Why income or acreage thresholds for farm stands are a bad policy design

(TLDR research brief)

Core claim
Policies that condition farm stand eligibility on minimum acreage or gross farm income exclude small and beginning farms, increase consolidation pressure, and weaken local food system resilience.[1]

Living systems remain resilient by allowing many small nodes to connect early. Requiring scale before access interrupts that process.

1. Small farms depend on low-barrier direct sales channels

Direct-to-consumer outlets such as farm stands and on-farm sales are among the most accessible diversification strategies for small farms because they require less capital, scale, and infrastructure than wholesale markets.[2]

Restricting access through income or acreage thresholds requires farms to prove success before being allowed to use the mechanisms that generate it.[3]

In biological networks, growth begins at the edges rather than the trunk. Blocking edge access reduces the system's ability to expand or adapt.

2. Beginning and small farms are structurally disadvantaged by income thresholds

Beginning and small farms typically experience low or volatile gross income during startup and transition years, even when land, skills, and demand are present.[4]

Minimum income requirements systematically exclude these farms during their most vulnerable phase, delaying or preventing market entry.[5]

Early nodes are not failures; they are incubators. Systems that only recognize mature output lose future capacity.

3. Regulatory friction already suppresses participation

Research on agritourism and farm diversification shows that regulatory complexity alone reduces participation, even when no formal thresholds exist.[6]

Adding eligibility cutoffs compounds this friction, producing fewer participating farms rather than clearer compliance.[7]

When resistance accumulates at multiple points, flow slows everywhere, not just at the rule itself.

4. Threshold-based policies favor consolidation over resilience

Research on food-system resilience shows that adaptive capacity depends on diversity, redundancy, and a wide base of producers rather than concentration among fewer large operators.[8]

USDA research documents decades of consolidation in U.S. agriculture, demonstrating that policies and market structures that reward scale concentrate production and economic power among larger farms.[9]

Dense monocultures collapse more easily than distributed networks. Diversity functions as insurance, not inefficiency.

5. Expanding activities while shrinking eligibility is not neutral

Zoning and agritourism research shows that policies can expand allowed uses while simultaneously narrowing who qualifies to participate, resulting in net exclusion.[10]

This effect disproportionately impacts diversified, small-acreage farms that rely on flexibility rather than volume.[11]

Adding branches while cutting roots does not strengthen an organism. Access matters more than permission.

6. Systems-level analysis confirms the structural risk

Systems analysis of food networks shows that threshold-based eligibility rules create closed loops that advantage scale and suppress emergent, community-embedded producers.[12]

Such structures reduce diversity, adaptability, and local economic circulation even when framed as efficiency measures.[13]

When access and information stop flowing laterally, systems harden and become brittle.

Conclusion

Income and acreage thresholds are a blunt policy instrument. Evidence shows they reduce participation, disadvantage small and beginning farms, and push systems toward consolidation. Inclusive eligibility paired with targeted safeguards better supports farm viability and community resilience.

References:

USDA Economic Research Service. (2010). Local Food Systems: Concepts, Impacts, and Issues.
https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=46395

Wang, W., et al. (2022). Challenges for the agritourism sector in the United States. Food Systems Journal.
https://www.foodsystemsjournal.org/index.php/fsj/article/view/1094

PDF:
https://aese.psu.edu/outreach/agritourism/projects/nifa-agritourism/project-publications/challenges-for-the-agritourism-sector-in-the-united-states.pdf

Chase, L., et al. (2018). Agritourism: Toward a new definition. Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development.
https://doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2018.081.016

Hughes, M. (2015). Selling to Local and Regional Markets: Barriers and Opportunities for Beginning Farmers. ATTRA.
https://attra.ncat.org/publication/selling-to-local-and-regional-markets-barriers-and-opportunities-for-beginning-farmers/

USDA Economic Research Service. (2010). Local Food Systems: Concepts, Impacts, and Issues.
https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=46395

Keith, D. (2003). Obstacles in the Agritourism Regulatory Process. UC Cooperative Extension.
https://ucanr.edu/sites/default/files/2022-03/364293.pdf

Vaughan, Y., & Roberts, K. (2025). Navigating zoning barriers: County-level policy gaps and agritourism growth. Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy.
https://jrap.scholasticahq.com/article/147055-navigating-zoning-barriers-county-level-policy-gaps-and-agritourism-growth-in-the-north-central-united-states

PDF: https://jrap.scholasticahq.com/article/147055.pdf

Béné, C. (2020). Resilience of local food systems and links to food security. Food Security.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7351643/

MacDonald, J. M., et al. (2018). Three Decades of Consolidation in U.S. Agriculture. USDA ERS (EIB-189).
Summary PDF:
https://www.ers.usda.gov/sites/default/files/_laserfiche/publications/88057/EIB189_summary.pdf

Schilling, B., et al. (2012). The economic impact of agritourism. Journal of Food Distribution Research.
https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/139575/

PDF: https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/139575/files/Schilling%20Agritourism.pdf

Tew, C., & Barbieri, C. (2012). The perceived benefits of agritourism. Tourism Management.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.02.005

Martin, R. (2026). Mycelium vs the Machine: Why Our Food System Keeps Breaking. Rogue Media Solutions.
https://roguemediasolutions.com/mycelium-vs-the-machine-why-our-food-system-keeps-breaking/

13. IPES-Food. (2016). From Uniformity to Diversity: A Paradigm Shift from Industrial Agriculture to Diversified Agroecological Systems.
https://ipes-food.org/reports/from-uniformity-to-diversity/

PDF: https://ipes-food.org/_img/upload/files/UniformityToDiversity_FullReport.pdf