



Forum Three

Final Report

Abbotsford, BC

February 20, 2014

Christine Koch
Ag One Consulting

Marion Robinson
Fraser Basin Council

April 2014

Funding provided by:



Executive Summary

To advance environmental work on farmland, two Forums were held, hosted by the Agriculture Environment Initiative (AEI). In October 2013, agriculture came together with environmental and government agencies to learn about similar advances in Oregon State and to discuss future cooperation. A second Forum was held in May 2013. From this Forum Roundtable, everyone agreed to continue the Forum process. The first joint-funded Forum, hosted by the Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition (FVWC) took place as Forum Three on February 20, 2014 with a Fraser Valley focus.

The objectives of Forum Three were:

1. Identify a project or projects to move forward on
2. Design/develop a template to use for other projects
3. Develop a method to approach producer associations to secure participation
4. Identify and develop a fund or other mechanism (e.g. tax incentives) for compensation.

Through dialog and consensus building, Forum Three achieved several key accomplishments:

1. Agreement on the nine-point Ecosystem Services Initiative Framework as presented by Dave Zehnder, a cattleman from the Kootenays.
2. The formation of two sub-committees. The first was to refine the structure to develop future agri-environmental projects. The second sub-committee was to look at possible funding mechanisms and who should be involved in securing funding for projects.
3. Consensus was reached on important concepts:
 - a. Agriculture would lead the process.
 - b. The ecological services initiative framework process would be used to develop a possible funding mechanism and to identify potential projects.
4. Agreement on next steps:
 - a. The Forum is a province-wide initiative with regional flavours. The group reached consensus that the Forum Three project deliverables would be in the Fraser Valley. This compliments work already underway in the Kootenays and Okanagan. Future focus groups would be in north Cariboo and Peace.
 - b. The first possible project will be a case study that looks at riparian cost and benefits analysis along a riparian corridor. The actual project will be based on the results of a list of potential case studies circulated by the Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition.
 - c. Other joint project ideas were provided by the roundtable.

The Forum process continues to form connections between agriculture, environmental agencies, and possible funding partners. The linkages could lead to the start of collaborations between agriculture and major funding bodies. The Forum process is based on consensus and is producer led.

Table of Contents

1.0 Background	4
2.0 Overview of the Forum Three Process.....	5
2.1 Welcome	5
2.2 Presentations	6
2.3 Identifying potential projects.....	6
2.4 ESI Framework Model	7
a. Select target regions	7
b. Hold a preliminary key stakeholder session	7
c. Establish a full program structure.....	7
d. Determine regional ecosystem service priorities within targeted regions.....	7
e. Establish administration and a one stop shop approach.....	7
f. Establish initial funding pot.....	8
g. Establish ecosystem service goals.....	9
h. Sign up sites	9
i. Implement project	9
j. Monitor results	9
k. Report on results.....	9
l. Make improvements.....	10
3.0 Next Steps	10
4.0 Wrap-up	10
Appendix One – Forum Three Agenda.....	12
Appendix Two - Forum Three Participants	13
Appendix Three – Responses to the Question - What are best possible outcomes we could achieve today?	14
Appendix Four – Sub-Committee to Develop Program Structure under the ESI Framework Model	15
Appendix Five – Round Table Responses to the question: “What projects ideas do you have underway or about to start that we can flag as a joint project; both outside and within the Forum process?	16
Appendix Six – Items for more discussion or follow-up	21
Appendix Seven - Evaluation questionnaire responses.....	22
Appendix Eight – Acronyms	27

1.0 Background

A Forum on agriculture and the environment aimed at encouraging communication and collaboration between agricultural and environmental/conservationist communities was held in Richmond on October 31, 2012. The meeting had 80 participants from agriculture, environmental groups, and government agencies. The Forum featured a day of discussion of key environmental issues and how to work together cooperatively to address environmental issues affecting agriculture. The focus of the day was communication, cooperation and collaboration. The Forum was successful in getting the groups together to discuss the improvement of mutual understanding and creating a respectful dialogue on environmental issues and opportunities facing agriculture. A basis for future collaboration was established.

Participants were positive about the 2012 Forum and most indicated a willingness to attend a second Forum, but challenged organizers to structure the event to get beyond generalities and make specific recommendations on future projects and policies. In the spring of 2013, discussions between the Agriculture Environment Initiative and Forum planners identified a possible next step – a Forum Round Table. The meeting was designed to be a working group where participation was limited to 35 representatives from agriculture, environmental, and government agencies. The Forum Round Table was held in Richmond on May 28, 2013.

At the end of the Forum Round Table everyone agreed that they would like to continue the dialogue process; continue to strengthen the relationships (or build the partnerships), and to work together to identify the next steps in developing projects to work on together. The Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition representatives agreed to approach their Board of Directors with the goal of hosting the next Forum in the winter of 2013-14. It was decided that the next Forum would have a regional focus and discuss ecological goods and services (EG&S) validation and a possible conservation fund; the two top priorities identified at the Forum Round Table.

As part of an application to the Agriculture Environment Initiative, the Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition hosted Forum Three on February 20, 2014. Funding of the event came from the Agriculture Environment Initiative, Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition (FVWC) and the Real Estate Foundation of BC. As was recommended at the Forum Round Table, Forum Three had more of a regional focus and the discussion focused on aspects of ecological goods and services (EG&S). The funding will also support the conduct of two EG&S case studies in the Fraser Valley that would involve evaluating the value of ecosystem services. The complete list of Forum Three participants can be found in Appendix 1. A tour was originally planned for Forum Three that highlighted a local riparian project, but it was canceled due to health problems with the host farm.

This report provides an overview and a summary of the key discussion points and findings of the Forum Three. This report should be considered a resource to direct further action on agriculture and the environment.

2.0 Overview of the Forum Three Process

The Forum Three Agenda can be found in Appendix 2. The desired outcomes for the Forum Three were identified as:

1. Identify a project or projects to move forward on
2. Design/develop a template to use for other projects
3. Develop a method to approach producer associations to secure participation
4. Identify and develop a fund or other mechanism (e.g. tax incentives) for compensation

Forum Three made significant progress in achieving its desired outcomes. After a day of dialog, participants agreed to a framework and formed two subcommittees to move the Forum process forward, identified potential projects, agreed that agriculture would lead the process, and agreed upon an ecological systems initiative framework to develop secure long term funding.

Forum Three had several main components; an overview of the previous two Forums, presentations, discussion to identify potential projects, funding mechanisms, and identifying next steps.

2.1 Welcome

Marion Robinson, the facilitator, provided an overview of the previous two Forums on Agriculture and the Environment that was held on October 31, 2012 and May 28, 2013. Many of the participants at the Forum Three had participated in the two previous Forums. Several new participants were invited to Forum Three because of the more regional focus. Marion provided an overview of the day and provided some questions to shape the day. One question which resonated with all the participants was whether participants wanted to spend their funds efficiently. She then asked participants what the best possible outcomes that Forum Three could achieve. The answers ranged from immediate goals such as identifying a project and long term goals such as sustainable funding for agricultural environmental issues. The complete list of responses can be found in Appendix Three.

The two chairs of the agencies that funded the Forum welcomed participants and provided some opening comments. Greg Norton, Chair of the Agriculture Environment Initiative stated that he was encouraged to see such diverse group in room all focused on agriculture and the environment. He hoped that the day would produce measurable results and that one of the results would be to develop a process or framework that can be applied to anywhere in the province. Detmar Schwichtenberg, Chair Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition supported the Forum process because it allows input from everyone and creates a process to provide participants with a sense of accomplishment. He too expressed the hope that a concrete project would come out of Forum Three – “a shovel in the ground”.

2.2 Presentations

Two presentations on environment projects that were accomplished through a cooperative approach between agriculture and other stakeholders provided context for the day's discussions.

Dave Zehnder spoke about conservation fund development and how an ecosystem service initiative (ESI) process could be used to develop conservation funds. The vision is a process that is farmer led with effective incentives that produces food and ecosystem services such as biodiversity. There are ESI demonstration sites across province that are working with producers and developing tools and models for other projects. Funds come from local conservation fund, mitigation dollars, corporations, and government. He went on to detail the process that he used in the past to establish a conservation fund. Steps included forming a team, listening to the community via polls, using focus groups to verify results and to see what the public will support, designing the fund, and communicating the success of the fund. He cautioned that there needs to be an awareness of agriculture in the community for the process to be effective. More details on the ESI framework are provided in section 2.4 below.

The second presentation was by Lee Hesketh and he spoke on group environmental farm planning. He discussed ways to find common issues between land owners and how to develop ways that land, farming, and stewardship can work together to generate cash. One example was group projects under the Environmental Farm Plan (EFP) Program. He provided examples of ecosystems before and after group projects were initiated to address environmental issues. He used creative ways to extend the value of limited program funds. He stated that projects should have positive motivation and must focus on the big picture; then the result is a win-win for everyone. Another key is project leadership; the project leader needs drive, commitment, and inter-personal skills. Projects need to value all the neighbours participating in the project.

2.3 Identifying potential projects

After the presentations, discussions progressed to identifying potential projects. There were three main components of the discussion – developing a funding mechanism, identifying possible projects, and identifying potential partners. To address the three areas, two programs or frameworks were discussed. The first possible model was the Investment Agriculture Foundation's Local Government Agricultural Area Planning Program. The Program often has two phases. The first phase gives all the background information on the "state of agriculture" and may include Agricultural Land Use Inventories, census information, agriculture arability studies and historical agriculture Information. The second phase focuses on "what is the vision for agriculture for the future and how do we get there?" This phase includes the vision, goals and strategies but is also expected to have an implementation plan which clearly identifies lead agencies, resources and timelines required to achieve the agriculture plan goals. This stage usually involves extensive community engagement and consultation and is guided by the Agriculture Advisory Committee or its equivalent.

The model that was discussed at greater length was the ESI model presented by Dave Zehnder. There was consensus between participants that the ESI model would be a good framework to facilitate discussions and to develop the process to identify funding, possible projects, and project partners. There was also consensus from Forum participants that the process should be led by agriculture and by producers.

2.4 ESI Framework Model

In the following discussion, the main headings are from the ESI framework; the bullets within each heading summarize Forum discussions.

- a. Select target regions
 - There was consensus that the project should be provincially coordinated and regionally focused. The region should be the Fraser Valley and the focus should be on agriculture. Further discussion may be needed to determine the agricultural focus area.
 - There was some discussion on how to involve other regions within the province. It was decided to connect with Dave Zehnder's work to build the linkages. The group acknowledged that leaders are needed in other regions to drive the process.
- b. Hold a preliminary key stakeholder session
 - Through the Forum process, stakeholder meetings are already well under way.
- c. Establish a full program structure
 - A sub-committee was struck to develop the process for the administrative structure for the Fraser Valley project. See Appendix Four for the complete sub-committee membership list.
- d. Determine regional ecosystem service priorities within targeted regions
 - There was considerable discussion on what the priority should be. It was suggested that the project should focus on riparian issues in the Fraser Valley because riparian issues affects all sectors within agriculture. As was determined in section 'a' of the ESI framework, the project should be provincially coordinated with a regional focus. Other agencies outside the Forum process may also be asked to participate. For example, the Investment Agriculture Foundation is also considering the question on how to move the EG&S model forward, so there may be linkages to future IAF EG&S projects.
- e. Establish administration and a one stop shop approach
 - The BC Agriculture Council (BCAC), the umbrella association for farm associations in BC was the obvious choice by Forum participants. BCAC is trusted by agriculture and through their management of the Environment Farm Plan Program have an existing structure to address environmental issues in

agriculture. However, in the end, the agency that administers the project may be determined by who funds the project. For example, if local government provides funding, they may wish to administer the funds.

f. Establish initial funding pot

- One of the key accomplishments of the Forum process is ability to form connections and initiate collaboration with potential funding partners that clearly see that decisions are reached by consensus and that the process is led by agriculture. Each funding agency has unique programs that address specific issues or causes. Open discussion in the Forum setting results in synergy and efficiencies of limited funding dollars. For example, one participant stated that he was looking for projects that addressed fresh water issues; another was looking for projects that focused on sustainable food production, fresh water, and strengthening the environment. Possible project discussions identified all these areas for possible projects.
- There are several factors involved in securing funding. It was recognized that producer engagement is key. Potential funding sources could be determined by the environmental issue that the Forum chooses to address. The region where the project is initiated will also impact potential funding sources. In addition, some funding partners may have concerns how funds will be administered before they become involved in any project.
- There were discussions around who would like to be involved in developing the initial fund and how mitigation dollars would be allocated and spent. A second sub-committee to discuss funding issues was struck. It has the following representatives:
 - Orlando Schmidt, BC Ministry of Agriculture
 - Michelle Molnar, David Suzuki Foundation
 - Marion, Robinson, Fraser Basin Council
 - David Hendrickson, Real Estate Foundation
 - James Casey, World Wildlife Fund
 - Dick Bunbury, Abbotsford Soil Conservation
 - Andrea Tanaka, Environment Canada – Canadian Wildlife Service
 - Monica Pearson, Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition
- Each of the six agencies would have a different role on the sub-committee and each agency brings different funds development aspects to the table. For example, the Ministry of Agriculture would be able to provide linkages to federal and provincial funding programs. The Fraser Basin Council brings management skills.

- The first step to identify potential funding may be to identify which other agencies should be involved in developing the funding. Some of the suggestions were: BC Hydro, mining, oil and gas, Fortis, and Spectra Energy. Mitigation can be a powerful funding source. For example, South Perimeter Road provided \$18 million for irrigation work. The sub-committee also needs to consider how to prepare for societal push back if funding is secured from pipeline or mining.
 - It was decided to start the funding process with this sub-committee and decide who else should be involved.
- g. Establish ecosystem service goals
- The Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition is working on a set of ecological goods and services case studies that could be used to provide some goals and suggestions for a possible first project. A survey that contained four sets of ranking options and possible projects was circulated after the Forum to all participants asking for their input on environmental issues and possible projects. The four sets of rankings will result in a matrix of priorities that will be used to select the first project to be initiated under the Forum process.
 - The survey asked participants to rank:
 - Ten different benefits of environmental projects ranging from clean water to crop pollination;
 - Five different landscape features ranging from hedgerows to streams;
 - Ten different agricultural production systems ranging from dairy to berries; and
 - Six possible projects in terms of which project would be the most useful, practical, and achievable.
- h. Sign up sites
- Enough sites are needed to provide significant results. The project should work towards specific targets. The sites need to include both the agricultural and environmental perspectives.
 - The sub-committee on infrastructure will investigate possible sites in more detail.
- i. Implement project
- j. Monitor results
- k. Report on results
- Communication back to participating farms, to funding partners, and to the general public is very important. Communication that promotes the success of the project and clearly demonstrate the project's win-win for agriculture and the environment are the first step in securing more funding for other projects.

- Communication avenues will be determined by funding partners and the scope of the project.

I. Make improvements

3.0 Next Steps

Through the day's discussions and by working through the ESI framework, Forum Three achieved consensus on some significant principles on moving forward on the first Forum Project. The key areas where consensus was reached were as follows:

1. Agricultural producers will lead the process;
2. The focus is on the Fraser Valley, as part of the larger ESI
3. The target issue would most likely be riparian related; and
4. The ESI framework model would be used to move projects forward; to identify projects, funding sources, and partners.

The next step in the Forum process will be to select and start a project. Before a "shovel can be stuck in the ground" the two sub-committees will need to meet to determine project structure and possible funding sources. These will be important factors in the success of the Forum process moving forward. The Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition's case studies may be used as a tool to assist in determining the first project.

Discussions during the Forum narrowed the focus of a possible project to riparian waterways and drainage. The Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition's case studies looks at riparian cost and benefit analysis along a riparian corridor. The final project selected will be based on ranking and prioritization results of potential case study site selection document that was circulated. Land-owner buy-in will also affect which project is selected and how the project moves forward.

During the day's discussion several issues were identified by Forum participants that should/could be areas for future follow-up or discussions. These issues fell outside the mandate of Forum Three, but it was felt that it was important to record them for possible future follow-up. These issues ranged from concepts such as 'safe harbour' or methods to pay producers for their environmental work. The complete list can be found in Appendix Six.

4.0 Wrap-up

To close Forum Three and to highlight the depth and breadth of environmental projects, the facilitator asked participants to list projects that they had underway or were about to start that might possibly be flagged as joint projects - both outside and inside the Forum process. The intent was to generate discussion and open the door to possibilities.

The participant round table discussion provided a list of current and future agriculture/environment projects that was far ranging and clearly showed everyone's commitment to the environment. Some participants provided funding while other participants initiated and managed projects. The discussion showed that the success of the Forum is based

on having both agriculture and environmental agencies in the same room for constructive dialog to address mutual objectives on strengthening agriculture and the environment. As was found in the two previous Forums, communication, cooperation, and collaboration will be the cornerstones of identifying and initiating projects. A complete list each Forum participants' comments during the round table portion of the Forum can be found in Appendix Five.

As Forum Three concluded, participants were asked to evaluate the day through a survey that asked the following questions:

1. What new thoughts occurred to you today? What did you learn that you didn't know before or hadn't thought about?
2. Your overall interest or usefulness of this day on a scale of one (good) to five (boring)?
3. Which part of the dialogue or presentations was the most interesting?
4. Suggestions for next steps or future sessions?
5. Is there anything you wish to add? Any thoughts or comments?

The survey responses showed that Forum Three had a wide range of readily identifiable perspectives in the room, all the way from 'shovel in the ground'; let's get started on a project to systems thinkers that were more concerned about process. The Forum also had significant funders in the room. The Forum had several producers in the room who dealt with agriculture and the environment every day. There were also several environmental agencies in the room; each with a slightly different focus. While it is always difficult to make everyone pleased with meeting outcomes; overall, the responses were very positive; both for the experience of taking part in the Forum and also for the deliverable of the agreement on the ESI framework, a task/structure sub-committee, and a fund development sub-committee.

The survey also showed a few areas where a future Forum-type meeting could benefit from changes. Some of the suggestions included making more time available for introductions and networking. Specific interest-areas within the Forum could be divided to provide specific input or carry out specific work. Sub-committees should work for a year then reconvene the larger Forum to provide updates on progress. A future Forum meeting should think strategically on how to invite new participants both from local governments and producer representatives. Participants also stated that the meeting would have benefited from holding the round table discussion of current projects at the start of the meeting as part of the introduction process.

The complete list of participants' round table responses are show in Appendix Seven. For easier comprehension and comparison, the comments were grouped together under broad topics such as Forum process, presentations, projects, and funding.

Appendix Eight has a list of acronyms used during the day.

Appendix One – Forum Three Agenda

**Forum Three
February 20, 2014
BC Ministry of Agriculture
1767 Angus Campbell Road, Abbotsford**

Objectives:

1. Identify a project or projects to move forward on
2. Design/develop a template to use for other projects
3. Develop a method to approach producer associations to secure participation
4. Identify and develop a fund or other mechanism (e.g. tax incentives) for compensation

10:00 Meet at Ministry of Agriculture meeting room

Introductions and welcome

10:30 Speakers

- a. Conservation fund development - Dave Zehnder
- b. Group Environmental Farm Plan Projects – Lee Hesketh

11:30 Lunch

12:30 Identify potential project (s)

- a. Potential projects – whole system benefits (examples circulated closer to the meeting)
- b. Discussion of potential funding programs/mechanisms (e.g. EFP group project funding and others)
- c. Discussion of potential partners

3:00 Next steps in the Forum process

Wrap-up and adjourn

Appendix Two - Forum Three Participants

	Name	Organization
Dick	Bunbury	Abbotsford Soil Conservation
Philip	Bergen	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
Greg	Norton	Agriculture Environment Initiative (Chair)
Allen	James	Agriculture Environment Initiative
Holger	Schwichtenberg	Agriculture Environment Initiative
Lynda	Atkinson	Agriculture Environment Initiative
Brian	Baehr	Agriculture Environment Initiative
Jennifer	Dyson	Agriculture Environment Initiative
Rick	Kantz	Agriculture Environment Initiative
Jaclyn	Laic	ARDCorp
Reg	Ens	BC Agriculture Council
Nancy	Chong	BC Blueberry Council
Dave	Zehnder	BC Cattlemen's Association
Orlando	Schmidt	BC Ministry of Agriculture
Dave	Trotter	BC Ministry of Agriculture
George	Rushworth	BC Ministry of Environment
Liana	Ayach	City of Surrey
Michelle	Molnar	David Suzuki Foundation
Christine	Terpsma	Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust
Matt	Connolly	District of Kent/Agassiz
Duane	Post	District of Kent/Agassiz
Dave	Melnychuk	EFP Planning Advisor
Susan	Vander Ende	EFP Planning Advisor
Danielle	Prevost	Environment Canada
Andrea	Tanaka	Environment Canada
Lance	Lilley	Fraser Valley Regional District
Natashia	Cox	Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition
Monica	Pearson	Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition
Detmar	Schwichtenberg	Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition (Chair)
Lee	Hesketh	FRISP
Ken	Bates	Investment Agriculture Foundation (Chair)
Coreen	Moroziuk	Investment Agriculture Foundation
Stephanie	Captein	Langley Environmental Partners Society
Costanza	Testino	Pacific Salmon Foundation
David	Hendrickson	Real Estate Foundation
Pamela	Zevit	South Coast Conservation Program
Lina	Azeez	Watershed Watch
James	Casey	World Wildlife Fund
Christine	Koch	Forum Coordinator
Marion	Robinson	Forum Facilitator and Fraser Basin Council

Appendix Three – Responses to the First Question - What are best possible outcomes we could achieve today?

- Sustainable funding
- Repeatable projects that can be carried across many, many farms
- Multi-generations benefits
- Producer support
- Solve a tangible problem
- Addresses highest priority issues
- Accessible
- Lessons that transferred to different landscapes
- Producer led
- Demonstration pilot project
- Societal buy-in (support)
- Capacity building
- Framing the ask for fund development
- Something tangible – action, more than just a report
- Many partners
- Market buy-in
- Committed partners
- Framework to work with other concepts

Appendix Four – Sub-Committee to Develop Program Structure under the ESI Framework Model

The following Forum Three participants volunteered to sit on a sub-committee to develop the program structure under the ESI framework model.

Dick Bunbury, Abbotsford Soil Conservation
Holger Schwichtenberg, Agriculture Environment Initiative
Jaclyn Laic, ARDCorp
Nancy Chong, BC Blueberry Council
Dave Zehnder, BC Cattlemen's Association
Dave Trotter, BC Ministry of Agriculture
Christine Terpsma, Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust
Matt Connolly, District of Kent/Agassiz
Duane Post, District of Kent/Agassiz
Susan Vander Ende, EFP Planning Advisor
Marion, Robinson, Fraser Basin Council
Natashia Cox, Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition
Monica Pearson, Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition
Detmar Schwichtenberg, Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition (Chair)
Costanza Testino, Pacific Salmon Foundation
James Casey, World Wildlife Fund

Appendix Five – Round Table Responses to the question: “What projects ideas do you have underway or about to start that we can flag as a joint project; both outside and within the Forum process?”

- Coreen Moroziuk, Investment Agriculture Foundation – *Funding many projects within agriculture. IAF funds the Agriculture Environment Initiative with federal and provincial government funding. The two previous Forums were funded through IAF with federal funding. They partially funding Forum Three along with the Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition.*
- Duane Post, District of Kent/Agassiz – *Have projects in progress. District of Kent is on a flood plain, with low sloop, and species at risk. Through Habitat Stewardship Program and working with the Fraser Valley Conservancy applied for funds for a drainage/habitat project.*
- Andrea Tanaka, Environment Canada – *There may be opportunities to fund species at risk related portions of the ecological services project through the Habitat Stewardship Program for Species at Risk. The application process is in fall, and Danielle or I can be contacted for more information. <https://www.ec.gc.ca/hsp-pih/>. As well, she is the contact at EC-CWS for local conservation funds and ecological services projects. They have potential BC-wide conservation funds. Working with local government with conservation funds for various projects.*
- Danielle Prevost, Environment Canada - *Works on projects related to species at risk on private land with conservation groups, local governments, and producers. One of the recent projects involved working with the Stewardship Centre for B.C. on stewardship practices documents for "Drainage Maintenance in Agricultural Waterways" and "Riparian Areas in Settled Landscapes". We delivered workshops on these documents in the Fraser Valley and Okanagan.*
- Holger Schwichtenberg, Agriculture Environment Initiative – *Working on his farm to develop habitat by planting trees that act as wind breaks, provide aesthetic benefits, and future agro-forestry potential.*
- Pamela Zevit, South Coast Conservation Program: *While the SCCP has a focus on endangered species and ecosystems across the southwest of BC it has not directly been involved in management or projects involving species at risk on agricultural lands. SCCP partners like the Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition and the Fraser Valley Conservancy have generally taken the lead and the SCCP is happy to provide assistance or support where its own work complements the work of these organizations. The Stewardship Centre of BC is also working on a set of multi-species Stewardship Practices for species at risk with special consideration to agriculture threat mitigation. The SCCP is providing input on the development of these guidance tools. Examples of where the work of the SCCP complements these types of projects are the SCCP's Landowner Contact Program which involves a number of rural properties in the Fraser Valley. The focus is on voluntary stewardship agreements and restoring or enhancing critical habitat for species*

like Pacific Water Shrew. The SCCP is also working with and has had dialogue sessions for a number of local governments from the Sunshine Coast to Pemberton to Hope. The focus is to avoid and reduce decisions that result in loss of critical habitat and population impacts for multiple species by changing the way land use planning is undertaken. More can be found on the SCCP's website at: www.sccp.ca > Programs.

- Dave Trotter, BC Ministry of Agriculture – Supports the ESI framework. The EFP Program aligns with Forum objectives - regional priorities supported, group EFP Plans and landscape planning with land use inventory data to develop and support BMP planning priorities.
- Liana Ayach, City of Surrey – Their environmental initiatives include: developing a final biodiversity strategy, conservation guide, salmon habitat stewardship projects.
- Costanza Testino, Pacific Salmon Foundation – More than 40 farms and vineyards have been Salmon-Safe certified in B.C. to date. Currently focusing on certifying more wineries to leverage their marketing expertise and raise profile of Salmon-Safe. Would like to collaborate with other Fraser Valley conservation groups/ stakeholders to target other non-certified agricultural sub-sectors (e.g. blueberry farms), and work with identified farmers to restore habitat on their land using Salmon-Safe certification as incentive.
- Monica Pearson, Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition – Current project is Forum III and EcoServices case studies. Also working with District of Kent towards integrated SAR and drainage projects on agricultural lands. Interested in working with berry farmers on pollination challenges.
- Greg Norton, Agriculture Environment Initiative (Chair) – As the Chair of AEI, he and the rest of the committee processes environmental applications. Currently working on a salamander project on private land.
- Stephanie Captein, Langley Environmental Partners Society – They are working with agriculture in several areas: agricultural sector interface, stream side restoration, manure education with horse sector, composting, livestock exclusion fencing as needed or requested, developing crossings for salmon bearing streams by building bridges, and soft ditch maintenance.
- James Casey, World Wildlife Fund – We have just completed intake for the first annual Loblaw's Water Fund. It is a fund available across Canada to local groups doing stewardship activities. It is not linked to agriculture per say but focused more on building a community of water stewards. We have received applications for restoration, monitoring and capacity building and will likely fund all three types of activities. The maximum amount we fund is \$25000 and do look for matching funds.
http://www.wwf.ca/conservation/freshwater/loblaw_water_fund/. The Coca-Cola Company has made a commitment globally to be water neutral by 2050. To achieve this target each national office has certain water efficiency and water replenishment targets it needs to meet. Coca-Cola Canada has been supporting projects in Canada in order to meet its water quantity and quality replenishment targets. While the Fraser is not a

priority watershed they have expressed a willingness to consider a replenishment project in the Fraser if it can demonstrate that it delivers enough replenishment points. Of these two possibilities it is the Coca-Cola funds that align the best with the spirit of the EGS concept because it is funds from a private entity to private producers for a pre-established ecosystem service. He asked the group if they have any project he could help facilitate an application to Coke.

- *Jennifer Dyson, Agriculture Environment Initiative – Carries out environmental work on own farm because they care about the environment. Projects include; water restoration, wildlife corridors, dugouts for water capacity, and pollinator restoration. They also carry out education awareness for children throughout valley.*
- *Lee Hesketh, FRISP – he is engaged in a number of what can best be described as discussions on best management practices involving watersheds recovery processes. In the Cariboo, FRISP has 2 projects in progress working with the ranching communities address impacts from pine beetle. FRISP is providing technical support and dialogue encouraging the communities to continue efforts on a community based recovery process that engages other stake holders in a solutions based approach. In the southern interior: Shuswap / Okanagan working on waste management issues related to nutrient management in a number of individual watersheds. FRISP is promoting collaborative monitoring and restorations efforts in a number of individual watersheds through promoting group planning through the Environmental Farm Plan and other partners like PSF and Fisheries and Oceans Canada.*
- *Jaclyn Laic, ARDCorp – Interested in how they can link with other agencies and projects to streamline all projects that they manage.*
- *Lance Lilley, Fraser Valley Regional District – Provides support to the partnership via the Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition.*
- *David Hendrickson, Real Estate Foundation – Projects on ecological services hit a “sweet spot” within our focus areas and the REFBC real estate and land-use mandate through education, research and law reform. The key focus areas for REFBC are: sustainable food production, freshwater sustainably, and the build environment. REFBC supports Dave Zehnder and the Windermere District Farmers Institute's Ecological Services Initiative Phase 2 Pilot in the Kootenays, which includes the Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition's case studies. REFBC would like to build robust partnerships to develop this initiative further.*
- *Dick Bunbury, Abbotsford Soil Conservation – They focus more on education for farmers and the rest of the community. They held agriculture adventure program last fall for school children at fish hatchery in Abbotsford. Education is worthwhile initiative. One agricultural issue that he would like to see some work done on is the issue of recycling agricultural plastic. Would like to encourage a study to see what is happening with agricultural plastic. This study has been done by other agencies in the past.*

- Christine Terpsma, Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust – *DFWT is a non-profit consisting of a partnership between farmers and conservationists. With the assistance of core funders, they've been implementing EG&S programs for over 20 years. Programs include: establishing grass land set-asides for soil conservation and wildlife habitat provision, and establishing winter cover crops, which help prevent soil erosion and provide a source of feed for overwintering water fowl. Other projects include: laser leveling and field liming programs, hedge row and grass margin establishment for pollinators and native song birds. The success and benefits of their work has been verified and proven by many years of research projects by UBC, SFU and other institutions. Communication about the benefits and challenges of their work is important. The work they're doing in Delta could be a good model to transfer to other regions. Agriculture is one of the biggest funders for their work. Feel free to contact her if you have any questions.*
- Michelle Molnar, David Suzuki Foundation – *Projects include the natural capital program. They are also developing funding mechanisms. They focus on the Lower Mainland; particularly Metro Vancouver. Looking to see what can be transferred over to other regions.*
- Lina Azeez, Watershed Watch – *They don't currently work with agriculture, but there is potential to build relationships and support work to make farms salmon friendly. Their focus is aquaculture and harvests issues. They've done some work on EG&S in the past, strongly support maintaining environmental flows in rivers and streams especially during periods of high irrigation.*
- Detmar Schwichtenberg, Fraser Valley Watersheds Coalition (Chair) – *He fully understands EG&S principles; the key how to hand funds to producers. He would like EG&S to pay producers who are doing environmental upgrades or services.*
- Lynda Atkinson, Agriculture Environment Initiative – *She works with a group called FARMED (Farming Agriculture Rural Marketing Eco-Diversification) that held an agricultural conference on diversity with the goals of bringing new farmers into the area, capacity building, and developing niche markets. Farmers should have recognition for the environmental work they're carry out. (farmed.ca)*
- Orlando Schmidt, BC Ministry of Agriculture – *Will serve as interim liaison with the Ministry in preparation of possible funding opportunities.*
- Susan Vander Ende, EFP Planning Advisor – *The details of the new EFP program and its list of eligible BMP will determine her approach to regional and group plan projects. There may be some group riparian projects developed under the EFP Program. There is also the possibility of commodity based projects. She may be able to link Forum participants with EFP group projects.*
- Philip Bergen, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada – *Interested in discussion and perspectives that were discussed at Forum Three because AAFC funds many of the activities of some groups around the Forum table – BC Ministry of Agriculture, IAF, and*

ARDCorp. Most of this funding is through Growing Forward 2, a federal-provincial-territorial Initiative.

- *Dave Zehnder, BC Cattlemen's Association – The Ecological Services Initiative (ESI) will be working towards fleshing out the five year ES framework that was endorsed at the Forum 3 meeting. This framework will guide the ESI in the next phase of the provincially coordinated/regionally focused project. Part of this approach includes creating a funding pot to capture and maintain funds for the project. The funding pot will initially target grant funds and work towards longer term sustainable funding sources such as local conservation and mitigation funds. The goal is to get money to the hands of participating producers within a year. He hopes to have a conference with world leaders on ecosystem services in Vancouver in the near future.*
- *Marion Robinson, Fraser Basin Council (and facilitator) – Has a history working with nutrient loading issues, resolving conflicts, building capacity in agriculture communities, is currently supporting the barn owl habitat project and scoping a joint-dairy project around fish habitat and improved drainage.*

Appendix Six – Items for more discussion or follow-up

- 'Safe harbour' clause – how do we safeguard projects and participants?
- The concept of 'payment' for environmental enhancement can be in other forms such as incentives, tax breaks or recognition.
- Important to address local issues in mutual benefit (i.e. drainage) and content, SAR, nutrient management plans
- Agriculture has many 'bins'; environment is just one. A complex sector with many issues.
- How do we formalize Forum relationship?
 - Develop champions – include councillors, staff – need a diverse team for most effectiveness
- How can lessons be transferred between land use types?

Appendix Seven - Evaluation questionnaire responses

20 responses returned out of 35

1. What new thoughts occurred to you today? What did you learn that you didn't know before or hadn't thought about? (*Comments* were grouped for easier comprehension.)

- Forum process
 - There is still a “good vibe” and environmental side is comfortable with the agriculture lead.
 - I came to better understanding of the agriculture viewpoint. Also learned a lot about existing case studies of PES. (ecosystems services)
 - Local perspective on Environmental Services. Good energy on topic and tangible steps generated.
 - Great start – lots of diversity – still some way to go – very ‘mainland’ centered.
 - For the first time I got a sense that this could work; previously I was a nay-sayer.

- Projects
 - Good to know that the FBC is starting work on dairy issue.
 - Many pieces that need to be brought together; Dave Z's work, FVWC, Agassiz seem to be doing same or similar work. Is this a duplication? We all need the information.
 - I didn't know about Zehnder's work/initiative
 - I learned about some innovative projects – I hadn't heard about FRISP before today.
 - Need regional champions.
 - Need local champions if the ideas discussed today are going to go forward.
 - How do groups better advocate for marketing the results of the various ESI projects to lever commodity interest that will foster greater involvement?

- Funding
 - That money flows from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada to ARDCorp and others.
 - Learning about the Kootenay ESI and FRISP. Also about Loblaws and Coca-Cola funds within the Real Estate Foundation.
 - That funding for case studies are established, EG&S established at \$20/parcel in Kootenays; interest and support for Regional based projects. What about commodity based?
 - I didn't know the value of ecosystem services was \$29,000K/ha. Dave Z. provided interesting information on public support for willingness to pay.
 - I learned about a number of “conservation” type funds. I have thoughts about paid ecosystem services – initial works to affect benefits-ongoing support-at what point are those services just expected?

- While bottom up is needed, significant effort and resources needed to gain support for funding agricultural ESI activities.
2. Your overall interest or usefulness of this day on a scale of one (good) to five (boring)? *(Reponses were grouped for easier comparisons.)*
- 11 responses at good (1); and comments
 - Glad to be included. I don't yet know about usefulness but for facilitating the discussion it was great.
 - I found the conversation very rich and the energy high!
 - Extremely interesting and useful. Good progress made.
 - Very interesting.
 - I wish there were more farmers there.
 - Good energy in the room.
 - 2 responses at 1.5; and comments
 - Sometimes the group went off the agenda and Marion's questions were vague, maybe on purpose 😊
 - Actually better than expected. Group was highly engaged. Excellent discussion
 - 4 responses at still good (2); and comments
 - I liked the networking.
 - All parties at table but still a lot of wheels spinning.
 - 3 responses at middle (3); and comments
 - I am impatient to see us working on proposal.
 - Groups would get off topic. Facilitator brought them back.
 - Some great discussion and opportunities to learn about the players but I will be more interested in seeing things a few steps down the road and relating that to my organization's work.
 - Zero responses at 4 or 5 – boring
3. Which part of the dialogue or presentations was the most interesting? *(Comments were grouped for easier comprehension. There are more than 20 responses because some participants provided several comments)*
- Forum format
 - Good time for breaks, networking conversations and good discussion in the afternoon.
 - Very interesting and seeing everyone (agriculture and environmental groups) at the table is great!
 - Afternoon worked through frustration to good outcomes; the energy was positive and productive.
 - Good facilitation
 - I was amazed at working through discussion and getting agreement on framework and task groups. Good work!
 - Marion – great job!

- Presentations
 - Dave Zehnder was most valuable
 - Lee Hesketh is a rock star. He is the face and interface between farmers and environmental/conservationist
 - Presentations were inspirational. Glad we had more time in lieu of tour
 - Lee Hesketh – short & concise
 - Dave Z.'s information.
 - Dave Z's was most valuable and I will be taking these ideas forward.
 - I liked the two speakers and ongoing discussions!
 - Zehnder was enlightening and Hesketh was inspiring.
 - The part where both Dave Z and Lee H explained how their initiatives are working on the ground to effect change.
 - Zehnder's presentation on fund development options
 - Dave's was most informative, Lee's was inspiring and innovative.
 - Both presenters were superb.
 - Dave Zehnder's presentation and Lee's

 - ESI discussions
 - The afternoon interactions
 - Working through the framework as a group. Thank you! Also for allowing ample working time!
 - Forming sub-committee and funding group was most helpful
 - The dialogue around a framework was very constructive
 - Conservation fund establishment was most interesting
 - Discussion debate about the mechanics of how the ideas discussed today can move forward (e.g. establish conservation fund an local working group)

 - Round table
 - The round table to find out who was working on what.
 - Final roundtable good, should start with that next time
4. Suggestions for next steps or future sessions?
- Overall format/process
 - The FVW Coalition bringing the case studies document with the aims of filling out during the Forum confused the issue and slowed momentum significantly. Good that the facilitator moved to email solution.
 - I still like to go around the room introductions even if we do have the list.
 - Provide more background information to participants, work done, or underway. Introduce all participants as the new ones were not there before. Seemed like there was a hidden agenda as some funding already established for EG&S and case studies.
 - Better discussion / dialog about what are the most critical issues that need to be addressed

- Use the same facilitator. She was good.
 - Sub-committees
 - Evaluate steering group's activities in a year.
 - Report out from working groups.
 - Start to develop smaller working groups to tackle the detailed work between larger forum meetings.
 - Do smaller working groups to move this forward now.
 - Task group reporting on next steps.
 - Split the sub-groups to work on specific deliverables re: framework. Establish funding development etc.
 - I think we needed more producer groups represented. I understand BCAC representatives but cannot individually voice concerns for every group like berries, dairy, veg, greenhouse, hobby farms, especially Horse Council
 - Get started!
 - Need to get shovels in the ground.
 - Refine tangible goals from Forum and have focus group style questions to us all in an email to gauge interest and project further involvement.
 - Identify projects and get shovels in the ground.
 - Start doing so next Forum shows translated actions.
 - Other
 - More public research. I like that polling thing. (*Editor's note: as was mentioned by Dave Z during his presentation to verify results.*)
 - Administration fund development, polling and producer/public outreach.
 - Dave Z present at MEMC
 - Set up, facilitate other regional task groups.
5. Is there anything you wish to add? Any thoughts or comments? (*Comments were grouped for easier comprehension. There are more than 20 comments because some participants provided more than one comment.*)
- Forum process
 - Took a while but I think we are getting there.
 - Facilitator was good.
 - We could have more detailed structure for future session and go over what is already established and what needs to be determined by end of day.
 - Great work building relationships between agriculture and environmental groups! I was at first Forum and I can't believe how far you've gotten.
 - Thank you Christine and Marion for putting this together.
 - Need directions to the venue on the agenda.
 - More work / details re ESI framework.
 - Start workshop with introductions.
 - I really appreciated the opportunity to attend and participate.

- I am a little sceptic but always hopeful.
- More momentum on PES than at first evident.
- We have to lead so government will join.

- Representation
 - More producer groups, marketing boards can be added later.
 - Ensure municipal staff is aware and hopefully supportive. Municipalities maintain and/or use drainage corridors. Management objectives must align and be supported by local governments.
 - More Fraser Valley focused than provincial so why were there representatives from all over the province?
 - More government representatives should be at next Forum.
 - Need more municipal representation.

- Other
 - See www.farmed.ca for connections to North Cariboo agriculture conference, farm tours, flyways, swallows, ducks, swans, capacity, diversity, niche markets, birch syrup, fruit wine, EG&S.
 - Capacity to deal with other regions is key; otherwise regions will be left out.
 - Orlando's comments are key.

Appendix Eight – Acronyms

AEI – Agriculture Environment Initiative
ARDCorp – Agricultural Research and Development Corporation (a subsidiary of BCAC)
ASCA - Abbotsford Soil Conservation
BCAC – BC Agriculture Council
BCAgri - BC Ministry of Agriculture
BMP – Beneficial Management Practices
DFWT – Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust
DUC – Ducks Unlimited Canada
EC – Environment Canada
EFP – Environmental Farm Plan
EG&S – Ecological goods and services
ESI – Ecological Services Initiative
FBC – Fraser Basin Council
FRISP – Farmland Riparian Interface Stewardship Program
GMOs – Genetically modified organisms
HSP – Habitat Stewardship Program
IAF – Investment Agriculture Foundation
IPM – integrated pest management
LEPS - Langley Environmental Partners Society
MAGRI - BC Ministry of Agriculture
MEMC -
MoA – BC Ministry of Agriculture
MoE – BC Ministry of Environment
NGOs – nongovernment organizations
PSF – Pacific Salmon Foundation
SAR – Species at Risk
SARA – Species at Risk Act
SCBC - Stewardship Centre for BC