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Abstract

Recent critical studies in food geographies have attempted to make “powerful, important [and] disturbing connections between Western consumers and the distant strangers whose contributions to their lives [are] invisible, unnoticed, and largely unappreciated” (Cook et al., 2004, p. 642). These studies are based on the assumption that there is merely a disconnection between ‘Western’ consumption of ‘Non-Western’ production of food products. This thesis reports findings that display far more insidious disconnections at smaller geographic scales of production and consumption that have consequences for both local and global food systems. In British Columbia these disconnections take the form of pro-local food initiative discourses in spaces of consumption occurring at a time where declining numbers of young farmers are able to get access to the land, financial and other resources necessary to continue farming. This thesis builds on concepts within political ecology and land-use planning that suggests that several regions, primarily in the global north, are transitioning away from productive landscapes to either post-productive or multifunctional spaces. Using a qualitative research framework including ethnographic interviews, surveys and archival materials, the research supports the conclusion that farming is becoming increasingly inaccessible and unaffordable to young adults. This is partially based on agricultural production being pushed out of the landscape by other land-uses, but also because landscape and food products have become valued, supported and fetishized in separate ways in BC that create challenges for farms to stay viable.
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### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR)</strong></td>
<td>Created through Bill 42 (which has been since amended) in 1973 by the Provincial Government, represented by the New Democratic (NDP). The objective was to prevent industrial and residential development that threatened productive agriculture land, which would diminish the regions food security (Simpson, 2003; Stobbes et al, 2011). The ALR continues to be enforced by a government appointed body known as the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC). The land in the ALR is protected by the constraints set by the ALC for its landowners, which included the inability to have subdivisions or use the land for most non-agricultural purposes (Provincial Agricultural Land Reserve, 2009; Simpson, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse</strong></td>
<td>The way in which language is “controlled, selected, organized and redistributed” (Foucault, Michel, 1972, p.210) to exchange ideas and ideology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michel Foucault</strong></td>
<td>French historian and philosopher who problematized issues of surveillance, discourse and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multifunctional Landscapes</strong></td>
<td>Landscapes that prioritize ecological protection and other initiatives, which are not productivist along with productivist activity including but not limited to agriculture (Wilson &amp; Rigg, 2003; Wilson, 2004; Wilson &amp; Memon, 2005; Burton &amp; Wilson, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neo-Marxist</strong></td>
<td>Perspective adapted from Marxist theory to understand relatively current issues around the unevenness, global economy and neo-liberal ideology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land-Use Conflicts</strong></td>
<td>Conflicts surrounding how land should be used at present and in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>Defined broadly in this thesis as agricultural production of edible products within BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Food</strong></td>
<td>Defined broadly in this thesis as the purchase of edible products produced within BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Ecology</strong></td>
<td>The study of the relationship between politics, culture and economy in respect to how humans interact with the physical environment through time and space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Productivist Landscapes</strong></td>
<td>When the corporate relationships between agricultural ministries and powerful farmer unions break down and formerly politically marginal actors, such as environmental groups or local grassroots organizations, into the decision-making and policy formulation (Wilson, 2004, p.462).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivist Landscapes</strong></td>
<td>When production is prioritized in decision-making and policy formulation due to relationships between corporations, agricultural ministries and powerful farmers (Wilson, 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Young Farmers Defined broadly in this thesis as people who produce edible products for commercial sale and not subsidence. Their ages range between 19 to 40, which is the age range used by the British Columbia Young Farmers Association (BCYF, 2012).
1. Introduction

“Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you’re a thousand miles from the corn field” - Dwight D. Eisenhower (1956)

“The family farm is all but disappearing from the American landscape, and with it a unique and vital breed: the independent farmer” (Victor Davis Hanson, 2002)

In 1956, Eisenhower was already able to decipher a disconnection between consumers and farmers. Despite the availability of mass communications presently in our global community this disconnection is arguably growing. We are connected to popular global ideas while disconnected from local actions and issues. In British Columbia (BC) it is evident as interest in local produce is conveyed in the media as an increasing trend in spaces of consumption (such as the trendy 100 Mile Diet created in Vancouver), while at the same time BC is losing spaces of prime agricultural land and there are fewer and fewer farmers to support the local food system. This was exemplified recently as a consumer report conducted by BMO stated BC residents (and other Canadians) preferred local produce and were willing to pay 17% more for it (Bank of Montreal, 2012). At the same time, thousands of pounds of Okanagan cherries remained on trees to rot because farmers were unable to compete with subsidized cherries from Washington State (Pfeiffer, 2012). This displays that the disconnections between producers and consumers through the fetishism of food are not merely between ‘western’ consumers and ‘non-western’ producers as put forth by critical food geographers, such as Ian Cook, but between producers and consumers at smaller geographical scales. For residents of BC a diversity of food seems to appear on the fully stocked shelves of supermarkets at anytime of the year and therefore when complex problems occur, which lead to transitions within the Province’s agriculture industry, they often go unnoticed. One transition, which is the focus of this thesis, is the decreasing numbers of young farmers. If this trend continues then despite the demand for local food
by consumers in BC, there won’t be the option as farmers either choose to leave BC or change careers.

The Canadian Agricultural Census collected by Statistics Canada shows that the number of young farmers has declined. The census for 2011 came out in May 2012 and it displayed that BC had the highest average age of farmers in Canada at 55.7 years of age (Statistics Canada, 2012). The census also displayed that the number of farmers under the age of 35 between 1991 and 2011 decreased by slightly more then 58% (Statistics Canada, 2012). This displays either an ageing workforce that isn’t being replaced, or a change in the farming system that has led young farmers to be unaccounted for in the official statistics. An example of a change to the system would be that some young farmers may not be able to branch out of the family farm and therefore are not seen as one of the primary operators and would therefore not be accounted for until their older relatives retire. As it stands the seeming lack of young farmers provides foresight into a decrease in BC agriculture, which will have several negative impacts because it will remove a local food source causing an increase dependence on fossil fuel consumption and global markets, a decrease in economic retention of capital in BC, removal of prime agricultural lands, and removal of a source of community building and nutritious food (Aiken & Boer, 2004; Anderson, 2008; Grewal & Grewal, 2012). BC agriculture is also necessary as it strengthens the economy through traded exports providing commodities for other markets (Ministry of Agriculture, 2011).

The purpose of this thesis, however is not to assess the benefits of having local agricultural production as that has already been argued. The focus will be to extend on concepts and frameworks of political ecology and land-use planning that suggests that several regions, primarily in the global north, are transitioning away from productive landscapes to either post-productive or multifunctional spaces. In these spaces I argue that agriculture becomes susceptible to contested visions of landscapes by multiple stakeholders. The main objective will therefore be to understand how the current contested landscape in BC is arguably pushing away potential and current young farmers in the region amongst other push and pull factors. As well it will be argued that the disconnection between farmers in spaces of production and consumers in spaces of consumption is where certain push factors stem from for young farmers as it create discourses around agriculture production that changes how it is viewed and valued by
important stakeholders. This involves not only observing the physical space, but the political economy and socio-cultural factors that create it. This ties to another objective of this thesis, which is to understand how farmers are valued as part of the physical and cultural landscape in British Columbia, by whom, and is it a sufficient enough of a representation in order to sustain livelihoods and an adequate local food supply. Providing farmers with strong livelihoods and incorporating them into the landscape will not only support local agriculture, but will provide them with basic quality of life that is ethical and well deserved.

In order to meet the objectives in this thesis I conducted ethnographic and archival research in two regions of BC, Delta and the Fraser Valley, in order to answer the following research questions:

What stressors are affecting current young farmers (and other farmers) that have not enabled them or discouraged young people from wanting to take it on as a vocation? What regions outside of BC are young farmers interested in going to, or have gone to farm?

What attracts young people to farming and how do young farmers envision themselves within the landscape?

How is agriculture viewed and valued (if at all) by policy makers and other stakeholders? How do young farmers feel these stakeholders and consumers value agriculture?

What land-use objectives come in conflict with agriculture? And how do stakeholders communicate and interact with young farmers, if at all?

The praxis of this thesis is to promote policy decision-making that involves agriculture and consumption behaviours that are informed by farmer’s perspectives. This is needed so that the food system in BC can have a stronger foundation in local production that is sustained by new generations of farmers for new generations of consumers. This is tied to an integral concept that planning should not just be focused on space and places of production, but also on the people within that space. The importance of having young farmers in BC to support BC agriculture, and hence the importance of this research, will be discussed in Section 2.1. In section 2.2 academic literature on political economy and rural sociology along with empirical evidence that have previously explained stressors and attractors associated with farming in BC and other regions will be discussed. This will be done to provide some background to the
economic, environmental, social and cultural factors that are associated with deterring and to a lesser extent attracting farmers into the vocation. These factors are also discussed as they shape local landscapes. In Section 2.3 the academic literature within political ecology, which assesses conflicts and disconnections within spaces of production and consumption that inform landscape transformations occur will be discussed to provide background and frameworks to answer the third question. Chapter 3 will outline the methodology and methods I used to gather primary and secondary data to inform all of the research questions. Chapter 4 provides the analyzed results. Lastly Chapter 5 provides the conclusions of this thesis and recommendations specific to planning for agriculture in the BC that may or may not be applicable to other regions.
2. Literature Review

Necessity of Farmers in British Columbia: Benefits at Regional and Global Scales

As mentioned in the introduction the purpose of this thesis is not to promote local agriculture because several studies have already described its benefits. In this section, however I will go over these benefits in order to provide a foundation for why it is important to conduct this type of research in looking at how young farmers are valued in the current landscape of BC and the effects this has on them.

Our current globalized food system that BC is a part of is a relatively recent phenomenon given that it was only in 1969 that Canada first became a net importer of food products (going back and forth between being a net importer and exporter since) (Country Life in BC, 1969). In this globalized food economy supermarkets provide an expansive variety of food products for consumers, which at times makes the changes in the region’s farming dynamic seem inconsequential. The transformations to the landscape have been argued to be a somewhat ‘natural’ transition from the era of production to a new era of tourism, retail and services for British Columbia (Province of British Columbia, 2012). Unfortunately the transition away from local production has direct environmental, economic, social, and cultural consequences for the region and indirect consequences for the global community. Young farmers are the foundation for the next generation of BC agriculture and in order to ensure a sustainable food system it is necessary to incorporate their needs into BC’s landscape amongst other initiatives.

Agricultural production and environmental protection have been conveyed in academic literature as at odds with one another. At the same time however they are connected in discourses of rural idyll and wilderness. The conflicts between environmental initiatives and agriculture arise from the fact conventional agriculture is the “human activity with the single largest environmental impact” (Aiken & Boor, 2004, p.360) because it uses extensive irrigation, chemicals and pesticides, fossil fuels and
degrades soils with tillage (Altieri, 2001; Grewal & Grewal, 2012). However, being the largest polluter also makes it an arena for environmental change. Incorporating a new generation of young farmers into the landscape where they can potentially grow with sustainable techniques for local consumption will provide several environmental benefits. It should be noted that supporting local farming in BC does not guarantee that farmers will use ‘sustainable’ techniques or that they will sell locally, however it is the only avenue for local food within our food system and it allows consumers to be connected to farmers enabling sustainability.

One factor that prevents sustainable practices is a disconnection between consumers and producers (Aiken & Boor, 2004, p.361). This disconnection leads to some farmers perceiving that providing quantity over quality of produce is always beneficial and consumers perceiving that having more cheap food rather then quality food as better (Newman & Jennings, 2008, p.188). By being connected to how their produce is created consumers can support farmers allowing them to invest in sustainable practices. Along with policy makers these consumers can also inform policy and legislation that will regulate production. BC along with the rest of Canada already is held to a higher standard than other regions. For instance hormones and steroids that are often associated with conventional agriculture have been banned Canada since the 1960s unlike other regions (Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2011). Often there are economic challenges from switching from conventional farming to alternative methods, such as increased labour costs, new technology and initial loss in yield. Farmers may feel trapped by the growth models that were passed down to them by their parents, farmers, institutions and agribusiness corporations. By supporting and informing this transition policy makers along with BC consumers can reduce the Province’s ecological footprint through sustainable production (reduce ecological impact while allowing economic gains that allow farmers to continue to produce food products) that leads to sustainable consumption.

Continuing to support young farmers so that our production remains high makes BC less reliant on global commodity chains, which has both environmental and economic benefits. One of the environmental benefits of local food systems is that a reduction in transport of goods from producers to consumers occurs, which significantly reduces fuel consumption and reduces spoiling of foods that leads to mass waste.
Fossil fuel consumption from transportation of commodities of global commodity chains is a large component to CO₂ emissions that contribute to global warming (Aiken & Boer, 2004; Guthrie et al., 2006; Helms, 2004). Having local production that is supported and bought by BC buyers and consumers will reduce this use of fossil fuels. Secondly having agricultural land creates potential spaces for carbon storage (e.g. soils, plants and grasses) that could otherwise be replaced by cement and suburban infrastructure. Food waste also occurs at a higher rate with global commodity chains because of the time taken and the damage with transportation (Grewal & Grewal, 2012). It is estimated that 40% of all sold food in Canada ends up as waste (Macdonald, 2009). This is not only a waste in the energy inputs into the food, but it is occurring while hunger is prevalent in Canada and globally and is therefore not ethical as well.

Agricultural commodities that are traded and sold locally strengthen BC's economy. The economic benefits of having local production and not relying entirely on global markets are that agriculture in BC strengthens GDP, decreases global market dependence and reduces economic leakages (Grewal & Grewal, 2012; Masi, 2008; Moustier & Danso, 2006). Farm cash receipts in BC on average annually provided 1.9 billion CAD in GDP. This helps stimulate the economy and provides both jobs and capital for the government to support necessary infrastructure (Ministry of Agriculture, 2011; Markey, 2008). In the recent Economic Report by the Federal Government they noted that agriculture was the most stable industry (Government of Canada, 2012). Without young farmers there could be a potential drop in GDP brought in by agricultural industries. If production decreases there could also be an increase in economic leakages as BC consumers put their money into other economies and multi-national corporations. Lastly, consumers will be susceptible to global markets where the price of food could increase in years of drought or political turmoil.

Having agricultural communities also supports shared local knowledge systems that cannot be re-produced if there is a loss of farmers. This concept goes back to Alfred Marshall’s theorizing that “When an industry has thus chosen a locality for itself, it is likely to stay there long: so great are the advantages which people following the same skilled trade get from near neighbourhood to one another” (1890, p.7). This quote from Marshall in 1890 looks at the advantages of having a region that consists of relatively long term shared knowledge, culture and skills in making it become associated with
success in a certain type of industry. This concept has been challenged as transportation and communication technology has evolved to allow for transfer of knowledge between spaces globally. Still the fact that clusters form in certain regions displays that Marshall theorizing around the importance of locality is still relevant.

When Marshall (1890) was originally assessing the value of shared knowledge it was not focused on agricultural production, but factories. He himself concluded that fertile soils were what led to agricultural production as they led to high crop yields and attracted “crowds of agricultural labourer.” (p.7). The singular role of soils in creating spaces for agriculture was likely relevant at that time, however as industry and markets become more complex, societies and cultures change, and as the amount of farmers and farmland shrinks we need to re-assess what “is in the air” (Marshall, 1890, p.6).

In their re-evaluation of Marshall and the Cambridge School of thought, Belussi and Calderi (2009) re-configure Marshall’s ideas into six relevant points that begin to unveil what is ‘in the air’ of certain regions known for, and relatively successful in a certain industry. The first is the benefit of hereditary skill that is passed down from one generation to another both consciously and unconsciously. The second is the expansion of subsidiary trades that supply the industry with material and non-material needs. Thirdly there is the ability of the region to own/and or share specialized machinery. The forth point is that there is a local market for special skills that benefits employers and laborers. The fifth point is that industrial leadership arises from an atmosphere created by these specialized regions. Lastly these areas benefit from the “introduction of novelties into the production process” (Belussi & Calderi, 2009, p.338) where neighbors share innovations and knowledge with others in their community.

As displayed above community is integral to the economy. Community is a term often defined by sociologists as “forms of collective life in which people are tied together through tradition, interpersonal contacts, informal relationships, and particularistic affinities” (Storper, 2005, p.31). The challenge for economists is to connect this concept that is associated with socio-cultural benefits to economic development. Concepts, such as Giddens’ (1984) conclusion that communities provide “intermediate levels of association” necessary to “avoid the pitfalls of a rigid, administered society and economy” (Storper, 2005, p.32) can seem somewhat abstract and hard to pin down. Yet
case studies in Italy, Taiwan, Denmark, Mexico and Germany have continued to display “the existence of communities which regulate complex inter-firm and firm-worker relationships through shared norms, reputation effects, and mutually aligned expectations” (Storper, 2005, p.32-33). Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti (1993) take from Marshall (1890) in their assessment that family networks and civic associations, which Putnam argues are essential for the emergence and retention of social capital, come from specific regions where historical processes have created them. Putnam then goes onto add that having shared culture, reputation, background, values and knowledge promotes trust, which Storper connects to regional economic development from several empirical studies and case study literature from regions such as Italy and Germany (2005, p.33). He goes on to state that communities and actor networks “can minimize moral hazards, reduce transaction costs, and generate certain kinds of positive externalities and increasing returns (Storper, 2005, p.36). These benefits create localities that are more resilient (although still susceptible) to global flows and unstable markets of the globalized economy.

Theories around the benefits of communities in economic development are relevant in terms of displaying their benefits, but do little to explain causality. This connects to Martin’s (2005) conclusions when observing clusters, which is that they occur in an ‘unplanned’ manner. Given that we cannot re-create clusters or communities it is important to realize their relevance and create policy that continues to support them, rather than trying to re-create their structure and success in other places. Therefore local production becomes important because these clusters in agriculture created through a series of critical historical events can’t be recreated in any spaces. Specifically the Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD) continues to be the most productive region, which is displayed by its high percentage of cash crops, farmers and diversity and number of farms. This is despite the fact that the FVRD only contains two percent of the ALR.

Agriculture in BC also has social and cultural benefits because it can create work opportunities, provides a nutritional foods at fair prices through Community Shared Agricultural (CSA) boxes, farmers’ markets and potentially in supermarkets, and promotes community building and agri-tourism (Archer et al., 2003; Farmfolk Cityfolk, 2011; Grewal & Grewal, 2012; Local Food Harvest, 2012). Local food systems add to a
community-building atmosphere and promote healthy eating, which is consistent in community engagement in farmers’ markets and local food events. Farmers’ markets draw people in for several reasons including: they like the atmosphere, it makes them feel good, freshness of produce, support local farmers, its different then the supermarket and because its a fun day where they get to socialize (Archer et al., 2003; Farmfolk Cityfolk, 2011). In their research on farmers’ markets in the UK Archer et al. found that people enjoyed their time at the market to the extent that 96% of respondents in their survey would return (2003, p.392). The success of farmers’ markets, agri-tourism and community projects around food display the attachment to the rural idyll of agriculture although these activities do not always display the realities of production, which consumers are often uncomfortable with, but benefit from.

The social consequences of not having consumers and policy makers connected to farmers have become widely acknowledged in critical geographies of food where commodity chains are analyzed. Cook et al (2004) in their commodity chain analysis of papayas were able to defetishsize the tropical plant and show the reality of struggling farmers and farm workers that were working in very poor conditions. The fruits that seemed to just appear in the supermarket for 99p in the United Kingdom were causing health issues for farm workers, such as latex burns on their hands, due to the lack of investment by managers and the farmers to pay for new gloves (Cook, 2004, p.657). The farmer and his managers were struggling to support basic rights of labourers because it wouldn’t allow them to compete in the global market.

These studies in food geographies attempt to make “powerful, important, disturbing connections between Western consumers and the distant strangers whose contributions to their lives were invisible, unnoticed, and largely unappreciated” (Cook et al., 2004, p. 642). This assumption presumes that the disconnection is merely between ‘Western’ consumption of ‘Non-Western’ production. Although these disconnections are important it will be argued in this thesis that there are also more insidious disconnections at smaller scales of production and consumption. This has consequences on both local and global food systems. Not only are ‘Western’ farmers facing similar problems, but the disconnection is leading to spaces of production changing to spaces of consumption aggravating the divide discussed in critical food geographies. Given the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of having local agriculture it is necessary
to understand how young adults are attracted and averted from farming, which will be addressed in the next section.

**Aversion and Attraction to Farming**

Global studies in political economy within rural and agricultural sociology along with empirical evidence within BC, partially informs why young adults are averting from farming as a vocation. Despite the stressors in this literature there are still young farmers who enjoy their vocation whether it be the attraction to the rural idyll, the status of provider, community and generational ties, or other benefits that have gone unrecognized in academia. Although the point of this thesis is not to see if farmers agree with the previous arguments for attraction and aversion it is necessary to have this background, so that its connections and contradictions with the data from this study can be analyzed.

Arguably the most influential stressors on farmers that are analyzed in academic literature are the regulatory frameworks and economic pressures that are studied within political economy (Anderson, 2008; Argent, 2002; Fraser, 2005; Labao, 2001). The economic pressures are often created from externalized costs, such as changes in unstable global markets that increase input costs or decrease returns. Other externalized costs are climate factors such as drought or flooding that destroy crops. In British Columbia the disproportionate externalized costs put onto farmers for their production is shown in the negative net income that has occurred exclusively within this Province between the years of 2005-2010 (Statistics Canada, 2011) as shown in Figure 1. This occurred while BC was rated the sixth province for farm cash receipts that brought in an estimated $1.9 billion in GDP annually (Ministry of Agriculture, 2011). Farmers continually face declining terms of trade, capricious commodity markets, growing cost of inputs, loss of farm or income due to unpredictable affects climate and pests on crops, and the ever changing government policy surrounding farming in relation to a range of economic, social and environmental pressures (Fraser et al, 2005, p.341). Their livelihood concerns have been consistently identified as a major cause of stress and a contributor to suicide, psychiatric morbidity and depression within North America, Europe and India (Fraser et al., 2005).
The underlying problem is that farmers are expected to carry an extent of the burden of externalities while competing with cheaper food products. Food in the US and Canada is relatively cheaper than other commodities as many social and environmental costs are externalized and global competition serves consumers at the expense of many producers (Anderson, 2008). Past generations of farmers were estimated to make 30 cents for every dollar spent by consumers on food. Recent farmers in the global food system receive an estimated 8 cents or less per dollar (Cabaj, 2008). Based on consumer reports British Columbians spend approximately 10.3% of their total expenditure on food (Statistics Canada, Spending Patterns in Canada, 2009, p.18). One of the difficult parts of promoting fair conditions for farmers and local food is that it is seen as relatively expensive compared to cheaper mass-produced and processed foods (Anderson, 2008; Cabaj 2008; Farmfolk CityFolk, 2012; Timmer, 2011). This puts the marginalized consumer against the marginalized farmer and is at the foundation of a large problem within the global food system. What occurs is that cheap mass produced
food is seen as necessary to feed people in need, which often means any external costs end up being set on to the farmers and not consumers. The costs set onto farmers in the name of food security were suggested by Anderson (2008) to be major cause in the erosion of farming in the US. She notes that despite the cheap costs of food 11% of Americans in 2006 were food insecure suggesting that this erosion in the name of food security does not provide the needs of impoverished Americans (Anderson, 2008, p. 596). These economic and regulatory framework stressors have also been studied in New South Wales where there was a drastic decrease in the number of farms between the 1980s and 1990s. Farms of all sizes decreased, although it was mainly small and large scale (Argent, 2002). Overall farmland decreased by 27% (Argent, 2002, p.110). The conclusion was that it was a “reaction…to the financial, climatic and environmental pressures facing pastoralism” (Argent, 2002, p.110).

Supporting local agriculture within the food system has potential to remove some of the externalized costs for farmers, (Anderson, 2008; Livanis, 2006; Timmer, 2011) making it more economically attractive as a career. Livanis et al. (2006) found that farmland near urban areas has a higher net farm returns of farmland. If this is true then the changes in the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) in BC, which exempts land near urban cores, could be increasing net income loss. The study found that “reductions in transportation costs… [along with] changes in the structure of farms…to [ensure] survival of (or conversion to) high-valued agriculture” (Livanis, 2006, p.928) increased farm income.

The creation of the ALR through Bill 42 (which has been since amended) by the Provincial Government has continued to be a policy that attempts to support agriculture. In 1973 the Provincial Government, represented by the New Democratic (NDP), created the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) in order to prevent industrial and residential development that threatened productive agriculture land, which would diminish the regions food security (Simpson, 2003; Stobbes et al, 2011). In BC the region of arable land is relatively small at about 1.2%, which made food security for the population that was over 2 million (now approximately 4 million) in 1973 a difficult prospect (Ministry of Agriculture, 2012; Provincial Agricultural Land Reserve, 2009). The ALR was created and continues to be enforced by a government appointed body known as the Agricultural Land Commission (ALC). The land in the ALR is protected by the constraints set by the
ALC for its landowners, which included the inability to have subdivisions or use the land for most non-agricultural purposes (Provincial Agricultural Land Reserve, 2009; Simpson, 2003). It was created after the BC Federation had pushed the government to allow farmers to be able to put farmland into dedication so that they could receive a tax break on land that wasn’t part of their homestead and in return the land would become a reserved for agriculture for future generations (Country Life in BC, 1971 & 1972). One of the stressors for farmers at that time and continues is the high cost of land and property taxes.

In 2002 the provincial government (represented by the Liberal party) decentralized the ALC (Province of British Columbia, 2002). The ALC still exists, however it no longer has jurisdiction over land-use exemption of the ALR. The change led to jurisdiction over land-use decision-making being given to the municipalities and can be overridden by the Provincial, Federal Government and First Nation Councils if it conflicts with other policies (Stobbes et al, 2011; ALC). The intentions for municipalities to increase industrial and residential development that could increase their property tax base has led many critics to state that this change in jurisdiction has led ALR land exemptions being supported for reasons other than the land not being desirable for agriculture. For instance in their study Stobbes et al. (2002) found a positive correlation between ALR exemptions that were passed in Abbotsford and in the Saanich peninsula by major roads that were prime for residential, commercial and social infrastructure (e.g. schools, community centres). Since the transition in jurisdiction, the additions of land were primarily placed in the colder, more arid, and less productive northwest while the exemptions were concentrated in the fertile south within and near urban centers (Stobbes et al, 2011). The lack of protection of the ALR not only removes an important resource for young farmers, but it devalues agriculture by confirming the notion that it isn’t worth protecting.

The ALR itself has many supporters and critics. The critics argue that between 25-50% of ALR land isn’t ‘used’ and that as the population grows the inability to expand development affects the economy. This potentially removes the ability to create more affordable housing (Katz, 2009). This argument is based on the projected population growth for BC. The supporters of the ALR argue that the increased population is going to
need a larger food supply that cannot be supported by global producers in a sustainable manner (Katz, 2009).

The critics of the ALR make a valid point in stating that the high percentage of ALR land currently not being used does display how the ALR does not necessarily promote agriculture production. The question that should be asked however is whether this should be seen as an issue with the ALR or does this display that having available land is not the only necessity in promoting agriculture? For instance in BC rental farmland grew from 1986-2006 by 35% in contrast to Saskatchewan and Alberta where it only rose from 2%-4% (Katz, 2009). This change in tenure arrangements has less to do with the ALR as it does to the economic changes within the region, and the new challenges facing farmers in owning land and paying taxes on it. Land in the ALR may be more affordable than other properties in BC, but given the increase in inputs and the decrease in net income and challenges with urban sprawl it may still be hard to acquire for young or new farmers.

One arguably positive transition in BC for attracting young farmers is having urban farming near city cores (Stolhandske, 2011). Statistics on farming has a set definition for who is a farm operator such as having a net income of $10,000 (Statistics Canada, 2011). Urban farmers in regions like Vancouver and BC are changing the dynamics of farming. Urban farming in Metro Vancouver is an agriculture industry that has been gaining momentum as sustainability has begun to get embedded into parts of the culture. This type of industry has been prominent in regions of Latin America, Africa and Asia, where locals can’t access global food chains easily, but is relatively new to North America (Stolhandske, 2011). Young small-scale farmers may be slipping under the radar both in terms of being counted in statistics and in benefiting from policies put in place to aid more traditional farming. There are constant transitions in policy affecting agriculture in BC where policy makers are influenced both by other scales of government and by outside policy initiatives that may be beneficial. Farming is susceptible to the process of policy mobilities. In the City of Vancouver policy in agriculture has mobilized as a way to promote community gardens rather then supporting farmers for food production (Stolhandske, 2011). Although this can promote local food, which is positive it also sets up barriers for young farmers who need support for long-term production and not just short-term consumption of green spaces.
In BC the emergence of support for local farmers has come from organizations whose members are farmers, such as the BCAC, BCYF, and associations that are commodity specific as well as other NGOs, such as Farmfolk Cityfolk, BC Association of Farmers’ Markets, food policy councils, Local Food Plus as well as Community Shared Agriculture (CSA) Programs\(^1\). These organizations create spaces where young farmers can build relationships with buyers and consumers, promote knowledge on sustainable local agriculture and work with government, corporations and consumers to promote pro-local food initiatives that supports farmers and may be a pull factor for young adults.

Despite these initiatives the number of young farmers has decreased. In BC the issues facing farmers likely coincide with past observations on political economy, rural and agricultural sociology and psychology. These issues may be tied to the significant decrease in young farmers since 1991 shown in Figure 2. From 2001 to 2011 the number of farm operators under 35 decreased from 2400 to 1620, a -32.5% change (Statistics Canada, 2008). Since 1991, which is the earliest census record of farm operators, the number of farm operators under 35 has decreased from 4180 to 1620, a -62% change. In The Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD) the total number of farmers under the age of 35 decreased from 490 to 385 (-22%) (Statistics Canada, 2012). In 2011 farmers under the age of 35 represented only 9% of total farmers in the FVRD. In Delta the 2001 data was not available, however the total number of farmers in 2006 and was 260 and only 25 of them were 35 and under, and in 2011 the amount of farmer operators grew to 320, but the number of young farmers remained at 25 (Statistics Canada, 2007; Statistics Canada 2012). Given that farming is capital intensive it is not surprising that there are more farmers over the age of thirty-five, but the fact that there are significantly less young farmers now than in 2001 is cause for concern and further investigation.

\(^1\) CSA programs are set up to allow farmers to sell a share of their produce on a plot of land to community members. These members then receive a box each week during the season of produce that is split evenly amongst other shareholders. This allows farmers to have a set income regardless of externalities and in the seasons where growing conditions are optimal consumers receive excess produce.
A decline in farming is not specific to BC and has been assessed in North America as a result of financial stress. Surveys conducted in the US showed that on average 90% of the earned income of respondent farmers was from other work (Labao & Meyer, 2001, p. 103-4). Not only is this vocation tending to be part time work, but it has also decreased sufficiently in the US as farming has gone from being a vocation held by one third of the population in the early 1900’s to approximately 2% of the population (Labao & Meyer, 2001, p.104).

This decline has been recognized as a consequence of globalization where regions that have struggling economies have taken advantage of their cheap labour and biotechnology to become competitors (Lipton, 2007). The unfortunate truth is that studies in these regions conclude that these farmers suffer from stressors as farmers in
economically ‘developed’ regions and that those farmers are simply unable to obtain other work (Altieri, 2001, Glover, 2007 Seedling, 2008).

In BC young adults have other choices for vocation and the aversion from these stressors to an extent is reflected in the changes to the economic landscape in the past 40 years. Until the mid 1970s British Columbia was a resource led economy that was reliant on industries such as forestry, mining, fisheries and agriculture. Although these industries are still the main drivers in some regional economies, the government has worked at diversifying the economy for growth and market resilience (British Columbia Ministry of Regional Economic and Skills Development, 2010). Recently the Province has also engaged in the Gateway Project to stimulate growth in trade with the Asia Pacific Region. In 2012 it is projected that the province will have 1.1 million skilled jobs for the 650,000 job seekers joining the workforce from schools (this does not include the current 6.9% unemployed) (Province of British Columbia, 2012). This displays a competitive environment that looking at BC’s present and recent past is being won by the service sector:

“Four out of five workers in BC are employed in the service sector. The largest employer in the sector is wholesale & retail trade, followed by health care & social assistance and accommodation & food services. The smallest industry in this sector (other services) employs more people (101,200) than agriculture, mining, oil & gas, forestry & logging, utilities and fishing, hunting & trapping combined (93,300)” (Province of British Columbia, 2012).

This transition is not relevant just to a decrease in farmers, but it also reflects a region where consumption is becoming a larger driver in the economy then production, which deters young adults from farming to other vocations. The Ministry of Regional and Economic Development has seen this transition as an opportunity to promote skilled labour education for the service industry in their 2020 plan (2010). The uneven distribution of support for different sectors will indirectly affect farming.

An under estimated stressor on farmers that may be deterring young adults is the family and work dynamics that are common in agriculture. The importance of family farms historically in BC can be seen in the Land Commission’s original mandate, which was to protect family farms in BC (Country Life in BC, 1973). In these generational farm
operations family dynamics can promote stress because they produce conflicts in justice, roles and identities in the work family dynamic and succession (succession referring to the legal process of passing down land, infrastructure, machinery and quota to family members). All of these are reflected in the fact that there is no customary or mandatory retirement age for farmers who tend to work longer, which places the younger generation of farmers in a dependent relationship with their parent and family members (Fraser, 2005). Issues around farm succession can lead to tensions between the two generations on the farm. One study in Australia “found that 63% of farmers had not discussed the issue of farm inheritance with their children, and 84% had not spoken to their daughters-in-law” (Fraser, 2005, P.342). It is also apparent that not being able to split the family environment from the work environment does not allow farmers buffer spaces and time for recovery from external stresses on the farm (Fraser, 2005, p.346).

Although the purpose of this thesis is not to confirm if these previous results in academic literature are present, it is important to see if they are incorporated into the aversion of young adults to farming in BC. It should also be mentioned that while gathering this information the lack of what attracts farmers to the vocation was evident. For this thesis I will be focused on understanding both aversions and attractions of young farmers within BC as transformations in landscape occur. However these transformations in landscape are likely influenced by the previous discussed factors especially those in political economy. As Appadurai (1996) states “locality is an inherently fragile social achievement” (p.179). He discusses this fragility as being highly influenced by global flows that he puts in the categories of ethnoscapes, technoscapes, financescapes, ideoscapes and mediascapes (Appadurai, 1996, p.33-35). These flows can shape how a region invests in infrastructure that once created in turn shapes behaviour and interactions within the region (Hall, 2010, p.58). Another argument for what shapes locality is within political ecology where local stakeholders shape the landscape based on their vision and level of influence. This will be discussed in the next section.
Political Ecology: Understandings and Transformation of Landscape and Landscape Value

Transformations in landscapes and changes in society have occurred, and will always occur. This acknowledgement is what lends to the concept that these changes in the landscape are somewhat ‘natural’ evolutions as humans adapt creating new technologies and gaining new knowledge. This thesis uses the theoretical approaches of academics that study within political ecology and land-use planning frameworks to understand why transformations occur in the landscape and who informs these changes. Within these theoretical frameworks academics insist that these changes are systematic and are formed by certain stakeholders and cultural norms, and therefore are anything but natural. Since having young farmers is important for British Columbia it is necessary to not only understand their position and view of themselves in landscape production, but also how influential stakeholders view and therefore place or displace them within the landscape. In this section I will go over the literature surrounding conflicts within landscapes of production and consumption as well as landscape transformations that inform agriculture production.

Studies have been done across North America, Australia and Europe to assess power structures and land-use planning conflicts that are place based. In order to understand why young farmers are appearing to get scarcer in BC it is necessary to look at changes to the political, economic, physical, cultural and social factors in landscape production that have affected agriculture. More importantly it is necessary to understand the power structures that have created this landscape through societal and cultural norms, planning initiatives and policy.

Two ways of assessing power structures through political ecology are the frameworks that have been put forth by Neo-Marxist academics and by Foucault. The Neo-Marxist's framework is insistent that “power circulates among and between different social groups, resources, and spaces” (Zografos, 2009, p.1729). This framework exemplifies the role of powerful stakeholders (usually the owners and financiers of industry) whose intent influences governance. Due to the inability to remove politics and power from the economy it displays how disparities occur for producers and workers.
Foucault’s concept is that power “is omnipresent and formative, that it becomes embodied in social practice, and that in this twisted way it provides ‘the very condition of [a subject's] existence and the trajectory of its desire’” (Foucault, 1984; Zografos, 2009, p.1729). Foucault was concerned with the power of discourse. He did not see language and discourse as innocent, but rather stated it was “controlled, selected, organized and redistributed” (p.210) in ways that control the outcomes of events and contain how societies function. In this framework power is associated with cultural norms created by certain stakeholders and institutions, and ideology that governs our actions and develops our landscapes. These are created or rather recreated through a history of discourses. These power structures arguably inform and therefore develop the physical environment. This in turn guides human behaviour that tends to follow the inertia of the built environment. This will be shown in the academic work of Walker and Fortmann (2003) and Abrams and Gosnell (2012). In their work we begin to see the formation of how discourses on the proper way to interact with nature develop as sources of power for certain stakeholders on how the land should be used, and recreated.

Powerful stakeholders and cultural norms are interesting concepts that prove to be difficult to unveil as different stakeholders enter arenas where community visions or ‘spaces’ are contested. Abrams and Gosnell (2012) observed a specific struggle in their case study analysis of the existing land-use conflicts in Wallowa Country, Oregon. These conflicts surrounded the passing of HB3326 by the Oregon Legislature in 2001. HB3326 allowed for landowners to remove or sell up to two non-farm parcels of land on previously zoned for Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) (Abrams and Gosnell, 2012, p.31). This restructuring created by policy relates Wallowa Country to British Columbia as the exemption of EFU is alike the exemption of ALR. HB3326 led to an influx of residents who were interested in a rural landscape, but not in rural production. Abrams and Gosnell argued that the restructuring of land by HB3326 is part of a trend in economically developed nations where the “creation of uneven rural terrains characterized by diverse economic activities, patterns of migration, and land-use expectations” (Abrams and Gosnell, 2012, p. 31) change and fragment the landscape. In this case discourses around rural landscapes by new property owners led to the fragmentation of the previous landscape of rural production.
The type of land-use planning in Wallowa County through HB3326 created an institutional arena “where struggles to define the meaning of the natural environment and how communities structure their relations with nature take place” (Abrams and Gosnell, 2012, p.31). In Wallowa County the main issue for farmers (and other production based workers) is that they need the land for their livelihood while the new purchasers are amenity-oriented and in search of the rural idylls of the conservation of ‘nature’ rather than production. Resident farmers felt the pressure on their lifestyle and income as policy began to support the “breaking up [of their] agricultural lands into home sites for the wealthy” (Abrams and Gosnell, 2012, p.35). In this case it becomes apparent that the issue of changes in space for farmers is directly related to the impact it has on their ability to farm for their livelihood. The farmers in this case can be seen as powerful in the way that they have the label as ‘local’ (entailing an attachment to space over time) as well as the status of ‘providers,’ while new residents are powerful in their financial ability to afford the new prices and taxes of land and as ‘protectors’ of the non-human landscape.

Walker and Fortmann (2003) have also analyzed contested visions of landscapes. Their case study occurred in Nevada County, California where the stakeholders of resource-based production were also fighting against stakeholders of new consumptive economies who value the aesthetics and non-human aspects of the landscape. It should be noted that this trend is not necessitated as the norm for conflicts on landscape, however the connections do raise awareness on the disconnections and problems around visions for production and consumption. NH2020 was a policy being put forward in Nevada County. Unlike HB3326 it did not revolve around exemption of land, but rather ecological protection as it was a policy for “county-wide biotic inventory and open space protection” (Walker & Fortmann, 2003, p.469) that would limit area for production. It went beyond individual residents moving in and an actual change in the vision for how land should be used by the community. Walker and Fortmann concluded that this conflict displayed the political ecology concept that “science is embedded in relations of power” as proponents of NH2020 used science as a source of objectivity for their agenda while opponents “who constructed for themselves an identity as oppressed ‘locals’ attempting to slay a would-be Goliath” (Walker & Fortmann, 2003, p.486) used it as well. They connected this to Peet and Watts’s concept that each community holds a
‘environmental imaginary’ that is created from the cultures norms as to what the proper way to interact with non-human aspects of ecosystems (2004). It therefore isn’t just stakeholders going head to head, but the cultural norms of each group that leads to conflicts into how to not only create the landscape, but how to interact with it. This article is a case study that displays the complexity of politics in regions where community members are divided in how they value create their community.

In BC there are land-use conflicts between conservation and farming, as well as urban, social and industrial development and farming. The underlying similarity with BC, Nevada and Wallowa County is that stakeholders each have their own vision. A current example explored in this thesis is the conflict in visions is with a Provincial Ministry and a Crown Corporation. The Ministry of Agriculture and Land’s mandate is that “All British Columbians should have access to safe, locally produced food” (Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, 2010). They see agriculture as both beneficial to the economy, as a large source of GDP and job creator, and to local residents who rely on it for food security. Along with the ALC and many other associations they attempt to build policy and initiatives to benefit BC farmers as well as consumers. The Vancouver Port President and CEO, Robin Silvester, argues that “agriculture is emotionally important, but economically [of] relatively low importance to the Lower Mainland. And in terms of food security, [it] is almost meaningless for the Lower Mainland” (Vancouver Sun, 2011). These two views display the problems of disconnection and prioritizing faced by industries like agriculture that are sensitive to land-use planning. As interests converge in land-use planning in BC each stakeholder needs to promote their vision of a landscape in order to promote their needs.

It recently became apparent that the vision of the Port CEO will become reflected on the landscape in Delta. Recently developer Ron Emerson bought 600 acres of ALR land from farmers for 185,000 CAD per acre that was previously valued at 75,000 CAD, knowing that once it can be used by the port sector it will be worth between 500,000 CAD and 1,000,000 CAD (Sinoski, 2012). Interestingly this occurred after Gateway put in place the South Fraser Agricultural Enhancement Strategy (SFAES) that involved the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure approving funding of $5,265,888.00 for the 80th street irrigation pump and $1,342,188.00 for the Big Slough Control Gate Project for better irrigation drainage for farmers (Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure,
If the land is converted then this project has done little to ‘enhance’ agriculture in the region. It also will display changes in value over time as this land in 1968 during the original port expansion was restricted to agricultural land-use (this pre-dated the ALR) because of the fertility of soils and benefits of agriculture that use to be seen as an integral part of the Delta Southlands (Sinoski, 2012). Although Emerson states that this is “not big business or political” (Sinoski, 2012) this was done with the intention that the Federal Government can override the provincial and municipal jurisdiction if it finds the ports vision as beneficial to Canadians. The ports vision being that the area should serve trade in the Pacific Rim that would create industrial work. The MLA of this district Vicki Huntington describes the deal as a result of fact that "Few people would turn down this kind of money, especially when it's clear the ALR means so little to our government" (Sinoski, 2012). In this sense the de-valuation of agriculture within the region by powerful stakeholders has led farmers to sell their land because they don’t themselves see it as valuable for farming. As mentioned this has nothing to do with fertility of soils, but rather the inability of agriculture to provide a livelihood or a sense of value for farming, both presently and for the future, over instant capital.

In BC community members see themselves as local buyers, but that doesn’t necessarily transition into a vision for production for the landscape if they continue to not stand up against development on ALR land by developers who don’t have it within their vision. Local food is great in the supermarket, but we want spaces for recreation, services, other industry, aesthetics and residential areas. This vision is promoted both by policy makers and influential stakeholders and it can potentially erode local agriculture by pushing young farmers away through pushing them out of the landscape transformation. (It should be noted that it isn't just other development that pushes out agriculture, but the previously mentioned economic and socio-cultural factors.)

The transformations in landscape that are putting pressures on farmers can be connected to the relatively recent theory that large-scale landscape changes from productive to either post-productive or multifunctional landscapes is occurring. The previous research examples of Abrams and Gosnell and Walker and Fortmann analyze place-based politics that are focused on local planning and a specific policy initiative. The transition of productivist landscapes to post-productivist, or multifunctional landscapes is based on a larger scaled framework that insists that a change is occurring
mainly in relatively high-income countries from production oriented to consumptive conservationalist as environmental interests gain momentum. Although at a larger scale this may still display the contested visions for landscape. The transition away from, or change in productivist work, such as farming, has been argued to be embedded in a transition to post-productive and multifunctional landscapes that prioritize ecological protection and other initiatives that aren’t productivist (Fitzpatrick, 2004; Mather, 2001; Wilson & Wilson, 1997; Wilson & Rigg, 2003; Wilson, 2004; Wilson & Memon, 2005; Burton & Wilson, 2006).

In his research along side other academics Geoff Wilson has advocated for the acceptance of post-productivism and multi-functionality as a new paradigm shift in rural governance (Wilson & Wilson. 1997; Wilson & Rigg, 2003; Wilson, 2004; Wilson & Memon, 2005; Burton & Wilson, 2006). Wilson (2004) uses these frameworks to analyze the “nature and direction of governance in the context of the changing economic, political and cultural expectations surrounding the strategic regulation of the countryside” (p.463). He argues that agriculture becomes post-productivist when the corporate relationships between agricultural ministries and powerful farmer unions break down and formerly politically marginal actors, such as environmental groups or local grassroots organizations, into the decision-making and policy formulation (Wilson, 2004, p.462). In its idealized form he insists that post-productivism, empowers a variety of community members while “changing attitudes towards destructive environmental management practices on farmland at the grassroots level” (Wilson, 2004, p. 462-3).

This ’greening’ of agriculture changes the role of farming (Wilson & Wilson, 1997), which dramatically changes how farmers can earn income. The transition of productivity based on quantity to that of quality can be difficult for farmers who are unsure how to make this transition and who aren’t involved or considered in the process of changes in policy that transform landscapes. It is also interesting to note that in recent history farms in North America have actually tended to increase in size. The question that needs to be addressed is does this change to the agricultural landscape to include other interests actually make the industry itself more sustainable or are farmers (especially small-scale farmers) and/or industry simply being pushed to other regions that use less sustainable farming techniques?
In order to develop this framework to incorporate farmers, Burton & Wilson (2006) used social psychology to understand the linear transitions between productivism, post-productivism and multi-functional landscapes in agriculture and its affects. Their focus was on the identity theory where individuals create their identities around social norms of their community. They obtained their data from a survey of farmers in Bedfordshire, UK. They use this data along with other European research studies to look at the changes in landscape and culture that they describe as “becoming more conservationalist” (Burton & Wilson, 2006, p.96). Their findings supported Wilson’s previous concept of multi-functionality because farmers’ identities are changing to support different roles in order to stay viable, however they are still primarily productivist in that they are food ‘producers’ (Burton & Wilson, 2006, p.111-2). What this article lacked is causality in how their identities changed and if there were any anomalies in this transition. Nonetheless they provided three identities based on social identity. They found that productivist self-concept saw their role as production dominated and that they saw non-productivist counter identity as both negative and other (Burton & Wilson, 2006, p.102). The post-productionist self identity was oppose to agri-business approaches to farming, but still saw themselves as productivists. Lastly the multifunctional self-concept was that there is no notion of 'otherness'. “Multifunctionality emphasises the ability for all identities to co-exist. While one identity will be salient, there are no approaches to agriculture which the farmer actively opposes” (Burton & Wilson, 2006, p.102).

What continually goes unmentioned by Wilson in his research is the diversity in farmer’s interests as he generalizes that productionist farmers are uninterested environmental protection. It is true that agriculture can degrade the environment, for instance conventional farming that has been promoted in agriculture by policy and the agri-business is at the root of soil degradation in some regions. However as noted by David Montgomery(personnel communication, 2012) soil erosion directly affects farmer’s interests and they often work with researchers, agricultural ministers and organizations to reduce the impact as soil is their livelihood. Having forests protecting farmland from winds and other eroders can potentially benefit both interests. Wilson’s conclusions have validity, but they should be taken as a simplified conclusion of a social network that is complex. Still he does give some insight as to why the landscape seems to be less informed by productivist work that is commonly associated with agriculture.
There are some critics of the post-productive or multifunctional transition. Evans et al. (2002) argue that it is a new problematic dualism promoted by academics that seek to take “the problems of land-use planning, rural development and both on farm and off-farm social and economic change [and fit them]... within a single catchphrase” (p.314). He configures an argument by reflecting on the problems of past dualism, such as Fordist and post-Fordist discussed by Cloke and Goodwin (1992, p.324):

“In an eagerness to join in with these new developments ['new times', 'post-Fordism, 'post-modernism'] rural [cf. agricultural] research may come to borrow inappropriate ideas and begin to use somewhat overarching concepts in a rather cavalier fashion . . . Thus, what appears to be a sea-change to a new epoch may well be the latest in a long line of ‘constant revolutions’, and hence any search for an extensive shift in rural society from Fordism [i.e., productivism] to its successor [cf. post-productivism] would seem to us to be somewhat premature.”

Evans et al. also argue that post-productivist academics describe extensification, dispersion and diversification without theoretical assessment and the empirical evidence to justify its existence (Evans et al, 2002, p. 316-17). They justify the critique by using evidence from empirical studies within Western Europe to show that despite changes in policy to include environmental interests that intensification, specialization and centralization is still occurring at the same rate. Due to the ‘cavalier’ use of the term Evans et al. put forward the notion to discard it as a framework as it “takes scholars down a false blind alley, ending in exaggerated claims of ‘surplus' land in agriculture and a ‘post-agricultural’ future for the countryside” (Evans, 2002, .328). They propose instead ecological modernization as an alternative social theory because they believe it does more to explain transitions occurring. Ecological modernization theory states that when a realization of the impacts of economic activity on the environment are becoming more evident that society changes, although it may not always be reflected through on the ground action (Evans et al., 2002).

Mather et al. (2006) challenge the assumption by critics (Morris and Evans 1999; Evans et al, 2002.) that post-productivism is a dualism that should be disposed of and the assumptions by its champions that are to generalized and focused on agriculture. They argue that post-productivism as a framework should be considered as a shift in policy and land-use, and that it does not insist that productivist interests have been
neutralized (Mather et al., 2006, p.451). They did however agree with Evans that it has elements of weakness in its empirical evidence framework and that it should be used in the future as a “theory on the fundamental drivers of change” (Mather et al., 2006, p.452) with a focus on causality in different regions. At present theory is not relevant in all regions. This is seen in Argent’s 2002 study that provided evidence that although agriculture in Australia is changing to include initiatives for economic and environmental sustainability that the region does not fit the post-productive framework. He argued that Wilson’s theorization “uncritically sifts historical events and processes into its constituent categories in order to uphold its own original hypothesis" and that it does not include “local-scale events and processes, mainly because farm-level dynamics do not fit neatly into any productivist/post-productivist divide” (Argent, 2002, p.212). This displays how the framework of large-scale transitions is difficult to assess because causality is usually complex and messy. Also the link between local and global systems, which I briefly discussed in the previous section, is often not addressed in this transition when it could play a large role.

This research is focused on looking at the causality of transformations in landscape as suggested by Mather (2006) et al. As well it assesses the impacts these transformations have on young farmers through comprehensive data collection from important stakeholders within agriculture, land-use planning and policy in BC. This thesis extends from an important question that hasn’t been asked by any of the academics in this section, which is: are these transitions creating sustainable production in necessary commodities, such as food, within certain regions? If transformations in the landscape are reducing the amount of young farmers in the BC I argue it is not at this point sustainable for the reasons mentioned in Chapter 2.1. It therefore is necessary to have them become represented and heard in visioning for the landscape, which is prevented currently by the complex interests of other stakeholders and a disconnection between consumers and producers.
3. Methodology and Methods

The praxis of this research is to promote decision-making by both policy makers and consumers that is informed by young farmer’s perspectives. This will allow the food system in BC to have a stronger foundation in local production that is sustained by new generations of farmers for new generations of consumers. This extends from the theorization that contested visions for landscape in BC have fragmented and to an extent pushed agricultural production (and with it young farmers) out of the landscape. This is occurring despite the continued rhetoric in BC that consumers want and value local food. The research design for this project is based mainly on an ethnographic methodology informed by qualitative data. The data collection was informed by Knigge and Cope’s grounded theory framework in that “multiple stages of collecting data, coding and analyzing and then reflecting on emerging themes, collecting more data targeted to initial theories, and constantly comparing the insights that evolve” (2006, p. 2024-2025). However given the specific inquiry and background knowledge that is entailed in this study it will not be defined as grounded theory.

Methodological triangulation was used to gather data in this study. I conducted interviews with young farmers within BC who are between the ages of 19-40, which is the age range used by the British Columbia Young Farmers Association (BCYF, 2012). Given the limited time for this thesis and limited availability of young farmers to be interviewed I also be gathered data through surveys sent to members of the BCYF. I conducted interviews with generational farmers, government officials and other stakeholders that affect agriculture and land-use policy within BC. Lastly, secondary data from archival research was used in order to see if it supports or contradicts the data from the ethnographic methods. This involved looking at policy documents within BC’s Provincial and Municipal Government websites and archives, media sources and journals.
There are two empirical sites within British Columbia that I focused on for collecting data. These sites were Delta and The Fraser Valley Regional District. These sites were chosen to represent two distinct regions of agriculture that have a historic connection between space, farmers and agriculture that despite changes still occurs in British Columbia.

Delta is a suburb that despite having an increase in development still has a core region known for its farmland in the Southlands (Delta Farmland & Wildlife Trust, 2011). In the 2011 Canadian Census of Agricultural only 25 out of the 320 operators on the reporting 202 farms were below the age of 35 (Statistics Canada, 2012). Residential and commercial development planning initiatives in Delta in the past few years have been trying to encourage a residential and farming mix in the Southlands (Century Group,
which would lead to a transition in the landscape in which young farmers are large stakeholders. At the same time space for agriculture in Delta is speculated to become even more fragmented and smaller because of other powerful stakeholders in the region that have other visions for the landscape.

The Fraser Valley, which contains six municipalities, represents a greenbelt region that despite an increase in urban development still has a relatively high percentage of farmland and is the region in BC with the highest cash farm receipts (Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, 2011; Fraser Basin Council, 2012; Statistics Canada, Cash Farm Receipts, 2012). Agriculture has a long history in this region that predates BC’s joining confederation and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It started in Agassiz in the early 1850’s-60’s as Europeans settled in the region en route to the Fraser Canyon where the gold rush was occurring (District of Kent, 2009). Despite these facts farmland and the numbers of young farmers has drastically decreased. This decrease has previously been linked to urban sprawl (Fraser Basin Council, 2012). Since 1974 4994 hectares have been removed from the Fraser Valley displaying that even in areas where agriculture is associated with the ‘space’ and community that agriculture is decreasing.

**Interviews**

Young farmers from the empirical sites were interviewed for this project. Young farmers for the purpose of this study were between the ages of 19 and 40 and who are farming edible commodities primarily for selling and not for subsidence. As well young adults who have displayed vast interest in becoming farmers, but have been unable to get into the ‘business’ were interviewed. These young adults did not just state interest, but have received degrees based on agricultural studies and have a background in farming; primarily within the Fraser Valley (usually from on, and being a part of a family farm). These interviews give insight to the challenges and positive aspects of farming for the young farmers as well as trends that are occurring to change the landscape for the newest generations of farmers. These farmers have also provided insight on other young adults who have chosen to either leave the region to farm elsewhere or whom have chosen not to farm anymore. I interviewed a limited number of farmers, approximately eight in total. The reasons for this small sample size is that there are limitations to
obtaining young farmers to interview, and because the purpose of this study is to do in-depth interviews with interviewees to provide reliability and trustworthiness in the data obtained.

For this study two anonymous farmers provided informal interviews and six provided formal interviews. Of these six one chose to remain anonymous. Below is a brief description of each young farmer

Heidi Schurmann: Heidi was born and raised on different farms and currently operates a dairy farm in Abbotsford along with her husband Mark Schurmann (also interviewed for this study) and his family. Heidi and Mark are currently in the process of succession to own their land. She holds a BSC in Biology and has worked off farm as a dairy feed rep and currently is contracted to work on the EFP project for the dairy sector. She is involved in both the BCYF and Mainland Young Milk Producers (MYMP). What attracted her to farming is that she loves both animals and the lifestyle. The main stressors she expressed were risings costs, finding employee and finding land. She has witnessed young farmers leave to go to the prairies and east coast due to lower land costs and more government support and has considered moving there herself as well based on the low cost and availability of both land and quota.

Mark Schuurman: Mark grew up on a dairy farm that he currently operates along with his wife Heidi and his family. He holds a BSc in Agricultural Studies. Along with being active in the BCYF he is involved with MYMP (past president) and the Young Farmers Group for Young Dairy Farmers and Employees (YFGYDF). Mark is attracted to farming as it allows him to be his own boss, and produce high quality milk for the Canadian consumers. The difficulties for him currently are the costs of inputs, dealing with HR and managing the stress that goes with those issues. Mark has witnessed young farmers leave to go to the prairies for the lower costs of production and ability to expand. As mentioned above Heidi and Mark have both considered moving to the prairies or east coasts based on costs and availability of land and quota.

Dale Krahn: After obtaining a B.B. A. at the age of 20 Dale chose to leave a management job at the border patrol office to work along side his brother, father and uncle on their family farm and with their construction company as a land developer and
The original farm was started by his Grandfather in the 1960s in the FVRD, which is the region that the family farm has expanded in and at present they produce broilers, eggs and turkeys and are supply managed. Currently Dale is going through the process of succession to be an owner of the farm. Dale is the current president of the BCYF and is associated with several associations, such as, but not limited to the BC Chicken Growers Association, 4H, Agrifair, Canadian Young Farmers Forum, Future Agriculture Business Builders and Ag-Entrepreneurs. He describes his main stressors as the costs of inputs and finding labour yet still he is attracted to the prospect of producing a high quality product and putting acreage to use. Dale has witnessed young farmers leave BC to go to the prairies based on low quota and land prices and although he has interest in expanding the farm there he does not foresee leaving BC himself.

Jill Robbins: Jill operates a farm with her parents in the FVRD. Originally the family produced raspberries, however when the price plummeted they were forced to move and now currently sell broilers and turkeys, which they raise outdoors. The farm is a small-scale supply managed operation that sells primarily at the gate, but also at Vancouver Farmers’ Markets. They also sell vegetables and herbs from a small garden along side the birds. The family is currently leasing a small plot to one of Jill's friends who did not grow up on a farm, but who has taking courses in agriculture and is trying to get into farming. Jill is in the process of succession where she will buy out her other siblings that have chosen not to take over the farm and support her decision too. Jill has a second career as a mediator for small claims court and for farming families dealing with succession. In dealing with the latter Jill has seen issues around succession lead to several young farmers being unable to continue to farm in BC. Jill is involved with the BCYF and the BC Agro Tourism Board and she makes the effort to participate in events around farming within her community, such as the Pacific Agriculture Show. Currently the main stressors faced by Jill surrounding her farm is the inability to obtain quota (she has been wait listed for two years) and that her land has many rolling hills, which makes it difficult for raising chickens. She is attracted to the lifestyle and community aspects of farming and the ability to pass what she has learned and taken from living on a farm to her future children. Jill has witnessed young farmers who rely on large acreage move to
places in Northern BC, such as Sorrento and Salmon Arm due to the cost of land, she herself has expressed no interest in farming outside of the family farm.

Amanda Vanderlinde: Amanda is the one interviewee who is currently unable to farm and currently works as an agricultural lender at Farm Credit Canada (FCC). Both her and her husband grew up on dairy farms in the Fraser Valley (hers in Aggasiz and his in Abbotsford). They both have full time jobs, but continue to do relief milking and feeding on a nearby dairy farm. Not only has Amanda and her husband had their own difficulties in trying to go through the process of succession or start their own dairy farm, but as a lender she has had to countless times deny several loans to young farmers and has a unique and integral perspective to the inaccessibility of farming in the FVRD and BC for most young adults. As she stated in her things have changed for the newest generation of farmers and the current issue is cost:

“My dad immigrated in the 70’s, coming to Canada with no money to his name, and in time managed to purchase a farm, through working hard. Those days are over. Our dream is to own our own dairy farm, but the reality of saving up ~$2,000,000 from our day jobs is unrealistic. I work as an agricultural lender, we get calls all the time from young people wanting to get into farming – however the #1 deterrent is the down payment! Particularly for land in BC at $50,000/ac. Unfortunately without a significant down payment, it is a decline. For a dairy farm, you need at least 80 acres not to mention the quota at $41,500/kg for 80kgs of quota – that’s $4,000,000 for land and $3,320,000 for quota. Unfortunately 80 kgs of quota can only debt service roughly $2,000,000 - 3,000,000. Down payment required: $4,320,000 minimum.”

I also interviewed generational farmers and industry representatives within the two empirical sites. Generational farmers are those whose farms were passed down to them by their family and plan to pass it on to other family members. These interviews were done to provide insight on the trends and changes happening within a longer time span in farming in BC. Lastly I interviewed government officials, both elected and hired, planners, and other relevant stakeholders. The relevance of these individuals was based on information of their impact on agriculture and young farmers in BC from either the interviews with farmers or from archival research. The focus of these interviews is to understand how these stakeholders envision the landscape in BC to either include or exclude agricultural production as well as what economic, social and cultural value they
attach to it. For key stakeholders involved in agriculture (e.g., retired ministers and agricultural reps) in BC the interviews will include questions that will ask for insight on what issues overtime have been prevalent in farming in BC and their views on why the number of young farmers is decreasing. This will provide a wider and perhaps different perspective on the issue.

In total there were seventeen formal interviews conducted and included in this thesis. As well there were ten informal interviews that were conducted early on in the research process that were used in the data building stages of this thesis, but will not be used as information and data in the following Chapter as the formal interviews. This is because the concepts were covered in more detail and by the formal interviewees and more rigour was used in obtaining that data.

**Survey**

After some initial interviews were conducted and a portion of the archival research was completed a survey was created and sent out to approximately twenty-eight members of the BCYF and Delta Farmers Institute (DFI) (Appendix 1). Out of the 28 there were 20 respondents. The purpose of this survey was twofold. The first purpose for the survey was to get a wider perspective of policies, issues and benefits that occur at present within farming in BC for young farmers as well as some background on the farmers and why they have chosen to farm in their region. The second reason was to get initial information and contact with young farmers within the Fraser Valley or Delta to prepare a semi-structured interview based off of the information previously collected in these surveys. The survey consisted of twenty-five questions and was sent out through e-mail on a word document so that the farmers could answer either briefly or at length. The information was then analyzed and compared to look for consistencies and anomalies. Questions 1-6 were asked to gain initial background information. Questions 7-14 were asked to gather information on how young farmers feel that agriculture is supported and valued by the general public and government. Questions 2,15-25 and focused on acquiring information around what the stressors and benefits (push and pull factors) of farming in BC are for the young farmers themselves and other young adults they know who have been unable or no longer want to farm in BC. Results from
questions 1-6 can be viewed below (Table 2) while the results from questions 7-25 will be discussed in Chapter 4 with other data.

**Archival Research**

Archival research was conducted to see if the primary data collected from the interviews and the survey is consistent or inconsistent with representations in government policy documents, planning documents, media, journals and academic sources. It was also conducted to look at the history of agriculture to see what types of stressors and policies have occurred previously that have developed the current landscape and to see what issues are specific to our current young farmers.

Government and planning documents were analyzed to see how policy makers and planners envision agriculture within the landscape. These documents provided some insight as to where conflicts are occurring in land-use. What was purposely avoided in the archival research analysis is looking at how agriculture is viewed specific to food policy and the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands because it may take a positive point of view and display a one sided view on how agriculture is being supported in BC. The Ministry of Agriculture and Land will still be observed to look at any changes in its structure, intentions or governance that may affect young farmers. Land-use maps and documents from the Agricultural Land Commission since its inception will be analyzed to provide how it unfolded, intentions, and how it upholds its mandate, which will provide insight to the changes to the physical landscape.

Media sources, such as GlobalBC News, The Delta Optimist and Vancouver Sun, provided representations of BC consumer’s viewpoints on local food, agriculture and policy initiatives in BC. In comparing these sources to information given by farmers I was able to see the connections and disconnections between consumers and producers as well as spaces of consumption and spaces of production. Different articles from media were also compared with one another to see the complexity of consumer/community member’s opinions within the province. Lastly, I spent time at the British Columbia Museum of Farm Machinery and Agriculture to look through its archives. I focused on the journal Country Life in BC because it contains articles reflecting the opinions of academics (mainly from UBC), the BC Federation of
Agriculture, farmers and policy makers within agriculture in BC as far back as 1905. The information from this archival research will allow in depth analysis of the contested visions of landscape within BC, with a focus on the two empirical sites.

**Contacting Participants**

Originally I used publicly available contact information to request interviews from potential interview candidates, however given the inconvenient (May-September) time of year it led to few responses. After meetings with BCYF and DFI it became clear that to send a survey through there organizations would be the best way to get responses from farmers. It also became clear that more farmers would be able to respond in November through February given hectic schedules. After certain young farmers answered the survey they also passed it along to members in their farming community to fill out. On these surveys the first question asked was if the participant was willing to be contacted for a follow up interview. If participants stated yes they were contacted. Once again some were available for interviews and others politely declined.

**Primary Data Retrieval, Analysis and Organization**

Central to this research is the information given by both young farmers and participants trying to farm. In order to provide reliability within these interviews I analyzed their test-retest consistency and the intra-observer consistency as defined by Knapp (2011) as to whether the data given by interviewees and my perceptions of it as a researcher remains consistent over time. This was done by taking the information given in the survey to create follow up questions for the interviews with each participant where I observed consistency of their answers through transcribed notes, as well as consistency of my interpretation. In interviews where consent to be recorded was given the data was transcribed and in cases where consent was not given I took meticulous notes throughout the interview and was given to the interviewee to check over at the end of the interview for any misprints. Within a few hours after each interview I took my own notes within a research journal of my observations. Interviews with other stakeholders, such as policy makers, planners and NGOs were conducted only once and therefore reliability can only be displayed through methodological triangulation.
where the information is compared with information from archival research to see if there is consistency within previous statements and actions by these individuals.

Table 1: Background Information on Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school Diploma/Certificate</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1) Age They Became Interested in Farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth-12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and Older</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2) Region Where they Farm</td>
<td>Fraser Valley Delta Lower Mainland Outside Lower Mainland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3) How they Acquired Skills</td>
<td>Education Family Farmhands/Social Network Self Taught/Motivation Apprenticeship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4) Participated in 4H</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5) Have Another Job</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6) Access to Land</td>
<td>Own-Purchased from Family Member Own with Family Member Own-Purchased from Market or Not Specified In Process of Succession Rent Rent and Own Not Specified/Currently Don't Own or Rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results and Discussion

In order to analyze how understandings and transformations of the landscape affect current and potential young farmers in the FVRD and Delta it was necessary to understand what attracted young farmers to those regions in the first place and what stressors are faced by farmers that have made it inaccessible or unattractive to young adults. The main themes that arose in the survey and interviews with current and potential young farmers were that the stressors of farming in BC were associated with economic factors, inability to access desirable land, and work factors (e.g. finding reliable workers and working long hours). The attractions to farming in BC were associated with the family farm, community, lifestyle, ability to produce and the physical environment.

In this Chapter the stressors and attractors will unfold through four sections that begin to explain how despite local food initiatives the number of young farmers in BC is continuously decreasing. The first outlines the complex economic factors that explain why farming has become inaccessible or difficult to continue for young farmers in BC. In the second section the social and cultural factors along with the physical environment that have attracted young farmers to certain regions of BC are observed. The third section outlines the disconnections between spaces of consumption and production that lead to the behaviour and valuation of agriculture by stakeholders. Taking the factors in the former sections in account, the forth outlines how land-use conflicts exacerbate the economic and work stressors faced by young farmers, while at the same time they display how the cultural and scientific values of land-uses are implemented through the planning of the physical landscape. These sections are all interconnected because each has impact and is impacted by the others. Therefore the underlying finding in this thesis is that if we want to plan for successful and accessible places for agricultural production we need to go beyond planning around scientific and economic knowledge. We need to
incorporate human behaviour and the social and cultural factors that help to explain why agriculture becomes successful in certain times and places and not in others.

Livelihoods and Lifestyles: Economic Instabilities for Young Farmers

“Everything costs more in BC yet people want their food even cheaper” Survey Respondent.

“It’s a cliché but it’s a lifestyle.” HS

“Just talking to the farmers that I know out in Delta the kids just don’t want to do it anymore.” Ron LePage

The main stressors connected to farming in BC that were given by respondents of the survey and expanded on in the interviews were: the high cost of land and inputs, low wages, lack of infrastructure, fragmentation, family dynamics and work. In the survey (refer to Appendix) question(Q) 20 and Q21 asked if the young farmers knew of any young adults that chose not to farm or left BC to farm elsewhere and the reasons for that choice. All but one respondent answered yes to knowing someone who was interested in farming, but chose to not continue or start based on high costs, low wages, family dynamics and the difficulty of the work. All respondents, but two knew of young farmers who chose to farm elsewhere. The regions where the young farmers were moving to were mainly Alberta and Saskatchewan. To a lesser extent they were moving to the US and east coast of Canada. The reasons for these moves were the cost and availability of the land, cost of inputs, supportive government policy and grants, and the fact there was no carbon tax in these regions. When discussing whether or not they have considered farming elsewhere all but two, answered yes stating they have considered the prairies and east coast of Canada, US, New Zealand and France for the same reasons as were given as to why others left. All of the stressors that have led to a decrease in farmers were directly or indirectly related to economic factors. In the interviews economic pressures also became relevant as the main stressor for young farmers. What became clearer through these interviews is that economic factors become problematic in different ways for young adults based on whether or not they have the ability to succeed their parents. In this section the different ways in which getting access to the means of production will be assessed, however first the issues themselves will be addressed with specific relation to BC, focusing mainly, but not specifically on the FVRD and Delta.
One of the challenges for agriculture is to create solutions for how we can take a career that is a lifestyle and allow it to be a source of a livelihood that is sustainable for farmers to pursue. A consistent theme in the surveys and interviews with young farmers and other stakeholders is that it is difficult for farmers in BC to compete in local and global markets against farmers from other regions who benefit from: lower costs for land, labour, feed, taxes, quota and other input, different policies pertaining to quality that cut costs, and subsidies. The current young farmers in the surveys and interviews discussed how they put long hours of work and capital into commodities where they don’t make fair profits. For these farmers it is likely more viable to put in these long hours in regions where there inputs are lower or where they have comparative advantage so that they can afford to continue.

An example is that for farmers who are tied to wanting to farm a certain commodity, which is tied to owning land and quota (e.g. dairy), they have had to move out of BC to stay viable in markets. Syd a retired agrologist (P. Ag.) describes the transitions in the below quote:

“Sons of dairymen, some of them have moved to the Okanagan, but unfortunately a lot of them have moved out of Province altogether to Alberta and Saskatchewan because of land prices and a growing population. Both of those provinces are doing well economically...That’s a trend we are seeing that is going to change the landscape of the Lower Mainland in whose doing the farming. The average age is up there now and it’s not going to get a heck of a lot better unless they find some niche markets.” Syd Pickeral, retriwed Ag rep

These young farmers are leaving BC and taking there skills, and farms elsewhere. This means that most of the remaining farmers are at ages where they are near retirement and may not continue farming the land or be able/want to pass it on to the next generation. For some young adults the lack of returns for there inputs have made them choose other careers. This was shown in the previous displayed answers to Q20 where young adults were choosing not to farm because it was not a viable livelihood. In BC the demand for high skilled trade workers in other industries, which are supported by the government as mentioned previously (p.g. 18), acts as a push factor for both farmers and farm workers away from agriculture with the promise of higher wages. The economic pressures that push out young farmers makes agriculture in BC
susceptible to other land-uses, particularly urban and industrial sprawl. Other stakeholders are able to argue that the land isn’t being farmed so it should have a land-use change, when in fact there are several young farmers who are interested in farming that land.

Poultry farming faces the same issues in being viable in BC with high land prices. The below quote displays how the high cost of land is related to feed costs, which are lower in the prairies due to climate and availability of land:

“Land prices here [are] incredibly high. In the prairies it is a small percentage of what we pay here... As far as layers and other poultry products it’s just cheaper to grow there. You’re closer to the feed. Your feed costs are lower.” Dale

The high prices of land within the ALR are currently due to speculation around land exemptions for development and competition from rural estates. If the government chooses to rezone an area as non-ALR this allows for developers or other buyers to develop the land for other uses. Landowners who see their neighbours remove land from the ALR and receive large sums of money often choose not to sell or give long-term leases to farmers because of the potential profit. This creates a vicious circle as high land prices makes the ALR inaccessible in the FVRD an Delta, which then leads to the land being classified as ‘unused’ and susceptible to be exempted for other land-uses. Currently the land being exempted in these regions are being shifted up North (Table 3) in BC where young farmers aren’t going, as shown in the quote below:

“I don’t see too many [farmers from the] Lower Mainland moving up to the Peace River Region. It’s a completely different region. They usually move from here to the Okanagan and then beyond.” Syd Pickerall, retired Ag rep

Land is a focus in this research because all farmers across commodities need a certain amount of land to be viable. However, each commodity also has other input costs. For dairy, broilers, eggs and turkeys one factor that is important is access to quota. Quota is the amount of a commodity a producer can sell (e.g. amount of broilers). These commodities are supply managed. Supply management is a process where provincial marketing boards for these specific commodities (which are delegated power by the Provincial and Federal Governments) create a system where quota supply will attempt to meet demand so that prices don’t decline. Farmers buy a certain amount of quota and are insured that they will receive a fair price based on averages of their input
costs. It is beneficial as well to farmers because imports of theses commodities into Canada are limited and given high tariffs. Farmers cannot produce past their allotted quota and as shown below this is problematic as quota is not only limited but is expensive in British Columbia:

“It’s not just land price, but for dairy it’s the quota price.” Heidi

“I think that BC probably has the biggest issue.” Heidi

“One of the biggest. In the eastern provinces it’s pretty tough too with the availability [of quota]. Prairie provinces you would have a better chance of buying quota. There’s a greater availability of quota in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.” Mark

The lack of returns makes it hard not only for farmers to afford quota and machinery, but it increasingly affects their ability to hire reliable farm workers as the farmers can’t afford to compete with other wages. It isn’t until other industries fluctuate that farmers are able to compete for workers.

“Dairy can afford to pay reasonably well for wage, but there was a lot of young guys that left. For example, they left dairy and went to work construction…The construction guys said, “Well we can give you $25 an hour for a eight hour day.” They (workers) were like, “Well that’s great money and I don’t have to work as hard as I did on the dairy farm for money.” Now that things have slowed down and those guys got laid off you can kinda see the trickle down effect, right?” Mark.

This makes farming difficult because in the case of many commodities, such as dairy, it does take specialized skills and time to get the right employees that end up helping, not hurting your bottom line:

“With livestock you kinda have it or you don’t. With animals it’s a little tougher you know.” Heidi

“It’s [livestock] not a machine.” Mark

“We’ve grown up with animals so we can look at a cow and go “uh she doesn’t look quite right”. You know lets check on her. With somebody who hasn’t, how do you teach them that? You can’t. We kinda struggle with that…To try and find people who have farm experience that’s a little bit more difficult and going forward it’ll get harder cause there’s less people exposed to it.” Heidi

As people become disconnected to farms they also distance themselves from understanding the processes and types of work that are difficult within farming. There may be assumptions that the work is entry level or easy when in fact it takes skills. The
constant retraining of workers makes things difficult because you are paying for wages at the same time that work is not being done or the work being done damages the farm. For Amanda she gave an example of a new worker who came to her father’s farm and when told to move the cattle threw up her arms and yelled “here cattle” startling them so that they ruined a fence. Another anonymous young farmer who was interviewed mentioned that when trying to find skilled labour he’d receive resumes that included “I have my own vegetable garden.” The misconceptions around work and farming, as well as competition around salaries from other jobs, has made finding good workers difficult and costly. In the surveys 9 respondents stated that finding reliable workers was a stressor. Although finding workers is likely difficult for many farmers in other regions as well, the fact that in BC there are often many other job opportunities and the fact that the government is focused on the service sector makes it more problematic.

For the young farmers growing berries and vegetables the main concerns were also the cost of land, inputs (e.g. infrastructure & fertilizers), cost and hiring of employees along with the carbon tax. Greenhouses were recently exempted from the carbon tax for a period, but other farmers still lose out on comparative advantages as farmers from other regions don’t have those costs.

Another important factor to note for berry and vegetable farms is that they aren’t supply managed with exception of a few crops. In the surveys Q9 asked: Do you sell through supply management? If yes, how has this effected your farm (positively or negatively) If no, why? In answering this question all young farmers that answered yes stated that supply management was positive reflecting on how it allows them stability in income. The four farmers who were not supply managed either mentioned it was not an option for their crop or that they were not confident in their volume. One berry and vegetable farmer stated that “it would be more beneficial for me if there was supply management.” This displayed how instrumental supply management, which is consistently being threatened in the political atmosphere, is to young farmers in BC with allowing them to continue to farm.

Berries and vegetables are also more sensitive to environmental factors and when farmers are forced to compete on the global markets it can be hazardous. Jillian’s family’s situation is a good example of the instability of this commodity. They used to farm
raspberries and after the market demand declined as well as environmental factors they were forced to change to a chicken and turkey farm in order to remain farmers:

“It’s (chicken and turkey farming) a lot more stable then berries were. If what you mean is marketwise. We do them outside so we loose a lot, but we can’t control that really. I don’t think it’s as risky and as flight as raspberries.” Jill

In the end if farmers consistently have to pay higher inputs while they are getting low returns they can’t continue to farm. Farmers in several regions globally suffer from many of these financial constraints as displayed in the literature review in Chapter 2, however given the economic, political, social and environmental that are specific to BC these issues are magnified as farming becomes non-accessible. It is also important to note that having policy and systems (e.g. Supply Management) in place are important in stabilizing wages. Still the difficulty of finding reliable work and being able to access the means of production in BC as oppose to the prairies starts to unveil the importance of discourse in decision-making arenas. Although more research should be done to see why government support is seen as stronger mainly in the prairies, the extension the Provincial Government of BC provides to the energy sector and transportation to support trade with Pacific Asia (p. 19 and explored later in this Chapter) gives cause for concern about how they create and expand discourse on the relevance of agriculture in BC. This reflects back on the need provided by Foucault’s theory to not looking at language as innocent or objective, but as a powerful tool that can be used by institutions to transform our ideology and with respect to this research transform the landscape. It also to an extent supports the Neo-Marxist framework in that there are key actors, institutions and resources where power is exerted. Changes to the landscape to remove land out of the ALR and remove extension for agriculture is not objective and should be challenged.

**Lack of Access for New and Existing Young Farmers**

“We (members of the BCYF) are all from farm families” Heidi

“If we wanted to start on our own without the family farm there’s no way that we could do it down here.” Heidi

“Ya you couldn’t afford to do it down in the Fraser Valley.” Mark

In the surveys only one farmer had not grown up on a farm. Succession is the main correlation factor in young adults having access to land, quota and machinery.
In my interview with Mark Robbins (Regional Agrologist for the Ministry of Agriculture (Langley and Abbotsford) and Farmer) and my interview with a planner it was expressed that they are expecting new farmers to come outside of farm families from the urban farm movement. Although the interest of these urban farmers seems promising, the barriers for them to get access to the means of production was expressed as limited by the young farmers interviewed.

One barrier is access to quota in the supply-managed commodities. As mentioned previously all the young farmers expressed that supply management was integral to their farm: “Yes, Supply management helps the producer receive a fair return based on a cost of production model. Many farms would not exist in Canada without it” (Survey Respondent). Supply management is currently one of few ways to obtain a stable farm (whether small or medium in scale) and for new farmers accessing quota is near impossible:

“The problem is nobody can buy quota right now. Like we can’t expand our farm. They’re putting major caps on it, just because of this looming thing (getting rid of supply management)… My fear would be the US taking over.” Jill

It becomes difficult for both established young farmers and those new to farming to obtain quota in BC as displayed below because there is a limited amount in BC and because of regulations around distribution of quota:

“Its tough (getting quota). There’s programs available to help them get in. All the marketing boards have new entrance programs. It is like a lottery. So there’s a certain number of people in each industry that are started every year to make sure that there is new people in the industry and that it’s growing”(mainly dairy, broilers, eggs).” Dale

“Well you’d have to find somebody willing to sell it (quota) first of all. Right now there’s not a lot of people selling and the price is very high. It’s restrictive. Like I said Saskatchewan cheaper.” Dale

What this displays is that the commodities that allow farmers to make a livelihood are the hardest to access. There are also limitations of not having supply management for fruits and vegetables as a barrier for farmers who want a fair price for their produce. In this case CSA programs may be beneficial, but the farmers in this study didn’t use that option or they didn’t feel they had the volume for it. These new farmers have to rely on their ability to market and sell their products, which are subject to many
environmental, market and political factors. This is if these new farmers can access the land to produce on. In the end the most affordable land is in the prairies, which decreases food production in BC as well new farmers may not want to leave BC for social and cultural reasons, as will be discussed later.

The price of land is what many young farmers stated as a factor of why new young farmers may have difficulty getting into farming. This leads to the only feasible option being leasing land. The young farmer in the survey who was not from a family farm was also the only one to state that they rented and did not own any land. As president of the BCYF Dale expressed the difficulty for new farmers to get started, but also expressed how programs are starting for poultry farmers:

“Cost of land is prohibitive too. But things are changing as well. Some of the industries have the ability to lease land. Lease a barn so you can get start programs (programs where farmers can access the means of production and get started in farming). I’m just talking on the poultry side. I can’t speak to berries. Berries, the cost of land is high. If you’re just starting out I can’t imagine buying it off hand. You’d have to rent it first. And leasing costs are reasonable.” Dale

Renting can prove difficult not due to cost but because landowners are fickle and may choose to give short leases as especially if they are on the verge of selling off there land. The farmers in these cases find it difficult to maintain a sustainable farming enterprise. As expressed by Dale many commodities need long-term rentals because they need time to grow:

“For blueberries I don’t think anybody would want to lease anything under ten years. It takes three years before you get your first berries and then you’d want to make some money off of it. You don’t want to just give your land over and the berries to the guy who has the land. When we make raspberry leases it’s from 7 to 12 years” Dale

“Well the risk of just renting land is that tomorrow it might not be there. Right, they could sell it tomorrow. And then what? We need feed and we need somewhere to go with the manure. In our case we are pretty lucky because we have a big land base for the animals we have. We have a good amount of feed. We have a lot of space to put manure so we’re not over shooting on the manure.” Heidi

It isn’t just the inaccessibility to long-term land acquisition and quota, but also other machinery and infrastructure that is capital intensive. For young adults this means
rather then putting time in at a job where you can make money you are continuously putting in capital and getting low returns.

“They have no way of getting in [without succession] because farming is very capital intensive. I mean people talk about the land, but it’s more then that because then you have to put in some infrastructure, drainage, you know laser levelling. You’ve got to manage the land, put up the buildings the equipment. There is all that that goes with it so it’s too expensive for most people especially new farmers to get into farming.” Planner

Mark Robbins insisted that the issue with the lack of young farmers goes beyond money as he states “where there is a will there is a way” in terms of accessing land. He argues that farming has always been capital intensive and that for new farmers it is the confidence that can only be gained by apprenticeship and experience that will give them incentive to put in the capital to the operation. On his farm he currently has given a plot to a new farmer:

“I have a friend who did the UBC sustainability program and we just gave her some of our land to do some veggies on. And I mean she does look a little bit lost out there, but at the same time she’s gung ho. She’s doing her thing. I think you can learn to do anything. Sure maybe me being raised in it I have a certain amount of knowledge where if things go wrong I’m better at trouble shooting. But you’ll learn that quick when you’re in it.” Jill

The issue here is that land is still necessary for access to these new young farmers, and landowners and other farmers may not be willing to pass it along. The idea that if there is a will there is a way does not seem to be applicable to the young farmers in BC who have been declined by lenders (discussed p.g. 69) and do not have access to capital. However if there is a will in the community especially with landowners to having agriculture supported then there is likely a way to access it. In the above quotes it is seen how farmers lease land to other farmers. Still as shown in the below quote even some farmers have difficulty passing on land to farmers they don’t know and who aren’t in there family:

“Some people they don’t want to pass it on to some stranger and some people do. That’s kinda on an individual basis.” Mark

It isn’t just the concept of a stranger that makes this type of apprenticeship unavailable, but simply the lack of time as farmers are incredibly busy with there own
farms, other jobs and may opt for having workers as oppose to simply have new farmers take over a part of their land base:

“They said, well ya we’d be happy, but you know we’d like them to come to our farm, not us come to their farm. So they recognize the value of connecting and helping, but they are busy business people. So somebody needs to facilitate that and that becomes difficult and time consuming. So unless there’s some market intervention by government or non-profit organizations you know these things aren’t going to happen. Land is not going to become available in the ALR all of a sudden. What we’ve concluded from our survey is that if we don’t do anything that it’s going to be business as usual and nothing is going to change. We need some intervention, maybe not us, but somebody. We need to change because it is just going to keep happening and land is going to be more unavailable to the farming community. New farmers or existing farmers.” Planner

As displayed in the above quote in terms of the ALR the powerful stakeholders are the landowners and at present there is not enough incentive for them to lease or sell their land for farmers. If opponents against the ALR, such as Katz (2009) see the removal of the ALR as more important then changing it so it promotes production, speculation would likely rise and landowners may choose not to rent their land in order to sell it for other developments.

It is important to note that ‘farm status’ does not currently necessitate production of food in the ALR, but can include rearing horses and turf farming, which some argue are part of the agricultural cycle, but can also be detrimental when they take over large spaces of prime agriculture land that is needed for growing food. Also landowners may be able to claim farm status while only having a small amount of land in production because they need to make an income between 2,500 and 10,000 to claim that status. Lastly retired farmers and/or their spouses can presently collect farm status without producing so long as they previously produced for 20 years (BC Assessment, 2013, What’s new in farming assessment), which can prevent them from leasing their land to new farmers. These issues were presented by a planner in the following quote:

“Access to land is one of the biggest challenges. There’s not enough incentive for the farm class status….For landowners in the ALR there’s more that don’t farm then do, which is scary enough as it is that there’s more people that aren’t farming then farming in the ALR. But there’s no incentive for them to farm. There’s a tax incentive for Farm class status, but it’s not very much so people don’t bother with it.”
Another thing that gets in the way of access to new young farmers is the disconnection that can occur between ‘urban’ farming and for lack of a better term ‘rural’ farming. As mentioned previously the BCYF has promoted community and seen some positive connections between young farmers across commodities and production methods, but there are still physical and cultural barriers as well as time restraints. Internships are one way to get new farmers started in a comfortable atmosphere, but farmers don’t have the time to head to different farms. As well new farmers may not want to work as a farmhand. So as expressed by one planner the ideas are there, but things aren’t mobilizing:

“I think there’s an acknowledgment that that’s insuring that new farmers have access to land, but there’s not a lot happening. There’s a lot of discussion at this point. [laughs] But I don’t see a lot happening at this point. A [current] study... [results confirmed that there are many] landowners [in the ALR] that are not farming in particular. And a lot of them are never going to farm, they don’t want to farm, they like their property the way it is. But there’s no real need to lease or farm the land that’s in the ALR and there’s not a lot of awareness of land leasing either. It happens with the established farmers because they know each other and they will swap with each other, but for new people coming on it’s pretty daunting. Farmfolk Cityfolk is working on community farms, Heather Prichard is doing work there. It’s believed to be a good way of getting more farmers on, but the concern is the housing issue for those types of arrangement, if cooperative arrangements don’t work then there’s no opportunity for housing” Planner

The issue becomes that the ALR does not ensure that land will be used for farming and that for small urban farmers, who may benefit from communal farming, the ALR does not allow for the number of necessary homesteads. In the end what is needed is government extension to promote these projects, but budgets for the Ministry of Agriculture and ALC are minimal. In 2012 for instance their total expenditure was 597,000 while the Ministry of Transportation was 1,257,592, 000 (Province of British Columbia, 2013, Budget 2012). This amount of capital leads to projects, surveys and employees who are all able to expand discourse around the relevance of their land-use and development. All of the young farmers that I interviewed stated they had had limited time with government officials and when they did show up on farms it was for regulations enforcement. These agriculture reps are often overloaded with work and spend little time at each farm because they have too much work. For dairy Heidi and Mark stated that there is ‘one guy’ and farmers usually never see him unless it’s an emergency or there is a problem. The lack of extension and funding for agriculture was expressed by a
government employee as a growing issue because it makes agriculture susceptible to global markets:

“There’s absolutely not enough extension for agriculture. I mean that got killed along time ago. Removed from budgets along time ago and they left it up to the suppliers, industry, you know people selling fertilizer to do the extension. We so desperately need extension back into agriculture especially when climate change is coming down and we need to adaptation. So that means different varieties, different conditions. You know helping them understand how to get into the markets, there’s the growing and then there’s the business element and that support isn’t out there. The farm families have that cause they have the historic knowledge, but new farmers there isn’t much out there other then institutions like Kwantlen and UBC farm, but it’s small scale...We’ve left it to the market, were not interfering with the market, but the price will bare. If you can’t afford it then you can’t farm, but what we are seeing is now urban agriculture is evolving because people do want to farm and they’re going to do it in backyards and other ways.” Planner

In BC water and electricity amongst other necessities are carefully planned for, but in terms of food production that is a necessary for life, there is limited planning and funds. This leaves farmers dependent on the unstable global market. Although urban farming is on the increase, the ability for these farmers who produce for sale and other farmers in BC to farm is stunted because of global competition. This is not necessarily due to having climate factors that lend to comparative advantage, but political factors as policy distorts supply chains. In the surveys several young farmers stated that they knew others who left or have considered leaving for the Prairies and East Coast based on grants and policy that support their industry. If BC does not give extension for agriculture the reliance of the market as trade broadens with Europe and other countries could lead to a continued decrease in the already few numbers of farmers.

To conclude, the appearance of the lack of extension for agriculture is shown in the below picture (Figure 4) taken for this research of Ministry Reports from the BC Farm Museum from the early 1900s to present give a visual to the time and importance put into agriculture. Although the reasons for why farming has decreased as a vocation are many the connection between extension and support is relevant to the decline through generations. In my interview with Syd he discussed how the Ministry of Agriculture use to go to farms with information and pass it on to farmers, which was important to obtaining knowledge and relationships, and how today the connections between government and farmers is decreasing and rarely in person.
Family Dynamics and Succession

Currently nine out of ten farms are family farms (Province of British Columbia, 2013) and as mentioned for most young farmers it is the ability to succeed that allows them to access and afford the means of production. This is why family dynamics and succession play a large role in keeping young farmers in BC. In the surveys the role of succession and family dynamics only came up once as a stressor. However, while conducting interviews it became apparent that when there are problems with succession that it makes farming non-accessible. All of the farmers in the interviews brought up their issues and/or other young farmers’ issues. Specifically, based on their careers both Jill and Amanda had an extensive amount of knowledge and examples of how it has gone wrong specific to the FVRD.

For Jill her experience with succession has been a positive one based primarily on the fact that everyone in her family has a secondary source of income; specifically her parents. She explains that one of the reasons why other young adults are unable to take over the family farm is that their parents still rely on it as both a source of income and pension.

“It takes a little bit of the pressure off in a sense. Where my dad can say “take the farm in two years time. I only want to take 10% out of it the rest you split between your siblings. You take the biggest share cause you’re working it. I got my pension”... So he's got this security. Whereas other farmers, what are they going to do. You farmed your whole life. Now these kids want you to retire and them start working it, but you still need money right. And then it directly effects there money how the kids are managing it.” Jill
For these farmers passing on the farm directly affects their living standards and therefore they don't want to risk losing money or having family arguments. This potentially leads to young adults getting frustrated and leaving the farm for other careers where they have more control and a better income:

“Yes huge problems with gaining ownership. Like a little bit, even a tiny amount, even five percent share to sort of make the young people want to be there everyday and to work in it cause they can see some actual money coming in asides from just the wages they get paid by there parents. And a lot of guys aren't willing to do that. That’s all I have to say about that [laughs].” Jill

She also explained that in some cases it is a lack of planning for succession and unforeseen tragedy that has left families scrambling over how assets will be split. In this quote the conflicts between letting go of control in order to plan for a farm’s future also become relevant:

“There’s a lot of situations. Some really really sad ones. [With] most of them Dad has always run the show and the boys or the girls work under Dad and then Dad dies. And Dad hasn’t put anything into place. Then nobody knows what’s going on and everybody is uncertain, fearful and assuming things. So when a parent passes away and hasn’t set things up it’s devastating. Sometimes parents are trying to set it up, but, I call it tight fisted control. Like they just can’t let go. Or they’ve always bought green tractors and then their son wants to buy a red one and then its just there’s no way.” Jill

Another way in which parents impact whether or not their children choose to take on farming is through how they present it. How a family passes along experiences around agriculture can either lead to their children wanting to farm or it can lead to them seeing it as a stressful career choice that leads to financial problems. Therefore even if parents are willing to, or wish to pass on the farm their children may choose not to as Jill’s examples below display:

“Cause as we get raised, farming is not very glamorous per se. You talk to a lot of young farmers and they’ll say they’ve always had a huge list of chores while their friends have gone off to the mall. Our whole lives we’ve been told that farming’s tough. It’s not a great life, you can’t leave when you want you have all this stuff and we see our parents working like dogs. So then all of the sudden it comes the time when conversations come up because Dad’s aging or Mom’s aging and you’re thinking well shit my whole life I saw. Maybe not, there’s good things too, But it’s a tough life. You have to sacrifice certain things. So some kids are like well I don’t really want to do this. Some do, but it really depends on how the parents have set them up since birth. How do you interact with your kids? Do
you say one day this will all be yours or is it with hard work and I don’t know, we could work this out so that you do have a part of this. Or you have nothing to do to this. We are selling it or something. So really it’s your expectations which have been shaped since you were a child.” Jill

In discussing issues of succession and family dynamics with Amanda she ties how well succession directly to the relationships and openness in families:

“My dad was involved in dairy farmers of Canada and was a representative so he always taught us about what was going on in the industry, talked to us about it. While my husband’s family. He grew up on a dairy farm too and he’s third generation, I’m second generation. A little bit different. His parents were more reserved. They didn’t talk about the farm business whereas my dad was more open about it. My dad went through a divorce, which made the financial situation. We knew what was going on. So it changed things as well. It was also the people who were involved. My dad’s always been very open about talking about the farm and management. Whereas my husbands there were certain things where even now I’m like how did you not know that you grew up on a dairy farm too. It was more they didn’t talk about the financial numbers. So I even notice within my customers who are for example dairy farmers. The younger ones, some of their parents did have them sitting at the table looking at financials. Had them entrenched in that, even at that younger age in their teens. While other families were a little more guarded. Didn’t show that information to their kids, but just were the management day to day operations.”

“keep it separate. Farm and family.” Researcher

“Exactly.” Amanda

Still even in the case of her and her husband taking over her father’s dairy farm it seems unlikely due to the fact that it would involve them having to live on a trailer on the farm and working for their family, which they were unwilling to do. In the end if they want to start their own farm they’d have to obtain a lot of capital alike new farmers. Dairy production is inaccessible based on cost alone as Amanda breaks down as a lender goes over financials in agriculture constantly when trying to support other young farmers through the FCC loan programs:

“I work as an agricultural lender, we get calls all the time from young people wanting to get into farming – however the #1 deterrent is the downpayment! Particularly for land in BC at $50,000/ac. Unfortunately without a significant downpayment, it is a decline. For a dairy farm, you need at least 80acres not to mention the quota at $41,500/kg for 80kgs of quota – that’s $4,000,000 for land and $3,320,000 for quota. Unfortunately 80 kgs of quota can only debt service roughly $2,000,000 - 3,000,000. Downpayment required: $4,320,000 minimum.”

Amanda
Dale and his brother have made succession plans with his father and uncle, which he describes as a costly. For other young farmers he knows the process has been much more difficult:

“The issue is getting Dad or Mom to actually sit down and talk about it. Getting them to commit to make it a plan, or even consider the next step. A lot of people don’t like to look at death or in fact that it happens, right. Or the cost of it [succession plan] is prohibitive sometimes. It’s not cheap to set up a succession plan. You gotta take work and time off. You gotta pay the lawyers and tax guys. Depending on the bigger the company, the more expensive it gets. And then of course there’s family dynamics. Brothers and sisters squabbling over who gets what. Especially when ones involved and the rest aren’t or something like that. I’ve seen and heard different situations. Some go so bad that they have to sell the farm and divi up the assets, which is really to bad...It’s a costly process, its time consuming and its emotional...Family dynamics are everywhere, some people are involved some aren’t, but everybody needs to be treated fairly. You know, you gotta put a price tag now on every bodies experiences and try not to hurt their feelings. It can be tough” Dale

The actual process of succession is a factor in young farmers not being able to farm. This is shown when Dale mentions the cost in not only money, but also the emotional toll it places and time it takes for parents to create a succession plan. In order to create a legal succession plan there needs to be lawyers, which are expensive. On top of this the largest issue seems to be that it is an emotional process that forces the parents to have to face there own mortality and figure out ways of being fair to their children who all have different attachments to the farm and value it in different ways. For some they value the farming experience and others may see it as a source of financial inheritance. In the end this discourages these farmers to take the time and go through this process as they likely want to put it off for other things in there busy schedule.

Still Dale’s experience is that the older generation of farmers he knows in the FVRD are wanting to see their children take over the family farm. This was not expressed by several stakeholder interviews in Delta, which may be a key difference. Farmers their, as a government worker points out “stand to gain a lot” from selling.

“No I don’t see that (on older generation trying to push children away from farming). For the most part when I talk to my dad and his friends or other older people that have owned farms. I know Dick Klien Yaletake is a dairy farmer and he’s ecstatic that some of his sons are involved. My dad he’s expressed his pleasure to have us [around] and that we are interested in it and I think he’s expressed that to his friends and his friends have got similar situations. I know
one of his friends, he doesn’t have anyone who is interested in the farm so ya
know he’s debating do I expand, do I sell. He’s debating what to do, or does he
just farm it until he can’t any longer and consider selling that. It’s a lifestyle choice
now as he gets older. I don’t see anybody not wanting to pass it down. What I
see is them wanting to pass, but not always can they... I don’t see a lot of people
saying no I’ll just sell it off its my nest egg. Although if I do see that I wouldn’t be
surprised ya know . I’ve never taken the stance that kids should really expect
anything anyway. If they get it then they should count themselves lucky” Dale

The other issue in terms of the farm is family dynamics within the business. For
all the young farmers their parents were still in control through the succession process
and hold a lot of influence as to whether their children can move forward in the industry.
For Dale this wasn’t expressed as a problem because he has great respect for his father
and what he built. For other farmers, however this type of dynamic may not work where
on family member makes the majority of the decisions:

“Because I’m not officially an owner or wasn’t an owner it would have been
tough. All I had to do was get dad to assign me a share. A revocable share. Like
it’s already pre-signed. Then he can take it back at any given time...That gives
me the ability to get onto the board and have voting rights. He assigns those
voting rights to me”. Dale

In this case Dale only has voting rights so long as his father doesn’t revoke his
share. Although this works for their family as there is mutual respect in other cases this
may not work. The older generation of farmers therefore retain decision-making power
and young farmers have less of a voting right in these powerful institutions. Given the
changes in farming and different issues facing young farmers who are just starting this
may be detrimental for their future and present success. There may also be issues with
the fact that many young farmers spend more time on the farm and may have valuable
insights that would benefit the farm.

“Well my dad’s not very present on the farm. He makes financial decisions and
some major decisions because he’s got the experience... but he’s given us a lot
of the reigns... Us coming to them (dad and uncle) for advice continually really
makes them feel comfortable with our decisions.” Dale

The relationships between the generations were further illustrated by Mark while
he discussed the marketing boards in dairy. What is displayed is that the older
generation farmers are making decisions while younger farmers work on the farm. It is
likely due to older farmers being experienced, but once again displays how young farmers may not be represented well in these key decision making spaces;

“There’s definitely a lot of grey hair around those board meetings for sure.” MS
“But mind you somebody has to be at home minding the work when they’re off on their meeting to Ottawa for days and days [laughs]. You know somebody has to be at home running things and that’s kinda where.” Heidi
“The younger generation falls.” Mark

For both Mark and Heidi they express the need to have their own farm. This is difficult given that Mark has a brother who may also want to stay on the farm. This makes a costly and stressful, more complicated:

“Its stressful.” Heidi
“It’s challenging yes.” Mark

“you know I guess it depends on the family too. But for us, I mean it hasn’t been that easy. But I mean right farming on your own isn’t easy either…. What we have discussed is either splitting the farm here somehow or buying another place somewhere else. Those are all kinda options, but that’s something that ideally. I guess from a benefits standpoint. If we were or if Mark’s brother were to say I want to stay her and farm and we said well we kinda want to have our own farm. We would probably look out of Province because. Well first of all to with the way dairy quota works right now. Even to buy a going concern you’d have to loose half the quota cause of the way the milk board has it structure. So if you buy a sixty cow dairy you only get 30 cows worth of quota. And then to try and buy additional quota is very difficult. So we would either have to take some from the main farm and transfer it or I mean if we go out of Province we can get more quota for the same price and we can buy a 60 cow dairy and get the 60 cows.” Heidi

“And there is more limitations in BC.” Mark
“I guess they’ve had issues with people not following the system.” Heidi
“So punish everybody.” Researcher
“Pretty much.” Mark

This case displays how succession goes beyond passing down land, but includes access to capital-intensive machinery and quota. Given the high costs brought up by Amanda (p.34) display the need for farmers to leave BC when succession does not work. Therefore in conclusion although being a part of a farm family is a correlation to being able to farm in BC access to the means of production is difficult for all young adults as they depend on the previous generation of farmers, agricultural institutions (e.g. marketing boards) and landowners. These stressors expressed by the young
farmers confirm and expand on Fraser et al.'s (2005) conclusions that family dynamics on the farm can be stressful. Although this research did not confirm any links to depression, as it was not the focus, the inability to separate work from family and the difficulties this puts on succession are prohibitive to being able to pass down land to the next generation of farmers. To extend on Fraser et al., the relationships as discussed by Jill on how farmers express their feelings, worries and joys around farming also have a place in associating it with stress.

It is important to note that despite the economic hardships that are arguably worse in BC these young farmers and others have still chosen to stay in the FVRD and Delta. In the next section the attractions to BC are discussed to see what factors have been and are important to young farmers so that they can be taken into account when trying to plan for agriculture in the landscape.

**Attraction to Place: The Role of Culture, Family, Community and Infrastructure in Creating Hubs of Agriculture**

In order to understand how transformations in the landscape have affected young farmers in BC it is important to understand what it is about BC that has attracted the young farmers that still choose to live and work there. This information is also beneficial to research on agriculture and food studies as there is a gap in academic literature and reports as to what attracts people to farming and more specifically, farming within certain regions. The focus in academia and by government officials has previously been on studying and understanding the stressors and negative aspects to solve these issues. Through assessing answers from the survey and interviews provided by young farmers the themes around attraction to farming in the Lower Mainland of BC were: family farm, community, lifestyle, work and the ability to produce food and the physical environment. Part of this attraction is place based for example soil, climate, community and others aren’t such as the farming lifestyle and ability to produce food. It should be noted that attraction entails both the reasoning for choosing B.C. by the young farmers and what aspects of farming in B.C. that they find attractive; which although these are similar concepts they are different. The role of access to the means of production through the family farm, community and the physical environment beyond soils and climate (which still remain as factors) display that the current system of validating where the ALR and
other spaces of agriculture should be included and excluded primarily through the soil class system is not viable in terms of promoting and planning for future agricultural production.

**The Family Farm:**
**The role of History, Family Relationships and Access to Land**

In British Columbia approximately “nine out of ten farms are family owned and operated” (Province of British Columbia, 2013), which underlies why many young farmers reflected on ‘the family farm’ when answering Q2 in the survey: What region(s) do you farm within? And why have you chosen to farm there? 13 answers primarily involved the family farm, 1 involved it being the region nearby where they grew up and the other 5 did not mention why they chose that region or currently are not primary growers. When assessing the role of the family farm, the attractive aspects are connected to historic sentiment to place, family relationships and access to land and means of production (the latter having been previously discussed).

The allegiance to the family farm and how it plays into history and access to land for young farmers as oppose to allegiance to a commodity is displayed in the below quote by a survey respondent:

“We farm in Richmond BC. We have been farming in Richmond since 1909. We have farmed many different crops from potatoes, strawberries, cattle, dairy and cranberries. Right now our family primarily farms cranberries and dairy. We didn’t really have a choice as to where we wanted to farm because it’s been in the family for so long. The reason why our ancestors chose Richmond to farm was the land and the type of soil that was needed to farm. Our ancestors originated from England.”

Later on in this survey the respondent states both land in and out of the ALR in BC as very unaffordable, which explains partially how they ‘had no choice’ when choosing where to farm as other land is unaffordable making it non-accessible. At the same time this farmer was the only one to answer that they have considered moving elsewhere in BC (specifically, the Fraser Valley and Vancouver Island) unlike the other respondents who had contemplated moving; all of which answered they would move out of province. This farmer states that they along with other BC farmers “take pride in their career and are proud to be BC Farmers," which suggests a historic connection to place.
For other farmers that stated the family farm as a reason for placement the role of family is more apparent. One respondent answered Q2 by stating “Lower Mainland Abbotsford, I was born and raised here” and later when answering what makes farming attractive part of their answer was “the fact I can work along side my dad and boys at the same time.” The connection to place here is not as much tied to being a BC farmer as it is connected to the family relationships that are tied historically and at this point in time rooted in Abbotsford.

In an interview with Mark and Heidi Schurmann the ability to take over the family farm in the Fraser Valley has kept them in BC. Heidi explained:

“ I think the big one (attractive aspect) is that it’s the family farm…What we have discussed is either splitting the farm here (between siblings) somehow or buying another place somewhere else. Those are all kinda options, but that’s something that’s ideal. I guess from a benefits standpoint. If we were, or if Marks brother were to say “I want to stay here and farm” and we said “well we kinda want to have our own farm,” we would probably look out of Province because. Well first of all to with the way dairy quota works right now.”

Again this displays the role of succeeding in family farms as being the most viable options for young farmers to access not only land, but also the means of production such as quota. Without the family farm in the FVRD Heidi and Mark no longer have access based on both the cost of land and production and the availability of quota and would gravitate out of Province.

From observing the data in this study it can be determined that the attraction works in two separate ways. The first role the family farm plays in placement is that it makes farming accessible because it provides young farmers with land, infrastructure, in some cases quota and because they grew up on the farm it also gave them access to knowledge and skill development. Secondly there seems to be to a smaller extent a tie to a sense of place identity and family historically, which makes young farmers drawn to staying in the region as oppose to selling and leaving.

The connection to the family farm through sentimental ties can be seen as both valuable as in the cases above, but can also make for poor business decisions. In an informal interview an interviewee expressed that he had seen some other young farmers run their farm into the ground trying to keep hold of the family farm. As previously
discussed, attraction to the idea of the family farm is something important to the older generation as well. In this case these farmers who own the land are the ones that want their children to take over the farm, which their children may choose not to do. If the farmer is tied to that vision rather than simply wanting the land to be farmed then they have the power to sell it to buyers who will choose to use the land for other uses when and if their family declines to farm it. This double edge sword was expressed by a planner in Delta and further assessed later in this Chapter:

“In Delta I think there’s quite a few, some younger farm families that are taking over the farm and so it is a really positive wonderful story to see that happen. It's been happening in multiple operations as well. While not all farm operations the children want to.” Planner

Community

On the role of BCYF: “Our mandate is to continually have farming active, to have it grow. We want networking as a primary tool at our functions to get farmers involved with each other. Not just always in the same industry, but across industries. Chickens with dairy, dairy with horticulture. Get everybody on the same page. BCAC also does a great job of that.” Dale

The role of community was expressed to be an attractor of farming in the Lower Mainland. Community came up during interviews in two ways. The first was the benefits of having a strong farming community, which was supported to an extent in the surveys as all the young farmers expressed that they had or were gaining positive relationships with other farmers. The second way community came up was through religion, which tied into both placement in terms of Dutch Dairy Farmers and access when it came to East Indian Farmers. For the Dutch Dairy Farmers placement close to a Dutch Reform Church was important. For East Indian farmers, culture and the value of land and family played a role in passing along the farm to the sons of the family. Both types of community display that having strong plentiful relationships, which are not always available in more rural regions of BC, are beneficial emotionally, as a way of assessing and taking on challenges to agriculture, and in terms of knowledge sharing.

“At one of the Canadian Young Farmers forums. This one person was saying you know its all farming. We should be sticking together... What we should be working on is making sure we all have viable farms.” Heidi
As displayed in the quote above one positive aspect of the community with the BCYF and other associations is that farmers from different backgrounds, different farm sizes and commodities have to come together because they realize a common value in what they all do. This ability to understand allows farmers to get past biases and stereotypes so that they can benefit from one another through knowledge sharing as shown in the below quote:

“...Its actually something new that I've seen. We've got more organic people. We had vegans at our last meeting (BCYF), which I never expected to see and I thought maybe we'd get some flack or controversy between the two. ‘Cause their vegans and I'm a broiler farmer. No hard feelings, nothing like that. Never got a bad vibe. This is good. We've got people who are growing vegetables and they come to our thing for information. To talk and find land and they are not upset at us for doing business the way we do it. They’re getting involved and this means we (the BCYF) do have something to offer.” Dale

This type of community also allows for potential access for new farmers. Established farmers can mentor them. Although as seen in the quote below the lack of time and resources of most farmers makes this difficult as well the apprenticeship may not occur in a fashion that allows a new farmer to farm and grow on their own farm as oppose to an existing one.

“They said, well ya we’d be happy (to mentor new farmers), but you know we’d like them to come to our farm, not us come to their farm. So they recognize the value of connecting and helping, but they are busy business people. So somebody needs to facilitate that and that becomes difficult time consuming. So unless there’s some market intervention by government or non-profit organizations you know these things aren't going to happen.” Planner

The above quote displays a positive trend that is happening in BC with the newest generation of farmers, which is that there is an attempt by many to create relationships across commodities, types of farming and different cultures to ensure that BC’s agricultural production is viable into the future. It is important to note that not all farmers are part of this trend or active in it as Heidi stated as a member of the board of the BCYF that they “have a big mailing list. But that's where it ends” and that the list contains mostly farmers in the FVRD.

Despite Delta being a smaller community and having less young farmers participating in the BCYF at this time the role of community and its importance in
keeping that community was expressed by a planner as a key component to agriculture continuing in the region:

“They have a very strong and progressive agricultural community, multigenerational farms, lots of experience. They have a very active Delta Farmers Institute. So they are very progressive that way, very entrepreneurial and engaged and um they build relationships, good strong relationships with the municipality and the senior governments. So they’re very progressive in that way.” Planner

It was through the DFI and these relationships that farmers were able to create compromises between other stakeholders that promote other land-uses in order to keep farming viable at this time in Delta, which will be discussed later.

One important factor of community for this generation, which is downplayed when making exemptions and inclusions into the ALR from the FVRD and Delta to rural regions up north is that this generation of farmers arguably value community and socializing outside of the farm. Through the changes in what farming has become and changes in society this new generation’s lifestyles are not going to reflect the past generations way of farming where your time focused solely on the farm as reflected in this quote by Jill:

“A lot of the farmers that we talk to back east or up north have a real sense of isolation and a real sense of non-community in the sort of farming area. And I find that here, especially in the lower mainland that there is an abundance of community. There’s a ton of associations. There’s a lot of events for farmers. You can meet up with ten other farmers at a Tim Horton’s on a regular basis…I think if I were somewhere more remote I don't think that farming would be as exciting for me. I do like the social aspect of farming. So I’m not solely driven by producing my own food or producing for the community. And because I was raised that way that’s what I want to provide for my children. So ya I don’t think I’d look at other areas at all” Jill

“I met some guys who come down from way up North. They just have nobody up there. So they are always on the farm. So there's no social, you don’t go out to a movie. While the farmers out here, there building a Silvercity at Mount Lehman. We’ve got all the modern day luxuries…Especially for the younger people coming up into it. There has to be something else. Our parents were very into sacrifice. The Dutch farmers that came over with 20 dollars in their pockets and made the amazing million dollars farms we have to day. We aren’t driven that same way….I find the young farmers now we want more from life then just the farming…Everybody I know in the lower mainland that’s a farmer here has a hobby. Everybody that I know from remote areas no. There’s no time and no access. ” Jill
The expectation that farming can and therefore will occur anywhere where there is soils and decent infrastructure is a reflection of the continual discourse around farming and agriculture that has kept it not only the idea of what farming is in the past, but farmers as well. The ability for powerful stakeholders to use these discourses around agriculture to their advantage when arguing for exemptions has taken away land in hubs of agriculture, which will be seen in the latter section. What the above statement displays is that young farmers are no different than other young adults and need a sense of community, hobbies and a life outside of farming, which means they can’t or rather won’t move to regions based on where the government places ALR.

Religious communities have also influenced the placement of young farmers. “Owning land” was expressed by both Mr. and Mrs. Mann of Mann (Mann Farms Abbotsford) as important to their culture. It was also important for them to make sure their son had land as well. Mr. Mann (who is also and engineer) took great pride in talking about his son being an innovative farmer. Unlike in cases farming parents see the land as a retirement fund or don’t want there children to take over the farm, which was discussed previously, the children of East Indian families and communities have access to land and are therefore able to continue to farm in BC. This was expressed as well by Jill in the statement below who is familiar with these farm families:

“That is true. You would never see an East Indian develop their farmland for a subdivision.” Jill

In this case attraction to BC for the farmers is only tied to place if the family farm is located there previously as well as the importance of being close temples was expressed by some young farmers. In the case of Dutch Dairy Farms the location is strategic to Dutch Reform Churches. For Amanda her husband’s family were insistent on them remaining not only close to the family but close to the church. Jill, Heidi and Mark all agreed that although they themselves are not part of the Dutch reform dairy group that they know several young farmers who will stay in the Fraser Valley based on the community:

“Yep, Community is huge because farming can be quite an isolation thing. So if you work all week on your farm cause it’s the busy season or something. You want that one day, at least one day where you can reconnect with your people. Whether that’s through church or whatever other function that is.” Jill
“We’re not in the Dutch dairy farmer category, but I know some of them. They have their Dutch Reform or Christian Reform Church… And if they are relocating or something they do look for a church.” Heidi

This displays once again that taking land out from a certain region and placing it in another will not necessitate that the farmers will move there. It goes beyond the physical environment to social and cultural needs and wants of both young farmers and their social groups. In these regions farmers have not just created hubs around agriculture, but spaces for community.

Physical Environment

“Part of it is it's home, and we've got the mountains, but we also have an awesome valley with incredibly fertile land some of the best land in all of BC if not Western Canada. I mean that’s part of it. We do have everything we need its not like the prairies where you have to go for miles and miles before you get to the corner store. We've got everything in a hub here. Business is really attractive here cause it just grows. You’ve got your distribution, you've got your agriculture, your ports, your ports to the states and also your sea ports and there is just so many business opportunities. Rail comes right through here. There’s just so many things right in this hub. And Abbotsford is very big actually land mass wise so its a lot of flat land that can be used.” Dale

The above quote from Dale displays the two aspects of the physical environment that currently keeps the FVRD attractive for farming. The first is what farming is normally associated with, which is rich soils and a mild climate. The second is the infrastructure that creates hubs of agricultural production, which is connected to the previously discussed agricultural community. Below in Table 2 it is displayed how the agricultural associations are largely rooted in the FVRD, which displays how integral the FVRD is to BC. This is related to Marshall's (1890) concepts of the importance of shared knowledge to hubs of activity. Having these councils in the Fraser Valley are a result of past actions in creating a community of agriculture where shared knowledge benefits farmers and farms. Notably in Delta there are few associations and this likely ties to the continuous decline of agriculture in the region for other economic activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Agricultural Associations in BC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC Agriculture Council (BCAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Blue berry Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Broiler Hatching Egg Producers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Chicken Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Egg Producers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Pork Producers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Poultry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Cole Crop Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Peas, Bush Beans and Corn Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Strawberry Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raspberry Industry Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Cattlemen’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Fruit Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Grain Producers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Grapegrowers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Greenhouse Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Landscape &amp; Nursery Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Potato &amp; Vegetable Growers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Turkey Grower’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Wine Grape Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Organic Associations of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Young Farmers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Young Farmers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley Organic Producers Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The role of accessibility is one factor that may make the FVRD more attractive than the prairies, which was listed by many farmers as the place to go to based in costs as seen in the quote below:

“One thing that’s nice down here is that, well anything we need we can get. And quite quickly. Where as my sister, they have a ranch in Southern Saskatchewan. So they are quite remote. If they want to go to a bigger centre it’s a good two hours. Where as for us. I mean especially being in Abbotsford, between Abbotsford and Chilliwack we have everything we need... And not just for that (personal consumption), but for the business. Everything really is here and if it’s not we’re so close to the states that we can get stuff across the two if need be. Like right some of your hoof trimming supplies comes from the states and order to get something shipped and pick it up in a day or two is no big deal.” Heidi

Delta is relatively close to the FVRD and benefits from some of the above aspects, but as the amount of farmers and production has decreased due to competing land-uses the secondary businesses such as processing plants have closed down. As explained by a GVRD planner the role of the physical infrastructure in the FVRD has created a hub making it more attractive then Delta:

“The hub is really important and the support industries and unfortunately as we loose more and more land we loose the support industries. A lot of them [in the GVRD] have been pushed over to Abbotsford because they have a good volume of activity, but were loosing it from the Western side. Farmers now have to go to Abbotsford to buy certain things. Support industries are now moving out and that’s really scary. You need a certain volume of activity to maintain those.” Planner

This can explain the transition from farmers in the survey who currently farm in Delta and the GVRD and are attracted to the FVRD. In the survey one respondent from Delta who currently farms in Delta on a family farm recently bought land in the Sumas area of the FVRD and two more were considering moving there. Still it should be noted that these moves were also tied to land costs and a tight farming community that were seen as appealing.

Tied to the physical landscape is the parcel size and structure itself as being attractive for farmers. In order to be efficient and reduce land-use conflicts. Farmers benefit greatly from having access to large parcels of land, which are more attractive then fragmented parcels as stated below:
“Delta is one of the municipalities that has maintained large parcels of agricultural land, compared to some of the other ones like Langley and Maple Ridge where there’s a lot of small parcels. So you’ve got these big continuous parcel of land, which is really valuable for economic efficiencies.” Planner

In terms of the role of soil and climate the 7 young farmer respondents stated it was an overall important factor for continuing local agriculture in BC as oppose to why they actually chose the location for where they currently farm as shown in the below quote:

“We have an amazing climate and soil structure to support an incredible array of products. Our production can be much higher than in other provinces. We have a comparative advantage in many goods and many competitive advantages.”

Two of the survey respondents explained that soil and climate were the main part of the reasoning for the original location of the family farm by their parents and grandparents. In this way it ties to Marshall’s (1890) theory that when an industry chooses a locality based on comparative advantage that it continues to benefit from the benefits of a hub of knowledge sharing and shared resources. In both the FVRD and Delta it is clear that they benefit from a relatively mild climate and rich soils, but through a history of farming, building infrastructure and the creation of subsidiary industries and associations a hub has been created that can’t be recreated in other regions of BC. We see that many of the young farmers state that they gained knowledge and in many cases machinery, quota and land from their families and past farmers. They have also chosen, mainly the FVRD in BC, based on proximity to goods and community. This doesn’t discard the importance of soils and climate to farming, but the importance of infrastructure, transport infrastructure, community and access to goods and services.

Limitations of Place: Lifestyle, Work and the Ability to Produce and Feed People as Attractors to Farming

Although young farmers mentioned several place based attractors there was another overarching theme that they have chosen to farm because they enjoy the lifestyle and work and feel pride producing food, which isn’t place based and one reason why if the stressors continue they may choose to leave BC. Question 24 of the survey asked the respondents what they found most attractive about farming and all of the
answers revolved around the lifestyle, type of work and ability to feed people and produce locally.

“Satisfaction of knowing that I am helping to feed so many people.”

“I love animals, I love the lifestyle and I don’t mind working all hours of the day if need be. It’s not just a job, it’s a lifestyle.”

“Every day and season is different and brings new challenges to be taken on. It is the satisfaction of feeling that you are doing something useful and you can see the fruits of your labour.”

“I have satisfaction in producing high quality food – much higher than in other countries. The ability to live on larger acreage and put it to use.”

“Lifestyle, working outside, my own boss, seeing the fruits of my labour, each day is different.”

“Being outside, witnessing the interactions of the various participants in the garden ecosystem and beyond.”

“The fact I can work along side my dad and boys at the same time, it’s an empowering sense of pride that farmers feed the world.”

This section is an integral part of this study as it displays that farming, as work, is still attractive as a career when it is accessible. It is important to also note that none of the farmers found it attractive as a good source of income, which ties into the main stressors. This is the root of a large issue with agriculture in BC. When talking with not only farmers, but stakeholders such as the DFI, the importance of stating that farming is a business and not charity was integral to it’s sustainability. Yet for many of them the drive to remain a viable business is based purely on the lifestyle and ability to provide quality food products for consumers, which is not directly related to their current region of farming. If farming continues to be unaffordable then the trend of these farmers leaving the Province to farm elsewhere will likely increase.

In my interview with Amanda she stated that FCC’s young farmer loan was inquired about on a weekly to bi-weekly basis, but unfortunately her drawers are full of declines based on financials. Once again it is financial issues and costs that have been described as the main push factors for potential and current young farmers that enjoy the work, lifestyle and fruits of their labour.
The Value of Agriculture in BC: Disconnections and Discourses

It is important to understand how agriculture is valued and understood amongst stakeholders in determining how transformations are occurring in the landscape to arguably push out more so than pull in agricultural production and with it young farmers. The focus in this section was to see how young farmers perceive agriculture is valued and connect it to archival and media sources that describe how it is valued by other farmers, the general public and policy makers. The amount of disconnections that were brought up by farmers and other interviewees between them and the general public led to four sub themes that will be discussed later in this section. It was beyond the scope of this project to see how consumers and policy makers value agriculture as opposed to food, however further research should be done to see if the disconnections the farmers describe are inherent in their perspectives. In the following sub-section the inconsistency amongst farmers to support and value agriculture in BC will be discussed.

Farmers

The young farmers who replied to the survey for this project and provided interviews were all unanimous in thinking that the ALR and agricultural production were important for their region as reflected by Heidi and Mark:

“Well otherwise I mean without [it] its just going to be acreages, commercial and everything down here. If we didn’t have the ALR it would be gone.” Heidi

“And another problem is that BC has such a small [percentage] of our land [that] is actually arable agricultural land…if you compare that to Alberta or any other province we’ve got the lowest amount of actual farmable land. We need to protect that to some degree.” Mark

However, when first assessing Delta for this project it was clear that not all farmers were interested in protecting or keeping the ALR, nor to a certain extent agricultural production in their region. In a letter to the Delta Optimist Trevor Harris a fifth generation farmer stated:

“I’m so tired of listening to the B.S. about saving the farmland here in Delta. I’m a fifth generation grower and I grow over 500 acres of potatoes, peas and beans in Delta. I chose this line of work because I was born into it and didn’t know any better.” (para. 1)
Trevor’s frustrations were primarily with the ALR legislation and how it promotes other uses at the expense of landowners and farmers that can’t sell or subdivide (para 4). What is important to note here is that farmers themselves have a wide variety of perspectives on the value of agricultural production and land. It does not seem that in the cases of Delta and likely in the Fraser Valley that it has unanimous appeal. Heidi described farmers as a ‘double edged sword’ in our discussion stating that:

“The ones [farmers] that want to stay here they don’t want land to be pulled out of the ALR, but you know there are farmers that want to cash in and go somewhere else. They want to get the most for their land. So since there moving they don’t really care. They just want the most they can so they can buy whatever they want somewhere else”

If farmers are tied to the work and lifestyle and not place it is not surprising that they would want to sell their land for profit and move elsewhere, where farming is less expensive. Despite some arguments that farmers who are ready to retire want to sell the farm at the highest bid as a retirement fund Heidi argues that it is in fact the new generation of farmers as oppose to the older ones that are looking to ‘cash in’:

“The young people who are already farming here they see the opportunities elsewhere. And they want to get the most for their land here so they can go somewhere else. While a lot of the people who have farmed a long time here. They would actually like to see somebody take the farm over, and stay on the farm and keep it on the farm. There’s almost more of a sentimental attachment.” Heidi

However it also became clear that how the past generation viewed the value of having their farmland remain in production was dependant on a family member taking it over as described by Mark:

“It depends on where your perspective is. If you have no one taking over your farm you probably don’t have the same desire for the ALC at that point right. You know what I mean. If you’re 55 or 60 and you want to retire and you have nobody else who wants to take over the farm. You are just looking at getting out of it what you can.” Mark

The value in this case is connected to the family farm as oppose to an actual value of keeping the land in production. What is also important and seemingly tied to the value of agricultural production and land in BC is how the farmer views the climate’s suitability. The benefits of growing in the Lower Mainland because of the climate and soil were stated by each of the farmers in interviews and at times in the survey. It should
also be noted that in discussing with past P. Ag.s and farmers that the need for a type of soil or climate is dependant on the commodity and farmers could technically farm anywhere where there is land. An example statement by a survey respondent in support of protection of the ALR was that “BC has a rich land base, we have perfect growing soil and weather is supportive of many farming practices.” It was noted in this research through reading over arguments for selling farmland (discussed in detail next section) and in Trevor’s case that the arguments around the soil being described as poor saturated clay based soils is often used. This reverts to the concept by Peet and Watts (2004) and Walker and Fortmann (2003) that the science gets embedded in power, and often is used to describe best practices when dealing interacting with the physical environment. The person who gets to be a part of the discourse in spaces of decision-making (e.g. city hall) around best practice or land-use has the ability to create and distribute transformative ideas on the landscape.

The differences in valuing the land as a source of capital versus a source for agricultural production was displayed in the conversations and demands by certain farmers during a consultation prior to the South Fraser Perimeter Road expansion that removed land from farmers in the ALR in Delta (discussed in detail next Chapter):

“The farmers fully support obviously the enhancements that were doing. The biggest area where we had some friction [from farmers] and it wasn’t necessarily with the institute. It was when we were acquiring farmland um you know there were some. There was not all, but quite a few farmers that didn’t feel they were getting the value that they thought they should be getting.” Ron LePage

“So was it not being compensated or was it the idea that taking land out of the ALR that they didn’t like.” Researcher

“No No. It was more compensation. We actually had several farmers support the project because they could see the benefits. They just thought they should be getting more [money] for the land.” Ron LePage

These findings display how the way farmers’ value agriculture in their region is diversified. Some believe its integral to have local food and agricultural production, while others see more value in getting monetary compensation for their land and farming (or working another career) elsewhere.
**Government**

To assess how the young farmers felt supported and valued by the government in the survey Q 13 asked: Do you think that agriculture is supported and valued by the government in comparison to other land-uses (e.g. residential)? The young farmers were given the options to choose: well supported, some support, no support, unsure, and well valued some value, not valued, and unsure. In terms of support 1 answered well supported, 15 answered some support, 3 answered no support and 1 had NA. In terms of value 1 answered well supported, 9 answered some value and 8 answered not valued and 1 had NA. In general this displays that the majority of farmers feel they have some support from the government, however the respondents are split between thinking that agriculture is somewhat valued and not valued by the government.

Some young farmers gave additional comments that further explained their answers. One whom stated some support and some value added: “There are some government programs that are meant to help farmers such as AgriStability, BCAITC.” Another who stated no support and no value added:

“Just recently they took a huge amount of acreage out of the Brander area ALR lands. Their reason was that the land had never been farmed and it was very good for farming anyway. Bullshit! Why is that a reason to bulldoze everything and build industrial parks? It seems to me what when big money and big developers want something out of the ALR they get it!”

Lastly a farmer who answered some support and well valued stated: “more money directed to farmers and agriculture through grants or the like is always nice but even without these I do feel that our government supports our farmers.” What these comments display is that there is support in terms of government programs and associations, but the land-use supported by the government displays no support or value by the overall Provincial Government.

The lack of value associated with agriculture by the different levels of government is exemplified by the fact that they continuously take out land of the ALR for other uses in the FVRD and GVRD. As shown below it is the government rather than private property owners that have taken land out of the ALR in these regions and placed them in colder climates up North as stated by Stobbes et al. (2011).
## Table 3: ALR Exemptions from 1974-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional District</th>
<th>Area at Designation</th>
<th>Inclusions</th>
<th>Exclusion Government</th>
<th>Exclusion Landowner</th>
<th>Area as of 1Jan2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Waddington</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>6,275</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>4045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni Clayoquot</td>
<td>7,935</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River</td>
<td>14,130</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>9546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>19,595</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>17060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley</td>
<td>21,984</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3628</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>17713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>21,053</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>18477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>20,478</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>18826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox Valley</td>
<td>24,249</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>4716</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>23054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish Lilooet</td>
<td>27,126</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>25141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Okanagan</td>
<td>33,077</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4513</td>
<td>2698</td>
<td>26076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena-Queen Charlotte</td>
<td>43,887</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>43780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rockies</td>
<td>45,554</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>45045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Shuswap</td>
<td>67,409</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>15448</td>
<td>2513</td>
<td>50860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary</td>
<td>55,061</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>53423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Vancouver</td>
<td>66,839</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3743</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>60508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay</td>
<td>71,539</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>7315</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>63575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Okanagan</td>
<td>70,283</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>4683</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>65211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitimat Stikine</td>
<td>64,170</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>66478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Valley</td>
<td>76,803</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>3837</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>71809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan Similkameen</td>
<td>86,478</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>2989</td>
<td>83757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay</td>
<td>272,510</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>6891</td>
<td>265162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley Nechako</td>
<td>297,611</td>
<td>70,873</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>366,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Fort George</td>
<td>349,636</td>
<td>43,533</td>
<td>9981</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>380836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Nicola</td>
<td>568,705</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>566538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cariboo</td>
<td>925,506</td>
<td>18,729</td>
<td>14326</td>
<td>4150</td>
<td>925760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River</td>
<td>1,453,434</td>
<td>26,673</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>2717</td>
<td>1477120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,717,519</td>
<td>183639</td>
<td>96639</td>
<td>44689</td>
<td>4759829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Former Agriculture representative Syd, who overall stated his support for the ALR, discusses the problem with the ALR that some of the young farmers were frustrated with:

“The down side (of the ALR) is it gets picked away at by government, all levels of government. They are always putting pressure on the land reserve and they’ll say “oh will trade and we will give you something else”... Most times that land isn’t suitable for farming... Exclusions need to be a rare event. Once they (developers) get the idea “well that’s the ALR there’s no use in putting in an application we will just get rejected.” But every time they (government) allow some land to be used they give the developers more hope.” Syd

Given the previous conclusions about what attracts young farmers the fact that land is being shifted away from regions that provide these attractors is detrimental to
overall food sovereignty in BC. Still in the interviews some young farmers responded
to government officials from the Ministry and Agriculture often stating that these
officials our overworked and under staffed, but in terms of the overall government felt
little if any support as shown in the below statements:

“It (agriculture) takes a back seat... It’s not that big of a player in the economy. It
is, but it isn’t.” MS “Well people don’t see it as a big player even though it is. I
think it’s because here we’ve never had an issue with food. We can go to the
grocery store and get whatever we want when we want it, how we want it. You
know it’s never been an issue so people don’t think about it. In places where it’s
been an issue their agriculture probably would take a bigger stance, but here
people just take it for granted.” Heidi

“They (the ALC) are doing a great job within their guidelines and within their
reach. I don’t think that. I mean I don’t know enough about their regulations and
how long their arms are. Can they tell the city bylaw people ‘sorry your going to
have to live with berry cannons and the smell. This is part of agriculture and
we’re in agriculture country’. If they can then I guess I would love to see more
from them. But. And more from general government. But I don’t know if they
actually have the legislation to do that.” Dale

In the former quote when Mark states “it is and it isn’t,” this displays how
agriculture does consistently provide billions in GDP annually, however that it isn’t
necessarily a growth industry like energy or other industries that are favoured by the
government for land-uses (which arguably in the case of non-renewable energy is a
short term economic player). Since in BC there have been no recent food shortages
unlike in other regions the focus get placed on short-term economic goals rather then
incorporating basic needs and economic goals into the landscape.

The latter quote displays the issue that agriculture in the Provincial Government
is consistently under funded leading to an over worked and understaffed ALC that do not
have the time or resources to meet the second part of there mandate, which is to
promote farming as a land-use in the ALR. Without having the ALC and other
government officials working towards this aspect farmers are left to fight their own
battles with the general public trying to continue farming. In the case of berry farmers
this means being allowed to have berry cannons to stop birds and other pests from
eating all their crops and for other commodities having manure that smells be used. It
should also be noted that as one young farmer mentioned that the Ministry of Agriculture
representatives don’t just deal with farmers concerns, but residents concerns about “their gardens.”

It isn’t just a matter of government not properly funding the ALC nor exemptions that have display a lack of support for agricultural production, but rather the continuous land-use changes, which are prevalent mainly in Delta and other area of the GVRD:

“The exclusions are limited. It’s called change of use. That’s where it’s happening because there are uses that are allowable within the ALR, such as transportation corridors, parks things like that. So it’s still in the ALR that hasn’t changed, but the use has changed…. It’s not the total number it’s what’s happening on the land that’s changing.” Planner

The ability for the government to change a land-use to a green space, which they argue is suitable to the ALR and not to individual landowners that same ability is at the root of farmers, such as Trevor becoming disenchanted with the concept of the ALR.

In the recent election the lack of attention to agriculture in comparison to energy and other resource extractions was apparent in the formal debate. The two contenders, who were the Liberals represented by Christie Clarke and the NDP Adrian Dix, built their platforms around skills training and energy; neither of which would benefit agriculture. As the government reflects the concerns of the province to an extent this displays how agriculture takes a back seat to other economic projects despite its continuous benefits to the economy. Still when discussing with Ron Lepage on the compromises between the Ministry of Agriculture, SFPR and the Ministry of Land and Transportation he stated that the Ministry representatives along with the DFI were “very interested in protecting agriculture in Delta and all over. I mean that’s their mandate. I mean Delta the city itself they value agriculture. They value their small town feel.” Still without the funds and time to actual support agriculture by all levels of government as oppose to just set regulations farmers are left as Dale explains feeling somewhat heard, and not often supported:

“I do feel that they are giving us a fair, a fair amount of time to speak. They are listening to us. Not always do they act the way we wish and maybe on the face it maybe looks like they aren’t listening to us.” Dale

The government has a large role in land-use planning and this is where currently the young farmers are expressing that they receive little support. This concept will be expressed in detail when looking at contested visions in the next section. Still it will be
argued that power doesn’t simply circulate between certain stakeholders as is argued in the neo-marxist perspective, but is rooted in discourses from a Foucauldian perspective. In this case these discourses are not just prevalent in government, but are rooted in social norms and then are worked through institutions. These norms will be assessed next when the general public value and support for agriculture and farmers are assessed.

It is important to note that in Europe and other regions farmers often benefit from agriculture extension. In these countries where closed borders and famines are occurrences in recent history the value of agriculture is more prevalent:

“In Europe, we have a lot of friends that farm in Europe and half of my family lives down there. They are supported by government cause government subsidizes them there…In Europe the way I was explained it is that because they have lived through shut down borders and famines and they understand that you’ve got to support what you have in your country so we can feed you when we need to.” Jill

It isn’t just lack of extension, but policies in BC that effect agriculture negatively. One recent policy was the carbon tax, which was instated as funds for the environmental Farm Plan became scarce. The Environmental Farm Plan gave funding to farmers who were implementing infrastructure or initiatives that would remove pollutants and lessen impact, unlike the carbon tax, which only penalized farmers. The carbon tax increased costs mainly for Greenhouse Growers, who managed to get the tax removed for a small period at present. Other farmers still have to pay into the tax and lose out on competitive advantage. These policies that are implemented without initial input from farmers take large time away from the farm for farmers and these policies and are always looming as displayed below:

“No. Farmers had to fight for it (support) and Greenhouses fought hard. I guess they actually fought harder then the rest of us and so they got listened to first. The rest of us are still fighting, but I think their a bit disheartened. The government changes. Ok new faces. Kinda starting the war over again, well starting the conversation over cause its new people in office. I mean Don McRea (former Minister of Agriculture) just got dropped so there’s really no one to talk to. So Ya things are on hold for the next couple of months till we figure out who’s in charge again. The ministries are all a bit different. The Ministry of Ag I think they’re pretty good.” Dale
The Carbon Tax is being implemented for positive reasons. Climate change will affect farmers as much as other stakeholders. The issue is that it was initiated as with many policies without any extension or support for farmers to transition. This lack of extension for agriculture, which makes it susceptible to global flows and local impeding land-uses will be expanded on later in the results.

**General Public: Small Scale Disconnections**

To assess how the young farmers felt supported and valued by the government in the survey Q 14 asked: Do you think that agriculture is supported and valued by the general public in comparison to other land-uses (e.g. residential)? The young farmers were given the options to choose: well supported, some support, no support, unsure, and well valued some value, not valued, and unsure. In terms of support 1 answered no support, 18 answered some support and 1 answered well supported. In terms of value three answered no value, 15 answered some value and 2 answered well valued. Through the comments attached to the survey and through the interviews the themes were that despite some consumers caring about local food and environmental issues that they were too focused on price to actually show support. When respondents answered some support they mentioned that some consumers would buy local products, but when discussing agricultural production they stated that the general public didn’t enjoy the “sounds, smell and sights of production”. The fact that local agriculture is valued differently then local food displays how basing value on supply and demand curves are problematic as demand may be high for one commodity and low for another commodity that is integral to its process. As well in terms of valuing agriculture the themes that came up were that consumers only associated value to the final product and also to certain type farming. Consumption of agricultural production becomes tied to the discourses created in spaces of consumption through media, which dichotomise farmers and farms into two types: small scale organic farms with farmers who care about the environment and their animals and the large scale factory farms.

**Disconnections and Discourses**

“But it’s not their fault (consumers). They’ve been so misinformed and they’ve been duped and I feel so bad for them. When they ask all these questions they’re
desperate for knowledge [on how their food is produced]. But they get one tidbit and they run with it…At some point someone needs to paint the full picture for them so they can feel better about it too.” Jill

The discussion around disconnections between people in spaces of consumption and production in BC for this research is primarily focused through the lens of the young farmers and their experiences that were observed from the surveys and interviews. The results display that the consumers do not value agricultural production and farmers the same way that they value food products nor do they connect their actions in the grocery store to the resulting agricultural landscape. Secondly, many consumers assume BC farmers and agriculture are part of a North American food production scheme. Lastly, consumers don’t know how food is produced nor do they understand how the industry and therefore work done by farmer has changed. These disconnections, which occur because consumers are not connected to local agricultural production spaces leads to the creation of discourses around farms and farmers that then impose themselves on the landscape. In this way these discourses reflect the use of power as determined by Foucault in that they are “omnipresent and formative” (Foucault, 1984; Zografos, 2009, p.1729) and in these cases power is less associated with the stakeholders (in this case consumers) then the prominent cultural norms and ideology that governs our actions and informs these discourses that then inform the landscape. These discourses revolve not just around the science and land-use or marketing of food products, but through media and it dichotomizing of good and bad agriculture. Part of the enjoyment of farming is the enjoyment of providing food for consumers so when these relationships become distance and negative it removes the enjoyment factor for young farmers. These discourses will be displayed briefly through archival research in BC of past and present local food movements.

Notably, when I first started this research I would discuss how consumers were disconnected to agriculture and their local farms, which created false images and discourses with other graduate students, family and friends. Immediately they would infer that they knew what I was talking about and what was really ‘going on.’ They saw the false image as the marketing of the ‘Old McDonald Farm’ and the true image as the factory farms in Food Inc. This is the main issue I argue that BC consumers are creating by being disconnected from BC farms. They only see agriculture through the lens of marketers that create discourses around ‘organic’, ‘free run’ and pictures of red barns
and old silos, or through the discourses brought on by media and certain advocacy
groups that create umbrella terms for Factory Farming in North America. In terms of the
latter the young farmers in this study felt misrepresented and devalued by the general
public. Without the support and understanding of the general public not only do farmers
lose out as consumers choose cheaper food from the US or elsewhere, but they also
lose out as people deem their land-use undesirable, again making agriculture
susceptible to other land-use changes. In this case it goes beyond the fetishism of the
product, but fetishism of the landscape.

**Dichotomies in the Media: The North American Umbrella**

‘Judgements prevent us from seeing the good that lies beyond
appearances.’ Wayne Dyer

In 2008, the film *Food Inc.* was released and brought to light the problems with
the USA’s corporately controlled food system. It is one of many media pieces that has
displayed the ugly side of industrial agriculture and juxtaposed it with organic and/or
small scale farming operations. Consumers after watching these media pieces are
arguably looking through the veil surrounding fetishized food products produced through
marketing to see the CAFO’s, poor working conditions, roots of ecoli and the struggles of
farmers. Although the film did make consumers more aware of what occurs to produce
the cheap US foods they consume, which should have benefited farmers across the
border, the evidence in this research suggests that it didn’t. Instead *Food Inc.* and other
media outlets created new discourses around agriculture that impede the consumers
ability to see the diversity that still exists in agricultural production in other places, such
as BC and the rest of Canada. The assumption that Canada and the US have similar
production methods and policies prevents consumers from understanding why there are
price differences. Arguably in the end price conscious consumers will still choose the
cheaper option. Although I am not stating that the media pieces are inaccurate what I will
argue is that the recreated discourses around agriculture that they produce do not
resemble the diverse food system. In this section the argument will be displayed through
the stories given by young farmers at pivotal interactions between producers and
consumers that convey the tensions and disconnections.
The first example of created discourses by the media and the power they hold on consumer behaviour will be introduced through Dale’s experience with a school teacher while he was trying to connect students to how their food, specifically broilers, were produced.

“We have had a few negative experiences. Sometimes from the papers... I know there was a teacher at one of the schools where we brought a chicken trailer. It’s got the broilers in it and the chicks and its got broiler breeders, which lay the eggs. We bring that around to the schools to educate everybody on how we farm and what it looks like. The broilers are not in cages. They are running around. They eat and drink whenever they want. We give them night, we give them day and all this stuff. And she came up to me, one of the teachers. She just said I’m brainwashing the kids. What? Pardon, sorry. She goes you’re lying. What am I lying about? It’s your product that’s causing our kids to develop so much faster now a days. I go oh are you talking about hormones. She goes ya. Your pumping them full of hormones and your pumping it into our kids. I says oh, Canada doesn’t have any hormones in our meat. Since the 60’s we can’t do it. There’s no hormones in any beef, milk, chicken, turkey. [We are] not allowed to put that in the feed. She didn’t believe me. She just called me a liar. I didn’t know how to reach her. She went off. I mean she was getting pretty angry. I just had to acquiesce and give her some information off the web and said hopefully you’ll find the information that shows you that I’m right” Dale

There is no way to trace back and find what specific information given to the teacher led to her determining that Dale was a liar and that his broilers were full of hormones. However given that since early 1960s there has been legislation that was put forth by the Federal government of Canada to strictly abolish hormones use in feed (Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2011) it was not from a reputable source, but rather from the media or other misinformed consumers. In this case the media institutions become powerful stakeholders in the re-imagining of agriculture through discourse, as the writers of these articles and producers of these documentaries are able to create or mould the discourse. This interaction described by Dale displays that the teacher did not see Dale, the farmer as a reputable source in relation to other sources, and secondly she is not aware of how food is produced in her Province or Country. The latter displays how there are normative imaginaries created by the media that spread and effect local relationships. Although Dale was obviously affected by the experience that kind of behaviour and beliefs (which are arguably shared by many consumer) also affects BC’s agriculture because it makes the differences in BC Products indiscernible from American products. An example of this type of consumer behaviour was brought forth in a Global
news segment. In this segment Washington residents were upset because British Columbian cross border consumers were clogging the lines and parking spots at their local Costco to get cheap milk and other products. In this segment you see families filling their trunks with cartons of US milk and stating that it’s so much cheaper then back home (GlobalBC, 2013). This hurts dairy farmers who are following policy that is more costly, but creates a better product as seen in the below quote:

“Then they go south to get the cheaper inferior product. It’s the education on letting them know the differences of the inferior products. Canadians are asking for higher quality products, but when they get to the store they are buying the cheaper stuff because they don’t want to pay for the higher stuff…there is a dedicated group of people that will. But it’s not the ones that are on the surveys saying we will pay the higher process. The survey and actions are two different things.” Dale

The first issue here is that consumers aren’t seeing what goes into there food, or doesn’t such as in the case of hormones, and the second is that there actions in the store aren’t reflecting what they say there preference is. Dale gave an example with eggs.

“Talk to Golden Valley. Talk to any processor. They’ll say this stuff (organic specialty, high quality) isn’t flying off the shelves. So they have a cap of how much they can produce. If every farmer wanted to produce organic it wouldn’t fly. What people would do is they’d change their protein source. Eggs are too expensive I’m going to pork because pork’s cheaper.” Dale

The fact that consumers are making decisions based on price isn’t just an assumption by farmers but is reflected in buyer statistics. Consumers don’t value the final product enough to pay more at the market yet they don’t realize that the choice then reflects on who gets to produce and how food gets produced. If consumers don’t automatically realize the value of local food it makes farming difficult because it is the farmers that often take the financial cut; especially if they are not protected by supply management:

“Total disconnect there. I mean the only way to make it cheaper is for someone to take a cut. And its usually not the retailers. The Wal-Marts etc are very powerful. The processors are large and powerful. Farmers are usually the ones because they’re individual or smaller and unless they band together in associations they’re not quite that powerful.” Dale
The US farmers that actually produce under the model shown in Food Inc. may actually in the end benefit because not only do they produce in a way that is cheaper, but certain crops are also subsidized. Dale explained the problem with being associated with the Food Inc. big industrial farms:

“Food inc. It’s an American Program. Our systems are so different. We have marketing boards and supply management. Ok ya let’s talk about price, but the product to buy it, it’s cheaper in the states. But the farmers aren’t making less money. They wouldn’t be in business if they were. They are being supplemented by the government. Subsidies. Huge subsidies. Which allows them to keep farming without any issues. Canada doesn’t have these subsidies other then grants for new ideas... You have to work for it, its technology innovation... Marketing boards make sure we get a fair price to make sure we can keep going. They got a price of production model that says here is your break even point. You need a reasonable living or in order to keep living else you are going to get out of the industry and go to the next best thing.” Dale

The American public in this case are paying for the process of production of certain favoured crops, and then paying for their food. The Provincial and Federal Government only support farmers to the extent that they are being innovative with technology. The value isn’t in providing food, but rather is about producing ideas that the government sees as more viable or efficient. One aspect they have policies that support conventional production of certain crops and the other is in the different policies that set standards on production:

“But ya the disconnect between the US and Canada is huge. They have the ability to use these hormones. They have the ability to farm chickens in various different ways state by state.” Dale

Heidi also expressed her frustrations with consumer preferences towards how animals are treated and yet how dairy farmers are left competing with the US as Canadian consumers go across the border for cheap dairy.

“You have these people too, who complain about. Maybe not just in the dairy, but also in the poultry. About the facilities the animals are kept in and treated and all this kind of stuff. Yet those, maybe not the same people, but a lot of the same people are going to go across the line and buy the cheap food. Well how do you think cheap food is made. It's made by huge farms. The animals are not necessarily kept that well. Yet they’re hammering the Canadian farmers that we need to treat our animals better, but they’re going across the line to buy cheaper food. Well it costs money to have more space for birds or whatever. I mean with dairy we don’t struggle with it nearly as much as the poultry guys. But in the dairy
they do seem to think that we use all these hormones. That milk is full of all these antibiotics and hormones and that is actually what the Americans use not the Canadian farmers.” Heidi

What this displays is that once again consumers are not aware of how within borders food is produced differently based not only on physical factors (climate), but regulations and public demand. Also what it shows is that how the general public demands the best-use practices of agricultural spaces is not in alignment with how many, but not all consumers choose to purchase.

One reason for why BC farmers and Canadian farmers get associated with the US was argued by Heidi to be because the USA has a stronger influence on media:

“I mean the states they are so much bigger. You know so many more people that I guess their story gets heard more. So if you Google it your going to get all the information on the American perspective on things and not necessarily the Canadian perspective side on things.” Heidi

The reference to Google and Food Inc. as sources of information that effect farmers negatively in BC relates to Appadurai’s (1996) ideas on ideascapes and mediascapes. These global ideologies and the ideas about the processes in ‘North American’ agriculture are affecting the farmers in BC as they devalue their products. Given the already low net incomes of farmers in BC we can see the fragility of local processes in the wake of the global ideas.

Dale along with the other farmers expressed how the disconnection is growing in BC between farmers and the consumers as farmers are becoming scarce. As farmers have to deal with the stressors:

“It’s incredible how there’s this disconnect. And it’s getting worse. It’s getting a lot worse. It use to be that the people in BC were the farmers, but not anymore. Farming is going down. Fewer farmers every year. Except for one Province in Eastern Canada that has 2% growth (Nova Scotia).” Dale

What is occurring is that farmers in comparison to past generations in time are becoming scarce and agricultural spaces are shrinking (due to land-use conflicts assessed in the next Chapter) due to stressors and this leads to the general public having fewer interactions with them. This in turn leads to consumer and buyer behaviour as well as political decision making that is distanced from farmers and that exacerbates
these stressors. This then leads to less farmers being able to work either full time or part
time at their farm.

**Value of Product and Place**

“I think if you ask them [the public] they’d put food first, but I think that they don’t connect that the food that they eat is from out there on the land. And a lot of it is imported to so how important is this agriculture. I mean you talk to the head of the Port and he says we can import all the food we don’t need this land for agriculture. That’s extreme but...How good is it for food security? How good is it for the quality of food that you eat. ‘Cause anything local, fresher is more nutritionally valuable rather then bringing it in on a ship, halfway around the world and the quality of the food you have no idea of how its produced while here we have very stringent safety regulations and quality control.” Planner

There is an inherent issue with this thesis’s use of terms spaces production versus spaces of consumption as elements of consumption and production occur in all spaces. For instance in spaces of agriculture production land is being consumed in a specific way and in spaces of consumption such as a super market images are being produced. In this section the consumption of landscapes where agricultural production occurs and products are analyzed in comparison to food products. Below is an article from the Vancouver Sun that was titled ‘Dora Rogers looks over local cherries on sale at Whole Foods Market on Robson Street in Vancouver. Store manager Julie Lustig says customers are willing to pay more for food grown close to home than food from big farms in California.’ This article came out at the same time producers in the Okanagan were firing their workers because they could not compete with growers from Washington and California (Vancouver Sun, 2012). This displays how it is important to discern between what consumers say they support in surveys and what they actual do support when making purchases.
Despite a core group of local enthusiasts, information given by the young farmers (as shown in the below quotes) and buyer statistics historically have displayed that local products by the buyers and consumers only get chosen if they meet expectations of price and in the case of grocery store chains also meet the bulk needs. Yet when these consumers visit farms, take part in agri-tourism and interact with these spaces their expectations don’t meet their actions when purchasing:

“All the consumer is driven by is they don’t want to spend a lot of money on food. They may talk about wanting to buy local or support local, but in a lot of cases it’s driven by what the cost is right.” Dale

On claims that 98% of public say ALR is important: “Put your money where your mouth is. It’s the surveys, you know surveys [pause] that’s why you have to have focus groups. A survey is only one thing and it is not good for every answer.” Dale

One reason for the inconsistency in support for agriculture versus food is that consumer interest is higher with food as displayed in the quote below:

“I’m not sure if it was that or just the public awareness of food. Local food. The whole local food movement. In this organization that got galvanized in 2008 when we had that big food spike, food price spike. And what was happening is
our politicians, our senior manager would go to these meetings and everyone would be talking about food. They were supposed to be talking about this, but they’re talking about food because it engages people. The minute agriculture starts becoming agriculture and food people get engaged, but unfortunately if it’s just agriculture it didn’t quite do that enough so once the whole concept of the food system started to bring awareness…I don’t think they [consumers] connect the food to agriculture as much as they should. It’s the way our system has evolved. It’s market driven like ‘we don’t have a food problem just go to the grocery store there’s tons of food.’ They’ve [consumers] been so disconnected from their food.” Planner

What the above quote displays is the disconnection between consumers and how they contribute to how their food is made and how the landscape gets shaped in the process. The final food product is an object that can be informed by fantasy, nostalgia and ethics (access to food, knowledge on food and animal welfare). It has different dimensions and can be moulded to our expectations of consumers, while farmers and agriculture are less malleable and seem to be cemented into stereotypes of big industry or small farms as discussed previously. In the next section I will begin to assess how values get imposed on the landscape. However what is needed in future research is to get an understanding of what drives consumers to place these different types of values on food, agriculture and space in order to understand these consumption patterns that conflict. In observing how local food and local agriculture were valued through through watching chefs promoting local food, advertisements at and for farmers’ markets, food policy councils and other media sources, it was always the food that was being displayed with marketing such as ‘local flavours,’ ‘organic,’ ‘nutritional’ and ‘support local farmers’ and ‘know where your food comes from.’ Yet asides from farmers’ markets these ideas were all being promoted without any direct connection to farmers or productive spaces. They are being fed to consumers on media devices and in consumptive spaces like supermarkets. Most recently Save On Foods has promoted local produce (conveniently after the Federal government changed the definition to local to being within the Province or within 50 miles of its borders). It is currently having its ‘Taste Local’ campaign until August 31st at select locations (Save On Foods and More, 2013). This statement displays how the word local is consumptive in it of its self and seems to have an expiry date. In their commercials they show farmers with their produce on the farm. Although this may benefit farmers as some consumers may begin to have an emotional connection to the actual visual it is likely not the same as having an actual interaction with a farmer or going to a farm. What I argue is that this mainly promotes a
new marketing label that may or may not have staying power as with ‘organic’ or ‘free run.’ In this case the value is of a fetishized product and not necessarily a value of agriculture, agricultural land or farmers. In the next section the perception of farmers and agriculture will be examined based on how the young farmers assume how they are perceived.

**Perceptions on Farmers and Agriculture**

![Figure 7: Snow, Shane. (2010). Farmville and Farming Comparison: Infograph.](image)

“They have perceptions of the agriculture, but unless you know farmers or go to farms or buy from local farmers and farmers’ markets and go do you picks and the agro-tourism stuff, they don’t know.” Planner

The above image displays differences between Farmville players (over 80 million users worldwide) and the average US farmer. Although it is unlikely that BC consumers think that farmers experiences are similar to the fictional farmers on Farmville this infograph is of importance because it goes beyond stating farmer statistics and contrasting them to Farmville, but it also displays different ways in which agriculture and food can be consumed. Even in how the artist here depicts the farmer visually with a straw hat and cowboy boots. How agriculture is consumed connects to how it is valued.
and how it is consumed is extensive in terms of the physical consumption of food to knowledge to aesthetics and culture as displayed through videogames, commercials, marketing, documentaries or the products themselves. The focus in this section is to display how young farmers perceive consumers are disconnected to how and where their food is produced and consumption in these arenas can potentially be destructive to both parties.

As a farmer who sells at the gate and at farmer markets Jill’s experiences are similar and yet different then the other farmers interviewed in this thesis. This is because she gets to see first hand what consumers believe or don’t believe about how she farms on a regular basis. She has had similar experiences as what was seen with Dale and the teacher where consumers don’t believe her:

“[Consumers ask] how do they live and when I say outside people usually don’t believe me... If they come to the farm I definitely take them around, but at the farmers’ markets we have pictures. And most people totally don’t believe that. Cause other people do that. There’s Rockwell poultry. They are all inside, but on his truck he shows grass and a red barn. There’s no grass at his place. So nobody trusts images, which I totally understand why. That’s why we encourage everybody to come to the farm because there’s no other way of explaining it. They have to see for themselves. I will take people out there. I will catch them a turkey. They can touch it [laughs]. They love it. We are trying to do a walk with the turkey cause they’re hilarious, they’ll follow you. People from downtown just love it.” Jill

In this case if she can actually show the consumer her farm then trust can be set, but for those consumers who won’t or can’t make it to the Fraser Valley they have to choose between information given to them and what Jill has told them. In the case above it is the other farmer, who is creating a false image based on rurality to pull in consumers. This not only paints an untrue portrait of production, but magnifies consumer lack of trust. The issue is then exacerbated by the fact consumers don’t have the knowledge on what their food can or should look like as it is produced:

“There is definitely a disconnect for sure. When they come to the farm they think chickens are turkeys and turkeys are chickens. They can’t even tell the difference. They don’t know what a carrot in the ground looks like. They haven’t been raised by it, its an education issue...I would never take it away from them (consumers) that they are definitely inquisitive and curious and not embarrassed to ask questions, which is good.” Jill
“And what kind of questions do they ask” K Our chickens are raised for substantially longer then commercial birds so there like 6 to 10 pounds. So a lot of the questions I get is why are you using steroids cause they’re so big. Which comes back to what is the normal size of a chicken? It is not three pounds. That is a two week old chicken...“So perception, why is anything bigger [is] super size me, like anything. Another thing is free run birds, it’s illegal in Canada to raise them any other way that’s not a selling feature.” Jill

What can explain in part why consumers have chosen to not believe farmers is that marketing by certain companies and producers has led to consumer mistrust. Just as certain products have been deemed bad if they are ‘big’ or not ‘organic’ so have products been without merit seen as good based on the marketing of ‘rurality’ ‘free run’ ‘specialty’ and ‘organic.’ Consumers who do not know what the regulations are for these terms, which in many cases like ‘specialty’ there are none, then they can end up.

“Another really good example of that is JD farms in Langley is a turkey farm and their called specialty turkey. So they just have a specialty grain. They’re all raised in doors. But if you ask anybody that’s not from that area. There’s a lot of people that have JD farms turkeys in Whole Foods downtown. So you ask them ‘so what do you think about the birds?’ ‘Oh they’re wonderful, they’re raised outside cause their special’. If you go to JD farms it’s just rows of barns. Just all barns, but even the people that go there don’t see it.... Well it’s there. There’s just no connection to what the hell’s going on in that barn. They are advertising that it’s hormone free specialty bird and people read into that whatever they want...Like free range you can have them half inside half outside or organic if you can’t find organic soy you can use regular soy so pfff.” Jill

“I honestly think that people got into organics because they wanted to get away from the big mass production. They wanted to get back to the smaller operation...I think people wanted to get back to the small, but they didn’t get what they wanted so now the big guys are pumpin out organic.” Jill

In terms of looking at how these disconnections reflect how consumers’ view the landscape both Heidi and Mark Schurman expressed how the general public doesn’t put value of the land. As dairy farmers they need lots of grazing pastures and for their Holsteins. Although the view of the farm may be aesthetically pleasing and valued they see it as unused:

“I guess most people from the city don’t get it.” HS

“They don’t understand ya” MS

“So they don’t know. They might see green fields just sitting there and being like they (farmers) aren’t even doing anything with that. Well ya we are cause we are cutting it and feeding it to the cows. I guess the main thing to is the disconnect
between farm and city is just getting bigger. So they don’t understand and then from that I think comes other ideas and thoughts. That sort of thing.” Heidi

Heidi has expressed one of the main issues with the decline in farmland for both farmers and the public. As land gets removed or placed elsewhere the divide grows between producer and consumer, which then exacerbates the dichotomies and discourse that again are relevant in the decline or re-placement of agriculture.

This problems with distance and the dichotomies are displayed in the below is a quote by Heidi about how consumers unfairly view farmers who interact with livestock and take part in animal husbandry. In the surveys and interviews with young farmers in dairy, poultry and other types of farming that involve animal husbandry all mentioned working with animals as a reason for why they enjoy farming. Therefore if they have reason to believe that consumers see them as cruel this is not only an unfair assumption but can be hurtful. As well as mentioned by Heidi the lack of support to actually provide farmers with the finances to create better living spaces for animals creates frustration:

“You have these people to who are complain about. Maybe not just in the dairy, but also in the poultry. About the facilities the animals are kept in and treated and all this kind of stuff. Yet those, maybe not the same people but a lot of the same people are going to go across the line and buy the cheap food. Well how do you think cheap food is made. It’s made by huge farms. The animals are not necessarily kept that well. Yet their hammering the Canadian farmers that we need to treat our animals better, but their going across the line to buy cheaper food. Well it costs money to have more space for birds or whatever. I mean the dairy we don’t struggle with it nearly as much as the poultry guys. Because with the poultry barns they have cut space for the birds a lot. But in the dairy we’re not struggling as much, but they do seem to think that we use all these hormones. That milk is full of all these antibiotics and hormones and that actually what the Americans use not the Canadian farmers.” Heidi

How these issues can be seen as geographic is that the locality of BC and regions in BC that exaggerate the disconnection. As shown in the below quotes BC has two issues in comparison to other regions such as the prairies. The first is that unlike the prairies there are less farmers and therefore less understanding of the public to farmers needs. Secondly there seems to be a curtain between Local Food enthusiasts in Vancouver in relation to the Fraser Valley. What is displayed in the second quote is that although the member of the Food Policy Council is educated in many ways that they still seem to be disconnected to the FVRD and what type of agriculture is occurring. They
automatically see the FVRD as big farms, which it may be true the farms are larger than the ones in Vancouver, but in reality they are relatively small to those in the prairies, America and other regions world wide,

“And people here are just more disconnected from agriculture then in the prairies. When you go to the prairies their not that far off the farm. A lot of people have left the farm and maybe just one generation off the farm. While here in the Valley for example, if you go to Vancouver or even Langley how many generations are people disconnected from farm right...The disconnect is just huge”  Mark

“I think there’s a lot of that disconnection. I heard it the other day at the Vancouver Food Policy Council ‘oh well that’s big agriculture’ about BC farmers. And I’m like big agriculture? Really? [Laughs] There all a bunch of small farmers actually. But you know at the time it wasn’t the forum to discuss it. But just hearing that from someone whom I thought was educated about agriculture it was immediately big agriculture, you know and that was an urban agricultural perspective...which is implying good and bad [small and big] and that’s unfortunate because we need all agriculture.” Planner

In conclusion it can be argued that the disconnections are indirectly connected to why young farmers are becoming scarce in BC. As shown by the previous quotes from young farmers, the negative experiences for young farmers and perception that consumers don’t fully support local agriculture aggravates the stressors described in the previously in this Chapter. Young farmers today have to be business minded, know the latest technology and climate trends and put in an incredible amount of time managing and working on the farm. Although Heidi was laughing as she mentioned rednecks in the below quote, there is an underlying concept of the old European model that farming is just physical work and that farmers are uneducated. Through observations during interviews and through answers in the survey it is the opposite, farmers are educated and farming is becoming incredibly complex work that involves both hands on life experience on the farm as well as formal education.

On how they think the general public sees farmers: “I don’t know, maybe like hillbilly rednecks. I have no idea.” HS “It’s a tough one to say how the public, well how we are perceived by the public.” Mark
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“At the end of the day who is championing for agriculture, right? There is the Protect the Bog (environmentalist protecting Burns Bog in Delta) people that will
jump up and down for the bog and there’s the local residents that will jump up and down for their neighbourhood. But there is no large crew locally, on a local basis that jumps up and down for agriculture. Even though the public as a whole places a high value on farmland.” Mark Robbins, Farmer and Regional P. Ag (Langley and Abbotsford)

Figure 8: City of Delta. (2012). Optioned ALR Land South Delta

The ability to afford and access land in regions that are desirable for young farmers is essential and is becoming increasingly difficult. In part, this is due to the economic issues discussed previously that make desirable spaces for agriculture unaffordable. Another factor for inaccessibility is the actual lack of land or inability to farm on land efficiently and safely as other land-uses come into conflict with agriculture. In this section land-use conflicts between agriculture and other land-uses are analyzed in order to look at transformations of the landscape in BC and its impact on young farmers.

This paper focused on Delta and the FVRD and through archival research and interviews it became clear that contested visions for the landscape and land-use conflicts are far more prevalent in Delta as a member of the DFI explains

“I work throughout the province, mostly in the Fraser Valley, but throughout the Province and there’s no area like this (Delta) in terms of
the complexity of land-use and agriculture is right in the midst of it and its continually under pressure. Big big pressure. And it causes a lot of challenges for existing farmers. It's probably a difficult area for new farmers to get established in the midst of these things. If you would compare this to an area in the interior say for instance the Dawson Creek area. Where there is large masses of fertile land and where there is very little urban intrusion, some industrial with the oil and gas, but for the most part its nothing like the intensity we have here. So if you're a young person wanting to get started farming and you grew up in the Dawson Creek area then the feasibility is much greater then if you are a young person in Delta wanting to get into farming in admist these land-use issues.” Member of Delta’s Farmers Institute

This partially explains why Delta has far fewer young farmers than the FVRD and why it was difficult to have them available for interviews and surveys for this study. Despite the magnification of the land-use issues in Delta, the FVRD reflects the same issues and throughout this study connections were found between the two displaying that impacts to agriculture in one region triggers issues in another. In this section a brief history of each region will be given. Then the four main conflicting land-uses for agriculture, which are environmental, industrial, First Nation Land Claims, and Urban encroachment and rural estates, will be assessed in context to both Delta and FVRD displaying the contrasts and connections.

Through observing the contested visions for landscape and the resulting land-use changes in both Delta and the FVRD it will be argued that although there is evidence of Wilson’s conclusions of a shift from productive to post-productive or rather multifunctional landscapes being viable, that it is not due to corporate relationships between agricultural ministries and powerful farmer unions breaking down and formerly politically marginal actors, such as environmental groups or local grassroots organizations, into the decision-making and policy formulation (Wilson, 2004, p.462). The shifts in British Columbia rather display the inaccessibility of land for young (or new) farmers that result in policy and planning that prioritizes other land-uses based on economic, ecological, social and ethical reasoning. In assessing these land-use conflicts the prevalence of both Foucault’s and the Neo-Marxist perspective of power can be seen as determining how the landscape gets transformed as although power does circulate between powerful stakeholders that the governance is also based off of what Peet and Watts (2004) described as the imaginaries for how people can best interact with non-
human aspects of the environment. Although agricultural production is starting to gain traction in decision-making arenas based off of science and support from certain internal organizations, the disconnections stated in the previous section and competition from other land-uses in arenas of contestation display that it has yet to take priority it needs to support food sovereignty in BC.

**History of Agriculture in Delta and the Fraser Valley Regional District**

The Fraser Basin in Delta has a rich history in farming starting in 1868 when Thomas and William Ladner settled in the area and began cultivating the land, which now exists as Ladner; named after the two brothers (Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust, 2011). Delta, more specifically South Delta (Ladner and Tswassen) became a significant site for agricultural production in the late 1800’s and early to mid 1900’s once the Canadian Pacific Railway and other transportation systems were built. It supplied the Lower Mainland with a large source of produce. Delta was able to be productive not just because of the fertile soils within the regions, but also because of the amount of capital and labour that led to necessary dyking, drainage, supportive industries and processing facilities that were built to support agriculture (Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust, 2011; Ministry of Agriculture, 1905; Country Life in BC). In the mid 1970’s as land was being procured by the Land Commission South Delta, being a farming community, had a large percentage of its land base put into the ALR. Since that time, however economic pressures and land-use conflicts have led to a large decline of agricultural production and farmers, as well as fragmentation of farmland, within the region.

The Fraser Valley has a long history of agricultural production because it was the first region in BC to be cultivated by European settlers. Farming began in the Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD) within Agassiz (also known now as Kent) as the first European families including T.B. Hicks and the famous Agassiz family settled there on route to the gold rush (District of Kent, 2009). In the late 1800’s, after the dyking of the Fraser River and the placement of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) along the FVRD, farming expanded in the region (Zbeetnoff Agro-Environmental Consultants & Serecon Management Consultants, 2009; Don Cameron Associates, 2012; City of Mission, 2012). Around this time, just prior to the implementation of the CPR, The Chilliwack Agriculture Society was formed in 1873, as an "educational institution organized for the
purpose of promoting and encouraging the breeding of live stock and the exhibition of grain, fruit” (Don Cameron Associates, 2012, p.7). Later in 1888 The Agassiz Experimental Farm became established as one of Canada’s first five by William Saunders (Mullock, 2011).

Farming also expanded in Abbotsford soon after in the early 1900s as farmers rallied together and created a petition to drain the Sumas Lake to claim for agricultural land. In 1924 this was completed and provided 8,900 hectares of land for farming (Zbeetnoff Agro-Environmental Consultants & Serecon Management Consultants, 2009, p. 20). This along with the draw of The Chilliwack Agricultural Society, led to an influx of a large number of “skilled enterprising farmers from the Canadian prairies, diversifying the previous dairy mainstay to other sectors such as poultry, hogs, raspberries and strawberries” between 1944 and 1946 (Don Cameron Associates, 2012, p.8). The dairy industry in Chilliwack has and continues to be “significant part of the agricultural community” (Don Cameron Associates, 2012, p.8). Despite the decrease in farms in BC due to competition from global markets after the building of Highway 1, Abbotsford amongst other cities in the FVRD were able to connect to local markets and remained strong farming communities (Zbeetnoff Agro-Environmental Consultants & Serecon Management Consultants, 2009, p.20).

The history of supporting agriculture and creating communities around it in the FVRD has played a part in the current amount and placement of associations, education facilities and subsidiary industries that create spaces were shared knowledge and culture in farming has expanded to create one of the most productive regions in Canada and the most productive region in BC. Presently there are several pressures from other land-uses and visions for the FVRD that have potential effects on agriculture and young farmers despite it being one of Canada’s strongest farming communities.

This section focuses on how different stakeholders view and value the landscape and how this has transformed it to both include and exclude agricultural production based off of the interviews and archival research. These other interests extend beyond what other academics have already discussed to include not only conservation and residential/urban sprawl, but also industrial sprawl and interests that combine social and environmental justice of the Tsawwassen First Nations. The purpose of this analysis is
not to state that agriculture is more valuable then these other initiatives, but to display the extent of pressures that face agricultural production that impact local food production and can push away young farmers from the region.

**Relationships and Conflicts within Agriculture and Wildlife Conservation**

Within Delta agriculture has consistently come into conflict with wildlife and ecological conservation both directly (e.g. wildlife eating crops and agriculture run off contaminating water) and indirectly (competing land-use initiatives). Within Delta there consists one of North America’s largest migratory flyways. As well within Delta there is Burns Bog, which is the largest peat bogs on the West Coast of America and was purchased in March 2004 for 70 million by the BC Ministry of Environment and is protected by the Parks Act, Protected Areas of British Columbia Act and Ecological Reserve Act (Ministry of Environment, 2011). The conflicts and the connections between agricultural interests and wildlife and habitat conservation interests have become magnified currently through industrial sprawl pressures on the land base by the potential expansion of the Port and the construction of the South Fraser Perimeter Road.

Delta is potentially a good example of what Wilson would describe as a change from productive to multifunctional landscape through the creation of the Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust (DFWT) in 1993. This Trust was created to compensate farmers for loss of crops due to foraging and for their setting aside of grassland and planting winter crops that would support birds and other wildlife (Delta Wildlife Trust, 2010/2011). Through this initiative agricultural spaces have become valued not necessarily as places for agricultural production, but as rural green spaces that allow for wildlife to flourish. The trust is a double-edged sword as its incorporation of farmer’s perspectives and compensation does display that farming and farmers are valued, yet it doesn’t promote agricultural production that can allow farmers to remain competitive in the industry. In short the DFWT supports farmers that support the migratory flyway as oppose to promoting farming in these spaces. This is shown in a quote from MLA Vicky Huntington when she discussed problems of industrial development in Delta:

“You’ve got a land base you want to preserve for agriculture because the agriculture has always been a component that would support your flyway,
but as crops change and as development pressures on the land develop you are starting to stretch the capacity of the land to support the flyway.”

Currently blueberry farms, cranberry farms and greenhouses have been discouraged by government and other stakeholders because they do not support the flyway, despite the fact that they are ways in which farmers can produce food and make a decent living. As stated by members of the Delta farmers Institute (DFI) this becomes “frustrating because they don’t want you to farm on farmland.” At the same time preserving the ALR has become important to these stakeholders that support conservation as it can be used in tandem with wildlife conservation to try to stop industrial sprawl. The question becomes is agricultural production actually valued in it of itself or only if it allows benefits wildlife and other aspects of the physical environment? As well, can we continue to have local farms in South Delta if this is how it is valued?

An example of the complex relationship between agriculture and conservation occurred during the initial planning the SFPR, which will be examined in depth later on in this paper. The building of the SFPR, as stated by a representative of the DFI and Vicki Huntington was ‘not wanted at all’ by farmers nor did environmentalists want to see that development. The main concerns for agriculture was the potential fragmentation of farmland, impacts on farming, and increased speculation and for environmentalists it was that the development would impact wildlife. However, these stakeholders were involved with SFPR’s creation because they realized it would go through and wanted to at least be sure that the construction would have minimal impact on farmers and wildlife (mainly within Burns Bog). In the initial plans the SFPR was not going to go through Burns Bog or farmland, but because of its proximity to the Bog and potential effects on wildlife the Ministry of Environment acting on behalf of conservation of Burns Bog fought to have a different plan be implemented that would go through farmland (Ron Lepage, DFI). This was the plan that was chosen. In an interview with two members of the DFI the change in plans promoted by the Ministry of Environment and environmentalists was not well received by farmers and displayed that farming was not valued nor supported to the extent that wildlife is by the government. It was however clear that although the Ministry of Agriculture was not able to lobby on behalf of farmers to stop the development from fragmenting farmland that it was involved in the process and along with the ALC and DFI to support farmers. This led to the South Fraser Agriculture
Enhancement Strategy to compensate farmers, which will be discussed in more detail later.

Agriculture has intertwined with environmental initiatives in an interesting way in Delta that brings forth the question of what is natural and what is anthropogenic. The DFWT displays how agriculture and wildlife conservation are tied together by anthropogenic intrusion. Whether the land is being used for crops for humans or wildlife there is nothing ‘natural’ about how the ecosystem is being supported. In the end it is about preservation of species and a space that reflect their value for ethical, ecological and other reasons or agriculture, which should be valued as a food source for humans. In a Province that has never faced famine, shut borders and has arrays of foreign foods in grocery stores agriculture is seemingly placed as a secondary land-use. This imbalance, however has not necessarily benefited conservation efforts in the long term as it has led the ALR to be susceptible to industrial sprawl and the industrial developments will negatively impact wildlife and their ecosystems as pavement covers what was once crop space.

In the Fraser Valley one main conflict between agriculture and environmental initiatives is currently between farmers and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). In 2005 the Salish Sucker was listed as endangers under the Species at Risk Act (SARA) under section 37. Being a fresh water fish it came under the responsibility of the Federal Government, specifically the DFO (DFO, 2012, p. iv). In the Fraser Valley habitat loss of the Salish Sucker was directly connected to agriculture:

“Approximately 77% of pre-settlement wetland areas in the Fraser Valley have been drained or infilled (Boyle et al. 1997). Fifteen percent of the area’s streams no longer exist, having been paved over or piped (Fisheries and Oceans Canada 1998). A large, but unknown, proportion of those that remain have been channelized and/or repeatedly dredged for agricultural or urban development. It is difficult to overstate the historical extent of fish habitat loss from these activities. Both permitted and illegal dredging of ditches and stream channels for flood control and agricultural drainage still occur annually in all watersheds known to have Salish Suckers.” (DFO, 2012, p. 9)

The DFO concluded that farmers should not clear or dredge ditches deemed as the fishes habitat (DFO, 2012; Agassiz Observer, 2012) and that they could not farm within several meters of ditches. This led to a protest in 2012 in Vancouver by farmers
from the Fraser Valley. They stated that “ditches that aren't kept clear can flood farmland, raise the water table and degrade the ability to grow crops or graze cattle” (Agassiz Observer, 2012, para 3) and that "It's coming down to the usual battle between big business and environmental values...Nobody is looking at how it affects small farm property owners" (Agassiz Observer, 2012, para 10).

When discussing land-use conflicts with young farmers the DFO and Salish Sucker came up as a source of frustration. The main issue being that there was a lack of consultation where land within the ALR became unavailable for farmers to farm land that had been previously in production for years:

“Well the DFO I’m not to happy with. I think they could do a little more, be a little more reasonable before they jump on the bandwagon or aim and shoot. What they propose I thought was incredibly unreasonable...You’re in that zone. You can’t change a crop. A lot of us have ditches... Some land is only that width. So you can’t farm that at all. It’s not farmland anymore. What do you do?... They (DFO) aren’t even asking what do we do about this. “Any ideas?”” Dale

Currently the DFO has begun to do community outreach. For young farmers and farmers alike this is described as the being of a positive change as prior to that decision arose out of books (as displayed in the below quote). In this case science and academic work was used to impose what was the best use or rather how the land should be used. However based on a methodology that is narrow and only looks at the benefits for one component of the landscape the underlying problems with purely academic or science based decision-making is displayed because it creates a power struggle.

“So now you gotta get someone with some common sense from the DFO so that they can see how it works and its not like its something they just read in a book and that’s how it’s done. That only started a year ago.” Anonymous young farmers (AYF)

When discussing the Delta Farmland and Wildlife Trust the conflict between agricultural production and environmental protection was looked at as an actual consultation:

“you’re talking to industry, you’re talking to stakeholders. You’re trying to find a solution rather then just standing your ground saying mine’s the best. You know asking if there are there any ideas cause we got a problem here. You know there are a lot of smart people out there. A lot of farmers with science backgrounds. PhDs actually surprisingly. A lot of educated people work in farming.” Dale
This quote doesn’t just display the importance of consultation, but the misconceptions and devaluation of farmers. One big misconception is that farmers who focus on production don’t care about the environment or aren’t educated.

“Not caring about the environment I don’t think was ever the case. Farmers care about the environment because without the environment we can’t grow. We always have cared about the environment. A few bad eggs really spoil the image. I mean that’s within the industry. There’s always somebody growing something the wrong way, who doesn’t know, or is new to the industry. Sometimes it’s their fault. Sometimes its industries fault for not training them enough. But I would say for the most part farmers really do care about it. It’s our livelihood.” Dale

“There’s some big ass farmers that just don’t care. But there’s some big ass farmers that cares a lot.” Jill

As shown in the quote below farmers do often understand the issue, but feel that their concerns and their land-use is continuously get pushed aside for environmental initiatives. Given the importance of land to farmers the inability to use their land without consultation or compensation combined with their high costs and low returns takes a way their ability to produce a food source that effects them and the general public:

“Oh environment always come over ag (agriculture). Always. The DFO, fisheries. I love them, but um they wanted to come in to save this Salish Sucker fish. It was a ditch fish… It contributed nothing to anything. But it was disappearing and I do understand that it’s a sign of an ecosystem disappearing. That’s bad. I get it. But they wanted farmers to farm four feet from ditches and there’s farms in Matsqui flats where it’s all ditches. So it comes down to the point where it’s like I get it. I get it. Environment wise that’s a sad thing. I mean something is going on and we should look at that. But where is the point where you say food production versus environment. And they are connected. So now we’re going to save the Salish Sucker and not save our starving people?... Where else are you going to produce that food then [that was] on that land? There needs to be thoughts of that too. I mean I get it we need to protect our environment.” Jill

In conclusion, what is occurring in both Delta and the Fraser Valley is the same underlying issue where agriculture is being pushed out as a land-use for conservation efforts. How these conflicts have unfolded is based on geography. Delta not only supports a different type of conservation effort based on the physical geography, but based on social interaction within the region between farmers and NGOs and its greater susceptibility to sprawl given it proximity to Vancouver. Secondly, reactions and relationships made by farmers display that many of them, although production oriented
do understand and are concerned for conservation issues, but become frustrated when their needs are dismissed from integral decision-making.

Urban Encroachment, Estates, and Aesthetic Consumption

Based on data obtained in this study agricultural production in the FVRD and Delta has been effected by residential development in two ways. The first is that wealthy homeowners buy plots of land to build rural estates that increase the cost of land and speculation thereby making it unaffordable and inaccessible to young farmers. Secondly residents and farmers have different visions for how farmland within and outside of the ALR should be used. The latter is often connected to the concept of valuing green spaces over agricultural production. In this case, community members at the expense of the production of food value the aesthetic consumption of the landscape.

Current Land-Use Inventories (LUIs) in both Delta and the Fraser Valley display that a large percentage of landowners are not using their land for agricultural production (Metro Vancouver, Forthcoming). One reason for this is that although certain restrictions on land-use within the ALR prevent certain developments it still allows for large country estates. Therefore based on the relatively low price of land and low taxes property owners can build their dream estate on ALR without consequence. As well property owners can apply for a farm tax discount based on what is arguably a small amount of production (between 2,500 and 10,000 farm cash receipts depending on size of land parcel). Having an increase in country estates and small hobby farms increases the costs of land and reduces the amount of arable land left for farmers as stated below:

“Just drive through Langley; Has huge houses. Has two or three houses that are massive just sitting on primary [agriculture land], that could have been used for so much more. And that’s starting to happen in Abbotsford. Like these mega houses. And they are putting them where they would prefer to have their house of course. They’re not putting it where. Well there’s gravel over here and great soil over there, we will put it on the gravel. They are putting it right in the middle of the field cause that’s where they can see [Mount] Baker or the North Shore Mountains. Get the best view. That kinda thing.” Dale

“I guess what they do is they ask you what a certain amount of money or whatever they make from their actual farm to have farm status. And to me it’s a little bit of a joke. Like what do you need 50 chickens and then you are good to go? Is that really agriculture. If they (residents) both have full time off farm jobs that’s not good farming” Heidi
“It’s just a green space” Mark

“It’s just a tax break to get the farm status. To get certain benefits that farmers get. Like having the farm plates and fuel and that stuff. So to me it’s just a little bit of a joke because people just do it for the tax benefits not actually for farming”

Heidi

The value of the space in these cases is not about best use principals based on soil mapping and climate that have previously determined the area to be of value to agriculture, to aesthetics of visual consumption. This displays that power isn’t always embedded in science, but still lies in monetary assets. Wealthy land owners have the ability to divorce farmers from their means of production by buying out prime agriculture land at a price above what farmers who are not independently wealthy can pay. This ties to Wallowa County (Abrams and Gosnell, 2012) where the history of farming had not only created the space for this aesthetic consumption, but the accessibility of its relative low cost. The original intent of the ALR was to have the price of land based on agriculture land-use, but with policy that taxes estates for their residential land-use this has made it prime property. This can be observed further in the below quote:

“I don’t know if Eagle Mountain drives the land prices. It’s more people looking for acreages or smaller titles. That, you know, that have this idea or notion. And you see that across the country where people will buy like a hunk of land with no real intent of farming it. They want to build their dream house on it right. Have an acreage. And once that occurs the land is lost to agriculture production.” MS “It’s the same thing. If somebody buys their 10 acre piece and they build their house and their yard and they want a couple of horses. Then that 10 acres is no longer being actually used for agriculture.” Heidi

“Its definitely a competing land-use.” Mark

These dream houses are built on the concepts and discourses around rurality that are based on green spaces, red barns and mountains as oppose to the reality of the ALR, which may include these, but also includes production. This leads to the second issue, which revolves around land-use conflicts. This isn’t just an issue between farmers and rural estates, but between them and residential stakeholders within and around the ALR. As these residents are also consumers this displays a large disconnection between consumers and their food, which is that the value the product, but not necessarily the sights and smells of its production.

“People are encroaching on our agriculture. You built your house next to a barn. You don’t want to live with the smell, but you moved there and he (the farmer)
was there first. Come on. You’re not that ignorant are ya? You expect them to shut down because you built this you know 1400 square foot house, putting in a sub-division... I know a few farmers that have gone at it with the people in the sub-division next door. I wouldn’t say [pause] well one of them didn’t go about it the right way, but he did win in the end so now the other people are just living with it. Other farmers are doing their best. You can’t spend millions of dollars to make these people feel comfortable. You’ll go out of business. And maybe that’s what they want. They want the place to shut down and build a sub-division next door. And then like food prices are too high [laughs]. It’s a round robin.” Dale

The last two sentences Dale gives displays the inherent issue, which is that land is valued in terms of how many sub-division can be made for profit in the residential market without concern for the other market which gets effected, which is the supply food from these farms in the FVRD and Delta. If consumers want a more aesthetically pleasing farm production where noises and smells are cut back then this effects the final cost of the produce, however given consumer behaviour the buyers will then choose cheaper out of Province goods. This type of disconnection of valuing different land-use can’t continue as it makes farming unsustainable.

One key component for agriculture is also secondary industries, such as processing plants, mainly slaughterhouses. Delta in particular has lost these secondary industries as they became unviable and also unwanted in Delta. For farmers like Jill these small-scale slaughterhouses are necessary for the farm as displayed below:

“The processing plants it’s a shame. We should have them. We have a processing plant luckily down the street from us, but if they shut down I don’t know what we do. Cause our birds are to big for commercial processing. So it has to be a custom kill plant. So there’s only one of those in BC...But there’s huge issues with the cattle cause they have to go all the way down to Alberta cause they closed down some of the slaughterhouses. The one Johnson Packers in Chilliwack is a nice small one, but all the neighbours want them to shut down...Promontory is the big fancy hill and for some odd reason before Promontory became what it is like an Eagle Mountain here. So before Promontory became sort of hoighty toighty Johnson Packers was there...I don’t know who did that cause the neighbours hate it cause they see the trucks with the pigs in it and their squealing.” Jill

The building of residential developments in these areas creates problems for farmers, as residents don’t want the visuals of the reality of their food production. In the end developers and the municipality are making profits from their sale and taxes and then the residents and farmers are left in confrontational positions. These residents are
being sold an image of green country spaces, without the final image of what makes these spaces agricultural. What makes an agricultural space are the key components of production, which span from fields of grasses for dairy farmers, to berry guns, to manure, to slaughter houses for broiler farmers. These conflicts and disconnections and their effects on young farmers are displayed in the following quotes from interviews:

“I think they think they are going to live into this wonderful country that they’ve seen on little house on the prairie…I think they are just looking for a cute country space and they don’t want anything to smell bad.” Jill

“There’s a big movement in Abbotsford right now in the Sumas Flats to only have crow guns for blueberry to go off at certain times. Not on weekends. Not on stat holidays. There’s one berry farmer that says he’d probably loose over $100,000 if that happens cause the birds would just come and take it all. And I agree that a gun going off every five minutes is definitely not enjoyable to live by, but they were there before you. I don’t know what to say to people. You need to know what your getting into when you want to live near it” Jill

“Some the issues I know they have now out there with the livestock is smell, odors. The city bylaws are trying to put a value on odor. Like a quantitative amount of odor that’s to high and start to fine processing plants and farmers for creating to big of a smell. I mean its pushing farming out.” Dale

In the end it is the Municipality and representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture are faced with taking complaints from residents and making decisions for regulations based on aesthetics that don’t take into account the challenges faced by farmers. As urban sprawl seeps into the FVRD and Delta the young farmers have to either find ways to cut costs in other aspects of the farm, increase income from other jobs, increase returns or leave the farm. This is at the same time where consumers are expecting a more sustainable type of farming and cheap food products, which in the end undermine our local food sovereignty because it puts to much stress on the farmers and the system:

“It totally is (a disconnect on what farming is by urban residents). They’re (city officials) taking the complaints from the urban encroachment. All the people that are in their high rises. And if they got acreage its martini farmers. It’s people who just look at their land. Mow it every now and then. Or you know the people in the subdivisions. They, they…we need them. They’re are market. But at the same time we’ve got this world to feed. And the cost. We are being told are food prices are too high. And we are told to get more efficient. And we are told to take price cuts. But our feed costs are high and they take corn for fuel. It’s a vicious circle and then we’re told the smells are to high. So we got to find out how to spend money on technology to reduce smells. Or find a way even if there is a way. So
there’s all these issues with urban encroachment. And then we’ve got, the cost of land just keeps rising because of it. A lot of the land prices are speculative. The value of the land isn’t really that high. Farming can’t, can’t [pause] it isn’t sustainable to pay for that amount, the quantity of the land that they want. Like in Delta its not based on making money on farming, even though its ALR. It’s making money on dividing it, sub dividing it into land parcels. To buy it now for farming, I mean it wouldn’t make sense unless its being passed down to you. Or unless you have a huge piggy bank.” Dale

“I mean it’s stressful. I mean your farming the way you’ve done, your families done for forty years or longer and then all of a sudden you’re told that no longer you can produce. Ya know. Produce a smell. No longer can you raise your livestock the way you have. Your cages are too small or we don’t want cages. You know you do have to meet the demands of the consumer. That’s our market. It’s just being told we cannot do it a certain way, its, it. Sometimes it’s hard to take. Change is hard. And often change is expensive.” Dale

As sprawl occurs there is an influx of residents that end up becoming important players in municipal decision making especially when they become the majority as in Delta and a large part of the FVRD. These consumers of the landscape want as the quote below states, for their use of the land to be the prime use.

On whether he thinks residential is a more valued land-use the agriculture by general public and government: “Sure. Ya they don’t smell. They don’t want industrial probably as much cause it’s loud or creates a lot of truck traffic. You know residential wants residential.” Dale

In conclusion, what is being valued here is a specific view by residents that is created in media as well as marketing. The ALR is being viewed under a lens where produced images of country spaces, such as Little House on the Prairie, postcards or the labels in commercials for certain commercial breads and yogurts or on containers of mass marketed food products. When faced with the reality of how these spaces are produced in diverse ways with smells and sights of production rather then green fields residents push back promoting there vision, removing the historical processes that led to that landscape and removing the places where the local food products many of them want to buy stem from them. This makes production either to costly or simply takes away the ability or the space for young farmers to produce food.

**Industrial Sprawl and Gateway’s Place in Delta**

“The public valuation of farmland is as high as industrial…These guys talk about the highest and best use and on small scale its valued more for industrial, but
from a total if you take the private evaluation and public evaluation it’s equal to industrial, but the public evaluation value doesn’t get championed” Mark Robbins, Farmer and Regional Agrologist (Langley and Abbotsford).

Currently in Delta agriculture has had increasing land-use conflicts with industrial development. Industrial gets championed as displayed by the above quote because of economic factors, efficiencies and outcomes that deem it as best use for a place. Delta in particular is increasingly being seen as a place for industrial development and transportation infrastructure; mainly for goods, but also people as it port expands. Current industrial initiatives that have affected farming in Delta are the Building of the South Fraser Perimeter Road (SFPR) and the past and current plans for the Delta Port Expansion. These industrial led projects have negative impacts for agriculture, while at the same time the consultation processes have been seen as victories for the agriculture community as mentioned by members of the DFI during an interview held with them.

The South Fraser Agricultural Enhancement Strategy (SFAES) (Refer to Figure 6) is one part of the SFPR project that is being conducted by Gateway, which is supported by the Provincial Government through the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (City of Delta, 2008) (Figure 6). The SFAES was created by Gateway in response to concerns about the direct and indirect negative impacts on farmland by the City of Delta and British Columbia’s Farmers institute (BCFI) that occurred during the proposal phase in 2007. The two main requests by the City of Delta and the BCFI were that there be No Net loss of Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) and that all of the indirect impacts of SFPR be fully mitigated. This included motions to consolidate smaller and separated land parcels in Delta, protect and reuse soils, buffer vegetation and repatriate the ALR (Gateway, 2007). The Agricultural Land Commission (ALC) was given the proposal of SFPR for its panel to set mitigation and make requests so that the SFPR had minimal impact on the ALR. In the end the proposal did run through agriculture land and in order to mitigate for these losses the SFAES was created to ‘enhance’ the ability to produce within the remaining land base.

The SFAES includes three parts. The first is an irrigation and drainage enhancement project (cost approx: 18 million CAD). This involves a new water intake to provide a high quality reliable source of irrigation to farms in East Delta. Based on the problems with salinization and access of water by farmers this was an appreciated
resource that was needed prior to industrial expansion. This extension to agriculture was
put in to meet industrial objectives, but in the end benefited agriculture production. There
is also a proposed new intake pump for the north end of 80\textsuperscript{th} street to enhance water
supply to South and West Delta Farms. The second part is road improvements (such as
a new overpass and underpass 72\textsuperscript{nd} street) to improve access for farm vehicles the
SFPR, Highway 99 and have better access to major road networks. Lastly there is a
section of other positive impacts of SFPR on agriculture which include: shared drainage,
Burns Drive extension, access to highway 99 development that will lower congestion on
local roads, improved storm water management, improved bee habitat, vegetative
buffers (to be provided at the expense of Gateway), reclamation of landfill sites (improve
soil and groundwater contamination, topsoil recovery and a separation of road and farm
irrigation ditches for drainage.

As of 2011 the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure approved funding of
$5,265,888.00 for the 80\textsuperscript{th} street irrigation pump. Construction began in September in
2011(Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, 2012). Also approved was funding of
$1,342,188.00 for the Big Slough Control Gate Project, which will be constructed where
Big Slough, Robertson Slough, and the Lorne Ditch converge (Ministry of Transportation
and Infrastructure, 2012).
Although the initial objective of the project was to protect agriculture rather than enhance it, the ALC recognized that Delta farmland could benefit from improved irrigation, drainage and road networks specific for farm vehicles. Delta’s “agriculture capability is limited by salinity” (Agricultural Land Commission, 2006) and the improvements can potentially flush out some of that salinity. In the end the benefits of this enhancement can only be beneficial if the farmland in Delta is protected, and more importantly, if it is in use.

Despite the SFAES, the SFPR project has been contested by local farmers. Warren Nottingham had 80 of his 240 acre property expropriated due to the project in 2009 (Emilylaughing, 2009). In an interview Nottingham stated that the managers of the Gateway project were not committed to consultation with farmers. On the other hand members of the DFI saw it as a victory. When discussed with the young farmers in this survey those that new other farmers in Delta mentioned that industrial conflicts were a frustrating processes. Some young farmers, when they heard of residents standing up for the ALR against industrial interests in the farms not freeway campaign, were impressed despite the undertones that residents didn’t want industry in their backyard:
“My initial thought is hey at least they’re standing up for agriculture. ” D The problem was these protests came mainly when SFPR was near finished completion. During this time on local news network Globaltv reports on the protest and exemptions of the ALR were shown briefly over two days as weekly segments cooking with local food with BC chef Ned Bell began to escalate to occur almost weekly. This relates to the role disconnections discussed in the previous findings where local food is valued, but land for agriculture isn’t.

The exemptions of ALR reported by global were by Ron Emmerson for port expansion. Although the SFPR and expansion of the Delta Port are two separate projects the connections between interests are undeniable as the goals in each project are to move goods and people with more efficiency. Therefore whether or not the agricultural enhancement strategy was a victory for the Delta Farmers Institute will lie in how well they, amongst other agricultural stakeholders such as farmers, Ministry of Agriculture and the ALC, are heard in the process of the Delta port expansion. It is clear that the overall objective of the SFPR would align itself with the creation of South Delta being industrial, yet because of the SFAES the landscape has also been constructed for efficiency with farming through irrigation and transportation infrastructure.

As mentioned previously in this thesis a large conflict between industrial and agricultural interests that has been brought up in the media is that in 2012 Ron Emmerson bought 600 Acres of land for 185,000 CAD per acre (previously worth 75,000 CAD) That will be worth between 500,000 CAD and 1,000,000 CAD if used for the Deltaport Expansion (Sinuski, 2012). This land if sold will further fragment an already fragmented ALR in South Delta and remove a large land base that could be used for agricultural production at present and in the future.

An important issue that has gone unnoticed by media is the conflicts between agriculture and industry that have occurred and will be magnified as South Delta becomes increasingly a space for industrial land and transport. In a consultation meeting between Port Metro Vancouver and the Delta Farmers Institute Clarence DeBoer (director of DFI and a dairy and Cranberry grower) brought forth issues for farmers in admist industrial and transportation growth:
“Even under the current infrastructure, farmers have had to make some huge sacrifices in terms of farms being carved up, parcels on one side and parcels on the other. This is one of the reasons that the Gateway Program has contributed a sizable amount to our infrastructure. We’ve said the unjust things in the past needed to be corrected. A lot of us, and we run farming operations on the south side of the track, there’s no way out. The only way out is across the tracks, and we’re noticing more and more trains. I guess at Colebrook they’re getting backed up and slowing down to buy themselves some time. I could tell you that if we conducted our operations in the middle of your track and held you up the way we’ve been occupied waiting for the trains to pass it would never go. And yet we have to put up with it. We’ve been putting up with that for years...It’s not just the port that is impacting. Not everything is tied to those 20 acres, but it goes back further, we’ve had to adjust to a lot of things. We’re not against progress, but it should be fair to everybody. Your progress shouldn’t come at the expense of ours. We should be able to benefit from this together, and I think it’s important that we work favorably together/” (p.13)

As we can see from the above highlighted transcript it isn’t about being adverse to any industrial projects, but rather an issue of unequal accessibility to be able progress based on their needs. The fact that farmers are continuously held back from their ability to produce, without compensation or seeing that the competing land-use stakeholders are compromising leads to frustration. The competing land-uses also have safety implications for farmers as their need for mobility between fields puts them in dangerous predicaments. This is one of the larger issues of fragmentation, farming becomes dangerous, inefficient and to an extent unsustainable.

The meeting between the DFI and Port Metro Vancouver was not just focused on agriculture in Delta, but incorporated the issues of other regions that occurring because of land-use conflicts and transformations. When it was noted that the land purchased from Ron Emmerson contained several blueberry farms he was quick to state that “there’s a lot of blueberries in the Fraser Valley” (MacLeod, 2012, para 23). However the concept that we can simply let go of these farms because blueberries can be grown in the Fraser Valley is flawed because the Fraser Valley along with most places has its own conflicting land-use issues that impact agriculture. In his statement in the meeting with Port Metro John Savage (President of the Delta Farmers Institute, and former Minister of Agriculture) mentioned the regional issue of land-use:
“Agriculture in the lower Fraser Valley is losing far too much land. In fact, darn poor compensation for it. And it’s having a bad effect on our processing sector. There used to be 11 processors, now there is 1. You can’t keep squeezing the land out of us, and expecting these industries to carry on. It’s a big issue for our agricultural community. I know we have more issues, but that’s one to start with” (p. 12)

This quote displays that although industrial sprawl (as well as urban) impacts Delta and the FVRD in different ways in terms of transformations to the landscape that the region as a agricultural community is tied together and when one area is effected negatively effects the region. The concept that we can simply shift ALR to other regions in BC without consequence is unfounded. The regions and their infrastructure, such as processing plants aren’t just built around soil, but around communities of farmers that use them. As land in the Fraser Valley and Delta becomes fragmented and young farmers choose to leave it negatively effects the whole community because this infrastructure, knowledge and people will not likely move together to the Caribou or Peace River Region where the land is.

More importantly it should be noted that Ron Emmerson himself recently came under scrutiny at a meeting over his proposal to take “225 acres from the Agricultural Land Reserve to create an industrial park in Bradner,” (Baker, 2012, para 1), which currently contains a blueberry farm on Lefevre Road, amongst other farms. Even if his statement was true that there are plenty of blueberry farms in the Fraser Valley, his actions display that he has no interest in them wither.

The concept that agricultural land and agricultural production can just be shifted without consequence is flawed especially given only 1.2% of BC’s land is arable and that the population here and in other regions is consistently expanding. When discussing this with a two young farmers involved in dairy the impact of removing land for blueberries in one space for another became apparent:

“Hmm…That’s a business move to make.” Mark

“That’s a very close minded statement to make. Cause that’s like oh you know what I can’t grow this here, but they can grow it in Mexico so let’s move it to Mexico. Especially in the [Fraser] Valley. Well ok there is only a certain amount of agriculture land so ya you could potentially grow it down here, but what else are you going to take out.” Heidi

“Ya what are you going to loose.” Mark
“We’ve lost how much land that we grow feed for cows on for blueberries. So he’s basically saying well lets take land away from dairy farmers and put it into blueberries cause I want industrial stuff over here. Like you’re creating a problem. You’re still taking land away from agriculture, whichever way you slice it. The guys just being sneaky.” Heidi

“It’s just a cash grab?” Researcher

“Well for sure that land is worth good money if it’s pulled into Port.” Mark

“I just think somebody like that should really have to pay the price for taking it out of agriculture. So either he, if he wants to take that land out of blueberries well sorry buddy you don’t get anymore blueberries. There you go. That’s what your doing. Blueberries are no longer available for you cause your taking 600 acres, which is a lot of blueberries and where is there 600 acres down here that your going to replace that with? Good luck” Heidi

Given the small land base and limited access to land for young farmers the Port Expansion has effects that reach beyond the region. This is why the issues faced by Delta farmers can be seen as precursors to what may occur in the FVRD of agriculture continues to be devalued, misunderstood and the ALR continues be removed and/or shifted as well as it has land-use changes that aren’t agriculture related accepted.

This removal of land from the ALR is instigated by a uniformed assumption about what ‘used’ and ‘unused’ agricultural land is. In her research it should be noted that Katz (2009) doesn’t go into detail on her definition of unused agricultural land neither are their any indicators that she has discussed the definition with farmers. This coupled with other studies and agendas put forth by stakeholders with other land-use interests leads to a misunderstanding of the current importance of the ALR is as shown in the below quote:

“There is a study that is fuelled by the real estate association so there’s a little bit of a back push, but um he (researcher) is going around and documenting all of the unused ALR land and I don’t know what he means by unused (ALR land) because we still need trees and we need like air and we need a little apace, a little bit of buffers… I don’t know what he is going to come up with, but um I think that it’s going to really mess with people’s minds that don’t have an understanding. They are going to be saying well shit farmers are saying that we are taking all this land out, and then you got land right there and you aren’t even using it.” Jill

The constant removal of land or the describing it as unused is a de-valuation of the land that is frustrating for young farmers. In the below quote the transition of devaluation of land to farming to food is evident as farmers don’t discern between these aspects:
“Cut down all our farmland and even the land that is not used in your opinion, maybe we will need it when it comes down to that day. I don’t know. I think nobody cares about food. You know one other thing, Europeans spend about 30 percent to 40 percent of their income on food and we spend like what 10 or some ridiculous amount. Like we are not food focused here, we don’t care about it in a sense. Its like getter in and we got more important things to do.” Jill

Social and Environmental Justice and Development on ALR

“We lost a lot of land here (Delta) for the First Nations as well. We lost almost 1000 acres I guess 895 acres.” Member of DFI

Previously when academics have looked at competing land-uses the legitimizing of how the landscape should be created and used is in embedded notions of science and proper ways to interact with non-human aspects of the environment (Peet and Watts, 2004). This ignores the complexities at the local scale, which include claims that become legitimized based on social and environmental justice through historical claims on land. Although the Ladner brothers were the first to be viewed as cultivation land in Delta for farming, it is important to note that the Tsawwassen First Nations (TFN) amongst other First Nation groups existed in South Coastal BC from an archaeological perspective since 2260 BC and from a cultural perspective of since time immemorial (Tsawwassen First Nations, 2011). After a long period of colonization and injustice the TFN have relatively recently reclaimed territories that were previously theirs.

On April 3rd 2009, after fourteen years of negotiations, the TFN “ratified the first Urban First Nations Treaty in B.C” (Tsawwassen First Nations, 2011, para. 6). This agreement gave the TFN jurisdiction equal to all levels of government of 724 hectares of land. As Shown in the figure below this has mainly impacted land within the ALR by removing land (Yellow and Brown Sections) from the ALR and fragmenting the existing land (Dark Green Sections) that is remaining. The new plans for this land base includes a large commercial development to aid their economic circumstances and a communal forest (Vicky, TFN). At present agricultural production is in these plans along with the communal forest (TFN Land-Use Plan), but many stakeholders interviewed for this thesis were weary given the development so far based on economic factors.
The purpose of looking at the impacts of the TFN land claims in this thesis is to display the complex forces that slowly erode farmland, not to state that the TFN land should have remained in the ALR. The TFN are just beginning to reclaim property rights that were taken from them and are making choices for the land base based on community consultation. The effects on farmers and the struggles for owners of land given back were the result of unfortunate circumstances.

The rights of First Nations extends into the Agricultural Land Commission Act. This is displayed in section 26 after being amended in 2004:

“(1) The commission may enter into an agreement with any of the following to enable a local government, a first nation government or an authority to exercise some or all of the commission's power to decide applications for non-farm use or subdivision with respect to lands within the jurisdiction of the local government, first nation government or authority:
(a) a local government;
(b) an agent of the government, a public body or a public officer prescribed by regulation;
(c) a first nation government in respect of treaty settlement lands.

(5) If the commission delegates its power to decide applications under section 25 to a local government, a first nation government or an authority by an agreement entered into under this section, the decision of the local government, first nation government or authority is a decision of the commission for the purposes of this Act.”

The TFN development is one that behind closed doors farmers and planners alike see it as the government getting away with development through the TFN. One planner stated that prior to the TFN agreement that in the Province had “staked out” that area for commercial development. Through having land claims it was displayed that science was not the root to gaining power. Proponents of the ALR have statistics and maps that display that the soils and climate are prime for farm use, while the commercial development could be built in several other regions. In this case it was property rights based on historic claims on land. Interviewing members of the TFN went beyond the ethics approval for this research, so getting there evaluation on why a commercial development was chosen did not occur.

**Closing Discussion**

The results in this section displays the points of contention and communication between stakeholders in agriculture (Mainly farmers and their advocacy groups) and the other land-uses that they come into conflict with, which were: wildlife and ecosystem conservation, residential, industrial and First Nation developments. Agriculture as a land-use is being fragmented in all of these cases to different degrees. What is illustrated, however is that these multifunctional spaces are not created by the breakdown of farmer relationships with associations or institutions so that environmental interest can be initiated, but rather a variety of other land-uses are converging on agricultural spaces contesting land-uses and creating tighter relationships amongst these farmers and institutions so that agriculture is supported. As well because fragmentation is occurring initiatives such as the SFAES are being implemented to create more intensified agriculture so that outputs remain the same and viable.
Secondly, how transformations occur in part are justified through science and revealing how it is ‘embedded in relations of power’ as Walker and Fortmann (2003) observed in Nevada County. In terms of science this extends to the mathematics that determine economical value of regions based on industry output as is used by Gateway and the Port to justify expansion. In the case of residential conflicts the role of science is not used, but rather ideas of how a landscape should be consumed based off of ideas and media of ‘green’, ‘rural’ or ‘country’ spaces are justified by landowners. This ties into the last finding, which is although social norms often rooted in science and culture are used to promote best land-uses it is still land owners who through wealth or historic claims hold power to make final decisions on how their land should be used. All of these stakeholder’s benefit from the output of agriculture, but in these spaces the output isn’t what is valued it is production on landscapes that is.
5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The previous results in Chapter 4, based mainly on surveys and interviews with young farmers, illustrate what the attractors were for current young farmers to BC as well as what stressors were causing them to move or switch careers. The economic stressors do not arise simply from global forces (e.g. global markets and media), but also place based factors of land prices and availability, quota prices and availability, family dynamics and succession, as well as policy and extension for agriculture. Place based factors are also shown as attractors such as community, family, infrastructure and climate. The enjoyment of lifestyle and work were also expressed, but these aren’t place based when associated with farming itself and not farming in BC. What this displays is that although locality can be fragile in relation to global shifts (Appadurai, 1996) that local, regional and provincial decision-making and characteristics can strengthen a regions ability to produce food. The results also display how in part these stressors and attractors are connecting to how agricultural production is valued. The disconnections between farmers, consumers and other stakeholders illustrate in part why agriculture production is being shifted and pushed out of the landscape in the FVRD and Delta. Lastly these results display how agriculture comes into conflict with other land-uses, which begins to explain why fragmentation and shifting occurs based on normative values and actions by powerful stakeholders. All of the results begin to shed light on why the number of young farmers is decreasing in these regions in BC. I argue that this is connected in large part to discourse that leads to changes in the landscape, which in both Delta and the FVRD of BC is pushing out agriculture.

Given these results I argue that discourse plays a role in two ways to affect young farmers in BC. The first is a discourse that dichotomizes how consumers see and therefore value agriculture in BC. The second is the discourse around how land-use and land-use planning should occur in BC. When analyzing the latter the role of certain stakeholders, institutions and resources are clear, however the former discourse is not as easily fitted in to Foucault’s theorizing on discourse or the Neo-Marxist framework on
power. The discourse in this sense may be linked to media, however can this be blanketed as one institution, stakeholder or resource?

In the prior section on ‘The Value of Agriculture in BC: Disconnections and Discourses’ in Chapter 4 unravels how the young farmers see themselves as valued by the general public of consumers and how they see consumers as disconnected. The discourses that create dichotomies behind ‘good’ and ‘bad’ agriculture are apparent from the experience that Dale had with the teacher as well as the questions asked by consumers towards Jill about her chickens being GMO. Although the discourse of ‘good,’ agriculture may benefit certain farmers with certain buyers the fact that quota for organic products is not becoming more accessible shows that many people aren’t pulled in by label. In these cases because non-organic is non-organic consumers may not see the difference in other products and choose the cheapest out of province product. This is the North American umbrella I argue where consumers who aren’t connected to agriculture see it in the media (e.g. Food Inc.) and assume that the methods, policy and structuring around production is not different over space. This is harmful in arenas of decision-making as well as with consumer choices. The fact that a well-educated member of the Vancouver Food Policy made the broad assumption that agriculture in the FVRD is ‘big agriculture’ automatically dismisses the whole region. It also begs the question how do you define big agriculture? Farms may be larger in the FVRD then in Vancouver, but are relatively small in regards to farms in the prairies and US. Given that Vancouver holds the largest population in BC and the fact that in an arena where food and agriculture is being discussed that this dismissal is occurring gives cause for concern of who is speaking for farmers in the FVRD (and Delta)? and are they representing them? This disconnection and continued dispersal of discourse can have potential effects on the farmer’s income and policy.

The second discourse around agriculture occurs in places of contestation and conflict. In this arena the discourse revolves around best use practices. What is best for BC’s economy and/or environment? Power becomes embedded in science in this case because of the associated objectivity involved that puts a veil over the bias of actors, and their methodology and language used to make determinations. The fact that bias is involved in science and that the capital by certain stakeholders can assume access to research is not grounds for dismissal. Rather I argue that in terms of creating long-term
land-use policy science, statistics and spreadsheets should not be the only factor in determining best practice. Also given the role of capital in research and determining discourse in order for agriculture to be represented extension needs to increase.

It is also important to note that the results in the section ‘Landscape Understandings, Conflicts and Transformations in Delta and The Fraser Valley Regional District’ in Chapter 4 reveal that the discourse around agriculture in these arenas is not stagnant, but it does seem to change depending on stakeholder’s positions. For instance agriculture that supported the flyway in Delta was deemed as important and connected to non-human aspects of the landscape, but when in the FVRD agriculture affected the Salish Sucker it was deemed as bad for the environment and anthropogenic regardless of whether the practices in agriculture changed.

When in conflict with industrial it is often a discussion around the economy. As for the Port CEO agriculture was seemed as ‘emotionally important,’ but because of its effects on GDP in relation to trade with Asia it was seen as something that could be done elsewhere (sentiment that farmers argue is shared by a large part of the public). In meetings with the DFI and community the Port CEO changed his language in consultation, but as shown by the farmers when agriculture becomes part of the discussion it becomes subservient to industrial (p.118). The farmers agree that the Port is important and so is the environment, but they fall short when railroads and development fragment their land. As shown in the discussion with young farmers the hub and community is important. Although transportation is part of that hub, when it continues to take and fragment land as is seen in Delta, it can dismantle it.

Conflicts with residential land-use provide an interesting cross section for land-use discourse. The first is in the actual discussion around developments. As the ALR is exempted in both the FVRD and Delta because of residential being favoured or the soils being determined to be unsuitable speculation rises for other landowners who are looking to sell. In Delta especially where land outside of the ALR is substantially higher (shown by evaluation of Ron Emmersons’s land bought in Delta for Port) speculation can lead to landowners sitting on the land and not having long-term leases to farmers or farming it themselves. Second is the discourse, or rather imaginings around what farmland and rural spaces come to represent by landowners of the large estates. In this
case the land is valued by the aesthetics and rural idyll, as referred to by Jill as something nostalgic and full of ‘nature’ as in the Little House on the Prairie. Although these spaces have less development because of restrictions in the ALR the production that needs to occur in these spaces does not feed into that nostalgia and aesthetics, which cause conflict. In one aspect farmers can’t afford to compete with landowners in affording land and in the other aspects they may have to change there production practices or stop producing in cases where the government sides with landowners (e.g. laws on amount of odour).

The issue with discourse is that language around how land should be used and what agriculture is, leads to a cyclical pattern where agriculture becomes removed from regions close to highly populated areas. This separation leads to physical barriers where interactions are less likely to occur, which then reinforces discourse by stakeholders who aren’t representing farmers. This affects land-use planning by having agriculture being the land-use that gets consulted with over projects then actually being the project or not consulted with. In the case of discourse around what agriculture it is the dichotomies that occur have led to consumers valuing certain niche markets, and not valuing the actual production. In many cases consumers making the assumption that food products are being produced under one system leads them to choosing cheaper foods. As food becomes valued and consumed in one space at odds with how agricultural production is valued in others spaces the food system becomes unstable. Even if demand is high for goods and people are willing to spend more money on local food and go to restaurants that source local meals at $50, if in the end the land and means of productions are unaffordable we may see a continued decrease in farmers and therefore a decrease in access to consumers of different socio-economic status’ to partake in eating locally source meat, dairy, fruits and vegetables.

The conclusions outlined next in this Chapter are in part recommendations for policy and actions to support young farmers as well as how to plan for long-term agricultural production. These conclusions are also additions to theoretical perspectives in political ecology and land-use planning frameworks. It should be noted that this study had several temporal limitations and that these recommendations reflect this in their broadness. It would therefore be beneficial for future studies looking at individual
Conclusion 1: Lack of Young Farmers is not due to a Shift in Interest to Careers other than Agriculture, but due to Stressors Outweighing the Attractive Aspects of Agriculture in BC.

It has been widely assumed that the decrease in the number of young farmers in BC is a result of young people in this region just not being interested in farming. Through interviews and surveys with young farmers as well as interviews with other stakeholders involved with agriculture this statement was shown to be untrue. Although there are young adults who do not wish to take over the farm many do. There are several who would like to farm, but the financial constraints and the prospects of low returns have made farming unaffordable and inaccessible as a career. These stressors reflect prior academic assessments in Chapter 2 that reflect a decrease in agriculture in the global north due to economic pressures. These financial constraints also lead to the inaccessibility to farm in regions in BC that have the necessary infrastructure as well as social and economic networks that are place based. Although farmers have always faced similar issues because the business is capital intensive and unstable these issues are becoming greater and are aggravated amidst changes in the ‘work’ of farming and changes in the needs and wants of this current generation. The fact that BC has the highest land costs and highest average age of farmers is arguably no coincidence.

One part of the issue of access to farming is with the problems faced by young adults coming from farm families with succession and family dynamics where parents are still tied to the farm financially. This puts up barriers to accessing the family farm. This expands on Fraser et al.’s (2005) assessment that family dynamics are problematic and in BC these stressors directly related to the process of succession. In these cases family and work become intertwined leading to an inability to distinguish work from home life and can create tensions between family members. This can lead to succession being ‘put off’ and may lead to the selling of land to purchasers uninterested in farming. With
the costs of inputs and land being lower in other regions and land and inputs such as quota being more available the young farmers who want to farm still are going elsewhere. Other young adults who see farming as to costly have either chosen other careers, or like Amanda have chosen careers that do support agriculture and volunteer or work for short periods on farms as her and her husband do as relief milkers. For some parents and industry professionals they have pushed young adults towards other careers as they see the primary production as vulnerable to global and local markets and environmental problems such as flooding and pests. The focus needs to be on making sure these potential young farmers who do want to farm have access to the means of production.

In terms of succession efforts by the Federal Government have been made with its Growing Forward movement to put out a guide for Approaching the Porcupine (2011); a fitting name for the process. The document, although valuable, may not be reaching several farmers whom have yet to discuss succession amongst there family. As previously mentioned one of the original intents of the ALR was to give tax breaks to farmers who agreed to pass land down to other farmers. It is recommended that farms in the ALR are notified and encouraged about creating succession plans. Given the current budget of the ALC this may be difficult. However, given the importance of succession having a budget to have a staff member make consultations with farmers, lawyers and other stakeholders involved in the process and to create policy initiatives to promote succession is necessary to ensure access to farms by the new generation of farmers. Also efforts to hire government workers to help create succession plan programs to connect new farmers with current farmers who don’t have successors should be instated to ensure that the ALR is used for production and not sold.

Another issue for young farmers was access to quota, which is one of the few ways that farms can be economically sustainable. The ability to obtain quota has become difficult for this generation of young farmers in two ways. The first is cost. For instance since the mid 1980’s quota costs have approximately tripled (Cairns and Meilke, 2011). Secondly quota in BC in particular is inaccessible with young farmers like Jill being put on waitlists for over two years. Given that the Supply Management system is a National system it is curious that young farmers need to move to other Provinces for quota access. It is not within the scope of this project to make recommendations for
marketing boards beyond the prospect that young farmers need more representation on these boards and associations to promote their needs in different Provinces.

New farmers coming from urban areas and family backgrounds not connected to agriculture have the greatest barriers to cross to become farmers. They face barriers to accessing land, inputs and knowledge from hands on experience with growing for selling purposes. As assessed in Chapter 2 shared knowledge and community, as put forth by Marshall (1890) and later academics, is important in strengthening hubs of production. Given the expectations of planners in the FVRD and Delta that these are the farmers who could potentially give rise to the numbers of farms then increasing internship partnerships is important as well as having arenas for communication; such as those provided by the BCYF and other associations. For urban farmers building relationships with experienced farmers would benefit both parties through knowledge transfer and provide more resources and support for new farmers who face the stress around starting from the ground up. As well having farmers and NGO institutions in Vancouver being connected to the FVRD and Delta can lead to mutual understandings and can help remove some disconnections between farmers in the FVRD and consumers in metropolitan areas, such as Vancouver.

Other stress factors for young farmers were lack of infrastructure and fragmentation of land. Other attractors were the family farm, community and physical environment. Based on these stressors and attractors the next section concludes on necessary changes for policy and planning for agriculture primarily, but not entirely, within the ALR.

**Conclusion 2: The ALR, Although Essential in Protecting Land from Development, in its Current Form does not Promote Agricultural Production nor does it make Land Affordable or Accessible to Young Farmers.**

Results in this research display that young farmers do see the ALR as important, however it is largely unaffordable and inaccessible as a result of speculation and competing land-uses. This reflects the two issues with Katz’s (2009) dismissal of the ALR. These are that she doesn’t properly define ‘unused land’ nor does she look at
causality. Conclusions of this paper reflect what the ALC sees as faults within the ALR, which are that although it does to a certain extent protect the amount agricultural spaces in BC that it does not promote agriculture. Unfortunately rather then focusing on that part of their mandate the ALC has changed it to “to encourage farming on agricultural land in collaboration with other communities of interest” (Bullock, 2013, P.1). Given that the intent of the original Commission was to stand in to promote agricultural interests in decision-making arenas this displays how agriculture may only become valued in reference to other land-uses by the ALC. This does however positively display the ALC’s efforts to be collaborative with communities. Still given that BC only has 1.2% arable land this may be detrimental in the end as other interests are used to transform that landscape at the expense of agricultural production. This relates to the political ecology perspective put forth by Abrams and Gosnell (2012), Peet and Watts (2004), and Walker and Fortmann (2003) that we create imaginaries of what the proper way it is to create a landscape (ways of interacting with non-human aspects of the environment) in decision-making arenas. If the ALC changes the way they observe how the ALR should be used it means farmers interests may not fully be recognized in these arenas as oppose to other stakeholder interests.

This ties to another conclusion surrounding the implementation of the ALR. Currently the ALR is primarily based on soil class when there are many other factors that attract young farmers and agriculture to certain regions. Lastly the ALR is restrictive to new types of farming and young farmers and therefore other policies and/or initiatives to promote these types of agriculture on non-ALR spaces.

There are three issues to expand on with the ALR; exemptions, speculation and competing accepted land-uses. As shown in Table 3 the largest amount of exemptions of the ALR is granted to government not private owners. Land inclusions are then placed in colder, arid and more isolated regions, which do not reflect the attractive elements described by the young farmers in this study. Although the amount of exemptions to the ALR has been decreasing since the 1980s, the amount of land-use changes is on the rise. There are also a large amount of landowners that do farm on the majority of there land if at all. Young farmers have expressed their frustrations with owners who build rural estates on prime agricultural land with no intent to produce food. Given the amount
of ALR as part of the land base in BC these rural estates are preventing agricultural production not only at present, but the future as well.

In order to promote agricultural production in the ALR and make it accessible to young farmers there are four recommendations. The first is that the ALR’s relevance should not only be focused solely on soils, but on social and economic factors that contribute to successful agriculture when making decisions around exemptions and inclusions. For example when large governmental exclusions are being determined young farmers who would like access to that land should be part of the consultation process. As mentioned in the Chapter 4 young farmers need to be around their community (whether religious or friends who gather with common interests) and physical infrastructure that help there business (e.g. subsidiary industries and highways for distribution of goods). The FVRD specifically is an example of an agricultural hub, which has been created through several historic initiatives where shared knowledge, subsidiary industries, infrastructure and shared goals has created a highly productive region that can’t be recreated elsewhere in BC.

Secondly farm status should not just be based on income, but percentage of land base in production. As well class 1 and 2 class ALR soils need higher restrictions on land-use. Lastly as discussed by Mark Robbins in an interview, landowners should be taxed based on land-use. For instance if someone chooses to build an estate they should be taxed for residential use and not given reduced taxes for living in the ALR. These changes would discourage other land-uses as well as speculation and make the land more accessible to farmers.

The ALR is policy that can help some young farmers get access to land, however there is a new segment of urban young farmers that need other ways to access land and housing. Given that the ALR prevents subdivisions these small-scale farmers can find it difficult to start. Therefore other options such as community farm projects, spin farms and community gardens need to be implemented in planning. Policy at the Municipal and Provincial level could be used to promote these initiatives. In the case of spin/backyard farms tax incentives could be given to landowners to promote long-term (approx. 10 year) leases on land for small land parcels outside of the ALR.
Conclusion 3: 
Extension Services for Agriculture have Decreased Despite Local Food Discourses and Initiatives

In this study some young farmers felt that through the current local food movement that the general public was becoming more aware and supportive of buying, however most were sceptical based on the fact that the majority of consumers still prefer to buy cheaper food products. This is supported by consumer reports that display the percentage of income British Columbians are spending on food is decreasing. As well many of them did not think that the government (mainly Provincial) outside of the Ministry of Agriculture was supportive or valued agriculture in BC, which was displayed by budget cuts and the constant removal of the ALR. Given the consistent need for initiatives and marketing to promote local consumption in BC this displays that there are underlying norms and systemic issues that prevent the success of local food movements that need further analysis.

Extension for agriculture has been removed in BC as explained by planners and displayed by budgets. This has made farmers reliant on the haphazard and inconsistent curves of supply and demand. This is problematic given the prior assessment that how final food products do not incorporate the value of production. Consumers are often not aware of the inputs, losses and regulations that local farmers face in comparison to other cheaper foods. They also may not realize that their choices greatly impact how food is produced or whether it can continue to be produced in BC. Lastly, how land and land-use is valued is different from final products that get produced from that use. For example overall in the Lower Mainland demand for residential developments is higher than agriculture, as well the land-uses may seem more aesthetically pleasing. In order for the local food movement to gain traction the conversation needs to shift away from the ‘tastes’ of locality, to focus on concern in arenas of production. Further studies in academia of geographies of consumption would allow for us to understand what is and isn’t valued by consumers in relation to local food and local agricultural spaces. This was unfortunately beyond the scope of this research project.
Conclusion 4: Disconnections occur at Smaller Regional Scales between Producers and Consumers due to Discourses and Lack of Interactions

“The game has changed. It’s a lot. People don’t see it though. Farmers are on their farms. They’re doing their thing. They’re trying to make money. They are not out there advertising these new technologies that they’re using. Saying hey look at me. Look at the billboard. I’m being green. Those kind of things. Farmers are concentrating on their land, concentrating on their product. They are growing stuff. They are not always communicators [laughs]. Most of us farm chickens cause they don’t talk back. It’s finding the right way to tell our story. Bruce Benson is great at encouraging farmers to do that. BCAC is great at supporting us. That’s one outlet for this. Have BCAC supporting us. BCYF is another way. Um we not only communicate with each other. We do go around. We talk to various people. Various industries have their ways. Milk guys they have their, they have their truck that goes around that has the cow in their that they milk. How do you milk a cow. Educate people on the process of farming.” Dale

The lack of interactions between farmers and the general public in BC along with a culture where global ideas and media shapes and inform discourses around food has created several disconnections between consumers and farmers. This was touched on and is connected to the previous conclusion of lack of extension. This illustrates how disconnections don’t merely occur over large-scale distances nor is it only an issue of ‘western’ consumers and ‘non-western’ producers. It is production itself that becomes normalized, devalued or valued, and veiled.

This research displays the misconceptions young farmers have faced in interactions with the general public. The disconnections were putting Canadian farmers under the umbrella of the North American corporate production system, dichotomizing farms and farmer into good and bad, and not connecting land and agricultural production to food and food prices. By having mediascapes and ideascapes that attempt to normalize a diverse system affects farmers who attempt to use better production methods that lead to higher priced goods. These goods are then overlooked by consumers as the same as others, but more costly.

One interesting theme that connected each of the farmer’s stories of experiences with disconnected consumers was the amount of distrust people had towards them and the amount of trust they give to media and marketing. This displays the power of certain knowledge transfers as global ideas contort local realities.
One positive program in BC that connects products to local agriculture is the non-profit Agriculture in the Class Room. One example is with dairy farms. Not only is there funding to support local milk being given to students in school, but students are taken to farms to understand where that milk comes from. Similar experiences happen with agri-tourism although only certain commodities benefit from this type of consumer behaviour. The recommendations are for increased support of Agriculture in the Class Room as well as an increase in education aimed towards adults not just children as the adults have purchasing power. Currently farmers are being marketed to the public, by the government and buyers such as Save On Foods in BC, but the actual education occurring is minimal and these short clips reinforce the same imaginaries of production that have been prominent in the past. Farmers and their associations need to be a part of outreach programs that seek public arenas where they can interact with consumers so that they can bridge gaps in communication and education from both farmers and consumers.

**Conclusion 5: Changes in the Landscape Reflect that Agriculture Production is not as Valued and Supported to the Same Extent as Other Land-Uses by Stakeholders, Especially Key Decision Makers, Despite Rhetoric in Surveys and the Local Food Movement**

Both the FVRD and Delta’s agricultural spaces suffer from conflicts from other land-uses. Delta being a city within Metro Vancouver is far more subject to sprawl and the effects on agriculture are far more prominent. However, given the lack of long-term planning for agriculture with specific initiative to promote agricultural production in both regions the FVRD is beginning to see the pressure of urban and industrial sprawl. It has the potential to suffer the same fate as Delta where they loose secondary industries and see the ALR deteriorate. Although in surveys the general public states that they support and want agricultural spaces it is in the key arenas for decision-making that this support does not show up. It is farmers and supportive organizations and institutions that protect the ALR. In Delta protecting the ALR has mobilized to become a tool used to promote green initiatives and residential motives against industry, by the general public. Although farmers saw this as beneficial, it did not display support for agriculture as a land-use in itself.
In terms of planning one positive aspect is that Official community plans (OCPs) are beginning to include agriculture, however they are broad and whether they promote agricultural land-uses is questionable. For instance Ladner’s OCP includes one section on agriculture and the environment, which is as follows:

“Protect and enhance the urban development in East Ladner by retaining existing trees and separating the urban area from the adjacent agricultural lands by pursuing buffers, such as playfields, bicycle and pedestrian routes, and other similar landscaped recreational areas. Retain as many trees as possible during site development or redevelopment. Require a two-to-one replacement ratio for trees removed as part of the development or redevelopment of commercial, multiple-family residential, or more than two single-family units.” (Corporation of Delta, 2013, 81-7)

A second more influential aspect is that farmers and their advocate groups, such as the DFI are being heard in decision-making spheres. Although the Delta Port expansion and SFPR were detrimental to agriculture, the ability to negotiate an enhancement strategy that benefits farmers does show that agriculture is viewed to have value. Although agriculture is not promoted in comparison to conservation with the Farmland and Wildlife Trust Fund, the funds farmers receive also displays that their needs to an extent are acknowledged. The fact, however that farmers and advocacy groups have to fight battles to continue to be a part of the landscape displays that although the public at large states in surveys agriculture is important that there actions and the actions of the government that represents them do not suggest that this land-use supported in comparison to other land-uses. This is problematic especially given that fragmentation is a large stressor on the agricultural sector. Future research needs to be done to answer the question of why in BC agriculture spaces are seen as not a necessity in certain cities and regions. As previously mentioned findings from this research suggest that consumers are too distant from spaces of production to understand and actively support production. The lack of famine and the increase of spaces of consumption where food supply is seemingly endless leads to this lack of support. The general publics’ value on the aesthetics of consumptive landscape in preference over productive landscapes is also harmful in this context. As will be discussed later imaginaries of best use practises of how to interact with non-human aspects of the environment have led to other land-uses being chosen in key decision
making arenas. The limitation of these assessments is that this study has focused on producer perspectives and has generalized consumptive behaviour. What is needed is further study on consumptive habits of locality in terms of food and agriculture to explain some of these outcomes.

**Theoretical Perspectives 1: Shifts in the Landscape away from Agricultural Production in BC do not fit within Wilson’s Theorization**

In the literature review and within this research Wilson’s theories on the causality of shifts away from production in the landscape are shown to be misrepresentative given geographic variability. In looking at the results from Chapter 4 it can be observed in part that changes are occurring because young and new farmers who have productivist and multifunctional interests cannot access land based on speculation and competing land-uses. The amount of contested visions have led to the fragmentation and shifting of agricultural production that has made land, which is necessary for all farmers, even more inaccessible to young and new farmers. What is illustrated is that these multifunctional spaces are not created by the breakdown of farmer relationships with associations or institutions so that environmental interest can be initiated. It is actually the interests of competing land-uses from all spheres that are pushing out agriculture, which are strengthening these relationships so that farmers are represented. This occurs as public support is not displayed in key moments of decision-making for agriculture. Also as fragmentation has occurred initiatives such as the SFAES are being implemented to create more intensified agriculture so that outputs remain the same and viable.

Given the variation in causality that occurs because of geography it is important not to normalize shifts in the landscape through what Evans et al. describe as a catchphrase (Evans et al., 2002). It is through observing causality in shifts that academics can begin to observe the underlying power structures and norms that create locality and through these understandings that we can make informed decisions on how to prevent the erosion of production while attempting to meet the needs of other integral land-uses.
One final statement for a point of further inquiry is that the erosion of agriculture and production in BC, Nevada or Wallowa County does not impact the consumption of the products produced in these spaces. Therefore production will likely continue to expand elsewhere. This in theory can cause a greater divide between producers and consumers and lead to the larger issues that Cook (2007) describes when observing the papaya chain. This creates more disparity between the global north and south while promoting supply chains that given our current energy crisis cannot and should not be sustained.

**Theoretical Perspectives 2: Reflections on Power Structures: Understandings and Transformations in the Landscape**

How transformations unfold in BC between conservation and agriculture follow Peet and Watts (2004) theorizing around environmental imaginaries and occur largely as Abrams and Gosnell state because limited space leads to confrontation “where struggles to define the meaning of the natural environment and how communities structure their relations with nature take place” (2012, p.31). As we begin to look into research questions that go beyond one policy that effects land-use these theories, although relevant, don’t explain all power relations. By power relations referring to how different groups exert power through capital, standing, science and technology in decision-making arenas. Although different stakeholders determine the best land-use often through science and technology, other factors become present, such as ownership, and social and cultural favourable characteristics.

For instance the demand by residents to decrease smell and noise isn’t rooted in science, but in their idea as to how rural landscapes should be produced and consumed. These ideas of how living within the ALR are not produced locally as production proceeds this, but reflects the ideology produced through what Appadurai (1996) describes as ideascapes and mediascapes. As these ideas intrude in decision-making arenas through policy that restricts and prevents agriculture production it displays that the locality is changed given its fragility. This does and doesn’t occur based on the power of the residents versus farmers. I would argue in this case this stems from normative values, capital and ownership of land, and the ability to be present in
community hearings. Farmers do not have the capital to compete with residents who
careers give them higher wages and are often busy farming so the end up loosing out
having there needs reflected in the landscape.

Based on these findings power reflects an interaction between Foucault’s and
Neo-Marxist theorizations. How the landscape is understood and the determinants for its
transformation rely on social constructions that are expelled through sciences, social
practices and media where these seemingly normative ideas for proper use then inform
the landscape. At the same time these social constructions are brought forward by each
group of stakeholders, and therefore the idea that powerful stakeholders in this case
land owners, government, NGO’s and farmers are able to exert financial and political
power based on there resources. In this way power to an extent “is omnipresent and
formative, that it becomes embodied in social practice’ and discourse, but how these
processes and discourses occur and reflect on the landscape is effected to a larger
extent by its circulation “among and between different social groups, resources, and
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Appendix.

Survey

Survey Questionnaire

Title of Study: The Role of Landscape Understandings, Transformation and the Political Economy of Agriculture in Attracting or Averting Young Adults from Farming in British Columbia

SFU Office of Research Ethics Reference number: [2012s0431]

Thank you for agreeing to fill out this survey for my research project titled: The Role of Landscape Understandings, Transformation and the Political Economy of Agriculture in Attracting or Averting Young Adults from Farming in British Columbia. I am a graduate student at SFU undertaking this study for a Masters of Arts degree in Geography at SFU under the supervision of Professor Peter Hall. This section clarifies the conditions of the survey and must be filled out at the bottom in order to participate.

This research is being done to provide insight to the question: why in spite of pro-local agricultural initiatives in BC by some consumers and government officials, there seems to be a decrease in young farmers? The main objective is to understand how the current landscape in BC and the political and economic conditions surrounding agriculture is attracting and pushing away young farmers in the region. A second objective is to understand how young farmers are valued as part of the landscape in British Columbia, by whom, and is it a sufficient enough of a representation in order to sustain livelihoods and an adequate local food supply. You and your community may benefit from the findings in this study in the case that they are used to shape policy and planning to incorporate farmer’s perspectives in order to sustain livelihoods, and local agricultural production that can potentially meet demand for local and non-local consumption.

This research is independent; no government, agency, institution, private interest, or organization has commissioned this research. Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary and you can choose to withdraw from the study at anytime.
without consequence. Your participation in this study (or withdrawal if you choose) will have no impact on your membership or status in the British Columbia Young Farmers Association (BCYF). Other members of the BCYF will have no knowledge of the information within your individual survey, as it will be returned to the primary investigator of this study. Ideally, I would like you to answer all questions, but please feel free to decline any or all questions you would rather not answer. I will make every effort to protect your privacy in the study process. All information you give will be stored securely and separately from this consent form either digitally in a password protected USB or hard drive that along with any hard copy or voice recording will be locked storage. Your name will be kept confidential in the thesis, however since you will be returning this survey via e-mail or mail I cannot promise 100% confidentiality. Your answers will be combined with those provided by other respondents.

If you have any questions please contact Kelly Baldwin at 604-612-5999 or kab18@sfu.ca. The research has been reviewed and approved by the SFU Office of Research Ethics (ORE). You may address any concerns or complaints to Dr. Peter V. Hall, Urban Studies Program, Simon Fraser University, 515 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, BC V6B 5K3(pvhall@sfu.ca), or as a secondary contact, The Director of the Office of Research Ethics: Dr. Hal Weinberg, Director (Office of Research Ethics), Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive, Multi-Tenant Facility, Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6 (hal_weinberg@sfu.ca). The SFU Office of Research Ethics Reference number is: 2012s0431

This study will be published as a thesis under the auspices of SFU. Once completed, my thesis paper will be published, and available for you to view within SFU’s Institutional Repository called Summit (http://summit.sfu.ca/). You may also obtain copies of the results of this study and/or request a presentation, by contacting Kelly Baldwin (kab18@sfu.ca) or her supervisor Dr. Peter V. Hall (pvhall@sfu.ca), Urban Studies Program, Simon Fraser University, 515 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, BC V6B 5K3. I may also seek to publish versions of the study in academic and policy publications. All participants will be invited to my thesis defense, which will be open to the public.
I ______________ agree, of my own free will, to participate in this questionnaire survey for: The Role of Landscape Understandings, Transformation and the Political Economy of Agriculture in Attracting or Averting Young Adults from Farming in British Columbia., 2012-13 (please check). ☐YES ☐NO

1) How did you become interested in farming?

2) What region(s) do you farm within? And why have you chosen to farm there?

3) How did you gain the skills to become a farmer (e.g. family, post secondary education, apprenticeship)?

4) Did you participate in the 4H club as a child or youth?

5) Do you have any other jobs/careers? If yes, please list

6) Do you rent or own your farmland? If you own farmland, did a family member pass it down or sell it to you?

7) a) What different types of commodities do you grow and sell throughout the year?

b) Are, or have you been involved in agri-tourism? If yes to either how has or did it impact your farm?

8) Do you sell through supply management or community supported agriculture (CSA)? If yes, how has this effected your farm (positively or negatively) If no, why?

9) Do you think that the current Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) initiatives supports farming over non-farming uses (e.g. golf courses) of ALR land?

10) Do you think that the ALR is important policy for BC? Would you like to see any changes within that policy?

11) How affordable do you think land within the ALR is for yourself and other young farmers?

Very affordable __ Affordable __ Neutral __ Unaffordable __ Very unaffordable __ Unsure __

Comments
12) Do you think that Agriculture is supported and valued by the government in comparison to other land-uses (e.g. residential)?

Well supported___ Some support___ No Support___ Unsure___

Well Valued___ Some Value____ Not Valued___ Unsure___

Comments:

13) Do you think that Agricultural production is supported and valued by the general public in BC?

Well supported___ Some support___ No Support___ Unsure___

Well Valued___ Some Value____ Not Valued___ Unsure___

Comments:

14 a) Do you sell locally (within BC) or to other markets?

b) If you sell locally, how much support do you think buyers and consumers give you

Well supported__ Some support__ No Support___ Unsure___

Comments:

15) What are your opinions on the current local food initiatives in BC?

16) Have you benefited from any government programs, bursaries or grants?

17) If you have had contact with government officials, employees or city planners was it through:

e-mail____ phone _____ face to face communication___ Other (please list):

18) How would you describe your relationship with other farmers in your city or region?
19) Are you aware of any organizations or associations that support young farmers, and farmers in general that you have contact with or are a part of? If yes, please list and give a brief description of the impact of this organization on your farm (if any).

20) Do you know any other young adults who have shown interest in farming, but decided not to take it on as a career? If yes for what reasons?

Other (if yes please describe):

21) Do you know any young farmers who have left BC to farm elsewhere? If yes, where and why?

22) Why do you think farming is valuable in BC? Do you think the general public in BC value farming in this way?

23) Have you considered farming elsewhere? If yes please list the place(s) and reasons for why you are or were interested in farming there?

24) What are the most attractive aspects of farming for you?

25) Where have you received support from that has benefited you and your farm?

26) What difficulties (if any) have you had in farming (e.g. hiring and keeping employees, costs of inputs, climate factors, work stress)?

27) Are you willing to be contacted for a potential follow up interview Yes or No:

If there are any additional comments please add them below. Thank you once again for participating in this study.