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Preface

Community gardens have been in modern urban centers since the 1960s—many are still in operation today. The factors that determine why a garden lasts are complex and difficult to capture in a brief survey. It is hoped, however, that at least a record of which gardens are lasting can be made, and point to some possible relationships. The survey is an attempt to record a snapshot of today’s community garden condition across the country, particularly with the changes in policy and funding that have been occurring since the 1980s. It will also provide comparative information to a previous survey.

The national survey was mailed to more than 40 cities, to people on the ACGA organizational member list. The people on the list included managers of gardening programs, cooperative extension departments, recycling programs, greening programs and various other garden related agencies.

There were a few changes to the survey since the one in 1992. The “types” category was expanded to focus on some types that have recently become popular. The growth rate and loss of the gardens is compared, along with numbers of gardens established in a land trust and any new initiatives. By asking respondents to predict losses and gains in the next five years, the outlook of gardens can be projected. Data from cities that completed both the 1992 and 1996 surveys is compared to measure any change in initiatives and also the composite of land ownership. How a garden is initiated is also included to explore any possible relationship between self-starting gardens and their longevity.
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A total of 38 cities responded to the revised survey, up from 24 that participated in a similar study in 1992. Of the original 24 from 1992, 15 replied again, giving information that could be compared.

The two-page questionnaire was mailed October, 1996, encouraging the members to respond on a volunteer basis. In some cases, several members within one city collaborated and made a synthesis of the information to avoid repeated numbers (particularly in New York and Boston). When surveys were incomplete or the information provided was confusing, a follow-up letter was sent to try to clarify answers. In addition, key cities were mailed surveys again after they did not respond to try to elicit information. When the validity of the information came into question, or no response was given, the city was eliminated from the study.

This survey is not a scientific sample, but the range of cities that did respond covers significant regions of the United States, different sized populations and a myriad of types of programs that exist in urban community gardening. The data that is presented is based on the questionnaires completed by overall city coordinators of citywide garden programs, teams of people from several programs that consolidated the information, or individual directors of several distinct programs that exist in the same city. The data is very recent—most surveys were mailed in by the end of 1996. A few were received in early 1997.

This report contains the following information:

- A summary of the major findings of the survey.
- City profile charts, containing much of the information from the questionnaire.
- A chart of city rankings, by total numbers of gardens, and by gardens per 10,000.
- Comparison information of the 15 repeating cities.
- Complete data on the 38 cities that participated in the survey.

Comments or questions about the survey are welcome. Write to:

American Community Gardening Association,
100 North 20th Street, 5th Floor,
Philadelphia, PA 19103-1495.
SUMMARY OF MAJOR TRENDS

Garden Types

Total gardens reported were 6020. The primary category of urban community gardens is the neighborhood garden, with 4055 reported, making up 67.4 per cent of the total. This type of garden is the one that is probably most recognized or valued by gardeners and non-gardeners alike when issues of urban community garden arise in the public forum.

The next two leading categories are public housing gardens (983, or 16.3 per cent) and school gardens (496, or 8.2 per cent). These two categories may be misleading, however. Of the 983 counted in public housing, 834 are in New York. The school gardens are underreported, since the numbers only represent those schools that are part of the citywide program, not the ones that are autonomous and managed by individual schools. Even if the percentages of school gardens were doubled, the number is very low considering the availability of land (or retrievable land from blacktop) and the educational and social benefits that school gardens provide.

Senior type gardens continue to be low as in the 1992 study. This most recent report counts 1.4 per cent of the total (85) in the senior center and housing category. As the population continues a “graying” trend, the needs of this group will surely be important to the gardening association. Further study into why this remains a small category should be undertaken. Mental health and rehabilitative gardens also make up a little more than 1.4 per cent (87). Considering the literature and research on the therapeutic properties of human and plant relationships, it would seem that more effort can be made in advocating the gardens’ value in rehabilitation programs to establish more of these types of gardens.

Most recently, much interest has risen for using gardens as training grounds and for economic development. These types of gardens include training at-risk youth and adults about horticulture and landscaping, marketing to exclusive restaurants or farmers’ markets, and making byproducts such as vinegars and jellies. Other economic endeavors may include greenhouse operations, raising cut flowers, and herb production. This category however, is still very small, at 36 total, or .6 per cent. At issue here are ideologies and perceptions that still need to be forged. Is it a conflict to have individuals or groups raise food or ornamentals for profit on public land? Could this type of garden be classified as a “public service” or assistance program? Could the value of maintaining the vacant lots cancel out the value of the produce raised when the cities look at what benefits they receive for letting the properties be run by someone other than their maintenance crews? At issue also is the profitability of these kinds of operations. Are they really cost effective? Can they pay for themselves? This category could grow larger and also more complex as it becomes a familiar type in each city.
Site Permanency and Rates of Growth

In almost all cases, respondents said that site permanency was an issue (only six said it was not an issue). There are 6020 gardens tabulated in this national survey, yet only a total of 318 are in ownership (131) or a land trust (187); this is only 5.3 per cent of the total number of gardens! What may be delusionary is the count of gardens more than ten years old; there are 1941, or 32.3 per cent of the total. These gardens have existed for more than 10 years, but they are not at all permanent. They may be at risk of dissolving depending on the lessor, the economic development trends in the city, and the value of the land where the garden sits. As an overall issue, resolution of site permanency has not been addressed, yet it may be the crux of the future success of urban community gardens.

Losses of gardens in the past five years total 542, or about 9 per cent. New gardens created in the past five years totals 1851, or 30.8 per cent, exceeding the number of losses by about 22 per cent. A look at the individual cities, however, will show that some programs are growing at a much slower rate, or are even declining. When taking into account the number of sites lost compared with the number of sites gained in the past five years, the percentage change in this period gives an estimation of the permanency for the gardens. The more successful gardens there are in a city, the more support they may expect to gain.

Cities that have rates of change equal to or less than 15 per cent include the following, with percentages in parenthesis: Boston (4); Cheshire (0); Columbia (12.5); Davis (0); Duluth (-6.6); Grand Rapids (-50); Indianapolis (13.9); Manhattan (0); Pittsburgh (-1.9); Santa Barbara (0); and Troy (14.3).

Cities that anticipate a low overall change in the next five years include: Austin (8.3); Boston (0); Davis (0); Dayton (11.5); Lansing (0); Madison (-5.4); Manhattan (0); Newark (4.1); New York (-7.9); Pittsburgh (-4.6); Portland (8.7); Somerville (7.2); Trenton (15); Troy (14.3); Tucson (0) and Washington, D.C. (8.6).

Rates of change for some cities have been very favorable in the past five years. This may be accountable for a number of reasons—the program just started in the past five years, losses are much lower than additions, or the garden program received extra funding or more favored status within the community. Those cities that have a rate of change equal to or more than 50 per cent include: Denver (64.8); Durham (50); Houston (65.4); Idaho Falls (100); Lubbock (85.7); New Orleans (95.3); Sarasota (100); Spokane (95.2); Springfield (80); and Tucson (80).

In this survey, comprised of both more established garden programs and others that have recently been initiated, there is a significant number of gardens that have been started in the past five years—30.8 per cent, or 1853. This rise in new garden starts could be a reflection of the success of ACGA’s mentoring program to help cities establish gardens, or a more
favorable outlook on gardens by city officials. There could also be a sensitivity to the general public’s concern about the environment and food security issues. It would be worthy of additional research to explore this issue of new gardens. In addition to searching answers into why gardens are cropping up, there should be focus on helping maintain them in the future.

Total gardens lost in the past five years equals 543—that accounts for 9 per cent of the total in existence now. Of the total lost, the primary reason given for loss of garden sites is lack of interest by gardeners (268; or 49.4 per cent), followed by loss to a public agency (107; or 19.7 per cent); and loss to private owners (83; or 15.3 per cent). Other reasons totaled 85 or 15.7 per cent.

The way a garden is initiated or developed does not seem to be the strongest factor in why losses may occur or interest may wane. In the case where gardens were started by outside intervention rather than by interested gardeners themselves, there are no strong trends to indicate that these gardens are lost more frequently than others. Comparing other cities where percentages of losses are more than 25 per cent, there are just as many gardens initiated from community-driven interest as well as program- or administration-driven assistance. Maintenance of group interest or governance may be a stronger factor that influences losses, along with how a particular garden is valued in the community.

### Open Space Initiatives

Of the 38 respondents, only 15 cities reported significant open space initiatives. There were three categories that were reported most often. The first was the spending of funds for garden development or maintenance. The funds came from community block grants, state or city funds from bond issues and other sources. The other most reported category was formation of coalitions with other groups for advocating open space and garden preservation. Another major category was the inclusion of community gardens in the cities’ overall plan.

Other initiatives cited by at least two cities included: consolidation of municipal departments for the management of open spaces, parks and gardens; code or zoning changes favorable to gardens; performing some sort of advocacy; and revision of water use conditions.

Single responses for initiatives included: establishment of a task force for land use inventory; formation of a land trust; transfer of community gardens into a more permanent status with a move to another department; and a special city waiver allowing the garden program to work on city land without paying union wages.
The Initiatives and the Cities That Reported Them

- Funds for gardens: Boston, Madison, San Francisco, Seattle, Troy
- Coalitions formed: Austin, Cincinnati, Boston, Newark, Springfield
- In city plan: Madison, Philadelphia, Portland, Seattle, Somerville
- Consolidated departments: Boston, Cincinnati
- Changed codes/zoning: Austin, Minneapolis
- Advocacy: Austin, Trenton
- Water arrangements: Austin, Boston
- Land use task force: Austin
- Land trust established: Madison
- Transfer to other dept.: New York
- City waiver on wages: San Francisco

Note:
Specific examples can be read in each city’s individual survey response following the charts. Just because a city did not report any initiatives in this survey does not mean that there are no current problems being resolved. Some cities reported significant action in the 1992 survey. It could be assumed that those initiatives are still in place.

Addressing the issue of open space and greening cities does not seem to come in sweeping changes. Even in such green-minded cities as Seattle, there are losses of gardens despite the inclusion in city plans, funds set aside for gardens and high populace support. As one respondent commented in a telephone interview regarding the survey, advocates cannot solve the problem all at once, there needs to be small, but significant, changes made over time. The changes need to be successful and have meaning to the people who have influence in changing policies, providing funding, and generating support for gardens and community managed open spaces.

Comparisons

Some hypotheses can be made on how community gardens fared in the past five years by looking at the data from the 1992 study and comparing it with repeating cities in the 1996 survey. For this comparison, total numbers of gardens and their percentage gain or loss were tabulated, as well as the permanent or land trust inventories and open space initiatives in effect.
Of the 15 repeating cities, 53 per cent reported more than a 40 per cent gain in new gardens started in the past five years (it is known that Davis did not have an increase in gardens, only an increase in the number reported). Four cities fell in the 37 to 19 per cent range of gain, while three others had 8 to -35 per cent rates of change.

The rates of change for establishing land ownership or land permanency through stabilizing contracts with owners has been increasing in the compared cities as the garden sites have been increasing (San Francisco did not report figures for the land ownership section of the survey.) Ten of the 15 cities reported an increase in their land holdings or 10-year contracts. Of this group, five had an increase in land trusts, seven had an increase in ownership by the organization or a supporting organization, four of the cities had more 10-year leases (although 2 had a decrease in leases); and four had more 10-year or more legal arrangements that made the land more stable for garden use. Seattle had the most growth overall; Trenton claims the most direct ownership of all its gardens in the compared cities.

Comparison cities have shown that open space initiatives are important and being enacted. In both 1992 and 1996, 40 per cent of the cities had reported initiatives active in their environs. Four cities reported some action in 1992, and two cities reported change in 1996. There were only two cities that did not report any open space initiatives in both surveys.

**Issues for Further Study**

Community gardens in general have shown growth in the past five years and many respondents foresee an optimistic future. The data, however, reveals that some issues still need to be addressed. Some types of gardens remain low despite the high population segment that could support it.

Study should be made in the senior, horticultural therapy, school and economic development categories for gardens. Permanency land issues are of concern to respondents, yet only an alarming 5.3 per cent of gardens are in permanent status of land trusts or other ownership, and just 14 cities of the 38 reported any significant policy changes in land use regulations that helped move gardens toward a more favored status.

The way gardens are initiated does not seem to create a tendency one way or the other for more losses, whether the garden is started by grassroots support from neighbors or an intervening agency. What may be a more telling study is how the gardens are maintained and managed, focusing on the garden group’s dynamics and the type and amount of outside support from institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Gardens</th>
<th>Population (in 1,000's)</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Gardens / 10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New York</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1. Newark</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minneapolis</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4. Trenton</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Boston</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>5. Pittsburgh</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pittsburgh</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>7. Troy</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Houston</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>8. New York</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trenton</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9. Spokane</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Denver</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>11. Wilmington</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Seattle</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>12. Davis</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Madison</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15. Somerville</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Austin</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>16. Duluth</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Indianapolis</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>17. San Francisco</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Cincinnati</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>18. Cheshire</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dayton</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>19. Dayton</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lubbock</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>22. Denver</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Columbia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23. Lubbock</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Duluth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24. Cincinnati</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Wilmington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25. New Orleans</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Somerville</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26. Seattle</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Troy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27. Austin</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Grand Rapids</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>29. Sarasota</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Davis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30. Manhattan, KS</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Springfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>31. Portland</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Tucson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>32. Indianapolis</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Durham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>33. Houston</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Santa Barbara</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34. Springfield</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Sarasota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35. Durham</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Manhattan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36. Santa Barbara</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Cheshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37. Idaho Falls</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Idaho Falls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38. Tucson</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9(NC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison**</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0(-200)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0(-200)</td>
<td>17(1700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- TOT=Total; LT=Land trust; OWN=owned by organization; 10 YL=ten-year lease or more; OTH10=land has an arrangement that keeps it stable for at least 10 year. NS signifies the respondent was unsure of past figures. NC is the symbol for no comparable data.

**NOTE:**
- *Davis did not report the three other gardens in the previous survey, although they existed.
- **Madison is currently working on ownership as partners with a land trust. They are also negotiating to buy some sites or purchase land easements.
- +San Francisco did not report numbers for the land ownership section of the survey.

## Compared Cities 1992 / 1996: Open space initiatives or innovations for land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices

• Community Garden Data Chart 1996
  available for PDF download at:
  http://www.communitygarden.org/pubs/index.html

• Individual Garden Surveys:
  on pages 12 through 91
Note:
When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of pages represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses

ALBANY

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Paul Winkeller 518/434-2677
Albany Community Gardens
88 N. Lake Ave., Albany, NY 12201

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Garden</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)?

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No
Gardens more than 10 years old? 5
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold or taken:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by public agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(includes existing number)

(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 5
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: ____________________________ Resources: ____________________________

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
ALBANY

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Paul Winkeller 518/434-2677
Albany Community Gardens
88 N. Lake Ave., Albany, NY 12201

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

13 Neighborhood Gardens ___ SeniorCtr/Sr. Housing Gardens
___ Public Housing Gardens ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes
Development, CSAs for rehabilitation)
___ School Gardens ___ Other types

13 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 8

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No
Gardens more than 10 years old? 5 Gardens that a a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 1 Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 6.5
by private owner 1 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 1.5
gardeners lack interest 0 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 18
other reason 0 (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 2 PERCENT CHANGE 38.5
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City of Albany: Dept. of Parks, Dept. of General Services; Albany Housing Authority; Albany

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Medical Center

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 5
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

75 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
25 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Albany Service Corps/
Resources: Albany Community Gardens

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Albany Service Corps has an annual contract with City Hall to run program. It is renewed each winter without a problem.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? No

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
AUSTIN

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Erik Peterson 512/458-2009
Austin Community Gardens
4814 Sunshine Dr., Austin, TX 78756 astncmgrdn@aol.com

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>School Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Other types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 5

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 3 Gardens that are a land trust? 1 (owned by ACG)

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:
- by public agency NR Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 5
- by private owner NR Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 2
- gardeners lack interest NR TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 39
- other reason NR (includes existing number)

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 10 PERCENT CHANGE 8.3
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City of Austin: Real Estate Division; City of Austin: Parks and Rec. Dept.; Texas General Land Office
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Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 24
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

10% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
90% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

**Garden Creation continued**

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin Community Gardens</td>
<td>Compost, technical asst., tilling, gardener workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Food Center</td>
<td>Seeds, plants, assistance, leadership training land procurement, compost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**
1. New city law recognizes “community gardens” in planning/development code.
2. New city law eases access to city water supply for “low-incomed” community gardens and subsidizes water hookup costs.
3. Coalition of groups interested in community and school gardens.
4. Food Policy Council has gardening committee to support community gardening.
5. Texas legislature passed law in 1995 setting up state task force to study location of community gardens on state-owned unused land to benefit low-income neighborhoods.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS**

1. When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
BOSTON

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Betsy Johnson 617/522-1996
Garden Futures
11 Green St., Jamaica Plain, MA 02130
betsy@usa1.com

**NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>120/67</th>
<th>Neighborhood Gardens</th>
<th>1/3</th>
<th>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>10/nr</td>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/ nr</td>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>1/nr</td>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>0/19</td>
<td>Other types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

148/103 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 82.5

**SITE PERMANENCY:**

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 100 Gardens that are a land trust? 60

**PAST LOSSES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites lost due to being sold or taken:</th>
<th>by public agency</th>
<th>1 1/3</th>
<th>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</th>
<th>7.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(includes existing number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GARDEN CREATION:**

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 17.5
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: remained the same

Garden Creation continued

95% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
05% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Garden Futures is collaboration of above four groups
Resources: Coordinates and prevents overlap for resource delivery among organizations—e.g. seeds, compost volunteers, workshops, etc.

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
1) Continued spending of about $500,000 annually of CBG money on capital improvements in privately held community gardens.
2) Advocacy efforts underway: formation of a task force to develop policy for short/long-term use of vacant land; zoning of all existing community gardens as Open Space gardens (the classification exists); striving for consistent level of maintenance support and services from city agencies to all community gardens and equity of water costs among publicly and privately held gardens.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? Pro-garden initiative are enforced—until the administration or key administrators change.

OTHER COMMENTS?

Garden Futures has two major initiatives underway—development of a City Gardener Certificate and a Service Corp program. The first is similar to the USDA’s Master Gardener program. The second is an

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
awareness campaign to encourage gardeners to do more outreach and build bridges to their surrounding neighbors.
CHESHIRE

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Sandy Petela 203/272-2743
Cheshire Parks & Recreation Department
559 S. Main St., Cheshire, CT 06410

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS: 1

1 Neighborhood Gardens  ___ Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
___ Public Housing Gardens  ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs  ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)
___ School Gardens  ___ Other types

1 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)?  0

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality?  Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 0  Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken:  by public agency  0  Gardens to add in 5 yrs.  0
by private owner  0  Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.  0
gardeners lack interest  0  TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years  1
other reason  0  (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years  0  PERCENT CHANGE  0
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Cheshire Parks and Rec. Dept.; Cheshire Land Trust

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 1
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

100 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Resources:
Connecticut Agri. Exper. Stn. Soil testing
Cheshire Land Trust Assistance, master gardener advice
Boulder Knoll Farm Initial plowing
Cheshire Garden Club Support, technical assistance
Cheshire Nursery Plants, seeds, humus
Town of Cheshire Recycling Fair Compost bins
Cub Scout Eagle Project Welcome sign, bulletin board
Life Skills program at high school Plants

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
CINCINNATI

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Civic Garden Center/ 513/221-0991
Neighborhood Gardens Program
2715 Reading Rd., Cincinnati, OH 45206

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

| 17/17 | Neighborhood Gardens | 3/9 | Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens |
| 2/6  | Public Housing Gardens | 0/nr | Large “farm” sites divided into plots |
| 0/nr | Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs | 0/nr | Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation) |
| 7/5  | School Gardens | 5/15 | Other types |

34/52 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 10

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 10 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES: FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken: by public agency 1 Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 25
by private owner 0 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 0
gardeners lack interest 0 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 59
other reason 0 (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 1 PERCENT CHANGE 73.5
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
First go to Hamilton County Auditors’ office to confirm ownership, then contact private owner or
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specific government office.

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 11
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

53% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
47% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Neighborhood Gardens Program
Resources: Design, construction, start-up funds, seeds, soil, technical asst., contract for land, garden education, leadership skills, etc.

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
All public green space has moved under the jurisdiction of the Parks Dept. CGC has member on Park Board Public Green Space committee. Previously coordinated by several different departments.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
### COLUMBIA

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Guy Clark  
Community Garden Coalition  
P.O. Box 7051, Columbia, MO 65205  
573/875-5995

---

**NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING:** 16

---

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 8

---

**SITE PERMANENCY:**

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? **Yes**

---

**PAST LOSSES:**

- Sold or taken: by public agency 0  
- by private owner 2  
- gardeners lack interest 2  
- other reason 0  

**TOTAL LOST in past 5 years** 4

---

**FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:**

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 5  
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 1.5  

**TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years** 19.5 (includes existing number)

**PERCENT CHANGE** 21.9 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

---

**GARDEN CREATION:**

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:  
Community Garden Coalition; City of Columbia Parks & Rec. Dept.

---

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 6
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: *remained the same*

13% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
87% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden Coalition</td>
<td>Seeds, water, tools, plots, technical assistance, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

Started one school garden and have interest in another. Working with food bank and county jail to start
a garden to be maintained by inmates.

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
DAVIS

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Suzanne Monroe-Santos 916/753-1926
Community Development Graduate Group, UC Davis
Davis, CA 95616

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

1 Neighborhood Gardens ___ Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
___ Public Housing Gardens 2 Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes
Development, CSAs for rehabilitation)
4 School Gardens 2 Other types

9 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 0

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 5 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 0 Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 0
by private owner 0 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 0
gardeners lack interest 0 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 9
other reason 0 (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 0 PERCENT CHANGE 0
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City of Davis Community Gardening Program, UC Davis Experimental College, and Orchard Park

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Community Garden coordinator.

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 1
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: *stayed the same*

100% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

**Name:** City of Davis Community Garden Program

**Resources:** Resources for one public garden

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
### NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>18/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development</td>
<td>1/ nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>2/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>1/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING:** 26/16

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 17

### SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes

Gardens more than 10 years old? 2

Gardens that are a land trust? 2

### PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold or taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by public agency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes existing number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

City of Dayton; Board of Education; private individual or organization; Grow with Your Neighbors

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
(we help negotiate sale or lease for any of the former)

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 14
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: remained the same

100% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Resources:
Grow with Your Neighbors All resources

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
DENVER

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:  David Rieseck 303/592-9300
Denver Urban Gardeners
1100 Acoma St., Denver, 80204

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, CSAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXISTING</td>
<td>54/45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)?  22

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality?  Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 3  Gardens that are a land trust? 6

PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sold or taken</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites lost due to being sold or taken:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by public agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

| Gardens to add in 5 yrs.                  | 50     |
| Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.                 | 2      |
| TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years (includes existing number) | 102    |
| PERCENT CHANGE (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.) | 87.3   |

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Denver Housing Authority; Denver Public Schools; private landowner; Denver Parks & Rec. Dept.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 40
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

25% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
75% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUG</td>
<td>All resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Soil, training through master gardener program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver &amp; Aurora Parks Depts.</td>
<td>Some construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Recycles</td>
<td>Compost training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
**DULUTH**

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Sue Katt 218/722-4583
Duluth Community Garden Program
206 W. 4th St., Duluth, MN 55806

**NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Village Gardens</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 8

**SITE PERMANENCY:**

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No

Gardens more than 10 years old? 11 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

**PAST LOSSES:**

Sites lost due to being sold or taken: by public agency 0 by private owner 1 gardeners lack interest 0 other reason 2

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 3

**FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:**

Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 2.5 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 0 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 17.5 (includes existing number)

PERCENT CHANGE 16.7 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

**GARDEN CREATION:**

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Duluth Community Garden Program; MN Extension; St. Louis County

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 2
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: NR

10% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
90% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

Name: Duluth Community Garden Program
Resources: Land, tilling, mowing, tech. assist., tools, classes, newsletter, consultation

Name: MN Extension
Resources: Land, consultation

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?
The Duluth Community Garden Program grew out of a group of gardeners who started one garden site and wanted to promote more. We now “manage” most sites in town.

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

3  Neighborhood Gardens  1  Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
___ Public Housing Gardens  ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic  ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes
   Development, CSAs  for rehabilitation)
___ School Gardens  ___ Other types

4  TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)?  2

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old?  1  Gardens that are a land trust?  0

PAST LOSSES:                      FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Sites lost due to being  Gardens to add in 5 yrs.  4
sold or taken:  by public agency  0  Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.  0
   by private owner  0  TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years  8
   gardeners lack interest  0  (includes existing number)
   other reason  0
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years  0  PERCENT CHANGE  100
   (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Durham County Commissioners

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 2
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

25 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
75 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: SEEDS
Resources: All resources

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

- 7 Neighborhood Gardens
- 2 Public Housing Gardens
- ___ Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs
- 1 School Gardens
- ___ Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
- ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
- ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)
- 2 Other types

TOTAL EXISTING: 12

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 8

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanancy considered an important issue in this locality? Yes

Gardens more than 10 years old? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken: by public agency 4
by private owner 0

gardeners lack interest 15
other reason 5

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 24

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 20
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 6.5
- TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 25.5

PERCENT CHANGE 113

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City government; several neighborhood assns.; churches and related religious organizations

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 30
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

25% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
75% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens? Name: Resources:

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
Lack of them: City does not consider green spaces necessary. Sites leased from city for free come with 30-day notice of termination clause. We have lost three gardens mid-year due to this.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?
1) Gardens are most successful where residents have taken the most ownership

2) Gov’t institutions will be convinced of community gardens’ value by concrete, successful models in their area, not by creative, high-minded ideas

3) Garden groups are most stable when partnered with or supported by larger community groups (like 4-H, civic groups, botanical gardens, etc.)

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
HOUSTON

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Bob Randall, Ph.D. 713/880-5540
Urban Harvest
1990 Kane St., PO Box 980460, Houston, TX 77098-0460
UrbanHarve@aol.com

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, CSAs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL EXISTING: 81

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 10

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No
Gardens more than 10 years old? 0
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 1
by private owner 1
by gardeners lack interest 10
other reason 0
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 12

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 60
Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 5
TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 136
(includes existing number)

PERCENT CHANGE 67.9
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Park depts.; schools; private landowners; utilities; churches; synagogues; neighborhood centers; etc.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 65
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

100% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Urban Harvest
Resources: All resources

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
None

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

\[1\] When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
### IDAHO FALLS

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Kristi Appelhaus  
208/524-0383  
Idaho Falls Community Garden Assn., Inc.  
6643 Limousin Ave., Idaho Falls, ID 83404  
klack@srv.net

#### NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctrl/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 1

#### SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? **Yes**

Gardens more than 10 years old? 0  
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

#### PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sold or taken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by public agency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(includes existing number)

(percentage change expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

#### GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

Private landowners; companies; city agencies; technical colleges

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 1
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

100  % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0    % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Idaho Falls Community Garden Assn., Inc. Resources: All resources

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1  When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
   responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
INDIANAPOLIS

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Tom Tyler 317/848-7351
Coop. Extension Srvc., Purdue University
9245 N. Meridian St. #118, Indianapolis, IN 46260
tom@marion.can.purdue.edu

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>15/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>4/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>10/4</td>
<td>6/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>36/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? Most

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No
Gardens more than 10 years old? 2 Gardens that are a land trust? 1

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:
- by public agency 2
- by private owner 0
- gardeners lack interest 1
- other reason 0
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 3

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 25
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 10
- TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 51
  (includes existing number)

PERCENT CHANGE 41.7
  (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Real Estate Srvcs. Division, City of Indianapolis

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 8
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

50% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
50% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Marion Co. Extension Srvc.
Name: Indpls. Clean City Committee
Resources: Technical, networking, training, volunteers, seeds
Resources: Soil, volunteers, in-kind

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
No significant policy set.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
**LANSING**

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Roberta Miller  
517/887-4307  
The Garden Project, Ingham Co. Health Dept.  
PO Box 30161, Lansing, MI 48909  
millerr3@pilot.msu.edu

**NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>2/nr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>2/nr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING:** 24/20

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 2

**SITE PERMANENCY:**

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? **Yes**

Gardens more than 10 years old? 7  
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

**PAST LOSSES:**

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:  
- by public agency: 0  
- by private owner: 3  
- gardeners lack interest: 3  
- other reason: 4

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years: 10

**FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:**

Gardens to add in 5 yrs.: 0  
Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.: 0  
TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years: 24 (includes existing number)

**GARDEN CREATION:**

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

**Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association**
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 14
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: *stayed about the same*

| NR | % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out |
| NR | % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need |

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Project</td>
<td>Tilling, seeds, amendments, plants, newsletter, workshops, canning supplies, tools, library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
### LUBBOCK

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Gerre Sears  
806/763-3003  
Lubbock Green, South Plains Food Bank  
4612 Locust Ave., Lubbock, TX 79404

### NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, CSAs</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING:** 21

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 8

### SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? **Yes**

Gardens more than 10 years old? 0  
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

### PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:
- by public agency 0
- by private owner 0
- gardeners lack interest 2
- other reason 0

**TOTAL LOST in past 5 years:** 2

### FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 12.5
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 5
- TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 28.5 (includes existing number)

**PERCENT CHANGE:** 35.7 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

### GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:  
Churches; city agencies; private landowners; schools; Boys and Girls Clubs

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 20
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

$50\%$ of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
$50\%$ of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock Green</td>
<td>Water, land prep, technical asst., seeds, plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>materials, office supplies, meeting room,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership training, receptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Gardeners</td>
<td>Horticultural expertise, training, education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**
None

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
### MADISON

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Joe Mathers  
608/246-4730 x212  
Community Action Coalition Community Gardens  
1717 N. Stoughton Rd., Madison, WI 53704-2605  
CAC@donenet.wicip.org

### NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>0/ nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>3/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>3/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>1/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>12/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING:** 37/31

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 4

### SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes

Gardens more than 10 years old? 14  
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

### PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:

- by public agency 1
- by private owner 1
- gardeners lack interest 0
- other reason 1

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 3

### FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 3
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 5
- TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 35

**(includes existing number)**

PERCENT CHANGE -5.4  
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

### GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

- Madison Parks Dept.
- Madison Real Estate Div.
- churches
- businesses
- utilities
- railroads
- other govt.

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
agencies; highway dept.; housing assns.; state of WI; county govt.

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 14
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: decreased

25% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
75% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Resources:
Community Action Coalition Gardens unit Land prep, technical asst., insurance,
land negot., maintenance contracts, water, construction, in-kind,
information dissemination, coordination, tools
Mad. Area Comm. Garden Coalition Advocacy, shared skills, negotiation
Urban Open Space Fdtn (new) Land tenure, long term arrangements, initiatives

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
1) Local land trust sets community garden land as major priority
2) Open Space Plan for city of Madison has “urban gardens” goal
3) State Stewardship Fund (10 year bond issue) has “community garden” category

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? A little. Increased cooperation and communication. Help in relocation of an interim site. Inclusion in some larger plan designs. Some glacial movement in our direction.

OTHER COMMENTS?
Madison is rapidly becoming urbanized with highly desirable properties. All local leaders are not in “garden” business. Need to form alliances between low-income constituents and moderate/middle income persons to build a broader base of support and action.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
MANHATTAN

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Madonna Stallmann 913/539-4805
Manhattan Community Gardens
7705 Lakeside Ave., Manhattan, KS 66502

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

___ Neighborhood Gardens ___ Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
___ Public Housing Gardens 1___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)
___ School Gardens 1___ Other types

2___ TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 0

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No
Gardens more than 10 years old? 2 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites lost due to being sold or taken:</th>
<th>by public agency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(includes existing number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City of Manhattan, Community Development Office

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 0
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: *remained the same*

100 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. for Mankind</td>
<td>Lease land, liability insurance, public relations, gardening classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**
None

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
MINNEAPOLIS

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Terri Goodfellow-Heyer 612/643-3601
Minnesota Green
1755 Prior Ave. N., Falcon Heights, MN 55113

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type of Garden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>283/70</td>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens 6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>Public Housing Gardens 5/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/ nr</td>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs 5/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213/3</td>
<td>School Gardens 0/23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

536/60 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 15

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes

Gardens more than 10 years old? 39 Gardens that are a land trust? 31

PAST LOSSES: FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 7 Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 250
by private owner 12 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 125
gardeners lack interest 8 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 661
other reason 2 (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 29 PERCENT CHANGE 23.3
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 605 **Includes boulevards, adopt-a-parks, wetland-prairie restoration, etc.—not part of gardens total above

Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

65  % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
35  % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN Green</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Resources Center/Urban Lands Metro</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
Minneapolis reviewing Urban Tree Ordinance to consider “green” (trees, gardens, open space) as part of the infrastructure.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
NEWARK

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Prof. I.C. Patel 201/648-5958
Rutgers Cooperative Exten. of Essex Co.
162 Washington St., Newark, NJ 07102

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1318 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 100

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 500 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken: by public agency 11 by private owner 1 gardeners lack interest 2 other reason 0

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 14

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 65 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 10 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 1373 (includes existing number)

PERCENT CHANGE 4.1 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City municipality, Newark Housing Authority

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 516
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

50  % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
50  % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Rutgers Urban Garden program
Name: Greater Newark Conservancy

Resources:

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
The Greater Newark Conservancy initiated the Newark Environmental coalition (comprised of grassroots organizations, businesses, city representatives and citizens). One goal is to create an Open Space plan for Newark.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? Doesn’t seem to be any open space initiative now.

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
NEW ORLEANS

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Mary M. Dike 504/286-2282
Parkway Partners Program, Inc.-Com. Gardens Project
2829 Gentilly Blvd., New Orleans, LA 70122

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

43 Neighborhood Gardens ___ Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
___ Public Housing Gardens ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes
for rehabilitation)
___ School Gardens ___ Other types

43 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 16

SITE PERMANENY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No
Gardens more than 10 years old? 1 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 0 Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 40
by private owner 1 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 0

gardeners lack interest 0 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 83
other reason 0 (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 1

PERCENT CHANGE 93
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Community Gardens Project

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 42
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

100 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Community Gardens Project
Resources: Seeds, soil, information/technical assistance

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
Vague—we develop gardens on adjudicated vacant lots.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
NEW YORK

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Lenny Librizzi  212/788-7927
Council on the Environment
51 Chambers St., #228, NY, NY 10007
conyc@interport.net

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Gardens</th>
<th>Number of Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>869/845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>834/200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>34/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>114/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>1906/1237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1906/1237 TOTAL EXISTING
How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 70

SITE PERMANENCY:
Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 700
Gardens that are a land trust? 2

PAST LOSSES:
Sites lost due to being sold or taken:

- by public agency 60
- by private owner 35
- gardeners lack interest 175
- other reason 65
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 335

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 300
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 450
TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 1756

PERCENT CHANGE -7.9
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

Most of losses are in Green Thumb gardens. Most of the gain is in NYCHA gardens.

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Vacant city owned lots—Green Thumb; Housing Authority land—NY City Housing Authority; Park land—NY City Dept. of Parks and Rec.; Public schools—Board of Education; Other sites—Dept. of Transportation, private land owners, churches, hospitals, etc..

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 800
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: not reported
98% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

Name: Resources:

Green Thumb                       Fencing, soil, seeds, lumber, bulbs, plants, license for land, training, technical asst., design
Brooklyn Greenbridge              Tech. assistance, plants, seeds, compost, workshops

Garden Creation continued

Bronx Green Up                    Tech. assistance, workshops, truck for materials pickup (fee), seeds, compost, plants, bulbs, woodchips
Cornell Coop. Extension           Soil infor., plant identification, disease and pest infor., low cost publications
Council on the Environment       Extensive material & tech. asst. to limited number of sites annually (2-4), tool loans and truck for materials pickup (fee), plant and bulb sales, workshops and infor. on gardening
Green Guerrillas                  Tech. assistance, free distribution of shrubs, trees, bulbs, flowers and containers (when available), composting asst., garden preservation and volunteer recruitment
N.Y. City Housing Authority-      For tenants of NYCHA residences: seeds, workshops, instructional materials, site prep, $40 grant towards seeds & plants purchase
Trust for Public Land             Garden preservation assistance, incorporation and non-profit mngmt. Procedures, grants for organizational development and community outreach, school gardening program

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

In July, 1995, GreenThumb was transferred from the Dept. of General Services (manages vacant land inventory) to Parks & Rec. This has provided an opportunity to transfer some of the best gardens--those achieving ample physical development and linkage to the entire community--to Parks. This is important because the gardens operating under DGS/GT 10-yr. term leases become vulnerable as these leases expire. There is now no new long term protection other than permanent transfer to Parks. Despite trying other mechanisms to protect those lots in intermediate status, there is still no answer to the permanency dilemma.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Are these initiatives actually being enforced? Yes. Several gardens operating under a GreenThumb long term lease were recently included in housing and commercial development plans that affect over 50 gardens. The long term leases protected these gardens; they were not included in the development.

**OTHER COMMENTS?**
Combining responses from several different groups (see those above) was quite complicated. A certain amount of educated guesswork was incorporated, with an expected 1-2 percent margin of error.

In an effort to raise revenue, NYC has mandated responsible agencies to develop with housing land on “hold” or to release that land that can then be auctioned off with land that has no “hold” on it. Nearly half of GreenThumb gardens are on these housing sites. The future is highly unpredictable because of the new city initiative to build on the garden sites. The types of mechanisms that will be put in place to preserve gardens is unclear.
PHILADELPHIA

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Michael Groman 215/988-8800
Philadelphia Green, Penn. Horticultural Society
100 N. 20th St., 5th Fl., Philadelphia, PA 19103-1495

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
1012 & \text{Neighborhood Gardens} & 12 & \text{Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens} \\
81 & \text{Public Housing Gardens} & 5 & \text{Large “farm” sites divided into plots} \\
& \text{Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs} & 18 & \text{Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)} \\
& \text{School Gardens} & 8 & \text{Other types} \\
\end{array} \]

1135 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? NR

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 457 Gardens that are a land trust? 20

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken: sr by public agency nr by private owner nr
gardeners lack interest nr other reason nr
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years nr

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 273 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. nr
TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 1408 (includes existing number)
PERCENT CHANGE 24.1 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Philadelphia Development Authority; Philadelphia Housing Authority; School Dist. Of Philadelphia,

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Office of Housing and Community Development; other public agencies such as water dept.; Fairmont Park Commission, etc.

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 273
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

95% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
5% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

_Garden Creation continued_

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Philadelphia Green
Resources: Most all resources

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**
Philadelphia Green working with Community Development Corporations (CDCs) to include community gardens and other community managed green spaces in their development plans. A pilot project funded by the city Office of Housing and Community Development will develop a Neighborhood Open Space Management Program in the New Kensington neighborhood. It is hoped this will be a model for redevelopment of other plans throughout the city.

Streamlined time to process city side yard program so applications can be done in batches.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
NORTH AMERICAN COMMUNITY GARDEN SURVEY 1996

PITTSBURGH

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Jeff Gerson
W. Pa. Conservancy
209 Fourth Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15222
WPACONSE@ix.netcom.com

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>50/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic</td>
<td>1/ nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>2/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>50/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108/79 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 17.5

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Y-N
Gardens more than 10 years old? 50 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:
- by public agency: 10
- by private owner: 10
- gardeners lack interest: 25
- other reason: 5

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years: 50

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Gardens to add in 5 yrs.: 12.5
Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.: 17.5
TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years: 103 (includes existing number)

PERCENT CHANGE: -4.6 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City of Pittsburgh, Urban Redevelopment, etc.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 48
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: decreased

100% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Resources:
West Pennsylvania Conservancy Insurance, land contracts, soil, compost, fencing
self-help organizing, landscape assistance

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? No. We are ignored or given lip service.

OTHER COMMENTS?
The highly visible flower bed program of planting annual flowers in strategic highway locations has become the conservancy’s core activity. It has been highly accepted by the public, press, government entities, etc.

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
PORTLAND

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Leslie Pohl-Kosbau 503/823-1612
Parks & Recreation, Community Garden Program
6437 S.E. Division St., Portland, OR 97206
pkleslie@ci.portland.or.us

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training,</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td>for rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, CSAs</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Other types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL EXISTING 23

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 7

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 16 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sold or taken:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by public agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENT CHANGE 8.7

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Parks & Rec.; school district; churches/synagogues; water bureau; dept. of transportation; city general

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 5
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: stayed about the same

75 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
25 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

_Garden Creation continued_

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

**Name:**

Parks & Rec., Community Garden Program
Friends of Portland Community Gardens
Master Gardeners program

**Resources:**

Tech. assistance, contract for land, education, leadership training
Grants, funding, advocacy education
Education

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**

City neighborhood plans can include suggestion for gardens. It is not binding, but a good tool.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? No. Open space initiatives concentrate on natural areas.

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
SAN FRANCISCO

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Brian Lease 415/285-7584
San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)
2088 Oakdale Ave., San Francisco, CA 94124
slug1@creative.net

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

131 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 6

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes, but complicated answer
Gardens more than 10 years old? 50 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Lost in Past 5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold or taken by public agency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold or taken by private owner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 0

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Expected Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
SF Recreation & Park Dept.; Dept. of Public Works; Water Dept.; Unified School District; SF Housing Authority. Others: churches; community and seniors centers; AIDS care facilities; hospitals.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 40
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

80 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
20 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

Name: SLUG

Resources:

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

1. 1987 Proposition J (Open Space) put aside property tax funds for development of open spaces in general. Community gardens received a line item in the budget which has provided some steady funding for maintenance and development of new gardens.

2. 1994 Proposition D exempted SLUG and SF Conservation Corps from requirement to pay union wages for work done on city property. Allowed us to keep running.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? Yes and no. SLUG gets some funding. Some say that Rec-Park gets a big chunk of the funds for administering it. I think it has been effective.

OTHER COMMENTS?
Considering the number of gardens, there is an amazing lack of guaranteed site permanency. City agencies (beside Rec-Park) refuse to commit longer than a year at a time. Garden losses are rare, however, thanks to the San Franciscan tradition of strong protest whenever someone tries something. My theory is, “if the garden is well used and loved, populist support is the best protection.” It seems to work here.

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
SANTA BARBARA

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Oscar Carmona 805/963-0583 X 114
CEC
930 Miramonte Dr., Santa Barbara, CA 93111

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

2__ Neighborhood Gardens ___ Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
___ Public Housing Gardens ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes
Development, CSAs for rehabilitation)
___ School Gardens 1__ Other types

3__ TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 3.

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? NR
Gardens more than 10 years old? 3 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites lost due to being sold or taken:</th>
<th>bye public agency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENT CHANGE 83.3
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City of Santa Barbara Parks Dept.; City of Santa Barbara & Pilgrim Terrace Sr. Citizen Coop.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 0
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: decreased

97% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
3% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: CEC
Resources: Seeds, tools, workshops, compost, information

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
**NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Garden</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING**

0

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? **0**

**SITE PERMANENCY:**

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? **Yes**

Gardens more than 10 years old? **0**

Gardens that are a land trust? **0**

**PAST LOSSES:**

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:

- by public agency: **0**
- by private owner: **0**
- gardeners lack interest: **0**
- other reason: **0**

**TOTAL LOST in past 5 years**: **0**

**FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:**

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs.: **10**
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.: **1**
- TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years: **12**

(includes existing number)

**PERCENT CHANGE**: **300**

(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

**GARDEN CREATION:**

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

- City of Sarasota, Sarasota County School Board

---

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 3
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: *increased*

33% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
77% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

**Name:**
Keep Sarasota Beautiful, Sarasota Recycling Division
Sarasota Cooperative Ext. Srvc.

**Resources:**

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**
None.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
### Seattle

**CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:** Barbara Donnette & Rich Macdonald 206/684-0264
P-Patch Garden Program
700 3rd Ave. 4th Fl., Seattle, WA 98104-1848
barbara.donnette@ci.seattle.wa.us

**NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Other Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>35/26</td>
<td>0/0 Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>0/nr Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>1/ nr</td>
<td>0/nr Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/0 Other types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXISTING:** 46/28

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? _14_

**SITE PERMANENCY:**

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? _Yes_
Gardens more than 10 years old? _19_ Gardens that are a land trust? _0_

**PAST LOSSES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold or taken:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by public agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years: _3_

**FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years: _54_

PERCENT CHANGE: _22.7_

(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

**GARDEN CREATION:**

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

---

*American Community Gardening Association*
P-Patch Garden Program

Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 22
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: *increased*

55% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
45% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need**

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

**Name:**

**Resources:**

P-Patch Garden Program All resources

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**

Seattle has a Comprehensive Plan which includes “at least one community garden in each urban
village.” In addition, Seattle’s neighborhood planning provides opportunities to select, fund and
develop new gardens.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? Yes. $650K in real estate excise taxes set aside in 1994
for purchase of land in densest areas.

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

**-- Percentage of outside group high because of new SHA Cultivating Communities Initiative. We
organized people who wanted to join community garden group.**

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
responses, followed by the 1992 responses.

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
SOMERVILLE

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Lisa Brukilacchio 617/776-4160
Greenspace, City Hall Annex
50 Evergreen Ave., Somerville, MA 02145

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 4

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? NR
Gardens more than 10 years old? 7 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites lost due to being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sold or taken:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by public agency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by private owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOST in past 5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Outcomes</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes existing number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
City of Somerville; Conservation Commission; Somerville Housing Authority

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 6
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

50% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
50% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Growing Center</td>
<td>Soil amendments, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace</td>
<td>Seeds, technical assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
Recent open space planning process identified community gardens as a priority. New open space committee will follow development of plan.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced? Too soon to tell.

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
SPOKANE

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Lori Steiner, MSW 509/326-8159
Spokane Community Gardens
2627 W. Gardner, Spokane, WA 99201

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

___ Neighborhood Gardens ___ Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
1 Public Housing Gardens ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes
Development, CSAs for rehabilitation)
___ School Gardens 39 Other types—Kitchen gardens or home gardens

42 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 39

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? No
Gardens more than 10 years old? 0 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Future Expectations:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 0 Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 350
by private owner 0 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 10
by gardeners lack interest 2 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 382
other reason 0 (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 2 PERCENT CHANGE 872
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Spokane Parks and Recreation

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 42
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

100% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood
0% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Spokane Community Gardens
Resources: Seeds, soil; technical assistance; training in composting, planting, food preservation and
seed saving; newsletter

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?
This community garden program is not like most programs. It encourages and supports the
development of home kitchen and side yard gardens.

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
responses, followed by the 1992 responses.

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
SPRINGFIELD

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Pam Bennett 513/328-4607
Ohio State University Extension
4400 Gateway Blvd. #104, Springfield, OH 45502
pjbennett@agrax2.ag.ohio.state.edu

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

1 Neighborhood Gardens 1 Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens
1 Public Housing Gardens ___ Large “farm” sites divided into plots
___ Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs
2 School Gardens ___ Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)

5 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 0

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 0 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 0 by private owner 0
gardeners lack interest 1 other reason 0
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 1

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 10
Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 0
TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 15 (includes existing number)

PERCENT CHANGE 200 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Public Schools; city commission; Metropolitan Housing

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 5
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

0 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
100 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens? No
Name: Resources:

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
County extension plans to develop coalition of agencies to assist in vacant lot development through urban gardens.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
TRENTON

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Ronald Friedman 609/393-5656 x17
Isles, Inc.
10 Wood St., Trenton, NJ 08618
Froggie405@aol.com

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Garden</th>
<th>Number Existing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>60/22</td>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>0/nr</td>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>Other types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>0/33</td>
<td>TOTAL EXISTING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 3

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 2 Gardens that are a land trust? 54

PAST LOSSES:  

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:
- by public agency: 1
- by private owner: 0
- gardeners lack interest: 1
- other reason: 0
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years: 2

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs.: 15
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.: 6
TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years: 69 (includes existing number)
PERCENT CHANGE: 15 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Mercer County Community College; Dept. of Horticulture; City of Trenton; private landowners

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: \textbf{16}
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: \textit{increased}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{0} \ % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
\item \textbf{100} \ % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need
\end{itemize}

\textit{Garden Creation continued}

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Name:} Isles, Inc.
\item \textbf{Resources:} Promotes, supports and administers the program
\item National seed companies
\item Seed
\item NGA
\item Funding and Mantis Award
\item Local vendors and corporations
\item Employee volunteer support, fund raising, participation, funding, greenhouse supplies, technical support
\item Rutgers University
\item Technical assistance and contacts
\end{itemize}

\textbf{SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:}
Isles, Inc. works with affordable housing authorities, emphasizing open space within the project proposals.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

\textbf{OTHER COMMENTS?}
Sustainability of the gardens will be highly affected in the future because of the nature of the community gardeners themselves. Teenagers are not interested, the 30-55 aged group is too busy working, and the elderly are moving away and running into health problems.

\textsuperscript{1} When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.

\textit{Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association}
TROY

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Sharon DiLorenzo 518/274-8685
Capital Dist. Community Gardens, Inc.
295 Eighth St., Troy, NY 12180

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13/12</th>
<th>Neighborhood Gardens</th>
<th>___</th>
<th>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>Other types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14/12 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? ___

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 10 Gardens that are a land trust? 7

PAST LOSSES: FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Sites lost due to being
sold or taken: by public agency 0 Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 3.5
by private owner 2 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 1.5
by gardeners lack interest 0 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 16
other reason 0 (includes existing number)
TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 2 PERCENT CHANGE 14.3
(expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Municipal housing agencies; housing for developmentally disabled; privately-owned housing

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 4
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: decreased

0% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
100% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Capital District Community Gardens, Inc.
Resources: Seeds, plants, information, tool lending, reference library, technical assistance, permanent site fund for buying land, urban landscape design services, volunteer coordination, tree planting consultation

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:
Capital District Community Gardens, Inc. created a designated “Permanent Site Fund”. All funds put into this account are used strictly for the purchase of land for new garden sites.

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?
Capital District Community Gardens, Inc. is a 25-year-old private non-profit organization that helps people improve their own neighborhoods through gardening and greening.

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
### TUCSON

#### CITY INFORMATION SOURCE:
Darlene Schacht  
520/795-6393  
Community Gardens of Tucson  
3324 E. Popinac Loop, Tucson, AZ 85716

#### NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 5

#### SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes

Gardens more than 10 years old? 0  
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

#### PAST LOSSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold or taken by public agency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold or taken by private owner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners lack interest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lost in Past 5 Years</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to add in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:

---

*Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association*
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 4
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

20% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
80% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Community Gardens of Tucson
Resources:

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?
The garden program began as Master Gardeners’ project under innovative horticulture extension agent. The group was dropped from the extension office when a new agent arrived. The Community Gardens of Tucson continues to survive on its own.

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996 responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
WASHINGTON, DC

CITY INFORMATION SOURCE: Judy Tiger 202/234-0591
Garden Resources of Washington (GROW)
1419 V St. NW, Washington, DC 20009
GROW19@aol.com

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58 TOTAL EXISTING

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 21

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 26 Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken: by public agency 3 by private owner 1 gardeners lack interest 0 other reason 0 TOTAL LOST in past 5 years 4

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

Gardens to add in 5 yrs. 10 Gardens to lose in 5 yrs. 5 TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years 63 (includes existing number)

PERCENT CHANGE 8.6 (expected rate of growth/loss in 5 yrs.)

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land: DC Dept. of Housing & Community Development; DC Dept. of Administrative Services

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 13
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: NR

90% of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
10% of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

Garden Creation continued

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: GROW
Resources: Seeds, technical assistance, leases, insurance,
leadership training
America the Beautiful Fund
DC Dept. of Public Works
Name: GROW
Resources: Seeds
Composted leaves

SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

OTHER COMMENTS?

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
responses, followed by the 1992 responses.
NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY GARDENS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Gardens</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing Gardens</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training, Youth Economic Development, CSAs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Gardens</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Ctr/Sr. Housing Gardens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large “farm” sites divided into plots</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (Shelters, group homes for rehabilitation)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL EXISTING: 15

How many are on privately owned land (as opposed to public land)? 15

SITE PERMANENCY:

Is site permanency considered an important issue in this locality? Yes
Gardens more than 10 years old? 1
Gardens that are a land trust? 0

PAST LOSSES:

Sites lost due to being sold or taken:
- by public agency: 1
- by private owner: 0
- gardeners lack interest: 3
- other reason: 0

TOTAL LOST in past 5 years: 4

FUTURE EXPECTATIONS:

- Gardens to add in 5 yrs.: 7.5
- Gardens to lose in 5 yrs.: 2
- TOTAL TO REMAIN in 5 years (includes existing number): 20.5

PERCENT CHANGE: 36.7

GARDEN CREATION:

Agencies to contact for permission to use land:
Private landowner—investigate through Office of Recorder of Deeds in City of Wilmington

Community Garden Survey 1996 ~ American Community Gardening Association
Number of gardens established within the past 5 years: 9
Comparing the past 5 years to previous years, the rate of new sites has: increased

100 % of gardens initiated by gardeners themselves; grassroots, from the neighborhood out
0 % of gardens initiated by outside agency or group, who sought interested gardeners after
deciding there was a need

*Garden Creation continued*

Overall community support group(s) that serve as resource for all or some of the gardens?
Name: Delaware Center for Horticulture
Resources: Seeds, soil, tool lending, technical assistance, advocacy, procuring funding, land contracting
educational outreach, garden special events, newsletter

**SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE POLICY INITIATIVES OR INNOVATIONS:**

Are these initiatives actually being enforced?

**OTHER COMMENTS?**

---

1 When a city was included in the 1992 ACGA survey, the first set of numbers represents the 1996
responses, followed by the 1992 responses.