source: Keep Berkshires Farming Restaurant Survey*

The local products most commonly used by North region restaurants are dairy products, including milk, yogurt, cheese and ice cream. This is followed by baked goods, fruit and vegetables. Very few restaurants source meat locally, and one reason noted for not using more local meat is that it is difficult to breakdown a half or whole animal, indicating that the options
for local meat may not include meat processed ready to serve, but rather meat requiring some processing prior to cooking.

Restaurants sourcing local food were split in how they developed relationships with local producers—some indicated approaching the producers; others indicated the producers approached them.

Findings from these interviews are similar to those in the Central and South regions. The chef/owner/manager supports local food and agriculture, and would like to serve more of it in their restaurant/store, but are challenged to do so because of:

- Seasonality—many menu staples are not locally available for much of the year due to climate and season length
- Convenience and Reliability—it is difficult to get local products delivered to their restaurant/store, whereas existing, conventional distributors deliver on a reliable and convenient schedule.
- Price—the local option is often more expensive than the conventional option and may not be part of their distribution contract
- Quality and Freshness—there is concern that local options may not be as fresh or as high quality as conventional options, especially in off-seasons

Food buyers currently source product from a range of suppliers, including small or independent farms, like the Berry Patch, McEnroe, Highlawn, Equinox; large, regional food distributors, such as Sysco, US Foods, and Ginsbergs; or grocery stores, such as Guido’s, Stop and Shop, Price Chopper and the Big Y. Crescent Creamery was frequently noted as a supplier.

The supplying farms are not just within Berkshire County, but within the greater Berkshire region, including Connecticut, the Hudson Valley, and southern Vermont.

The chef/managers/owners did note customer demand for local foods, with emphasis on specific items, such as:

- Meat (including grass-fed)
- Seasonal produce all year round
- Wheat and grain products
- Potatoes

North region restaurant chefs expressed interest in all strategies identified as means to expanding local food in restaurants, including a regional food hub, assistance in identifying local growers, and a centralized source with listings of availability.

Residents

**Consumer Behavior**

Two hundred and ninety-seven (297) residents were surveyed, and represented the North Berkshire communities of Williamstown, North Adams, Cheshire, Adams, Clarksburg and Florida. Williams College students conducted the surveys at a number of commercial and business
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outlets in the North Berkshire region in an effort to gather a representative cross section of the North Berkshire region.

Residents in the North Berkshire region do think where their food comes from is an important consideration. Eighty percent of residents indicated that they do look to see where their food is grown when grocery shopping. Northern Berkshire residents most frequently shop at supermarkets, although many noted in their survey response that they would like to shop at farmer’s markets/farm stores more frequently, but find the smaller, local options to be not as convenient as the supermarket. In terms of the least frequented grocery outlet to, nearly 200 residents indicated that they never get food from a CSA.

The two biggest drivers in grocery outlet choice for North Berkshire residents are convenient location and affordability.

When asked where residents most often purchase local foods, North Berkshire residents indicated the following (listed in descending order):

- Farmers Market/Farm Store
- Garden
- Food Coops
- Supermarket
- Pick Your Own (PYO)
- Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)

Fewer than fifty residents indicated that they don’t specifically purchase local food.

North Berkshire residents indicated the following reasons as to why they purchase local food (listed in descending order):

- It supports local farms and farmers
- It is fresher
- It is healthier
- I know how and where it was grown
- It is good for the environment

North Berkshire residents indicated the following as barriers to purchasing more local food (listed in descending order):

- It is too expensive
- It is difficult to get to the places that sell it
- It is not readily available where I shop
- There is a lack of variety

**What are consumers purchasing?**

North Berkshire residents take advantage of the variety of agricultural products present in the region. Figure 12 is a word frequency map, indicating which products were most often mentioned as a favorite local food. The most popular products were vegetables (specifically corn and tomatoes), fruit (specifically apples), eggs and cheese.
Food Processors, Distributors and Stores

Fifteen stores, processors and distributors were interviewed in the North Berkshire region. The distributors included larger distributors such as Garelick Farms, Ginsberg's and Black River Produce, and the stores included places like Price Chopper, Big Y, Wild Oats and Whitney's Farm Stand.

Most of the vendors surveyed indicated sourcing the majority of their food regionally, though this was closely followed by nationwide. Quality is the top priority when selecting product. Customer preference was indicated as the second most important factor influencing purchasing decisions. Thirty-one percent of the vendors indicated having a few or no liability concerns. A quarter (25%) of vendors indicated that they rely on long term relationships with growers and processors to mitigate liability concerns. Interestingly, 19% of the vendors require some type of certification (insurance, GAP, others), while 13% grow their own food to reduce liability concerns.

A larger, regional vendor noted that they'd been “challenged on doing local because [I] can’t take a delivery of produce that hasn’t been refrigerated or properly cleaned...[I] have to go to a larger farm that can provide me with a refrigerated truck or has accreditations”. Most vendors (80%) have the flexibility to make their own purchasing decisions, while 20% have to refer to corporate offices. All but two vendors had seen an increase in customer demand for local food.
The processors surveyed by the North Keep Berkshires Farming team are small businesses creating value-added product within the region. These include a specialty butcher shop, bakeries, and spirits, yogurt and cheese businesses. Ten of the twelve businesses interviewed said they have a sustainable business and there is overwhelming demand for their product in the Berkshire region. They are also able to sell their product outside of the region. Processors indicated that most of the product they use comes from local suppliers.

Local Demand – Potential - Institutions

All of the fourteen institutions expressed interest in purchasing more local food. Barriers to institutions wanting to purchase more local food included the following (listed in descending order):

- Budgetary Constraints
- Restrictions in the Bidding Process
- Timing/Frequency of Deliveries
- Seasonality
- Availability
- Liability/Farmer Compliance with Food Safety Regulations
- Extra Time and Labor to Prepare and Serve
- Customer/Student Preference

Besides these barriers, the food service providers also described concern in terms of viability of additional local food sourcing, including the challenge of delivery to rural, smaller schools; the ability of local farmers to meet the large volume needed at larger institutions.

Institutions were most interested in a regional food hub to help aggregate products and clearly market available products to food service directors. Delivery and storage were two services that presented the greatest potential for food service directors. Contract growing was also an option of interest. Because food service directors so inclined already have local farm contacts, media such as a list-serve were not high on the list.

Specific Opportunities

Clarksburg Elementary is interested in working further with local farms after a successful “Farm to School” week.

Mt. Greylock High School expressed interest in purchasing more local apples along with other local products.

The North Adams Commons food service director expressed interest in more local food, and would pay more if necessary.

Restaurants

Thirty of the restaurants surveyed in the North Berkshire region are interested in buying more local food. They noted the following barriers to increased purchase of local food:

- The challenge of connecting with local farmers
- The inconsistency and seasonality of local produce supplies
Lack of infrastructure to store fresh, local food
Lack of meat processing facilities

Solutions to help better connect restaurants to local farmers included:
- Farmers expand marketing to local restaurants
- Direct contracts between farmers and restaurants (specified quantity and advance schedule)
- Regional food hub for aggregation and distribution of local product

Residents
Ninety-nine percent of respondents indicated that they would purchase more local food if they could. Affordability and location were identified to be the two largest barriers to residents purchasing more local food.

Residents in the region enjoy purchasing local food when it is available, and would purchase more local food if it were available in more market outlets and was equivalent to conventional food in price.

The local product residents most frequently indicated wanting to see more of is meat. This indicates that the local supply of meat does not meet local demand, and this could be because there is not enough meat being produced in the North Berkshire region, or it could also be because the meat that is being produced in the North Berkshire region does not necessarily get sold to residents in the North Berkshire region.

Residents also indicated desire for more local fruit, vegetables and grains. As in the Central and South region, some residents want more exotic products, such as mangos and avocados.
Food Processors, Distributors and Stores

**Challenges**

Processors indicated that demand exceeds supply, and they noted the following challenges to increasing supply:
- Facility space/processing capacity
- Food regulations
- Distribution/marketing

Expanding processing space and capacity in the region would help processors, but it is important to note that an individual processor may want to retain their brand identity and control over the quality and content of their product. Or, their specialty product may require ingredients that are not available all year round or in sufficient volume to make local sourcing a viable concept.

The Williams College student teams identified a list of top six challenges faced by processors, distributors and stores:
- Difficulty in purchasing local food in large quantities
- High price of local food
- Food safety and handling concerns related to local food
- Communication gap between local purchasers and farmers
- Lack of decision making capacity for purchasers at local level
- Absence of local processing and value-added facilities.

**Specific Opportunities**

- Pittsfield Rye, Berkshire Mountain Bakery and Black River Produce all expressed interest in sourcing grains locally if a sufficient quantity were being produced.
- Black River Produce is receptive to consumer demand and has considered starting its own meat processing facility.
- Walmart expressed interest in purchasing local produce for the Super Walmart.
- One local store in Williamstown expressed interest in partnership with the Williams College meal plan in order to secure greater cash flow which would help them buy more local food.
- The Store at Five Corners expressed interest in receiving a compiled list of regional farmers, categorized by type of food produced, and also expressed specific interest in local honey supplier connections.
- A custom butcher in Savoy is interested in offering an apprenticeship to share farming techniques and skills.
- Two processors expressed interest in local distributor and/or delivery options.
- A local distillery would like to purchase more local grain.
- A few land owners or farmers in the larger Berkshire region have started to grow hops or have expressed interest in hop production.

**Food Access and Security**

The food and health team in the North Keep Berkshires Farming team interviewed meal site clients rather than the meal sites themselves. Forty-nine residents were surveyed at different meal sites.
DEMAND

Identifying Vulnerability: Families, Children and the Elderly

In the North Berkshire region, there is one USDA food desert. That is in North Adams. It is possible that the opening of a Super Walmart removes access challenges, but some of the neighborhoods and communities in the North Berkshire region still face great food insecurity, or issues which enhance vulnerability to food insecurity.

North Adams has the largest number of residents living in poverty. It also has the highest number of children under five living in poverty, as well as the highest number of children under eighteen and elderly residents living in poverty.

Of the fifty residents surveyed at meal sites, the top three sources for meal assistance were identified to be SNAP and WIC, food pantries or food package programs, and free community meals. Thirty three percent of respondents indicated that they sometimes worried about food running out before they had money to buy more, and thirty seven percent of respondents used community meal sites daily to provide nutrition for their household. More than a quarter of the respondents (26.5%) described that they sometimes run out of food before they can get more in a month, 18.2% indicated they often can’t afford balanced meals and 32.6% said they sometimes cannot afford balanced meals. Thirty four percent (34%) of the respondents indicated that they have had to cut meal size or skip meals because there was not enough money for food. Eighteen percent (18.3%) of these respondents said this happens almost every month.

As fuel and food costs increase, and more of the Berkshire region population ages into and beyond retirement, food security and access could become a greater issue. Younger families and children could also be further challenged by cost of living increases, making the need for access to fresh, local food opportunities greater than it is currently. Older residents with transportation or mobility challenges may also struggle to access fresh, healthy, local foods.

In terms of local best practices, Berkshire Grown hosts ‘Share the Bounty’, a donation program. Donations buy local products from local producers, and these products serve pantries and other meal assistance programs. The ten-year old program, largely funded by the Berkshire Taconic Community Foundation, provides support for 14 farm-organization partnerships. These include farms and food assistance organizations throughout the Berkshire region: Cricket Creek Farm, in Williamstown, provides food to the North Adams Berkshire Food Project; Indian Line Farm, in Egremont, provides food to the North Adams Berkshire Food Project; Indian Line Farm, in Egremont, provides food to the North Adams Berkshire Food Project.

The Northern Berkshire Community Coalition’s Mass in Motion program also seeks to address issues of hunger and nutrition in North Adams through promoting active lifestyles and encouraging the availability of healthy, fresh foods in corner stores and food cafeterias. The North Adams Farmers’ Market accepts SNAP, WIC and Senior benefits. The North Adams Comprehensive plan includes a food and agriculture chapter with goals, policies and actions, which include strategies such as a veggie mobile and increasing the number of community gardens in the city.
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Supply: Emergency Food Sites

Two emergency food sites were identified and surveyed in the North Berkshire region. While these sites like to use local products, their selection is largely dictated by affordability and donations. WIC offers the greatest flexibility, in that enrollees may use WIC at Farmers’ Markets. Some of the larger providers of emergency food assistance are bound by cost and wholesale contracts to out of area suppliers. In terms of service availability, survey responses indicated the weekends as periods of time with no service offered. It would appear that Sunday and Saturday lack opportunity to access food for residents seeking a food pantry or meal site service. Only one of the service providers indicated being open 24/7. This could pose a challenge for people working during scheduled hours, or for people relying on public transportation or friends/family to get them to the food pantry or meal site. Currently, Wednesdays have the most coverage in terms of service provision.

If a majority of residents living in poverty are school-aged children, the dearth of meal sites or services on weekends poses an issue for families seeking ways to meet hunger needs during the weekend when their children are unable to get food from their school meal services.

Approximately 700 clients are served weekly through these meal sites. Fifty percent (50%) of the sites have an application process or eligibility criteria to participate in the program or service being provided. The other 50% of sites do not. One organization reported receiving 90% of its donations as private donations. The other largest percentage came from government funding. With these resources, three out of five respondents indicated that they are able to meet demand. Two indicated that current resources do not enable them to meet demand. All organizations base their decisions on what food is available from their sources. Menu planning ranges from a day in advance to an entire month in advance.

In terms of local food, two organizations stated that it factors into menus as it is available and as the season allows. Two organizations indicated that local food does not heavily factor into menu planning. Menus are planned based on both nutritional guidelines and what food is available. Two of the four respondents indicated that they are able to meet nutritional guidelines using available food. One indicated that they are unable to meet nutritional guidelines. Of the two who said they can meet nutritional guidelines, one said ‘most of the time’, implying that there are times they cannot meet nutritional guidelines with the food they have available. Five organizations indicated use of fresh produce at the meal site. When asked what percentage of food served is locally grown April-October, responses ranged from 10% to 80%.

Meal sites are challenged to offer more local food because of:

- Affordability
- Access (transportation)
- Availability
- Volunteers

Two of the organizations donate waste to a local pig farm. Two organizations compost. One organization indicated having no way to dispose of produce that cannot be served as food.
Vision/Mission Statement

OUR VISION:
Northern Berkshire County has a resilient local food system that includes a full spectrum of economically viable farms offering a diverse range of products. The community supports its farmers both as neighbors and as businesses, purchasing their food for consumption at home, school, or out to eat. Successful farm businesses are part of the region’s sustainable economy, keeping more money in the economy from local spending. Regional investment in value-added infrastructure has also enabled farmers to increase production and profits. Farmers continue to care for the productivity and health of the land and community by employing best practices for soil, water, habitat, and biodiversity. Eating local, healthy foods is promoted through education, networking opportunities, and economic development activities. It is also made possible for those of limited income or mobility to access more healthy food options at affordable prices to foster a hunger-free community. (Note: The north county group did not articulate a formal vision statement. The statement seems to encompass the broad goals of the project.)

Ayrhill Farm in north county. Source: Melissa Adams.
Goals and Strategies

Regional Economic Impact

**GOAL: INCREASE PROCESSING CAPACITY FOR LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS**

**Strategies**
- Form a committee to explore feasibility of processing facility in Berkshire County – research other feasibility studies to understand volumes needed; identify appropriate sites; understand regulations and costs; grant writing for feasibility study and infrastructure costs.
- Field trip for interested livestock producers to visit Glynwood to tour & learn more about modular processing unit as an interim step until a processing facility is built in region.

**GOAL: INCREASE NETWORKING OPPORTUNITIES FOR NORTH COUNTY FARMERS TO CONNECT WITH ONE ANOTHER**

**Strategies**
- Hold annual farmer potluck dinner for networking
- Form North County livestock producers to meet regularly to discuss common issues, such as marketing, production standards, and processing
- Encourage the formation of Agricultural Commissions in towns without one, to support and advocate for agriculture at the municipal level
- Agriculture Commissions create a brochure highlighting farms in town that welcome the public (KBF would provide list of farms for Ag Com members to contact for permission, brochure could include a map of farms and key info such as what they produce, location, and seasonal events)

**GOAL: INCREASE VIABILITY AND PROFITABILITY OF DAIRY PRODUCERS TO PROMOTE CONTINUED DAIRY FARMING IN BERKSHIRE COUNTY**

**Strategies**
- Form committee to identify feasibility of processing/value added facility in Berkshire County. Research other models to understand possibilities; assess interest among Berks dairy farmers; identify appropriate sites; understand regulations and costs; grant writing for feasibility study and infrastructure costs.

**GOAL: INCREASE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF FARMS AND AGRICULTURE RELATED FOOD BUSINESSES IN NORTH COUNTY**

**Strategies**
- Explore feasibility of demand and supply to support winters market (once/month?) or help promote existing holiday markets to increase farms & customers (Williamstown?)
- Promote Adams and North Adams as good locations for value-added businesses that support area farms – work with Chamber of Commerce, local land trusts, Berkshire Grown, Carrot Project, etc.
• Explore feasibility of food hub/value-added processing facility in North County (possible location: old Wal-Mart site)
• Strengthen and support grower and buyer networking opportunities (Berkshire Grown events & locally grown guides; explore online system of what’s available i.e. www.yourfarmstand.com; trade show at Ag fair; explore/promote contract growing opportunities)

Land Access and Transfer

**Goal:** Increase amount of land in production in North County to increase supply of local produce

**Strategies**
- Connect available farmland with farmers looking for farmland in North County by promoting online landlink website newenglandfarmfinder.org (Land for Good through USDA grant)
- Map land that might be available for farming but is not currently in production: Give info to town Agricultural Commissions to work with landowners and farmers interested in leasing additional land
- Promote mentoring programs at Berkshire Grown and NOFA-Mass to connect established and new farmers - skills training & relationships that could lead to land transfers
- Hold workshop on succession planning to inform farm families how to pass land onto next generation (Land for Good/AFT)

Farm Support, Technical and Business Assistance

**Goal:** Improve productivity and profitability of area farms

**Strategies**
- Promote existing technical and business planning programs, grant programs, and financing opportunities to farmers (KBF, Berkshire Grown & Ag Coms promote MDAR, NRCS, Farm Energy Program, Carrot Project, Common Capital, etc.)
- Workshops & events (i.e. KBF/MAAC AG Com gathering)
- Materials & brochures

**Goal:** Increase amount of land protected for agricultural use

**Strategy**
- Inform farmers about protection options (Chp61A, APR, conservation restrictions)-workshop at KBF/MAAC Ag Com gathering)
**Food Security, Access and Health**

**GOAL: GET MORE LOCAL PRODUCE INTO INSTITUTIONS, SCHOOLS AND COMPANIES**

**Strategies**
- Workshop on Farm to Institution – to better understand work being done in Berkshire County by Berkshire Organics SEEDS, MA Farm to School and identify any gaps or barriers
- Farmers could bring their produce through CSA drop-offs or on-site farmers markets for employee customers at hospitals, companies– may be collaboration opportunities among farmers for delivery of products
- Help connect farmers to GAP certification training (GAP = Good Agricultural Practices, a food safety certification required by supermarkets and some institutions/distributors)
- Promote awards and public recognition for institutions purchasing local food
- Document and announce the volume and dollars spent by institutional sector on local food

**GOAL: GET MORE LOCALLY GROWN PRODUCTS TO LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS**

**Strategies**
- Explore mobile market to travel to low-income neighborhoods
- Support to maintain/expand community garden programs and associated trainings on nutrition and food preparation
- Map land in urban areas that might be available for community or urban gardens for food production to go to residents, food pantries, church programs
Implementation

Implementation has been an ongoing focus of Keep Berkshires Farming, and has been championed by Berkshire Grown.
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Farmer
1. Alibozak
2. Balawender
3. Beisegle
4. Butterfield
5. Chocquette
6. Clairmont
7. Daniels
8. Ed Clairmont
9. Egrazaek
10. Elmartin Farm
11. Emil Kittler
12. Foisy
13. Gary Alibozak
14. Grimshaw
15. Gwozdz
16. Jayko
17. John Daniels
18. Kruszyna
19. Mack
20. Malloy
21. Mark Warner
22. Paul Malloy
23. Roger Field
24. Stanton
25. Ted Jayko
26. Werner
27. Whitney's
28. Zieminski
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