

LP4 Landowner Comparison Chart

	Operators and Non-operator Landlords from Farm Families	Non-operator Landlords: Individuals, Institutions, Trusts	Land Trusts and Conservation Organizations	Public Agencies	Private Institutions: Churches, Schools, Civic Groups
Characteristics	Knowledgeable about needs and challenges of farmers, ranchers and the business of agriculture	Often know very little about needs and challenges of agriculture. May live on/near property or be absentee all or part time.	Conservation mission and property characteristics will drive what activities are allowed. Agricultural land trusts have knowledge of agriculture, but others mostly do not.	May or may not be knowledgeable about agriculture but likely have priorities beyond agriculture. Processes are formal, well defined and rigid.	Probably know very little about needs and challenges of agriculture. May live on/near property or be absentee all or part time. Institution’s mission and property characteristics will drive activities permitted.
Motivations	Income, maintain tax rates, quality of life. Operators may want to age in place or keep land in active production after retirement. Non-operators often are heirs who want to keep the farm in the family.	Income, maintain tax rates, want to support agriculture, quality of life, interest in other features of property (i.e., recreation)	Looking for revenue to help with stewardship/organization costs, need for parcel maintenance or implementation of conservation practices (grassland bird habitat, invasive control), may want to support local agriculture or community food systems.	For federal grazing lands, protecting the quality of resources and receiving a fair market value. Other types of agencies have various purposes from property maintenance to complementary uses (e.g., hunting, open land around prisons, airports).	May need the money, may be holding pattern until a “better” land use emerges, may want to support ag and local food systems, quality of life, maintenance, supports other values of the parcel.
Challenges	May have fixed ideas about production and marketing – and may not be open to alternative approaches. May try to be involved in operation. May have real or perceived rights to some uses.	May question ag activities, not available for decision making, may have unreasonable expectations on rental rates, purchase price	Deed/easement language may drive allowed farm activities. May not understand agricultural needs. Other conservation needs of property may not be compatible with farm needs (i.e., public access, late mowing of hay). Decision making is slow.	Notice of sales or rental availability may have rigid time sensitive process (like responding to a RFP). May be incompatible with other uses (public access). May limit some farm activities, require conservation/management plan. Decision making is slow.	Deed/easement language may drive allowed farm activities. May not understand agricultural needs. Other uses of property may not be compatible with farm needs (seasonal parking). Decision making is slow. May be sold with little notice.
Opportunities	May be possible mentors, source of labor, equipment and housing. May be interested in creative paths to ownership, reduced lease rates. Have many contacts in the community.	Rental rates may be more affordable, may barter costs to maintain fields/infrastructure, meet other needs. May contribute to costs of improving property.	Rental rates or sales may be more affordable, may barter costs to maintain fields/infrastructure. Members and contacts are possible customers. Have many contacts in community.	Rental rates or sales may be more affordable, may reduce rental costs to meet other objectives. Requirements of conservation plans may mean that natural resources have been better protected.	Rental rates or sales may be more affordable, may barter costs to maintain fields/infrastructure. Members and contacts are possible customers. May be potential partners for education, food security activities. Have many contacts in community.