Theme	Description	Barriers to Address	Potential Actions
Trust, legitimacy, and relationship-building are foundational	Repeatedly, participants emphasized that projects succeed or fail on trust, authenticity, and whether communities believe developers are acting in good faith.	Skepticism driven by past negative experiences with utility-scale solar.	Start engagement early, before designs are locked.
		Community concern about greenwashing or “agricultural” claims that are only superficial.	Use trusted local messengers: producers, county leaders, extension, landowners, grazers, conservation groups.
		Social pressure from neighbors and local politics.	Shift from transactional outreach to relationship-based engagement.
		Mismatch between developer timelines and the time required to build trust.	Be explicit about tradeoffs, not just benefits.
			Build farmer-to-farmer and landowner peer networks.
Agrivoltaics must be agriculture-first, not solar-with-grass	A major recurring distinction was between true dual-use systems and projects that simply place panels on agricultural land without meaningfully supporting agriculture.	Loose or inconsistent definitions of agrivoltaics.	Define clear criteria for what counts as “real” agrivoltaics.
		EPC and development models optimized for standard solar rather than working lands.	Involve producers in design from the start.
		Financial structures that privilege energy output while undervaluing agricultural function.	Design systems around actual farm operations, equipment, grazing, irrigation, and labor realities.
		Limited precedent for cattle, crop, and irrigation-compatible designs.	Compensate agricultural value explicitly in contracts, not as an afterthought.
			Treat landowners and producers as long-term operating partners.
Economics remain a central hurdle	Cost, ROI, and financeability appeared in nearly every conversation. Agrivoltaics is attractive in principle, but many stakeholders still see it as more expensive, more complex, and harder to underwrite than conventional solar.	Higher upfront costs for racking, spacing, irrigation, foundations, fencing, and taller arrays.	Develop stronger enterprise budgets and whole-project financial models.
		Solar remaining the dominant revenue stream, making agricultural components harder to justify financially.	Quantify both direct and indirect value: agricultural revenue, water savings, soil health, pollinator value, land preservation, community benefit.
		Limited lender comfort with novel or small-scale projects.	Create incentives specifically for dual-use features rather than standard solar alone.
		Insurance uncertainty and perceived operational risk.	Use blended capital approaches: grants, catalytic funding, patient capital, public-private support.
		Federal and policy uncertainty affecting tax credit timing and capital confidence.	Educate lenders, insurers, and tax-credit stakeholders on real agrivoltaic risk profiles.
The field needs more evidence, case studies, and bankable data	Participants repeatedly called for real-world examples, performance data, and shared learning to move agrivoltaics from “interesting” to credible and repeatable.	Research timelines are slower than development timelines.	Build a library or registry of projects, designs, lessons learned, and contacts.
		Data are fragmented, not standardized, or not public.	Expand demonstration sites, field days, and site tours.
		Lack of enough mature projects to show long-term outcomes.	Produce crop-, livestock-, and region-specific case studies.
		Difficulty translating research into developer, policymaker, and financier decisions.	Share data on economics, yields, biodiversity, soil, water, and O&M.
			Support participatory research with farmers, counties, developers, and universities.
Local policy and governance matter as much as technology	Many discussions returned to land-use authority, county process, permitting, procurement, and local definitions as key levers.	Limited county staff capacity and uneven expertise.	Create local code language that distinguishes agrivoltaics from conventional utility-scale solar.
		Legal and quasi-judicial constraints on some public officials.	Use zoning, setbacks, design standards, and decommissioning requirements to encourage true dual use.
		Risk of overregulation that unintentionally blocks projects.	Identify preferred sites and reduce friction where dual-use goals are met.
		Misalignment between state goals, local impacts, and utility needs.	Use public procurement and public land policy to reward dual-use and stewardship outcomes.
		Fast-changing policy conditions that outpace local rulemaking.	Share model ordinances, templates, and county-to-county learning.
Project delivery is still too fragmented	Several sessions highlighted breakdowns between developers, EPCs, irrigators, producers, O&M teams, livestock managers, and insurers.	Different professional groups often do not share language, assumptions, or incentives.	Bring engineering, irrigation, agriculture, safety, and O&M perspectives together earlier.
		Standard solar delivery models do not account for agricultural realities.	Write clearer EPC contracts with explicit agrivoltaic scope, responsibilities, and success criteria.
		First-of-kind projects carry learning-curve delays and scope confusion.	Create continuing education and training pathways for EPCs, county staff, insurers, and agricultural partners.
		Long-term O&M and safety costs are often underestimated.	Design for O&M, livestock movement, wire protection, water access, and fire safety from the beginning.
			Normalize cross-disciplinary project teams.
Water, soil, biodiversity, and land stewardship are not side benefits — they are core value propositions	Water scarcity, soil health, habitat, grazing, and land preservation surfaced as some of the strongest reasons communities might support agrivoltaics.	Water-rights complexity and scarcity.	Frame projects in terms of working-land preservation and resource stewardship, not only power generation.
		Easement restrictions and limited precedent on conserved lands.	Build monitoring around water use, soil health, forage, biodiversity, and habitat outcomes.
		Difficulty monetizing ecological and community benefits.	Prioritize designs that reduce dust, support pollinators, and maintain productive land use.
		Tension between maximizing electrical efficiency and maximizing agricultural/ecological function.	Link agrivoltaic planning to conservation and drought-resilience goals.
			Work with land trusts and conservation organizations early where conserved lands are involved.
		No shared baseline understanding of agrivoltaics.	Map stakeholder groups and their distinct motivations, risks, and desired outcomes.
		Low trust in formal engagement processes.	Build participation formats that work for people who are not paid to attend.
		Uneven participation from underserved or less powerful groups.	Make community costs and benefits visible and specific.

	Community engagement needs new methods, not just better messaging	Several sessions suggested that the issue is not simply “communicating better,” but rethinking who participates, how they participate, and whose incentives count.	Aesthetics, tax concerns, land-use concerns, and generalized uncertainty.	Humanize project teams and reduce jargon.
				Use pilot projects and local champions to make agrivoltaics tangible.
	Scaling will require stronger partnerships and institutional creativity	Public-private partnerships, universities, nonprofits, counties, landowners, financiers, and developers all have pieces of the puzzle, but those pieces are not yet well integrated.	Institutional silos and slow internal processes.	Build durable cross-sector coalitions rather than one-off projects.
			Leadership turnover and funding instability.	Use universities and extension as translators between research and practice.
			Limited technical assistance capacity.	Align public funding, procurement, and policy with stated working-land and climate goals.
			Partnerships take longer than stakeholders expect.	Create technical assistance networks for grants, finance readiness, and partnership formation.
			Threatened or uncertain public funding streams.	Identify “creative bureaucracy” opportunities inside agencies and institutions.