

WORKING LANDSCAPES IN THE MIDWEST:

Creating Sustainable Futures for Agriculture, Forestry & Communities

Conference Proceedings



**November 8 - 9, 2001
Lake Lawn Resort
Delavan, Wisconsin**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	2
Acknowledgements	3
Conference Program	4
Plenary Addresses:	
David Zach, Futurist: <i>“The Future and Changing Paradigms”</i>	7
Phil Lewis, President, Marshall Erdman Academy of Sustainable Design: <i>“Sustainability and Multifunctional Working Landscapes”</i>	10
Kathleen Falk, Dane County, Wisconsin, Executive: <i>“Myths, Policies and Institutions Impacting Sustainable Working Landscapes”</i>	15
Plenary Buzz Sessions: Reflections on Morning Plenaries and Roundtable Discussions Addressing Key Statements on Working Landscapes	20
Lunch Addresses:	
Bonnie McGregor, Regional Director, United States Geological Survey	22
Albert Appleton, Senior Fellow, Regional Plan Association	24
A Tool Box for Sustainable Working Landscapes: Panels and Discussions	30
Tool Box Agenda	32
Tool Box Presentation Abstracts	36
Policy Panel: <i>“Do New Policies and Initiatives Promote Sustainable Working Landscapes?”</i>	49
Sandra Batie, Elton R. Smith Professor in Food and Agricultural Policy, Michigan State University: <i>“The Farm Bill Predicament: Its Historical Roots and Prospects for the Future”</i>	50
Wayne Edgerton, Agricultural Policy Director, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources: <i>“Conservation Aspects of the Farm Bill”</i>	56
Gene Francisco, Wisconsin State Forester, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources: <i>“Forestry and the Farm Bill”</i>	58
Chuck Hassebrook, Executive Director, Center for Rural Affairs: <i>“The Farm Bill and Rural Communities”</i>	60
Reports on Key Themes and Observations:	
Laurel Kieffer, Sheep Dairy Farmer and Citizen Advisor, University of Wisconsin Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems	62
Timothy Bowser, Executive Director, Fires of Hope	65
Harvesting Ideas for Change: Breakout Sessions on Needs and Opportunities for Advancing Sustainable Working Landscapes	67
Innovating Smart Growth to Include Multi-Generational Rural and Urban Sustainability Goals	68
Exploring Cutting-Edge Stewardship Options for Backyards, Farms, Forests and Landscape Partnerships I	70
Exploring Cutting-Edge Stewardship Options for Backyards, Farms, Forests and Landscape Partnerships II	72
Measuring Success and Selecting Appropriate Sustainability Indicators	74
Experimenting with New Products and Market Innovations to Support Sustainable Working Landscapes	76
Community Dialoguing, Visioning, Organizing and Decision-Making that Promote Sustainable Policies and Working Landscapes	78
Driftless Region/Greater Blufflands Region Proposed Forum for Landscape/Environmental Issues	80
Lunch Address: Jim Drescher, Windhorse Farms: <i>“Generosity in the Working Landscape”</i>	83
Harvest Festival: Needs and Opportunities, Recommendations and Strategies for Sustainable Working Landscapes	89
Closing Plenary:	
George Boody, Executive Director, Land Stewardship Project, <i>“Challenges and Pathways to Create Working Landscapes”</i>	91
Jean Buffalo-Reyes, Red Cliff Tribe	93
Appendix I: Biographical Sketches of Plenary Speakers	94
Appendix II: Conference Co-sponsors	100
Appendix III: Conference Exhibitors	102
Appendix IV: Conference Participants	104
Appendix V: Upcoming Events	116

FOREWORD

On November 8th and 9th, 2001, after almost two years of visioning and planning, over 200 individuals gathered in Delavan, Wisconsin, for a conference entitled *Working Landscapes in the Midwest: Creating Sustainable Futures for Agriculture, Forestry and Communities*. It was an unprecedented gathering that brought together an unusual cross-section of individuals, organizations and agencies to explore practices and policies promoting land-based economic activity that sustains families, communities and ecosystems while providing multiple benefits to society. Conference participants included farmers, federal and state agency staff, non-profit organizations, entrepreneurs, farmworker advocacy groups, students, foresters, elected county officials, planners, policy analysts, Tribal representatives, extension agents, professors, co-op leaders, scientists and marketers.

The goal in bringing together such a diverse group was threefold:

- 1) To nurture a new integrative *mindset* for addressing economic, social and environmental issues
- 2) To create a *groundswell* for action around these issues
- 3) To establish a *foundation* from which local, regional and national dialogues about working landscapes can be catalyzed

Throughout two days of presentations, workshops and breakout sessions, perspectives were shared and stories were told. Many topics were explored, from farmer-organized dairy cooperatives to the policy implications of the Farm Bill. Discussions yielded mutually reinforcing definitions for working landscapes; brainstorming sessions produced goals and strategies for transforming working landscapes concepts into action.

The pervasive question at the close of the Working Landscapes conference was *where is this working landscapes idea going?* The remarkable answer from most of the participants was *home to my community*. Between existing projects and new undertakings coming out of the Working Landscapes gathering in Delavan, it is clear that a groundswell is building behind this vision.

An important note: ***this is not a new movement***. Pieces of the working landscapes vision have for many years been embodied by the sustainable agriculture movement, the eco-forestry movement, the smart-growth movement, the conservation movement, the green business movement and by all of the committed individual landowners who are “doing the right thing” in spite of the economic costs. As one conference participant expressed, “It feels like we’re using new words to describe our ongoing work.” In many respects this is true. The difference, however, is twofold. First, the goal of working landscapes is to link each of these movements together, in an effort to pool resources and knowledge and to achieve critical mass. Second, working landscapes emphasizes the need to begin partnering with non-traditional allies such as bankers, developers, insurance brokers, distributors, corporations and government.

It is clear that the promise is there. Grassroots manifestations of the working landscapes vision prove that unlikely partnerships can be forged and can be fruitful. We must now transfer this energy, these successes, into a larger political strategy that will put working landscapes on the national radar screen.

For more information on working landscapes, please visit <http://www.workinglandscapes.org>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to extend our gratitude to the many organizations, agencies, businesses and individuals whose dedication of time, energy and resources helped guarantee the success of the Working Landscapes Conference: Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, the Federal agency partners of the Midwest Natural Resources Group, Meridian Institute, Fires of Hope, U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Geological Survey, Land Stewardship Project, Rural Action, Midwest Organic and Sustainable Education Services, Trees Forever, National Agroforestry Center, University of Wisconsin Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems, North Central Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service Northeastern Area – State and Private Forestry, the Ford Foundation, the Turner Foundation, the True North Foundation, the Surdna Foundation and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Thank you also to the numerous organizations that co-sponsored the Working Landscapes Conference. (A complete listing of co-sponsors can be found in Appendix II.)

Special thanks to Cedar Grove Cheese, Inc., Summit Brewing Company, Future Fruit Farm, Nokomis Bakery, Peace Coffee and Lake Lawn Resort for their generous donations of food, beverages and services at the Working Landscapes Conference.

And finally, to all of the presenters and participants at the Working Landscapes Conference, your input was invaluable and your passion inspiring. May we all forge ahead with renewed intent.

Working Landscapes Conference Steering Committee:

Zoe Bradbury, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
David Carvey, Natural Resources Conservation Service
William Franz, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Elisa Graffy, U.S. Geological Survey
Tammy Keith, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Jim Kleinschmit, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Steve Light, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Michelle Miller, University of Wisconsin Center for
Integrated Agricultural Systems
Donna Myers, U.S. Geological Survey

Jennifer Pratt-Miles, Meridian Institute
Rex Raimond, Meridian Institute
Mark Ritchie, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Heather Schoonover, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
John Sowl, National Park Service
Barb Spears, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Barbara Stinson, Meridian Institute
Caroline van Shaik, Land Stewardship Project
John Vickery, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy

Working Landscapes Conference Proceedings Committee:

Zoe Bradbury, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Marin Byrne, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Jim Kleinschmit, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Steve Light, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy

Jennifer Pratt-Miles, Meridian Institute
Heather Schoonover, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Barb Spears, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Barbara Stinson, Meridian Institute

These conference proceedings were compiled by the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy and the Meridian Institute. Several of the talks and discussions contained herein were summarized from available notes and video footage. Any inaccuracies are the responsibility of the Working Landscapes Conference Proceedings Committee.

WORKING LANDSCAPES IN THE MIDWEST:

Creating Sustainable Futures for Agriculture, Forestry & Communities

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Wednesday, November 7, 2001

5:00 PM EVENING PRE-CONFERENCE REGISTRATION

5:00 PM RECEPTION*/CASH BAR

Thursday, November 8, 2001

7:00 AM CONFERENCE REGISTRATION / CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

8:00 AM MORNING PLENARY: Welcome, Introductions, Goals of the Conference, Attendees Roles and Intended Outcomes: Steve Light, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy; Dave Carvey, Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA; Barbara Stinson, Meridian Institute

8:15 AM KEYNOTE ADDRESS: David Zach, Futurist “The Future and Changing Paradigms”

9:15 AM ADDRESS: Phil Lewis, President, Marshall Erdman Academy of Sustainable Design: “Sustainability and Multifunctional Working Landscapes”

9:55 AM ADDRESS: Kathleen Falk, Dane County, Wisconsin Executive: “Myths, Policies & Institutions Impacting Sustainable Working Landscapes”

10:40 AM BREAK

* Thanks to Cedar Grove Cheese, Inc., Future Fruit Farms, and Summit Brewing Company for their generous contributions

11:00 AM PLENARY “BUZZ” SESSIONS: Reflections on Morning Plenaries & Roundtable Discussions Addressing Key Statements on Working Landscapes

- To me, healthy working landscapes are ones that ...
- If we want to see healthy working landscapes, then we need ... to happen.
- The quality of life in my community is dependent on ...
- Barriers to healthy working landscapes in our communities include ...
- Healthy working landscapes maintain specific characteristics such as ...
- Ecological systems in a healthy working landscape have qualities such as ...
- Our vision for healthy working landscapes is one that ...
- National, state or local policies that would help us create and maintain healthy working landscapes include ...

12:30 PM LUNCH & ADDRESSES:

- Albert Appleton, Senior Fellow, Regional Plan Association
- Bonnie McGregor, Regional Director, U.S. Geological Survey

2:00 PM A TOOL BOX FOR SUSTAINABLE WORKING LANDSCAPES: Panels and Discussions in the Following Areas:

- Landscape Conservation Approaches in Practice
- Citizen-based Planning and Community Visioning
- Delivering Assistance to the Landscape
- Community Revitalization and Change
- Picking Your Targets and Knowing if You Hit Them
- Environmental Management
- Approaches to Influencing Policies and Programs
- New Products and Markets

4:40 PM BREAK

4:50 PM PLENARY PANEL SESSION: “Do New Policy Initiatives Promote Sustainable Working Landscapes?”

- Sandra S. Batie, Elton R. Smith Professor in Food & Agricultural Policy, Michigan State University;
- Wayne Edgerton, Agricultural Policy Director, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources;
- Gene Francisco, State Forester, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources;
- Chuck Hassebrook, Executive Director, Center for Rural Affairs

6:15 PM RECEPTION* & NETWORKING: Exhibits and Tool Box Follow-up

7:15 PM DINNER

8:30 PM ADJOURN

* Thanks to Cedar Grove Cheese, Inc., Future Fruit Farms, and Summit Brewing Company for their generous contributions

Friday, November 9, 2001

7:30 AM CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST

8:00 AM REPORTS ON KEY THEMES AND OBSERVATIONS:

- **Timothy Bowser, Executive Director, Fires of Hope**
- **Laurel Kieffer, Sheep Dairy Farmer and Citizen Advisor, University of Wisconsin, Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems**

9:00 AM HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE: Breakout Discussions on Needs and Opportunities for Advancing Sustainable Working Landscapes in Five Topical Areas

- **Innovating smart growth to include multi-generational rural and urban sustainability goals**
- **Exploring cutting-edge stewardship options for backyards, farms, forests, and landscape partnerships**
- **Measuring success and selecting appropriate sustainability indicators**
- **Experimenting with new products and market innovations to support sustainable working landscapes**
- **Community dialoguing, visioning, organizing and decision-making that promote sustainable policies and working landscapes**

10:30 AM BREAK

10:50 AM HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE CONTINUED: Breakout Discussions on Needs and Opportunities for Advancing Sustainable Working Landscapes in Five Topical Areas

12:00 PM LUNCH & ADDRESS: Jim Drescher, Windhorse Farms, Nova Scotia: “In Harmony With Nature — A Wholistic Approach”

1:30 PM PLENARY DISCUSSION -- HARVEST FESTIVAL: Needs and Opportunities, Recommendations and Strategies for Sustainable Working Landscapes

3:00 PM BREAK

3:15 PM CLOSING PLENARY ADDRESSES: “Pathways to the Future”

- **George Boody, Executive Director, Land Stewardship Project, “Challenges and Pathways to Create Working Landscapes”**
- **Jean Buffalo-Reyes, Red Cliff Tribe**

4:00 PM CLOSING REMARKS AND CONFERENCE ADJOURNMENT

KEYNOTE ADDRESS:

David Zach
Futurist

“The Future and Changing Paradigms”

November 8, 2001

Preface: Rather than give a detailed account of the technology and trends mentioned in my talk, I'm going to limit this article to some perspectives on how to think about those trends and changes. That way, if you read this five years from now, it might still be worth reading. I'm also sprinkling a few of my favorite quotes into it, giving some suggestion of the inspirations for my conclusions.

1. A skeptical futurist. The first thing to know about futurism is to be skeptical about it. People will use statistics to prove something that your intuition should tell you is non-sensible, but if it's done with logic and eloquence, we often believe it.

You may recall that I statistically proved that in the future just about everyone will end up being an Elvis impersonator. One would hope that you used your own intuition to suspect that just being a futurist doesn't provide automatic legitimacy for the forecasts made.

Quote: Gregg Easterbrook: If you torture numbers enough, they'll confess to anything.

Quote: Robert Bernstein: In an age of information, only intuition can protect you from the most dangerous individual of all, the articulate incompetent.

2. There are always alternatives. It's important to always remember that the future is full of alternatives. Some alternatives are likely, and some are obscure. Your task would be to figure out how to get from where we are now to where you want us to be. If the popular notion of the future isn't where you want to go, then you have to choose between being quiet and going along or organizing your thoughts and your allies to fight the good fight. Keep in mind that the future doesn't just happen, it's something we build day by day, step by step.

3. There are always implications. No matter what you do, something else is going to happen. Most of the time, the implications of our actions go unnoticed by most and they don't have far reaching implications. Some implications are global in scale. The real mark of a futurist, or anyone who recognizes their interest in making sure we have a good future, is to try to anticipate what are the implications of our actions. Most important, they need to take this forward, and identify the implications of the implications.

Note that in the Iroquois Confederacy, probably the longest lasting democracy in the world, the impact of decisions is supposed to be considered unto the seventh generation. One might suspect that in such a society, there are few chances taken and few leaps of advancement made, but they certainly do think about the future. It's a start.

Quote: Jacques Maritain: A man of courage flees forward, in the midst of new things.

4. *There will always be failure.* One of the unique things about America is that you not only have the freedom to succeed, you also have the freedom to fail. That's actually rarer than you might suspect. The freedom to try and fail, and then try again is one of the great contributions that America has made to the world. Too much of the world fears failure, and in many societies, if you do fail, you're permanently out of the game. In America, especially in the entrepreneurial sectors, if you haven't failed, you're probably not trying hard enough. This is closely related to the notion of play, in which failure is an ordinary and safe part of the play.

Quote: W.C. Fields: If at first you don't succeed, try, try, again. Then give up. There's no sense in being a damn fool about it.

5. *The definition of futuristic.* Futuristic means anything that has value in the future. It does not mean the latest, cool high tech toy. Those are simply cool, high tech toys. Look at those same high tech toys a year from now and they are like, sooo twentieth century.

Now go look at your favorite natural scene. Notice the beauty, notice the natural systems, and notice the timelessness. Those things, though often undervalued, have value that transcends time. Those are things that we will, or at least should, value at any time in the future. That's futuristic.

Let's take this a step further. How do you find a balance between change and continuity? Quite clearly, not all change is progress, nor is it all forward. Are there things that should never change? Are there things that you're holding onto with all your might, but in reality you're clinging to mostly because it makes you comfortable and not because it's valuable to others? Do you agree with the words of Ogden Nash, "progress is fine, but it's gone on too long?"

Quote: Ralph Waldo Emerson: The excellent is new forever.

Quote: Eric Hoffer: You can never get enough of what you really don't need.

6. *Who makes you think outside of the box?* We all think we're open to change, but if you scratch the surface of most people, you'll find that most of us really think that change is what other people need to do. If only other people would see the light, then we'd finally have progress, achieve a higher moral purpose and everybody would be above average. Not likely.

The reality is that the future is this great big democracy, with lots of people who don't vote, lots of people who belong to cartels and lots of people who only pursue their own individual

interests. There are those people and of course, people like you and me who really are enlightened and are pursuing that higher moral purpose harped upon in the previous paragraph.

One key challenge of the making the future work is to engage the other sides. Who does make you think outside of your box? Perhaps more important, what do you really feel about them? What do you do to seek them out?

7. There will always be a desire and a need to learn. No matter where you live on this planet, you have to recognize that we now live in a world in which the right to stop learning is gone. If you stop learning at any point in your life today, you are toast.

And, given the amazing growth of power and knowledge in specialized circles, there are four subjects that are most important as a part of the emerging learning culture. Those are philosophy, theology, history and biography. Not to discourage learning in any other subject, but the questions we are most critically facing in the coming years come from those four subjects. Never stop learning.

Quote: Eden Philpotts: The universe is full of magical things, patiently waiting for our wits to grow sharper.

8. Time Frames. This is the one assignment from my talk. Get a double sided picture frame. On one side of the frame, put a photo of someone from your past who you love, respect and always want to remember; someone who represents what you want to hold onto from the past. On the other side of the frame, have a photo of yourself as a playful, little child.

Place this frame somewhere you will see it everyday and when you start to feel either left behind or ahead of the pack, stop and listen to what these photos would tell you. Listen to the past and the lessons of history. On the other side, listen to that little you, reminding you of all the opportunities that still lie before you.

Doing this will help you avoid what's called the egotism of time, in which you start to assume that everything that you know right now is valid and true. The reality is that a lot of what we believe in just makes us comfortable, even if we're uncomfortable with it because it's the devil we know as opposed to the devil we don't know. When you learn to see yourself not just as a point in time, but rather as part of a continuum, it will help you put the present in perspective as just a point in time. All decisions will impact the future, and without reflecting upon the past, your decisions will be ill-informed.

© 2002, David Zach. www.davidzach.com.

To contact David, please call Rob Carsello at Speaker Resource Center: 312-641-0791.

PLENARY ADDRESS:

Phil Lewis

President, Marshall Erdman Academy of Sustainable Design

“Sustainability and Multifunctional Working Landscapes”

November 8, 2001

I am a landscape architect and have been studying the Upper Midwest landscape for the last 50-some years. My profession, for over 100 years, has been identifying the landscape as a working landscape, but also as a landscape that serves as our life support system. What we're talking about today are the possible threats to that working and sustainable landscape and how we can guide growth in harmony with our landscape in the future.

I am going to show you visually some of what I think I have learned over the last 50 years and identify some of the directions in which we might be going. Instead of futurism, I like to think of it as “delayed futurism.” I think today we have many of the concepts needed to guide us in the future, it is now a matter of education – a question of how to communicate these ideas to the public and the decision makers. My time here today is too short to show fifty years of work, but I at least have the possibility to share with you many of the ideas we have been developing in the Upper Midwest.

We begin our review in the area of environmental planning and design with a current global population of over six billion people. These people are making a physical impact on the land about which many of us are quite concerned. In the Upper Midwest, the major urban systems are sprawling out across some of the richest farmland in the world.

Through the years, I've put my ideas together into an interdisciplinary approach that I call a “Regional Design Process for Sustainability.” The Regional Design Process for Sustainability allows us to look at the patterns in the land that serve as our life support systems and to offer guidelines to determine where not to build, where to build and what and how to build. We begin by identifying critical life sustaining patterns, and then through creative design, green architecture, etc., determining where and how we build future urbanization patterns in harmony with the identified life sustaining patterns.

In looking at value patterns in the *Upper Midwest Value Search* (1956-2001) and taking a little closer look at the values we cherish, we begin to recognize what has to be protected and enhanced for future generations. Through looking at various systems throughout the Midwest, we look at patterns in the land that we want to protect and enhance and serve as what we call in the profession “form determinants” to guide the patterns of people.

After looking at the relationships of these patterns, I began to discover that most of the exceptional diversity that gives quality personality to the land falls within a common pattern that

I titled “environmental corridors.” Environmental corridors include water systems, wetland systems and steep topography patterns.

In the fifty million dollar study that I directed for the State of Wisconsin, 220 icons were utilized to identify natural and cultural resources values that people cherish. The study concluded that 90% of them fall within the environmental corridors. So if you protect the water, the wetlands, and the steep topography, you protect all of those additional qualities valued by the public.

Now that we have some of the information of where not to build, we also have some of the information needed to determine where to build. The same work with icons has been done for urban areas and has identified urban “street” corridors. The next step allows us to connect these urban “street” corridors to the suburbs, to farmland, and to the wilderness personalities, and to think of them as life-sustaining “livability corridors” for the region and the watershed. Development should be directed outside the boundaries of these corridors.

In the last 100 years, our attitude has moved from viewing our land as only an asset to be developed, to recognizing that certain lands and landscapes should be managed with complete and rigid protection while others, guided by a regional design process, can offer sustainable and regenerative futures.

To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Act of August 25, 1916 establishing the National Park Service

This task still has not been accomplished for the United States on a uniform scale to establish a framework for national, regional, state and local land-use decisions. Immediate use of land for recreation and tourism alone would serve also as a tool for protecting threatened natural resources, for protecting and enhancing water resource quality and for guiding transportation planning and other ongoing land and resource uses as urbanization sprawls across the land.

For many of you people representing the various agencies, the challenge is how to get together and how to understand and accept well-developed processes that will be applied region by region to get this task accomplished.

In 1989, the National Security Council said that by focusing solely on military threats to security, nations ignore other threats. Consequently, the NSC established a committee on oceans, environment and sciences, giving expression to a growing awareness among policy makers in Washington and around the world that traditional definitions of national security are no longer adequate. We must consider our life-sustaining resources and protect and enhance them.

Always based on education

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform them of their discretion.

Thomas Jefferson, September 29, 1820

I have tried to document my 50 years of experience in the Upper Midwest in my book, “Tomorrow by Design.” I also worked with the historical society of Wisconsin to produce a document for children, entitled “Learning from the Land: Wisconsin Land Use,” to teach them these values and to help them envision what it would be like if these values were destroyed. In addition, I’ve been looking at educational networks in the region, by which we communicate and allow the public to enjoy a system so that they see and experience the value of it.

The Dane County E-Way (environmental, educational, ecological and exercise way) System is a good example. I received a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts to lay out a twenty-one mile system connecting an urban corridor and a rural regional corridor. Over the last 10 years, the county has put in over one million dollars in land acquisitions. I am happy to say today that this system is almost entirely in place, connecting the Capitol, State Street, the University, the arboretum, Nine Springs Creek, the Dane County Expo Center and the new Frank Lloyd Wright Convention Center. I like to think of this as an educational tool in the backyards of the legislature and the University of Wisconsin where we can communicate the values that we must protect. Along that 21-mile system there are at least 40 institutions and museums that are concerned with values, providing a wonderful opportunity to offer creatively a ‘sense of place.’

More recently, the county and the county parks have built an eight-mile bike trail through the southern part of the network so that people have access to the environmental corridor and can envision how the concept could be applied in any community across the globe.

Within that system, on the east trail, a Heritage Center was proposed and funding has been obtained to build a section that includes a campground. This will enable people to come see the state capitol, camp out overnight, visit the Heritage Center, learn about local natural and cultural values and take the trail to see whatever has been programmed. There is no reason that in the future an out-of-state school teacher should not be able to access a website to get information about the E-Way, plan a field trip, and then take students on a walk through the E-Way, to the museums and to the capitol, to see the value systems in place.

To provide an environment that supports and encourages the discovery of the history, culture and resources both natural and recreational of the Dane County Region through interactive programs, events and exhibits.

The Interpretive Mission of the Dane County Heritage Center

We currently are working on the stories that will be told in the Heritage Center. There will be the stories of the environmental corridors and the E-Way system; the native American stories, especially about the Ho-Chunk nation which used this very set of natural resources for sustenance and shelter; stories about the land of the four lakes and the natural resources of the county; exhibits portraying this place in time and history; the story of the early pioneers coming to the area; and then a changing exhibit. Because of the work that has been done and the richness of the resources available here for the 100th anniversary of the Wisconsin State Park System, two new state parks have been designated. One of the parks is located adjacent to the Heritage Center and the plan is to integrate it into the educational system.

In Review:

I have spent most of my professional life identifying the resources of Illinois and Wisconsin (and have in these states 39 years and 37 years respectively). In looking at these resources and

thinking of tourism as an educational system, you begin to see that Wisconsin and Illinois are like a great island in that they are surrounded by water: Lake Michigan; the Tippecanoe, the Wabash, the Mississippi, the Ohio and the Namekagon-St. Croix Rivers; and Lake Superior. And because the water is there, that is where many of our historical artifacts are located, with a rail system linking most of them. We've been talking about some sort of an educational/tourism system, but right here in the highest density place (Southern Wisconsin and Northern Illinois), we have a loop rail system from Chicago to Milwaukee to Madison to Spring Green to Prairie du Chien to Galena, Illinois, and back again that we've been looking at in more detail. We identified all of the two- and four-year colleges that are within this system and have found that there are 1,451,686 students and 88,454 staff members who never speak to one another. You're all speaking to one another here I hope, but here is an incredible opportunity to be able to create an educational system on these educational frameworks that can communicate and entertain at the same time. Because if we don't communicate these values and visions, we simply are not going to protect and enhance what we have and implement new visions for the future. I have been illustrating that the system is in place, it is just a matter of programming it.

With the latest GIS information, we have the water and the rail systems in the area mapped. It's interesting that at one end of the rail system there is the opportunity for steam boat excursions and at the other end we have Great Lakes cruises. When I started promoting cruises on the Great Lakes, people thought we were out on cloud nine, but today there are three cruise boats operating. By enhancing and restoring rail passenger service on these idle tracks, education and recreation can be integrated, providing both enjoyment and learning.

Threats of Urbanization

I've discovered from my work in the United States that urbanization is linear in nature. It is linear because it occurs along the arteries of growth: transit, electricity, water, communication, power and sewage. If you have those systems, you have growth; if you don't have them, you don't have growth.

I decided to focus on one of these linear megasystems that is developing on some of the richest farmland in the Midwest and the world, encompassing Elgin, Rockford, Chicago, Beloit, Janesville, and Madison. We have to begun to re-examine this kind of farmland within the context of the new economy and to look at all of the valuable crops that may be grown and that can be turned into all kinds of products that could help, for example, to wean ourselves from of the necessity of importing oil. We need an economy that allows us to create a more livable mega-community without destroying valuable resources. Here in the Midwest, in this particular megasystem, we know that it is the rich soils we need to protect; yet we also know that the area ranks third in the nation in terms of the amount farmland lost.

We now have adequate information to determine within this corridor how to guide development, if we can utilize that information. The aforementioned corridor is linked by transit, integrated utilities and fiber optics – the question is how to treat it as a system. In Germany, the same systems are being identified, and villages are being built along them so that everyone in the village is within a quarter-mile walk of the transit system. Comprehensive GIS resource information within the corridor can determine the most economic and ecologically conservative location for new communities.

In Dane County, the capitol (Madison) sits at the center of a “star” of railroads that radiate out in all directions. All of the communities are located on these rails. Within the county, there have been several major studies, encouraged by the next speaker, so that there now exist data on priority farmland, the water and wetland system, the steep topography system and environmental corridors. Now the question is how to begin to think in terms of linear urbanization along the rail corridors, leaving wedges of farmland and areas of scenic diversity in between the urbanized areas. From there we need to begin to think of totally new urban systems, where the system in between them is protected. This is not a new concept, as linear systems have been in place in nations such as Japan for many centuries. New architecture and energy systems can be used to reduce the energy usage and innovative technology can be used for new sewage systems. Solar and wind power, the use of recycled materials, improvements in energy efficiency, and incorporation of vegetation need to be integrated into community-wide developments, both new and existing.

To take into consideration the carrying capacity of the land and to put these new green architectural buildings in harmony with the land requires an interdisciplinary talent that is available in our universities, government, and professional design and planning offices: the land team, the people team, the computer team, the design team, the feasibility team, the communication team, and the education team. However, it depends upon long-term ethics to succeed in building that sustainable growth. We’ve identified the breadth of talent available and we’ve been thinking about a facility in which we can house the team under one roof. Regional centers have already been established in the Midwest, such as the Iron Ore Range Center in Minnesota and the Great Lakes Visitor Center in Wisconsin; places where people can come to learn about the history of the resources in the region.

I’ve often thought that what we really need in terms of education, at least in Madison, is a center that brings the old ‘Wisconsin Idea’ back to life to integrate the town, the government and the universities, so that together they may identify options for saving the working landscape. One of the greatest opportunities we have now is the possibility of building a new \$100 million Art Center right on State Street in Madison. The state legislature has just passed a \$300 million matching fund for the State Historical Society to expand on the Capitol square. I see this as an opportunity to create what I call a ‘Wisconsin Idea’ center, where the breadth of the talent of the university and the government can be brought together to communicate these values and visions of the state – where the past and the present are brought together to learn of future sustainability options.

The big question is whether we will have the funding and support to tackle the real war of the world, that of environmental degradation, that makes possible hunger, disease, poverty and terrorism. We need to protect and enhance our global life support system by working together and organizing, all people, region by region.

Thank you for your time.

For more information about Phil Lewis and his work, please see <http://www.erdman.com/academy/>

PLENARY ADDRESS:

Kathleen Falk
Dane County, Wisconsin, Executive

“Myths, Policies and Institutions Impacting Sustainable Working Landscapes”

November 8, 2001

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak to this important, cutting-edge conference. And I am especially pleased to have the chance to follow Phil Lewis. He is one of my long-time heroes, and his work over many decades has made a vital contribution to the way we think about landscape and design, and about how people and nature can relate. He is an extraordinary man of vision. He has also been on the front lines of the practical application and implementation of his ideas since his early days in then-Wisconsin-Governor Gaylord Nelson's office.

The title of my talk is “Myths, Policies and Institutions Impacting Sustainable Working Landscapes.” Here is how I plan to address this topic: first, I want to speak briefly about the power of myth in our culture, as in any culture. By “myth” I mean “myth” in the ways that we think of myth as used by Joseph Campbell in “The Power of Myth”; and not as a term to define something that is wrong or an error, as may be the more popular understanding of the term. Myth is much bigger and more important than this.

I intend to show how our actions regarding our relationship to nature and to landscapes have been powerfully affected by our myths, and how these myths are pervasive and deep in ways that we may not know. Then I'll suggest that it is time for a new myth about our relationship to nature, and suggest how the very themes of this conference can illustrate the principles of these myths. I'll provide some examples from Dane County and other places that illustrate ways that we should think about the relationship between economic activities and nature, as well as ways to think about the relationship between rural and urban landscapes. I will then discuss how public policy reflects cultural myths, and that if we change our myths we need to change public policies as well. The same goes for institutions.

It has only been 150 years or so since European civilizations began inexorably to push out Native American civilization in this part of the country. Many would say that the Native Americans have a civilization and myths that placed them in much great harmony with nature.

But the European culture often viewed the natural landscape as something to be conquered and shaped and used. And this culture was enormously successful in finding ways to exploit the resources, to grow and raise plants and animals, to produce amazing amounts of raw commodities for food and clothing. The swamps were drained, the land was plowed and the forests were cut. Massive economic wealth was produced, and much of nature was devastated. This was the good, bad and ugly of that myth of economic progress.

Rene DuBos wrote in “So Human an Animal” that virtually no place in England was untouched by the hand and influence of humans. You could say the same about Wisconsin or Illinois or Minnesota (except for the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and a few other places).

We have dramatically changed the way our land looks, the quality of our waters and the amount of topsoil that remains. This outcome is a direct result of the cultural myths we have about the relationship between humans and the rest of nature, and of the public policies that were thereby developed.

Environmentally, the outcomes have not been good. On a global scale, consider the findings of a recent study of the global impacts of agriculture that appeared in *Science* in April 2001 [“Forecasting Agriculturally Driven Global Environmental Change”, *Science*, 13 April 2001]. The study concludes that if current trends in population and agricultural practices continue, agriculture has the potential to have “massive, irreversible environmental impacts” and eutrophication and habitat destruction could cause unprecedented ecosystem simplification, loss of ecosystem services, and species extinctions.

The study also states that, “Even the best available technologies, fully deployed, cannot prevent many of the forecasted problems. Major new international programs are needed to develop new technologies and policies for ecologically sustainable agriculture.”

In Dane County, where I am county executive, the landscape is dramatically affected by the work we ask it to do. In some ways, this is positive. Most people like the rural character of much of the county, and want to save it from urban sprawl. But the form of agriculture that has dominated the county has also produced more groundwater pollution (especially nitrates and pesticides) and more tons of soil lost than any other activity. And it has had a significant impact on wildlife habitat and water quality.

There are some good signs. Sustainable agriculture has made some progress, our conservation agencies are working hard with landowners to save soil and wetlands and forests, sustainable woods co-ops are an exciting idea (there are now about eight of these in Wisconsin, three in Minnesota, and up to ten in other parts of the country), organic foods are seeing double digit sales increases and CSAs and farmers markets are alive and well. Over time, many states, counties and the federal government have invested significant sums in saving and preserving land.

But when you do the math, it doesn't look so great. Even in Dane County, often cited as an example of cutting-edge practices in community-supported agriculture and restaurant use of locally grown foods, and containing the largest farmers market in the country, the sales from all of these activities total less than two per cent of agricultural product sales. Federal commodity program payments in the year 2000 brought Dane County farmers about ten times the amount of all of these local foods activities combined.

I think it is time we found and fully implemented new myths to reconcile two deep and powerful needs – our relationship with nature and our need for materials for food, clothing and shelter. The concept of sustainable, working landscapes and the specific ideas and practices that will be described in this conference represent a very promising effort to do exactly that.

But we know this will not be easy. There are other values and myths and approaches on either side of the concept of sustainable working landscapes. On one hand, the most adamant supporters of private property rights would find answers in a hands-off approach that I believe would lead to even more devastating impacts. On the other hand, there are supporters of deep ecology who see that we have a moral imperative to save the biosphere, and that all human activity should be subordinated to that end. More powerful are the political and economic forces that gain so much by the current system. The forces of new technology have the potential for major positive as well as negative change. Global population growth will make the challenge even larger. And if the growing populations in the less developed countries improve their economic circumstances, as we hope they will, this could place additional burdens on the biosphere, depending on how it is done.

In the face of all of this, there is another myth in which we should believe. It is the myth of progress. But a “progress” not just of increase in technology or material wealth, but of greater respect for nature, for non-human animals, for the spiritual sides of our existence.

If sustainable working landscapes becomes a representation of a myth concerning a sustainable relationship between humans and non-human nature, then this relationship should be expressed and supported through public policy changes.

The principles of the new policies could be:

- Redirect federal financial assistance to promote conservation. The Conservation Security Act on which many of you are working is a good illustration of this.
- Create at least a level playing field for sustainable practices.
- Promote urban-rural linkages, ones that are more than the ceremonial "Rural-Urban Day" events.
- Examine, and where beneficial, promote environmental management systems, green tier, etc.
- Support green development.
- Recognize the powerful impact that transportation systems and land use have on our landscapes.
- Expand natural area preservation.

The Dane County Experience

Now, I'd like to offer some perspectives from Dane County. Dane County has over 400,000 people and we are one of the fastest growing counties in the state. We have about 575,000 acres of agricultural land, rank first in corn production, second in soybean production and third in

dairy production in the state of Wisconsin. We also lose about 5,000 acres a year to development, mostly urban sprawl or scattered rural sprawl.

One of the first things I did as Dane County executive was to ask farmers – because I’m not a farmer – to tell me what we ought to be doing, what county government could do for them. I can’t do much in my corner of the world to affect dairy prices – we need to elect good people to Congress to do that – but what can I do to help farmers keep farming in Dane County, in a way that county government has never done? When you ask the farmers, they give you great ideas, and then my job is to try to accomplish those things for them.

Last year I released a report with findings and recommendations on ways to promote the vitality of urban areas in Dane County and to protect the rural character of the areas that are now rural. The report, titled “Farms and Neighborhoods: Keeping Both Strong” set forth a number of proposals to improve existing programs or create new ones.

Among these initiatives were:

- Funding for the BUILD (Better Urban Infill Development) program, which provides planning grants to local governments on a competitive basis for planning for innovative infill developments.
- The Great Neighborhoods program, a companion program to BUILD under which we promote the design of traditional neighborhoods that are more pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented, more compact, and more attractive in the eyes of many. This is also a competitive grant program.
- The Agricultural Enterprise Grant Program, which provides competitive grants to farmers for developing new ideas. Last year, the first year of the program, we had only \$37,500 in the program, but there were 50 applications for nearly \$400,000 in funding. There is tremendous energy and creativity in the farm community, with many people looking for ways to make farming more profitable and retain the rural character of the county. We hope to increase funding for the program this year to \$66,000, but that has not yet been approved by the county board. This program, and some other agricultural policy areas, is overseen by an 11-member unpaid citizen board comprised mostly of farmers.

This year we've also allocated some Community Development Block Grant federal (HUD) funding to the ag grant program. We recognize that the economic vitality of rural communities depends on the vitality of agriculture. Even though we can't possibly hope to match the federal support level, we know there are positive things the county can do, and these will make some difference.

We've also used some county resources to help to establish a new farmers market in South Madison. This farmers market is different. It is located in a low-income minority neighborhood, and we include a variety of nutrition education programs, WIC program eligibility, and a variety of community-based activities as part of the market.

To help to preserve open spaces and parks, the county appropriates over \$3,000,000 annually for land acquisition and maintenance. In large part, this is a result of the referendum I initiated three

years ago, which passed overwhelmingly, and which had the support the development community and well as the environmental community. Dane County also has a very strong soil and water conservation program.

In short, we think the county has a role to play in addressing the major themes of this conference.

You may note a common theme among all of the above programs. None involve the use of regulatory power, and most involve relatively small amounts of county money that leverages other public and private resources.

There two reasons for this approach. First, it works better to provide some funding that inspires creativity and induces other funds. Second, it's essentially a necessity, because county government in Wisconsin doesn't have much legal authority on these matters, or much money, either, especially during times of intense demand for human services and law enforcement.

I would like to leave you with 4 main points:

1. County government can be an important part of the challenge of developing sustainable working landscapes, not because we have so much money and power, but because we are well-positioned (big enough to cover a lot of territory, but small enough to be "close to the people")
2. "Partnerships" has become a trite expression, but it really is important, especially with the private development sector.
3. We need both examples of best practices as well as a new vision, or new myth, to marry the idealistic with the practical. I applaud you at this conference for doing both.
4. It's an old axiom in the environmental community that everything is connected to everything else. If you take that too seriously you'll be paralyzed because it's just too hard to think about. But it is fundamentally true. If we don't connect land use, transportation, sustainable development, affordable housing, agricultural development and conservation and even more subjects we won't achieve our goals.

There is a deep yearning in our society for connections to nature as well as for material progress. We need to find ways to connect to these deep needs, and to show how environmentally sustainable policies can meet these needs.

PLENARY BUZZ SESSIONS:

Reflections on Morning Plenaries and Roundtable Discussions Addressing Key Statements on Working Landscapes

November 8, 2001

The Plenary Buzz Sessions were intended to stimulate discussion around visioning and values. They gave participants an opportunity to reflect on the morning plenary addresses and to communicate their thoughts about working landscapes with each other. Participants met in small groups that were randomly assigned so as to encourage interaction between diverse interests that would not usually come in contact with each other.

The following statements were put forth as suggestions to frame the discussions:

- To me, healthy working landscapes are ones that ...
- If we want to see healthy working landscapes, then we need ... to happen
- The quality of life in my community is dependent upon ...
- Barriers to healthy working landscapes in our communities include ...
- Healthy working landscapes maintain specific characteristics such as ...
- Ecological systems in a healthy working landscape have qualities such as ...
- Our vision for healthy working landscapes is one that ...
- National, state or local policies that would help us create and maintain healthy working landscapes include ...

Although these roundtable discussions addressed a wide range of topics and ideas, the importance of integrating the ecological, economic and social aspects of both human and natural communities emerged as a common theme. Some of the many statements that resulted from the Plenary Buzz Sessions included:

Healthy working landscapes:

- Support the people who live on them – the people of today and the people of the future.
- Are diversified yet integrated.
- Meet the needs of all species, human and non-human, in an efficient manner where development is appropriate to location and sustainable into the future.
- Integrate rural and urban communities.
- Maintain characteristics such as biological diversity and on-going community-building.
- Occur when the land takes care of the people and the people take care of the land.
- Have the capacity for self-renewal: they are economically viable and support life, with a net balance of energy and material flows.
- Are the biophysical manifestation of a negotiated, shared vision.

- Require the participation of and interrelationships between communities within the landscape.
- Are micro-managed in a macro framework.
- Allow us to live in a place we don't want to leave.

If we want to see healthy working landscapes:

- We need circles to happen. Circles mean talking, visioning, interacting, teaching, listening, feeling, understanding and remembering. We need to network the circles.
- We must consider the true costs of our activities, accounting for externalities and non-market benefits.
- We must educate the general public about the benefits of maintaining family farms and healthy landscapes.
- We must creatively engage the private sector, in addition to the public and civic sectors, in the creation of healthy working landscapes.
- We must form partnerships and build coalitions with a diverse group of stakeholders and interests other than our own.
- We must re-define “self-interest” and “the good life” to include the ethic of stewardship, such that community responsibility and environmental quality are of as much importance as cash economics.
- We must build community and create a sense of place – reconnect the disconnect.
- The public institutions and non-profit organizations that support communities need to work with communities to understand their past and help them shape their future.
- We need to consider all scales of landscapes – individual, local, regional, national and international.
- We need a unified approach through all levels of government toward achieving healthy working landscapes.
- We must educate consumers about the importance of buying local and organic products.
- We must move from a political and economic system that encourages ecological destruction to one based on long-term ecological sustainability and resource renewability.
- We must create policies and incentives that encourage stewardship and re-invest in the local community, that subsidize the practice, not the product.
- We must better communicate ideas from the community level to the policy level.
- We must change from a “fire-fighter” approach to solving problems to an approach that is more long-term and larger in scale.

Our vision for healthy working landscapes:

- Is one where we achieve spiritual satisfaction by meeting the environmental, economic and social needs of all life.
- Is one that includes diversity, functionality and resilience, where the individual is valued as much as the whole.
- Is one where education, planning, coordination and communication provide a strong thread that ties all levels of the landscape together.
- Requires local commitment and ideas but also recognition that this vision is embedded in a larger-scale financial and policy environment.

LUNCH ADDRESS:

Bonnie McGregor
Regional Director, U.S. Geological Survey

November 8, 2001

I am here representing the Midwest Natural Resources Group (MNRG). We were delighted to be able to help you by providing some funding to enable the Working Landscapes Conference to take place. We were especially pleased that we were able to put our two conferences together – our MNRG Roundtable and your Working Landscapes Conference.

I thought it might be useful to tell you about the Midwest Natural Resources Group. MNRG is an ongoing partnership effort consisting of senior managers from 14 federal agencies. As you can imagine, getting all of us to sit down together, as you all are, to talk about our varied perspectives on the world, our missions and our work on the landscape is a real challenge. But it is very important that we do, in fact, take the time to sit down together to get to know each other and to better understand some of the common issues that we share.

One of the goals that we have as federal agencies is to figure out how we can bring together our disparate missions and activities on the landscape and make them more than just the sum of a whole bunch of parts. We are dedicated to bringing focus and excellence to improved environmental quality, wise economic development and sustainable resource use. Natural resources is the common theme that ties us all together.

The purpose of MNRG is to coordinate, enhance and identify effective partnerships between federal, state, local and tribal governments and other partners, to explore and commit to new partnership opportunities, and to better leverage and use minimal resources to reap maximum benefits. We are all about partnerships, which is why it is so important for us to be a part of your conference.

Some of the goals of MNRG are to report cooperative accomplishments, to bring understanding and awareness to the high economic, cultural and ecological values and needs of resources in the Midwest, to focus on the wise use of natural resources, and to garner federal support and enhancement of our natural resources. The senior managers come together to achieve these goals and to better leverage the resources each of our agencies has.

Because the Midwest is so large, we have broken ourselves down into 12 focus groups. The focus groups can be grouped into two areas – a Great Lakes Basin focus area and a Big Rivers focus area. We also have a planning committee and a communications committee. We recently assembled a GIS committee in an effort to better share information between the different agencies.

MNRG meets three times a year and the chairmanship of the group rotates each year among the agencies involved. We try to hold our meetings out on the landscape. During the MNRG meeting that took place right before the Working Landscapes Conference, topics of discussion

included GIS activities, decision support tools, invasive species, and activities taking place in the Upper Mississippi River basin. The Great Lakes have the dubious honor of having the poster child of invasive species – the lamprey eel – as well as other species such as the zebra mussel. Resource managers are trying to figure out where these species are going, what niches they might occupy, and what impacts they will have. Our activities in the Upper Mississippi River basin include work on the Gulf hypoxia issue, a basin-wide natural resources stewardship initiative being conducted by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), implementation of the U.S. Geological Survey GIS system for sharing information between agencies, and consideration of a corporate wetlands restoration project where private companies would help provide funds for restoration projects. Again the key to all of these activities is partnership.

In closing, let me just say that there is a desire and need for the federal agencies to work together. Similarly, there is a desire and need for us to be working closely with others such as yourselves. All of this can only be accomplished with the three C's: communication, cooperation and collaboration. This hopefully leads to sharing resources, trusting each other, understanding our problems and issues, and together finding solutions that enhance the environment.

So thank you all. On behalf of the Midwest Natural Resources Group we wish you a very successful conference and hope that you enjoy the dialogue, the getting to know each other and the sharing of your issues and thoughts with each other.

LUNCH ADDRESS:

Albert Appleton
Senior Fellow, Regional Plan Association

November 8, 2001

Thank you for that generous introduction. I have been asked to speak about working landscapes from a broader, more strategic perspective. To get right to the heart of the matter, what we are talking about today--working landscapes--is an idea whose time is clearly coming. It is an idea that is going to have an enormous impact because it is the most transforming idea about the American landscape since we turned to mechanized agriculture in the late 19th century.

Working landscapes is where the country is heading, must head, if it is to preserve its treasured farm and forest landscapes; both as ecosystems and as social and human communities. A fundamental cause of the current landscape crisis has been the conflict between the ecological and the human. Now in the concept of working landscapes we are wisely and desperately trying to put these two things together while there is still time to create a future for our landscapes and their human communities that have been such a rich part of the American heritage.

The transforming element of the idea of working landscapes is to recognize and monetize all the services to our larger society that landscapes provide. I am going to first talk about how a landscape services strategy was at the heart of creating New York City's watershed protection program.

The essential details of the New York City watershed story are as follows. New York City draws 1.5 billions gallons of drinking water a day from an upstate watershed of 2000 square miles, an area roughly the size of the state of Delaware. This was surface water of such high quality it was called the champagne of drinking waters and did not have to be filtered before drinking. But, over time, as suburbanization spread into the City's watersheds, and as agricultural and forest practices grew more intense, there was a growing threat to water purity. By the late 1980's, the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the New York State Department of Health were saying that it was inevitable that the city of New York would have to build a multi-billion dollar filtration works to filter pollutants out of its water and insure future drinking water safety.

In 1990, after I became Commissioner of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection and Director of the New York City water and sewer system, the first issue that confronted me was how to protect the quality of New York City's drinking water. Was there any alternative to spending billions of dollars on building filtration works to cleaning up the growing pollution in the watersheds? What about watershed protection? Today, watershed protection is all the rage. But in 1990 it was regarded as the kind of warm, fuzzy idealistic thinking that no hard-headed water manager took seriously. The general view was New York should accept the fact that sooner or later all watersheds need to be filtered, and get on with building this multi-billion dollar project.

This seemed to me to be patently silly. Why waste so much money on building water treatment plants, when for far less money we could gold plate the environment of the Catskills and do far more for the local residents?

Because, said the traditionalists, that sounds good on paper, but it will never work in practice. Everyone, starting with the farmers, will fight you tooth and nail; you will spend a lot of money, get a few marginal improvements, and after all that still have to filter. One could not blame them for this skepticism. They were traditional regulators and, for watershed farmers, environmental regulation of any kind was anathema, just another way of making it harder and harder to make a living farming.

So, with these unfavorable prospects, how did we turn the idea of the City paying farmers for landscape services to preserve water quality into reality? We began by setting up a series of dialogues with the farmers. In the first series, we educated them about drinking water purity, about what we were doing and why we were doing it. These discussions succeeded in getting the farmers to accept, however much they initially did not want to admit it, that we had a serious environmental problem with farming— that my agency was responsible for providing nine million people with safe drinking water, and that there were real problems with watershed farming that had to be resolved if we were going to continue to be able to do so. Then we had a second series of dialogues in which the watershed's farmers presented the City with a basic primer on the realities of farming in the Catskills and their sense of the causes of agricultural pollution, one that convinced us that traditional water quality regulation and traditional best management practices would be too disruptive of local farming to ever work.

The result was a recognition that designing a program of watershed protection had to be an exercise in mutual problem solving. And behind that recognition came another: that keeping an agricultural landscape would actually be in the best interests of the City's drinking water. For if the environmental problems could be solved, a landscape based land use would be far preferable to the exploitative suburban or exurban landscape that would replace it. And that mutual conclusion, that farming was a preferred land use in the watershed, was the first major step towards what we ultimately accomplished.

But could the environmental problems of watershed farming--a row cropping, cow shedding, manure spreading dairy industry--be solved? The farmers went away and talked amongst themselves, and then came back and asked us to let them provide clean water. In effect, they offered to become clean water stewards on their own farms, offering the City a farmer-run program utilizing technical assistance from local agricultural agencies and resources. In return, the City would fund the program out of the savings from eliminating the need to build expensive filtration plants.

What made this program work for them as well as us is that the farmers proposed that the environmental plan for the farm be integrated with the business plan for the farm. Instead of just applying a standard menu of best management practices, or a one size fits all set of pollution control requirements, the farmer would be intimately involved in planning the pollution control program for his farms, balancing his needs as a farmer with his needs as an environmental steward. It gave each watershed farmer an immediate, personal interest in improving the environment because now the environment, instead of being the enemy of the farmer, became the

farmer's friend. Now environmental service became a source of new investment capital for the farm business.

In recognition of this integration of business and environmental service, the watershed farm program was named "Whole Farm Planning."

However, before the program design was complete, two other issues had to be addressed. The first was how to apply safe drinking water regulations to farmers participating in this new program. We took a logical but bold and unique step and told the farmers that we would drop all watershed regulations that applied to farming, with the exception of a willful polluter regulation, for anyone who participated in the program.

That left the toughest issue of all. True to their own traditions of independence and self-sufficiency, the Catskill farmers had insisted that any watershed program had to be voluntary. That was a deal breaker for them. However, from our perspective, the problem with voluntary environmental programs was that they almost never achieve critical mass. We had to have critical mass. We needed more than a collection of individual farm improvements. We needed an environmentally sustainable farm landscape. Finally, we achieved a critical breakthrough. The farmers had stated a number of times that, if it was locally run, the farmers could deliver clean water. Very well, we said, we have given you a locally run program. Now what we propose is this. It can be voluntary with respect to any individual farmer. But you, the farmers, have to get 85% of all the farmers in the watershed enrolled in the program in five years. The farm community's leaders accepted that challenge and New York City's watershed farm program was in business. Today, I am pleased and proud to say, 93% of the farms in the watershed participate in the City's whole farm planning program. With whole farm planning, and the other similar components of its watershed program, the City has demonstrated that it is far cheaper to invest in landscape services and maintain environmental quality than to pay to clean up after a polluted landscape. And, investing in landscape services also generates far more social and human benefits than just building environmental treatment plants.

What was crucial to the success of the Catskills program was that it put both the economic well-being of the farmer and the environmental integrity of the Catskills on equal footing. One was not a trade for the other – there was a mutual commitment to both goals.

So what is the larger message of the Catskill success? You are here today because of a crisis in the American landscape. Family farming is in mortal peril. Rural landscapes are being depopulated, the environmental consequences of modern farming have proven to be more and more destructive, while perverse economic and regulatory incentives have placed farming and the environment in bitter conflict.

But you are also here today because you are not content, as so many have been, just to blame either farmers or environmentalists, depending on your point of view, for all that is wrong with farming and the environment. You are here because you are in the forefront of recognizing that neither farming nor the environment can be served without each together serving each other, and that the way to put them together is through an explicit recognition that landscapes do many more things than produce food. In the concept of working landscapes, landscapes that provide many different goods for our whole society, lies the path to both a new rural prosperity and a

new environmental vitality for the American landscape. That is what we learned in the Catskills. That is what you are here to learn from each other today.

So what are the things to learn if you are going to take this insight and turn it into reality? What are the things to learn if you are to overcome the inertia and special interest of the status quo and realize the vision of hope that working landscapes represents?

I am not going to talk a lot about specifics. You each have a wealth of specific experiences to share with each other. But there are some strategic things, things that too often we don't recognize because we are so close to them that I would like to make sure you understand.

The first is to recognize the critical difference between working *lands* and working *landscapes*. As the idea of landscape services has begun to gather momentum, programs to promote landscape service concepts on farms have been added to the Farm Bill and other Federal programs. But historically, these federal programs (and similar state level programs) have focused on individual farmers, not on building and restoring farm landscapes and communities.

Whenever I go to meetings such as this, I hear three things that people want: an economic future for the individual farmer, a sound environment, and viable rural landscapes. Trying to achieve these individually is not the same as achieving all three. For example, if I buy nitrogen reduction on 200 farms that does not mean that I've achieved nitrogen reduction in that watershed. The key question is what are we trying to do – are we trying to help farms or are we trying to help farm communities? As we had to do in the watershed, we need to get all of this energy operating not only on the individual, but on the collective level. As we did in the watershed, we need to find a way that respects individual choice but makes individual choices supportive of larger community objectives, not just beneficial to those particular individuals.

Another large question. What makes me and why should you think that an idea like working landscapes will prevail against all the forces of the status quo?

Questions like this lead people at conferences like this to spend a lot of time on issues like networking, media, advocacy. Unfortunately, far too often they think, consciously or unconsciously, that pursuing an idea like Working Landscapes is similar to selling Coke or Pepsi. It is all about media and sales technique. It isn't.

The single most important and misunderstood fact about public interest politics is that ideas matter. Ideas matter a lot! A good idea is not enough, but a bad idea means certain defeat. Good ideas are simple, elegant and obvious. They have a feel about them, a sense that they are developing, that they have jumped the queue.

In working landscapes, you have a really good idea. You've got to trust it. You have to keep pushing it. You can't apologize for it or worry that you are sounding impractical or visionary. You're right, they are wrong. They may have been right once, but times have changed. This is not the only future of the American landscape, but it's the most intelligent future because so far it is the only one anyone has come up with that could work.

Now, when you've got a good idea, the best thing you can do to help sell it is to get a signature. That is, you get some programs that you can point to that embody your idea and serve as an

example of its success. You want some things you can point to and say “this is what we mean by working landscapes.”

And when you have a good idea you also have to trust it, and that means let it go, not try to control it, not try to keep it safe or all for yourself. A good idea is an idea you can share. I would never have succeeded in saving the New York City watershed if I hadn't let the farmers take the lead in the farm program. Working landscapes is going to lead in all sorts of unexpected directions, push forward all sorts of new leaders as happened in the Catskills. No one in this room can predict where it's going to go. You need to recognize this and embrace it. As in all great changes real leadership will consist in sharing leadership.

That also means that, like a good canoeist on the stream, you have to trust the current's momentum and let it help you. Whether you're operating at a small scale or a large scale, you're contributing something important. Nearly all of us must operate on a small scale, but we do far better when we understand the large scale that goes along with it and drives it.

Now sooner or later, if ideas are going to get from small scale to a large scale, you have to get your hands on the money. Although you can do brilliant things with a lack of money, at the end of the day we're talking about looking at 69% of the American landscape, and that's not cheap. (Private lands comprise about 69% of the American landscape.)

You've got to think big bucks. The way you get big bucks is by getting the money from old outdated programs (i.e. the Farm Bill) by showing that you can do something better, faster and cheaper. That is always your fundamental argument – that working landscapes will deliver the goods better, faster and cheaper. And while you are pulling funds out of the old programs, you have to win over the best of the stewards of those old programs. Many have struggled for years with the fact that they have been underfunded by the political system. They are often for what you are for. To bash them because they are slower than you in seeing a new world emerging or because you do not understand their institutional imperatives is to lose some wonderful potential friends. And remember, if working landscapes is the right idea, and it is, it will not need that kind of help to sell itself.

So where are you today on the political landscape? A good landmark is the National Governors Association's report, “Private Lands, Public Benefits.” What this stands for is that the idea of working landscapes has been recognized as important, but what it really could accomplish or how to get it to its full potential is not well understood. If you read through the Governor's report, it calls for more flexibility, more coordination, better delivery of programs, etc. All of which says that working landscapes are at that awkward moment in a social process where people are for change but don't fully understand yet that it means really changing things. So you must be inexorable about the vision you have so wisely embraced, but patient about working the process of change through. For good ideas sell themselves if you give them time to do their work. But don't give them too much time.

Land is wonderful. But no land protects itself anymore. People have to protect it. And the best way to protect it is to think of land and people together. That means getting beyond stereotypes. Idealized pictures of family farms versus corporate agriculture are not a good guide to any kind of action. Working landscapes are about real people who own real land in all shapes and dimensions. Working landscapes will have to offer real things to those real people. And what

those things must be are a better economic future, a better environmental future and a better future for the kind of communities people want to live in.

Finally, and I cannot stress this too strongly, the cynicism and anger and disillusionment people often bring to politics often blinds us to the fact that politics, for all its craziness, for all of its human quirks, is about the right order of things. I want to say that again, at its heart, politics is about the right order of things. Part of what you are about when you get behind an idea like working landscapes that can help so many people, is that you're not only appealing to many immediate interests and needs, but you're evoking a deeper resonance, speaking to a deeper human longing. The right order of things, particularly in the short term, often does not prevail. But to be for it is to be for history, to be for it is to be for democracy, to be for it is to be for each other. History made the world's most cosmopolitan city commit to the preservation of a 200 year old farming culture because that was the best, fastest and cheapest way to preserve the best urban drinking water in the world. History, I predict, in the shape of this same extraordinary idea of working landscapes that you are here to explore and pursue, will find equally wonderful and exciting ways to make the idea real for you too.

Thank you.

A TOOL BOX FOR SUSTAINABLE WORKING LANDSCAPES:

Panels and Discussions

November 8, 2001

The Tool Box for Sustainable Working Landscapes was a session of information sharing and mutual learning about projects, tools and initiatives being used to identify and promote the goals of working landscapes. Tool Box panels were made up of three (in one case, two) presenters, each providing a different perspective relating to the same theme. Success stories and lessons learned featured prominently during the panel presentations. Many of the featured “tools” linked the broader goals of a working landscape with the real need to support our natural resources, our communities and our livelihoods. These ideas were presented within the context of the following Tool Box panel themes:

- Landscape Conservation Approaches in Practice
- Citizen-based Planning and Community Visioning
- Delivering Assistance to the Landscape
- Community Revitalization and Change
- Picking Your Targets and Knowing if You Hit Them
- Environmental Management
- Approaches to Influencing Policies and Programs
- New Products and Markets

Landscape Conservation Approaches in Practice highlighted innovative projects on a landscape-scale, involving many landowners and partners.

Citizen-based Planning and Community Visioning highlighted successful initiatives and projects that engaged citizens and local governments in the planning and visioning process for innovative approaches to landscape management that cross many boundaries.

Delivering Assistance to the Landscape provided incentive-based examples of how to accomplish a wide variety of goals for sustainable working landscapes such as improving water quality, enhancing wildlife habitat, developing partnerships and engaging volunteers, protecting land with conservation easements and other land set-aside options, and locating funding sources.

Community Revitalization and Change provided examples of how communities have come together to address changes in the landscape in an economically, environmentally, and socially creative manner.

Picking Your Targets and Knowing if You Hit Them explored key indicators of change meaningful to communities that are planning for the future and setting goals.

Environmental Management presented examples of approaches that result in changes to traditional land management practices and planning strategies to create healthy, sustainable landscapes.

Approaches to Influencing Policies and Programs shared creative options and lessons learned with those interested in engaging in the political process relative to sustainable working landscapes issues at the local, state, and federal policy level (in particular, the Farm Bill).

New Products and Markets focused on keeping working lands working by sharing ideas on producing alternative energy; promoting eco/agri-tourism, green certification and eco-labeling; using cooperative structures; and creating and identifying innovative marketing strategies.

A number of key questions and points arose during the question and answer periods following the Tool Box presentations. Among them were:

Key questions

- Is there, or should there be, national coordination between efforts being made at local or regional levels?
- How do you get a representative diversity together in a community-based initiative?
- How can communities develop long-range plans and projects with limited resources?
- How can community development programs be funded?
- How can the agricultural community strengthen relationships with urban interests?

Key points

- You define success by the values you declare
- Citizen-based initiatives empower people and build community
- A good project requires much persistence
- Long-term planning takes time but is minimal compared to the life of the issues concerned
- Building relationships with others is very important
- Including local communities in planning efforts is essential

A TOOL BOX FOR SUSTAINABLE WORKING LANDSCAPES:

Tool Box Agenda

November 8, 2001

SESSION ONE

CITIZEN-BASED PLANNING AND COMMUNITY VISIONING: TAKING ACTION

Kate Clancy, Managing Director, Henry A. Wallace Center for Agricultural and Environmental Policy	“Engaging Rural Communities in Visioning, Planning and Policy”
Brian Ohm, Associate Professor, UW-Madison Department of Urban & Regional Planning	“Planning For Working Landscapes”
Mark Weaver, Community Planner, National Park Service/America Outdoors	“Lynden Hill: Community Participation Techniques”

CITIZEN-BASED PLANNING AND COMMUNITY VISIONING: LOCAL INITIATIVES AND PROGRAMS

Sharon Lezberg, Executive Director/Program Director, Friends of Troy Gardens	“Community Participation and Non-profit Organization Collaboration in Land Use Planning”
Roger Hunt, Field Coordinator/Design Specialist, Trees Forever	“Trees Forever Working Landscapes: A New Family Farm Program Concept to Foster Sustainable Rural Landscapes”
Dennis Dreher, Chicago Wilderness Smith Family Fellow, Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission	“Protecting Nature in Your Community”

DELIVERING ASSISTANCE TO THE LANDSCAPE: USING MARKET-BASED MECHANISMS TO PRODUCE ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

Suzie Greenhalgh, Associate, World Resources Institute	“A Nitrogen Reduction Strategy for the Mississippi River Basin and the Gulf of Mexico”
Mark Kieser, Senior Scientist, Kieser and Associates	“Water Quality as a Commodity? The Shift to Market-based Incentives for Environmental Improvements”

COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION AND CHANGE: THE PROCESS

Martin Kleinschmit, Sustainable Agriculture Specialist, Center for Rural Affairs	“A Sustainable Approach to Economic Development”
Gerald R. Campbell, UW-Madison Extension Dept. of Agricultural & Applied Economics/Center for Community Economic Development	“Working Landscapes: An Opportunity for Building Community and Democracy”
Chuck Francis, University of Nebraska, Department of Agronomy & Horticulture	“Challenges at the Rural/Urban Interface: Creating Win-Win Situations”

PICKING YOUR TARGETS AND KNOWING IF YOU HIT THEM

Clark Miller, Assistant Professor of Public Affairs and Science Studies, UW-Madison La Follette School of Public Affairs	“Indicators of Sustainability: A Social Approach”
Albert Appleton, Senior Fellow, Regional Plan Association, New York	“To Save a Particular Landscape, Define Success First”
Donna Meyers, Great Lakes Program Coordinator/Elisa Graffy, U.S. Geological Survey	“Tracking Environmental Success: A Midwestern Water-quality Story”

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND MORE

Bob Wills, Owner, Cedar Grove Cheese, Inc.	“Farm/Processor Collaboration for Community Improvement”
George Boody, Executive Director, Land Stewardship Project	“Policy Development Based on an Economic Analysis of Agriculture for Multiple Environmental and Social Benefits”
Dr. Sonya Newenhouse, President, Madison Environmental Group, Inc.	“Tools to Achieve Results: The Importance of Integrating Numbers, Words, and Images”

APPROACHES TO INFLUENCING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS: MAKING IT WORK

Lorrie Stromme, President, Minnesota Shade Tree Advisory Committee	“How Concerned Citizens Came Together to Advance the Health, Care and Future of Community Forests”
Ed Minihan, Director, Upper Midwest Field Office, American Farmland Trust	“Influencing Policies and Programs”
Mark Roffers, Principal Planner, Vandewalle & Associates	“Wisconsin’s Smart Growth Law and Agriculture and Forest Sustainability”

NEW PRODUCTS AND MARKETS: WHAT, HOW AND WHY?

Audrey Arner, Western Minnesota Program Director, Land Stewardship Project	“Creating a Community Food System from the Ground Up”
Dan French, Farmer, PastureLand Farms	“Grass Farmers Take Their Cheese to Market: PastureLand Co-op – its History and Hopes”
Jim Maetzold, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Alternative Enterprises and Agritourism Leader	“Alternative Enterprises and Agritourism Opportunities”

SESSION TWO

LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION APPROACHES IN PRACTICE

Gary Bentrup, Research Landscape Planner, USDA National Agroforestry Center	“Conservation Buffers: Applying a Landscape Approach”
Dave Miller, Minnesota Forest Resources Council	“Landscape-Level Planning and Coordination in Forested Landscapes of Minnesota”
Jim Patchett, President, Conservation Design Forum, Inc.	“Designing Sustainable Communities – A Synthesis of Art, Engineering, and Ecology”

DELIVERING ASSISTANCE TO THE LANDSCAPE: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO HABITAT CONSERVATION

Tony Thompson, Farmer, Willow Lake Farm	“Challenges of Private Wildlife Conservation”
Wayne Edgerton, Agricultural Policy Director, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	“Working With Those Who Are Working With the Landscape”
Dan Imhoff, Wild Farms Alliance	“Wild Farms Alliance”

DELIVERING ASSISTANCE TO THE LANDSCAPE: GETTING IT DONE

Ed Minihan, Director, Upper Midwest Field Office, American Farmland Trust	“Land Acquisition and Easements: Town of Dunn”
Del Christensen, Program Director, Trees Forever	“Engaging Volunteers in Tree Plantings While Growing Community Spirit”
Darwin Kelsey, Executive Director, Cuyahoga Countryside Conservancy	“The Countryside Initiative”

COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION AND CHANGE: MAKING A DIFFERENCE

Beth Knudsen, Wells Creek Watershed Coordinator, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	“Wells Creek Watershed Partnership: Using History to Build Community; Using Community to Create the Future”
Warren Gaskill, Sustainable Woods Cooperative	“1,3,15: Learning the Infrastructure for Community-based Sustainable Forestry”
Allen Moody, Pork, Egg and Produce Coordinator, CROPP/Organic Valley	“CROPP/Organic Valley: An Organic Marketing Cooperative”

APPROACHES TO INFLUENCING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS: ADVOCACY MODELS

Kate Clancy, Managing Director, Henry A. Wallace Center for Agricultural and Environmental Policy	“Connecting Local Activities to National Agriculture Policy”
Michael Jacob, Outreach Director, UW-Madison Center on Wisconsin Strategy	“Sustaining Wisconsin: A Statewide Dialogue About Wisconsin’s Future”
Margaret Krome, Agricultural Policy Coordinator, Michael Fields Agricultural Institute	“Is Policy Too Pointy-headed to Make a Difference?”

**APPROACHES TO INFLUENCING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS:
GETTING ORGANIZED**

Todd Hanson, State Coordinator, Wisconsin Stewardship Network	“Experiences of the Wisconsin Stewardship Network”
Teresa Opheim, Regional Director, Midwest Sustainable Agriculture Working Group	“Sizing up a SAWG: A Model for Grassroots-Guided, Inside the Beltway Advocacy”
Tom Larson, Director of Land Use and Environmental Affairs, Wisconsin REALTORS* Association	“Strange Bedfellows: The Passage of Wisconsin’s Smart Growth”

**NEW PRODUCTS AND MARKETS: OPPORTUNITIES IN ENERGY,
CLIMATE CHANGE, AND CARBON SEQUESTRATION**

Lisa Daniels, Founder/Director, Windustry	“Harvest the Wind”
Lauren Sharfman, Environmental Business Specialist, Environmental Law & Policy Center	“Climate Change and Repowering the Midwest”
Dennis Keeney, Senior Fellow, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy	“Can Carbon Dioxide in the Atmosphere be Affected Significantly by Sequestration in Soils and Biomass?”

**NEW PRODUCTS AND MARKETS:
GREEN CERTIFICATION AND ECO-LABELING**

Phil Guillery, Director, Community Forestry Resource Center	“Creating Incentives for Responsible Forest Management Across the Landscape”
Deana Sexson, Biointensive IPM Field Coordinator, UW-Madison, NPM Program	“The WWF/WPVGGA/UW Collaboration Story: Developing Marketing Opportunities for Wisconsin Potatoes”
Ray Kirsch, Farm Coordinator, Midwest Food Alliance	“The Midwest Food Alliance: Promoting Sustainability and Community Health through Eco-Labeling”

A TOOL BOX FOR SUSTAINABLE WORKING LANDSCAPES:

Presenter Abstracts

November 8, 2001

Albert Appleton, Regional Plan Association

Website: www.rpa.org

Presentation Title: *To Save a Particular Landscape, Define Success First*

Abstract/Description: Information not provided

Audrey Arner, Land Stewardship Project

Website: www.landstewardshipproject.org

Presentation Title: *Creating a Community Food System from the Ground Up*

Abstract/Description: Pride of the Prairie is a collaborative project with the West Central Regional Sustainable Development Partnership, the University of Minnesota at Morris and Land Stewardship Project. Aspects of this collaborative include organizing farmers, creating a directory, community surveys and getting local foods on the University's menu.

Gary Bentrup, United States Department of Agriculture National Agroforestry Center

Website: www.unl.edu/nac/conservation

Presentation Title: *Conservation Buffers: Applying a Landscape Approach*

Abstract/Description: Integrating agriculture, forestry and communities in the Midwest is essential for creating healthy and productive landscapes that promote a rich quality of life. Conservation buffers can play a major role in this transformation by providing key ecological functions while offering social and economic benefits. The challenge lies in creating a planning framework and design tools for multi-functional conservation buffers that work in harmony with the ecological, social and economic context of the Midwest ecoregion to create futures for agriculture, forestry and communities.

George Boody, Land Stewardship Project

Website: www.landstewardshipproject.org

Presentation Title: *Policy Development Based on an Economic Analysis of Agriculture for Multiple Environmental and Social Benefits*

Abstract/Description: Significant environmental benefits would result from the diversification of working farms in two Minnesota watersheds. This will require innovative approaches and policies that provide sufficient incentives to result in land management changes. The Multiple Benefits of Agriculture Project utilized scenarios for different agricultural land-uses that were developed by citizens and then applied to a predictive model to estimate quantitative environmental benefits. The economic values of these non-market benefits were significant and could be achieved for no more, and possibly less, than taxpayers currently pay. More diversified systems would also require different kinds of social capital and assistance from institutions. Seven recommended approaches to policy development were developed that

would result in multiple and high levels of environmental and social benefits and more effectively involve the public at national and local levels in agricultural policy.

Gerald R. Campbell, University of Wisconsin-Madison Extension Department of Agriculture & Applied Economics and Center for Community Economic Development

Website: www.uwex.edu/ces/cced/gcnewpg.html

Presentation Title: *Working Landscapes: an Opportunity for Building Community and Democracy*

Abstract/Description: Across the United States, people have been working on building community capacity for problem identification and problem solving. This work has several labels including civic capacity, social capital, arts of democracy, and public work. This presentation provided an overview of the approaches being taken toward community capacity building and illustrations of how these approaches might work with the evolving “working landscapes” perspective.

Del Christensen, Trees Forever

Website: www.treesforever.org

Presentation Title: *Engaging Volunteers in Tree Plantings while Growing Community Spirit*

Abstract/Description: Trees Forever is a nonprofit organization founded by two volunteers. The spirit of engaging volunteers from the onset is key to the organization’s efforts. Since 1989, Trees Forever has worked with over 400 Midwest towns and engaged over 103,000 volunteers. Its mission is to facilitate the planting and care of trees and forests through action-oriented programs that empower people, build community and promote environmental stewardship. The efforts of Trees Forever provide an example of how a non-government organization (NGO) can partner with government agencies, private corporations, community volunteers and others to grow more than just seedlings.

Kate Clancy, Henry A. Wallace Center for Agricultural and Environmental Policy at Winrock International

Website: www.winrock.org/what/wallace_center.asp

Presentation Title 1: *Engaging Rural Communities in Visioning, Planning and Policy*

Abstract/Description: Winrock International has worked with nine local groups over the past four years to initiate institutional and policy changes related to agricultural development. The groups have chosen key issues related to the viability of agriculture in their area, gone through a policy visioning session, and developed a plan of activities to reach their goals. The stories from these sites are very informative with regard to leadership, capacity building, collaboration and other key elements of community and economic development.

Presentation Title 2: *Connecting Local Activities to National Agriculture Policy*

Abstract/Description 2: One of the objectives of a five-year visioning, planning and policy project (WAGPOL) was the development of national farm policy recommendations that reflected the needs of local people. From the needs and ideas generated in local and regional visioning sessions and follow-up conversations, a large set of national policy recommendations was crafted. Several drafts were fed back to the participants for their reactions and changes. Simultaneously, the local groups were tackling policy initiatives in their communities. Many lessons were learned from this complex exercise.

Lisa Daniels, Windustry

Website: www.windustry.org

Presentation Title: *Harvest the Wind*

Abstract/Description: This presentation described Windustry's work in encouraging wind energy development in rural areas in Minnesota and elsewhere in the Midwest. Lands in economically-deprived areas that do not have good soil, water, or other resources may nonetheless be ideal for a wind farm. A wind project being developed on a farm in Woodstock, Minnesota, is the first farmer-owned, commercial-scale project in the Midwest. Windustry promotes local ownership for rural economic benefit and encourages people to view agriculture-based energy as a significant new farm commodity, a clean energy resource, and a new industry for the rural economy. Windustry is currently exploring incentives that might be placed in the Federal Farm Bill to encourage these "new energy crops" for farmers.

Dennis Dreher, Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission

Website: www.nipc.cog.il.us

Presentation Title: *Protecting Nature in Your Community*

Abstract/Description: There are many opportunities and programs that local governments can implement to identify, protect and restore natural areas and biodiversity. Examples include sustainable land use planning, improved storm water management, stream and wetland protection, natural landscaping, open space preservation and public education. These approaches are endorsed regionally in an award-winning Biodiversity Recovery Plan that was developed by a coalition known as Chicago Wilderness. To date, over 200,000 acres of natural land have been preserved in the Chicago Wilderness region, ranging from southeast Wisconsin, through northeastern Illinois, and into northwest Indiana.

Wayne Edgerton, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Website: www.dnr.state.mn.us

Presentation Title: *Working With Those Who Are Working With the Landscape*

Abstract/Description: Private landowners must be able to trust and work with public agencies that have legal and technical responsibilities for the natural resources found on private lands. Ten years ago the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources instituted a focused effort to improve working relationships with private landowners. This presentation described some of these efforts, assessed their effectiveness and explored future efforts.

Charles A. Francis, Department of Agronomy & Horticulture, University of Nebraska

Website: agronomy.unl.edu

Presentation Title: *Challenges at the Rural/Urban Interface: Creating Win-Win Situations*

Abstract/Description: Growth of U.S. cities increasingly encroaches on farmland and creates areas of friction between rural and urban residents. In addition to the loss of agricultural production, there are changes in ecological function of lands that are converted to acreages, malls, business areas, and transportation corridors. The balance between controlled growth with thoughtful comprehensive plans and unrestricted development based on owner decisions and short-term market economics is one that needs to be carefully studied. A course in "Urbanization of Rural Landscapes" is taught at the University of Nebraska to help students and community residents explore the options and their long-term impacts. A

concept of developing stable "ecobelts" around our cities is proposed as a solution that will make the interface a zone of education and communication rather than a zone of conflict.

Dan French, PastureLand Co-op

Presentation Title: *Grass Farmers Take Their Cheese to Market: PastureLand Co-op – Its History and Hopes*

Abstract/Description: A group of grass farmers in Southeast Minnesota came together to try to add value to and market milk. This presentation provided a brief history of PastureLand, what the Co-op hopes to gain, and what it has to offer its customers.

Warren C. Gaskill, Sustainable Woods Cooperative/Rapid Improvement Associates

Websites: www.sustainablewoods.com, www.rapid-improvement.com

Presentation Title: *1, 3, 15: Learning the Infrastructure for Community-based Sustainable Forestry*

Abstract/Description: The Sustainable Woods Cooperative has learned many lessons in its 2+ years of putting landowners/members, sustainable forestry practices and consumers together. This presentation covered some of the key lessons learned, including details on how the Cooperative's efforts were strengthened and deepened this year when multiple cooperatives linked together, demonstrating that together we are more much capable than any one of us alone.

Elisa Graffy and Donna Myers, United States Geological Survey

Website: www.usgs.gov

Presentation Title: *Tracking Environmental Success: A Midwestern Water-quality Story*

Abstract/Description: Environmental goals are often part of the sustainable vision of working lands, and improving water quality is perhaps the most common environmental goal identified by individual landowners, land managers, and communities. Being able to see real changes in water as a consequence of changed practices or other strategies is an important motivator for further investment of time, energy and resources. What does it take to set meaningful, achievable goals for water quality at a landscape level? How much time and patience does it typically take to see improvements occur? How do you measure success? This talk addressed these questions, with emphasis on the case of the Maumee River, an Ohio tributary of Lake Erie.

Suzie Greenhalgh, World Resources Institute

Website: www.wri.org

Presentation Title: *A Nitrogen Reduction Strategy for the Mississippi River Basin and the Gulf of Mexico*

Abstract/Description: Nutrient pollution, now the leading cause of water quality impairment in the United States, has had significant impact on the nation's waterways. The hypoxic 'dead zone' in the Gulf of Mexico is one of the most striking illustrations of what can happen when too many nutrients from inland watersheds reach coastal areas. Despite the efforts of programs to improve municipal wastewater treatment facilities, more stringent industrial wastewater requirements and agricultural programs designed to reduce sediment loads in waterways, water quality and nutrient pollution continues to be a problem, and in many cases has worsened. WRI undertook a policy analysis to assess how the agricultural community could better reduce its contribution to the 'dead zone' and also evaluate the synergistic impacts of these policies on other environmental concerns like climate change. Using a sectoral model of

U.S. agriculture, WRI compared policies including untargeted conservation subsidies, nutrient trading, Conservation Reserve Program extension, agricultural sales of carbon and greenhouse gas credits and fertilizer reduction. The economic and environmental analysis is watershed-based, primarily focusing on nitrogen in the Mississippi River basin. The model incorporates a number of environmental factors, making it possible to get a more a complete picture of the costs and co-benefits of nutrient reduction.

Phil Guillery, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Community Forestry Resource Center
Website: www.forestrycenter.org

Presentation Title: *Creating Incentives for Responsible Forest Management Across the Landscape*

Abstract/Description: Extensive scientific research has shown the multiplicity of impacts of forestry practices on water quality, biodiversity, landscape, and sustainable economic yields. Poor forest management practices can adversely affect the environmental well-being of the world's forests and surrounding ecosystems by creating soil erosion, pesticide contamination of water supplies, depletion of biological diversity, negatively altered microclimates, and rapid and sustained loss of wildlife habitat. Fortunately, there are important new innovations in forestry that can protect water quality, promote biodiversity, and increase available habitat for birds, fish and other wildlife -- while at the same time providing reasonable economic returns and benefits to surrounding communities. One promising approach being used to bring forestland under protection management regimes is the use of third-party certification. Under certification standards, forests must be managed for a full range of ecological, economic, and social benefits. On a worldwide basis, the certification has catalyzed interest in governments, companies, environmental groups, and communities in promoting more responsible forest management.

Todd Hanson, Wisconsin Stewardship Network
Website: www.wsn.org

Presentation Title: *Experiences of the Wisconsin Stewardship Network*

Abstract/Description: The Wisconsin Stewardship Network (WSN) is a network of hunting, fishing, conservation, and environmental groups working to strengthen Wisconsin's stewardship ethic for the betterment of its people and natural resources. The WSN maintains a Madison office, but it also engages regional hub coordinators to serve as local points of contact, perform outreach activities, and help implement tasks locally. The WSN sees great value in holding periodic meetings with its nontraditional allies. This builds trust and lets participants see that what they have in common regarding the environment is often more than what separates them.

Roger Hunt, Trees Forever
Website: www.treesforever.org

Presentation Title: *Trees Forever Working Landscapes - A New Family Farm Program Concept to Foster Sustainable Rural Landscapes*

Abstract/Description: The Working Landscapes Program, developed by Trees Forever, will use community-based planning and visioning tools currently used in the Community, Roadways and Buffer Programs of Trees Forever. The Working Landscapes Program's primary focus is to help farm families develop a wholistic vision for their land and their interaction with it.

Dan Imhoff, Watershed Media

Website: www.watershedmedia.org

Presentation Title: *Wild Farms Alliance*

Abstract/Description: Information not provided.

Michael Jacob, Center on Wisconsin Strategy (COWS), University of Wisconsin-Madison

Websites: www.cows.org, www.sustainingwisconsin.org

Presentation Title: *Sustaining Wisconsin – A Statewide Dialogue about Wisconsin’s Future*

Abstract/Description: Sustaining Wisconsin is a statewide, community-level policy education effort that puts the Wisconsin Idea in action by extending the boundaries of the university to the entire state. COWS has conducted dozens of 30-minute slide presentations designed to engage audiences in the project, educate them about the issues, and encourage them to learn and do more. The presentation has been delivered to groups as small as two and as large as more than 1,000 in all corners of the state. The project’s scope and depth, along with its ability to talk formatively with ordinary, busy people about public policy issues is something never attempted before. COWS has learned much from the Sustaining Wisconsin effort and how it can be used as a model for civic engagement.

Dennis Keeney, Senior Fellow, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy

Website: www.iatp.org

Presentation Title: *Can Carbon Dioxide in the Atmosphere be Affected Significantly by Sequestration in Soils and Biomass?*

Abstract/Description: The cycling of carbon on a world scale gives many opportunities for building of sinks but there are also numerous natural and anthropogenic sources. While there are many opportunities to lower or at least ameliorate the anthropogenic increase in carbon dioxide through sequestration in soils and plants, it may be that there is not sufficient political will and economic incentives to make this a top priority for agriculture and forestry. Further, the amount sequestered may be smaller than some calculations indicate, and over time most of the sequestered carbon will again be released through biologic processes.

Darwin Kelsey, Cuyahoga Countryside Conservancy

Presentation Title: *The Countryside Initiative*

Abstract/Description: The Countryside Initiative is an innovative new program to rehabilitate and revitalize 30 to 35 farms which operated in the Cuyahoga Valley of Ohio from the mid-19th to mid-20th centuries, and which still survive within the boundaries of the Cuyahoga Valley National Park (CVNP). These new-old farms will pursue modern sustainable farming practices in harmony with the purposes for which CVNP was created and in harmony with long-established cultural and environmental values of the National Park Service.

Mark S. Kieser, Kieser & Associates

Website: www.kieser-associates.com

Presentation Title: *Water Quality as a Commodity? The Shift to Market-based Incentives for Environmental Improvements*

Abstract/Description: Traditional regulatory approaches to achieve water quality standards have reached a point of diminishing returns with billions of dollars invested in wastewater technologies and improvements over the past three decades. Non-point sources of pollution are now the common focus of our attention to achieve desired and mandated improvements in our impaired waters. Voluntary approaches to reduce non-point source impacts are one of the primary non-regulatory strategies being broadly adopted to address these concerns. Such voluntary non-point source reduction efforts, however, are often limited by competition for, or lack of funding. Incentivizing non-point source reduction efforts by developing markets for improvements on the land that result in improvements in our waters is now being examined nationally as one of many voluntary strategies. This market-based approach, commonly referred to as “water quality, watershed or effluent trading,” was examined in a three-year Water Quality Trading Demonstration Project conducted in the Kalamazoo River watershed of Michigan. The project evaluated how this new tool could be used by several non-point sources in agricultural, municipal and industrial settings to voluntarily achieve water quality improvements. Lessons learned and the framework for a trading approach were presented in the context of the burgeoning need to fund sustainable strategies for managing our land and water resources.

Ray Kirsch, Midwest Food Alliance/Land Stewardship Project

Websites: www.landstewardshipproject.org, <http://www.thefoodalliance.org/midwest.html>

Presentation Title: *The Midwest Food Alliance: Promoting Sustainability and Community Health Through Eco-Labeling*

Abstract/Description: The Midwest Food Alliance is an education and marketing project that uses a seal of approval (an eco-label) to distinguish local, sustainable foods and farms. Additionally, the seal directs consumers to educational food-buying information that helps them make the link between their food choices and their health. The long-term goal of the program is to reward good stewardship and help farms and communities become more economically viable, environmentally sound, and socially responsible.

Martin Kleinschmit, Center for Rural Affairs

Website: www.cfra.org

Presentation Title: *A Sustainable Approach to Economic Development*

Abstract/Description: There are alternatives, other than smokestack chasing and/or pledging your children's future, that a community has when it comes to economic development. A sustainable development plan preserves the quality of life of a community, manages its resources, and maximizes its advantages. A three-step evaluation process can identify economic drain, recognize and support local businesses, and capitalize on local resources that increase economic growth. Much was learned by the Center for Rural Affairs after year one of a three-year economic renewal process in one community.

Margaret Krome, Michael Fields Agricultural Institute

Website: www.mfai.org

Presentation Title: *Is Policy Too Pointy-headed to Make a Difference?*

Abstract/Description: Is policy irrelevant, tedious and a good excuse to leave the room? Are policy initiatives worth undertaking in a government whose elected officials are so influenced by monied interests? Are there real ways to make genuine change? These questions were explored using examples from the current Farm Bill debate and the sustainable agriculture movement's annual funding fights.

Beth Knudsen, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Website: www.dnr.state.mn.us

Presentation Title: *Wells Creek Watershed Partnership: Using History to Build Community, Using Community to Create the Future*

Abstract/Description: This 52,000 acre watershed in southeastern Minnesota is a landscape marked with the impacts from past land use decisions. It is also a place with a rich history of families living on the land. The Wells Creek Watershed Partnership has been built upon the common ground created by this shared history of place and people. Using a locally written vision for the future as the guide, the Partnership has been gathering and sharing information, monitoring resources and land use changes, and participating in decisions that impact the watershed. The Partnership is now poised to take further steps to move the community toward its described future.

Tom Larson, Wisconsin REALTORS* Association

Website: www.wra.org

Presentation Title: *Strange Bedfellows: The Passage of Wisconsin's Smart Growth*

Abstract/Description: Wisconsin's Smart Growth Law was authored and supported by a unique coalition of interest groups, including the Wisconsin Realtors Association, the 1000 Friends of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Towns Association, and the League of Wisconsin Municipalities. While these groups have traditionally been combatants on the issue of land use, they worked together to enact arguably the most significant land use law in Wisconsin within the last 50 years.

Sharon Lezberg, Friends of Troy Gardens

Presentation Title: *Community Participation and Non-profit Organization Collaboration in Land Use Planning*

Abstract/Description: Six years of active citizen planning have resulted in a vision for an integrated agricultural and natural landscape at Troy Gardens, a community-owned and -managed property that blends an urban farm, community gardens, and edible landscapes with prairie and woodland habitats and a 30-unit mixed-income affordable housing development. This property is located in the north side of the City of Madison, Wisconsin, in an area experiencing rapid urban growth and development. Residents, working with an array of non-profit and neighborhood-based organizations, were able to stop the State sale of the land (to what was regarded by neighborhood residents as undesirable development), and later to negotiate ownership of the land by a community land trust for the purposes of conservation and sustainable agriculture activities. Information on how this process unfolded and how citizen planning continues as the 'Friends of Troy Gardens' implements the development plan and creates educational programs on the land was shared in this presentation.

Jim Maetzold, United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service
Website: www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/RESS/econ/ressd.htm

Presentation Title: *Alternative Enterprises and Agritourism Opportunities*

Abstract/Description: Farmers, ranchers and rural communities have looked to alternative enterprises and agritourism to sustain them or increase their income. This is being driven by: 1) low prices at the farm and ranch gates, combined with droughts and floods, that have caused farmers, ranchers, and rural communities to look for alternative income-producing opportunities; 2) people returning to rural communities to live and farm small acreages looking for ways to generate income from the land and other natural resources; and, 3) people looking to replace or supplement traditional farm operations. Individual farmers, ranchers and rural communities have added many nature-based enterprises to the traditional hunting, fishing, maple syrup and etc. businesses. These new enterprises include adventure climbing, sky diving, on-farm/ranch experiences, cultural heritage appreciation, and birding and nature-based tourism. Farmers and ranchers have also entered into the Bed and Breakfast, farm dinners, craft making/sales, food/conference/wedding services and other on-farm experiences. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has developed a “tool kit” to aid in this transition.

Clark A. Miller, University of Wisconsin- Madison, La Follette School of Public Affairs
Website: www.lafollette.wisc.edu/

Presentation Title: *Indicators of Sustainability: A Social Approach*

Abstract/Description: Preliminary results from an ongoing study of how communities construct and use indicators of sustainable development (ISD) in pursuing sustainability goals suggest that important differences exist between how communities actually develop and make use of ISD and typical conceptions of that process presented in training materials and programs developed for communities. These differences can best be understood by understanding ISD as a social tool as opposed to an analytic or expert tool. In turn, this social approach offers new perspectives to communities about how to go about designing and implementing indicators of sustainability.

Dave Miller, Minnesota Forest Resources Council
Website: www.frc.state.mn.us

Presentation Title: *Landscape-level Planning and Coordination in Forested Landscapes of Minnesota*

Abstract/Description: The 1995 Minnesota Sustainable Forestry Act (SFRA) established a framework for promoting sustainability of the forested landscapes of Minnesota. Part of that framework calls for landscape planning and coordination on a voluntary basis across all ownerships. Citizen committees, called Regional Landscape Committees, have been established in two of the six landscapes. These Committees guide and direct the process of landscape planning and coordination.

Ed Minihan, American Farmland Trust
Website: www.farmland.org

Presentation Title 1: *Land Acquisition and Easements: The Town of Dunn*

Abstract/Description 1: Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) is an effective tool to protect land from development pressure. Citizens from the Town of Dunn, Wisconsin, have come together to create a land use plan that specifies goals and objectives as well as criteria for projects to protect farmland. Currently, five farms are protected and 21 projects are in process.

Presentation Title 2: *Influencing Policies and Programs*

Abstract/Description 2: Working from the outside of the political arena, it is helpful to follow these steps to create political will: 1) build coalitions by engaging all stakeholders, 2) be persistent, 3) base arguments on supportable facts, and 4) get on the inside. From the inside: 1) champion the idea, 2) build and inside constituency, 3) provide wide public involvement; and, 4) implement by taking the next step and hiring competent staff. Several examples from communities throughout the U.S. were highlighted.

Donna Myers and Elisa Graffy, United States Geological Survey

Website: www.usgs.gov

Presentation Title: *Tracking Environmental Success: A Midwestern Water-quality Story*

Abstract/Description: Environmental goals are often part of the sustainable vision of working lands, and improving water quality is perhaps the most common environmental goal identified by individual landowners, land managers, and communities. Being able to see real changes in water as a consequence of changed practices or other strategies is an important motivator for further investment of time, energy and resources. What does it take to set meaningful, achievable goals for water quality at a landscape level? How much time and patience does it typically take to see improvements occur? How do you measure success? This talk addressed these questions, with emphasis on the case of the Maumee River, an Ohio tributary of Lake Erie.

Allen Moody, CROPP/Organic Valley

Website: www.organicvalley.com

Presentation Title: *CROPP/Organic Valley: An Organic Marketing Cooperative*

Abstract/Description: CROPP, the Coulee Region Organic Produce Pool, started in 1987 with the collective marketing efforts of seven farmers. Initially they started with organic vegetables, but soon realized they would go broke sooner than later if they stayed with vegetables. A look around revealed no organic milk at the markets so they began to produce organic milk. Today the Co-op will gross close to \$100 million and collectively markets added-value production from over 400 farmers in 15 states. Distribution of the Organic Valley products covers all 50 states and minor exports into Canada and Japan. CROPP also markets organic meats (beef, pork and poultry) under the trademark name of Valley's Family of Farms.

Dr. Sonya Newenhouse, Madison Environmental Group, Inc.

Website: www.madisonenvironmental.com

Presentation Title: *Tools to Achieve Results: The Importance of Integrating Numbers, Words, and Images*

Abstract/Description: There are a variety of quantitative and qualitative tools available to resource professionals for planning purposes. Integrating methods and disciplines to understand, document, and create solutions for working landscapes is important. The benefits of integrating tools include: 1) engaging the participants; 2) adding value to documentation efforts; and, 3) improving the decision making process. Examples of integrating tools for small and large projects range from creating a few acres of green space to drafting new legislation.

Brian W. Ohm, Department of Urban & Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Website: www.wisc.edu/urpl

Presentation Title: *Comprehensive Planning for Working Landscapes*

Abstract/Description: Land use issues are the result of a complex interaction between choices made by public and private interests. Comprehensive community approaches are needed to begin to adequately address local land use issues. Local comprehensive planning provides an important opportunity for communities to build local support for a public policy framework that is supportive of public and private efforts to recognize and support efforts to protect working landscapes.

Teresa Opheim, Midwest Sustainable Agriculture Working Group

Presentation Title: *Sizing up a SAWG: A Model for Grassroots-guided, Inside-the-beltway Advocacy*

Abstract/Description: The Midwest Sustainable Agriculture Working Group (MSAWG) is a coalition working for a system of agriculture that is economically profitable, environmentally sound, family-farm based, and socially just. MSAWG has played a key role in the creation and codification of many Federal programs, including the SARE (Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program), EQIP (the Environmental Quality Incentives Program), and the WRP (Wetlands Research Program). MSAWG has been successful because its coalition of farmers and nonprofit groups working in the Midwest offers continuous advice and feedback to an excellent lobbying staff in Washington, D.C.

James Patchett, Conservation Design Forum, Inc.

Website: www.cdfinc.com

Presentation Title: *Designing Sustainable Communities – A Synthesis of Art, Engineering, and Ecology*

Abstract/Description: This presentation explored current innovations in integrated land and water resource management, with particular emphasis on illustrating emerging techniques that combine art, ecology, and advanced water resource engineering in urban, suburban, and rural design and development projects. Case studies from the United States and Europe were presented. Basic design theory, as well as specific technical engineering and ecological applications, was also discussed.

Mark Roffers, Vandewalle and Associates

Website: www.vandewalle.com

Presentation Title: *Wisconsin's Smart Growth Law and Agricultural and Forest Sustainability*

Abstract/Description: This presentation focused on the use of Wisconsin's Smart Growth Comprehensive Planning Law to create plans for rural areas that emphasize agriculture and sustainability in the face of residential and tourism development pressures. Case study examples included a northern Wisconsin county and five Dane County towns.

Deana Sexson, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Nutrient and Pest Management Program
Website: ipcm.wisc.edu/bioipm

Presentation Title: *The WWF/WPVGA/UW Collaboration Story: Developing Marketing Opportunities for Wisconsin Potatoes*

Abstract/Description: The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) teamed up with the Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association (WPVGA) and the University of Wisconsin (UW) to educate potato growers about using more biologically based pest management systems. The collaboration has achieved significant progress toward reducing the toxicity levels of pesticides used in potato production while increasing biointensive IPM adoption. Raising consumer demand for biologically based IPM produced products has been a goal of the collaboration from its inception. In the fall of 2000, ecological standards were written for potatoes. The eco-standard is divided into two parts: 1) a biointensive IPM adoption section; and, 2) a toxicity score. If growers meet both portions of the standards, they qualify for the non-profit eco-label called Protected Harvest. To maximize the marketing effort, there has been an agreement that all potatoes grown under these standards will be sold under the brand name of Healthy Grown. During 2001, 17 growers signed up over 8700 acres of russet, red and white potatoes to be grown under the Healthy Grown label. The Healthy Grown label offers environmentally-conscious consumers a quality, competitively priced product that is approved by Protected Harvest certification.

Lauren Sharfman, Environmental Law and Policy Center
Website: www.elpc.org

Presentation Title: *Climate Change and Repowering the Midwest*

Abstract/Description: Climate change is the most serious environmental threat of the 21st century. For the Great Lakes and the Midwest, natural and managed ecosystems are especially at risk of climate-induced changes to the forest ecosystem, natural grasslands, wetlands and agricultural lands. Fortunately, the region has many opportunities to reduce its impact on climate change. In the electricity sector alone, incorporating energy efficiency and renewable energy into the current mix of nuclear power and coal can help reduce carbon dioxide emissions 51% below a business-as-usual scenario by 2020, enough to meet the terms of the Kyoto Protocol. The Environmental Law and Policy Center, along with environmental advocates around the Midwest, released *Repowering the Midwest: The Clean Energy Development Plan for the Heartland* to demonstrate how these environmental improvements and safeguards against climate change can be made.

Lorrie Stromme, Minnesota Shade Tree Advisory Committee
Website: www.mnstac.org

Presentation Title: *How to Work Within a Bureaucracy, Make Your Pitch, and Work With Elected Officials.*

Abstract/Description: Practice the art of gentle persistence. Some pointers when you are dealing with elected officials: 1) tell them about your successes and how public funding will help leverage future successes, 2) ask yourself, “What’s in it for them?” or “Why should they care?,” 3) keep in mind that they want to make a difference, but they also want to be responsive to their constituents and be re-elected, 4) persuade those who are “maybes,” the fence-sitters. Don’t waste time preaching to the converted, 5) speak to them when they are receptive to listening such as during election years, budget time, town meetings, etc. Make your pitch: 1) keep it simple; 2) be FOR something rather than against it; 3) strive for win-win outcomes; and, 4) use photos, graphics, and visuals. Working within a bureaucracy: 1) find

out WHO makes the decisions, HOW, and WHEN (timeliness), 2) pick your fights; and, 3) be nice and show respect.

Tony Thompson, Willow Lake Farm

Presentation Title: *Challenges of Private Wildlife Conservation*

Abstract/Description: Information not provided.

Mark Weaver, National Park Service/America's Outdoors

Websites: www.ncrc.nps.gov/programs/rtca, www.americasoutdoors.gov

Presentation Title: *Lynden Hill: Community Participation Techniques*

Abstract/Description: Lynden Hill is a three-acre site in center city Milwaukee, owned by the city. For the past twenty years, the site has been an unofficial neighborhood green space for the nearby residents. In 1991, threats of development mobilized local residents to preserve it. In 1999 the site was designated as an Urban Tree House site (a federally-sponsored environmental education program), which reinvigorated the sagging neighborhood preservation momentum. Today, Lynden Hill has a master plan and preliminary construction documents for the Tree House. The Hill Partnership anticipates construction of the first phase of park improvements in the next year or so. This presentation described the steps taken to reinvigorate resident participation via festivals, brainstorming sessions, and the broadening of the partnership.

Robert Wills, Cedar Grove Cheese Inc.

Website: www.cedargrovecheese.com

Presentation Title: *Farm/Processor Collaboration for Community Improvement*

Abstract/Description: Collaborative efforts can enable small farms and processors to take advantage of their unique characteristics to maintain a diverse and competitive structure and improved environment.

POLICY PANEL:

***“Do New Policy Initiatives
Promote Sustainable Working Landscapes?”***

November 8, 2001

***Sandra S. Batie
Elton R. Smith Professor in Food & Agricultural Policy,
Michigan State University***

***Wayne Edgerton
Agricultural Policy Director, Minnesota Department of
Natural Resources***

***Gene Francisco
State Forester, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources***

***Chuck Hassebrook
Executive Director, Center for Rural Affairs***

The Policy Panel offered reflections on the potential impacts of new policy initiatives, particularly the United States Farm Bill, on working landscapes. Sandra Batie set the stage by providing a history of the Farm Bill and discussing some of its implications. Wayne Edgerton, Gene Francisco and Chuck Hassebrook then responded by presenting conservation, forestry and rural community perspectives, respectively, on the Farm Bill and U.S. farm policy.

POLICY PANEL:

Sandra S. Batie
Elton R. Smith Professor in Food & Agricultural Policy,
Michigan State University

*“The Farm Bill Predicament:
Its Historical Roots and Prospects for the Future”*

November 8, 2001

Michigan’s urban newspaper, the Detroit News, had a recent editorial that labeled the House proposed farm bill of \$168 billion for ten years as a “boondoggle.” It quoted a study by the Environmental Working Group as finding “no excuse is too flimsy for Congress to hand gobs of money to farmers.” The editorial continued: “over 60 percent of Congress’ largess goes to the richest 10 percent of the nation’s farmers,” and it noted – with some concern – that some money even goes to non-farmers. They reminded the reader that the Freedom to Farm legislation of 1996 was sold to the public as a way to “wean farmers from New Deal-era price supports in exchange for giving them more flexibility to grow what they wanted.” Instead, the Act became “an excuse to hand farmers vast sums of so-called emergency aid.” The new proposal would provide farmers with about \$69.5 billion more than it gave them in the last 10 years. The editorial continued by noting that the Secretary of Agriculture Ann Veneman had warned Congress that the mammoth scale of these newly proposed subsidies would cause the World Trade Organization to find them as trade distorting and in violation of international trade rules. The editorial urged President Bush to refuse such a bill.

The editorial could have mentioned, but did not address, the state of rural communities and the economic viability of many of America’s working farms. I need not tell this audience that many rural communities are suffering from serious depopulation and poverty problems or that many farmers are finding they can no longer make a living on their farm or ranch. Sometimes these farms and ranches are sold to neighbors, other times they are converted into non-farm uses.

Just how did something that seemed so beneficial in its Depression-era beginnings evolve into a so-called “boondoggle” and stray so far from its original goals of assisting rural landowners and rural economies? There are many components to the answer. Let me mention just six that I will then intertwine in my exploration of the historical roots of the Farm Bill: the political economy of subsidies; the relationship between subsidies and land prices; the declining dependence of rural economies on agriculture; the increasing dependence of agriculture on healthy rural economies; unintended impacts on prices, markets, risk, technologies, structure, and social and human capital; as well as political ideologies on the role of the federal government in agriculture.

Relief, Recovery, and Reform

Let’s go back to the roots of the Farm Bill. The Farm Bill was borne in the Great Depression, when agriculture found itself in a most perilous state, and when 25 percent of the U.S. population

was rural. Between 1929 and 1932, farm prices fell by more than 50 percent, as did gross farm income. By 1933, the incomes of farm people were less than 40 percent of non-farmers. Land prices fell by almost 30 percent and nearly a million farmers lost their farms between 1930 and 1934 (Ingersent and Rayner, 1999). The situation was so grave that the political climate favored some major new agricultural sector innovations; the answer came with the abandonment of the previous free market approach to governing the agricultural sector. In the Presidential campaign of 1932, Democratic candidate, Franklin D. Roosevelt, promised a “New Deal” that would lead to “relief, recovery and reform.” With Roosevelt’s election, the New Deal became the rationale for the first Farm Bill of 1936.

From its beginnings, the Farm Bill has had as its major objective the protection of income for farmers producing major crops such as corn, wheat, rice, and cotton. It did so by supporting, in one way or another, the price received by a farmer for a bushel of grain. (This crucial decision to subsidize bushels and not acres or family farmers, meant that the more a farmer produced, the more subsidies he or she got. This 1936 decision to subsidize on a per bushel basis has much to do with how agriculture is structured today.) The Farm Bill was coupled with programs that provided subsidized irrigation water, rural electric power, barge and rail transportation, and fertilizer and lime as well as publicly developed technologies (and publicly provided technical assistance) to enhance productivity. The programs of the New Deal and the economic stimulus that came from World War II eventually meant that the need for relief and recovery from the Depression were no longer an issue (and, for the most part, the reform of institutions was simply forgotten). Rural economies evolved to a point that a farm policy was no longer a rural policy. Farmers increasingly depended on second jobs in rural towns, more than rural towns depended on a viable agriculture.

Yet, despite all the changes in the structure of the rural economy, the Farm Bill continued with the same goal of income protection for farmers of major commodities. At one time, this targeting provided income support to many rural people, and thereby propped up many a rural community. Now, however, this same targeting means that current Farm Bill payments are directed at only a few of the many rural landowners in the U.S. – those who produce many bushels of the major commodities. Except in those few isolated communities that rely solely on agriculture, rural communities receive few benefits.

I suspect, and anecdotal information suggests, that the provision of large subsidies to a few farmers is not what the majority of taxpayers think they are buying with farm programs. If the Farm Bill is not producing what many say they want it to, then why is it so hard to change? One reason is the important impact of agricultural subsidies on the price of agricultural land. This impact of subsidies significantly increasing land values is a direct impact for lands that are suitable for growing the major commodities, and an indirect impact for other agricultural lands. Since land is pledged as collateral for loans, bankers and landowners of agricultural land all recognize that significant reductions in subsidies will lead to significant reductions in agricultural land values. So even farmers receiving smaller subsidies will lobby for high subsidy payments, not only to be assured of their smaller but valuable “share,” but also to protect their land values. These farmers are joined by bankers whose portfolios would suffer if land prices slid too quickly downwards. Then these farmers and bankers join in lobbying with the 10 percent of the farmers who receive the 61 percent of the farm subsidies and produce 70 percent of the covered commodities, as well as agribusiness firms, who add their impressive political heft to the politics.

The Farm Bill is thus a prime example of “constituency politics,” as opposed to representative politics. Lobbying pressure tends to be the strongest from the groups already obtaining the most benefits from the existing legislation. Absent equally strong constituency countervailing voices, significant remodeling of the Farm Bill is stymied. The situation is made worse by the equal split of parties in the Senate – no one wants to risk losing elections and party power by alienating beneficiaries of the current Farm Bill.

Unintended Impacts

So the Farm Bill continues with its New Deal Roots intact, proof that, once established, government programs prove difficult to terminate or substantially remodel. As writer Jonathon Rauch said, using agricultural policy as his example, “It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that, in Washington, every program lasts forever.” With the Farm Bill continuing as usual, few flexible funds remain to solve rural problems not addressed by the Farm Bill.

There are “losers” with the Farm Bill of course. The Farm Bill has had over time, like all legislation does, unintended negative impacts. These impacts are the subject of many a study, but include such things as (a) inducing technological innovations that lowered the cost per bushel of harvest, reduced farm labor costs, but led to the concentration of ownership-- accelerating the trend to fewer and larger farms, (b) encouraging the farming of risky and marginal areas, exacerbating negative environmental impacts such as chemical runoff, encouraging the destruction of wetlands, and reducing the use of rotations and organic agriculture. Furthermore, because historically the Farm Bill did little for rural communities but claimed the policy space and funding of a rural policy, the nation was left with neither significant help from the Farm Bill nor other significant rural legislation for struggling rural communities.

I do not want to overstate the case. The contribution made by the Farm Bill incentives to these impacts is much debated, but it is reasonably certain that without the influence of the Farm Bill and related legislation, the agriculture sector would be different. For example, without a sugar policy that subsidizes the price of sugar, there would probably be little sugar grown in the U.S.; research suggests that only some sugar cane in the South and in Hawaii would be profitable if U.S. sugar prices were the same as the world’s sugar prices. (Also, without sugar policy you would not have as much corn fructose in your soda pop or store-bought cookies, nor corn growers lobbying for sugar policy. In addition, in some regions, you might have more and healthier wetlands.) But to change sugar policy now means many clearly identified, politically influential people are harmed (e.g. sugar growers, processors, and others with investments in sugar and/or corn fructose).

On the other hand, the beneficiaries of a policy change are diffuse – users of sugar and supporters of reduction of sugar production for environmental reasons. This problem of clearly identified beneficiaries (i.e. gainers) versus diffuse bearers of costs (i.e. losers) is the norm. The bearers of costs have less incentive and less ability to lobby. In any case, clearly identified, highly motivated “gainers” usually trump more diffuse, less motivated “losers” in any policy debate every time.

The Farm Bill as a Conservation Vehicle

But what about conservation policy? Isn’t that part of the Farm Bill history? Since its beginning in 1936, the Farm Bill has had conservation provisions. However, for much of this history, the conservation provisions of the Farm Bill were directed at improving on-site productivity and

farm income; off-site problems were neglected. Until the 1970s, for example, farmers could get technical assistance for the liming of fields, the draining of wetlands or wet soils, or for irrigation projects. Not until 1985 did the focus of the Farm Bill turn to soil erosion as a threat to off-farm environmental attributes. The Farm Bill now provides modest conservation funds for such things as reducing off-farm nutrient runoff or providing cover crops for wildlife.

However, much of the conservation budget is spent to idle farmlands – the motivation of which comes as much from the need for supply control for budgetary purposes as it does for concern for conservation goals. In 2000, about 85 percent of the USDA Conservation Budget was spent on land retirement assistance; only 15 percent was spent for land treatment on working acres (SWCS, 2000). EQIP – The Environmental Quality Incentives Program – has even more modest funding to do some environmental protection projects. In short, the magnitude of the conservation funding pales in comparison with farm subsidies. And the resolution to assure successful and enduring conservation and environmental outcomes, (that is, enforcement and monitoring), appears to be weak.

Part of the reason for this limited funding of conservation and environmental goals is that the Farm Bill conservation programs have been designed with multiple objectives – only one of which is conserving resources on the farms and ranches and/or protecting the environment. Furthermore, it is clear that politicians do not ascribe the same importance to conservation that they ascribe to other Farm Bill objectives. This multiple objective focus and the second fiddle status of conservation programs dilute their effectiveness.

Another and related reason for the lack of attention to conservation and environmental problems, is that there is a poor match between the geography of the existing Farm Bill program payments and the geography of most environmental problems – particularly those associated with water quality. A reallocation to solve many environmental problems produces a set of vocal interests who will be harmed by such a reallocation. These vocal interests are not always offset by vocal interests who will benefit from reallocation, so the changes are rarely made in a major way. Where payments have been directed at these problems, there has been only modest funding and limited geographic targeting.

The Future

Could the Farm Bill be redesigned to achieve more conservation and environmental goals? Could it be used to provide a more appealing landscape or to provide assistance to a more diverse set of farmers and communities? Of course, but major redesign will have to overcome major political and budgetary barriers. As we are seeing in action in the halls of Congress today, there are strong political forces for maintaining and strengthening the existing distribution of farm program payments; redistributing these payments on the basis of non-commodity goals is proving, now, as always, to be exceptionally difficult.

There are also non-Farm Bill programs addressing conservation and environmental problems at all levels of government. Some are quite innovative and effective. Yet, too often, these programs work at cross-purposes with the Farm Bill or attendant legislation such as the federal crop insurance. As one observer noted with reference to environmental goals, the divergent agricultural and environmental policies amount to “one foot on the gas and one on the brake” (Ervin, 1999, p.63), although the pressure on the “gas pedal” has been far heavier than that applied to the environmental brake (Ruhl, 2000). My take on much of the current discussion of

the 2002 Farm Bill is that the Farm Bill is not being remodeled, nor is a foot going to be taken off the gas pedal. Rather, some, such as Senator Harkin, are attempting to add more countervailing pressure to the brake pedal.

However, unless the Farm Bill undertakes more of these non-commodity goals, there will be more non-Farm Bill activity addressing them. Personally, I think many of the important actions influencing environment and community are outside the Farm Bill. The Farm Bill is, as we all know, however, one of the few pieces of legislation that starts with the assumption of significant funding. Significant funding is hard to achieve with a new piece of legislation. As Al said at lunch, you have to “get your hands on the money.” This is one reason there is so much interest in newer ideas such as green payments.

The panel that follows me is focused on new and recent initiatives being contemplated or implemented in states and at the federal level. These panelists are well versed in these specifics, so I will leave it to them to elaborate on opportunities and alternatives. But I want to conclude with some thoughts on the role of government in pursuit of working landscapes.

It should be obvious from our discussion today that the economic forces that influence farmers, communities and landscape well-being are not unfettered market forces that reflect only farmer, processor, and consumer-citizen decisions. The political and legal choices we make immensely affect the health of the agricultural sector and the rural environment. Think of three large circles, of decreasing size, one within the other. The outer most circle is the natural systems, the middle inside circle is our social system, and encompassed within the social system circle is the economy. Each affects the other. For example, a functioning economy in an unhealthy environment or one with social discord and conflict will soon be undermined. Yet, there is not an automatic mechanism in the functioning of markets that recognizes these connections and intricate relationships between the natural, social, and economic worlds.

Specifically, an unfettered market in agriculture will not supply some of the public benefits such as environmental protection or open space amenities, because these public benefits do not translate into private benefits for farmers. Harming these benefits does not usually result in private costs for farmers. Thus these benefits and harms are not in the private market calculus. In addition, there is little in the functioning of a market to inform farmers or others of the existence of the benefits or harms. It is these “missing markets” and this “missing information” that provide a strong rationale for a public role in agriculture.

Society should augment and alter market forces if they are not serving the desired social objectives. What are these desired social objectives, how to consider ecological and social system interactions, and what mechanisms and institutions to use in accomplishing these objectives are questions partly for science and but mostly for the democratic process.

This role for the government is not, despite what some say, promoting “inefficiency in agriculture.” Farms that specialize in producing the lowest cost bushel of grain may not be as “efficient” in supplying other desired services, such as diverse landscape values. Farm technologies that enhance productivity but harm ecological systems may be considered inferior by society to those that are complementary to both on-farm and off-farm systems. Dispersed ownership of agricultural resources may be preferred to concentrated ownership of agricultural resources. Such social preferences are neither non-economic nor inefficient.

In conclusion, it is apparent that the management of our farmlands can have a major impact on the quality of our air, water and soil, on the attributes of our landscapes, and on the health of our communities. The Farm Bill and attendant agriculture programs do have a major influence on the management of farmlands.

Like all Americans, I have reflected on the impact of my work in light of the events in New York and particularly I have reflected on how it relates to core values worthy of defense. Now, especially after the attack on September 11th, is a very good time to reexamine our values, to sharpen our articulation of these values, and to see that these values get embedded in policy. We have an excellent panel to assist us with this task.

POLICY PANEL:

Wayne Edgerton
Agricultural Policy Director, Minnesota Department of
Natural Resources

“Conservation Aspects of the Farm Bill”

November 8, 2001

The Farm Bill is the most important piece of federal legislation in terms of having influence on conservation on private lands across the country. We get to review the Farm Bill outcomes periodically, and as Sandra mentioned, more often than not we have been a bit disappointed with the conservation provision outcomes. But if we look back to 1985, when broader based conservation was first included in the Farm Bill, and compare what we have now to what we had then, we've come a long way.

The question we are supposed to address in this session is “do new policy initiatives promote sustainable working landscapes?” I guess the answer to that is yes, no, maybe and it depends. It depends on what you're really talking about. Policy initiatives can promote working landscapes, but in most programs the nuts and bolts of what really happens depends on how they are interpreted. Budget constraints play a key role. Ten years is probably too short for some of the conservation aspects of the Farm Bill and too long for some of the commodity aspects. What we've been seeing is that farmers have been forced to farm the Farm Bill. We didn't even know what soybeans were when I was on the farm in the late 1960s.

What we really need is a toolbox of programs, working with the landowners to learn from them. Farmers know the right thing for their land. They don't want to mine the land; they want to preserve their land to be able to pass it on to their children.

The “I” in programs such as EQIP and WHIP stands for “incentives.” But as these programs are currently set-up, many of these “incentives” are not really incentives at all. Many of them go toward helping large farms achieve compliance with regulatory standards. Incentives should encourage people to do something they would not otherwise do.

The possibility of including stewardship payments in the Farm Bill is very encouraging. We must pay people to do the right thing for public benefits, rather than encouraging them to do what they know is wrong. This will broaden the base of people who can take part in the farm bill. We need to make sure that programs such as CRP, WHIP and EQIP are implemented properly with conservation in mind.

Never before have we heard conservation talked about so much in the Farm Bill. Harkin, Kind and Luger have all proposed conservation stewardship measures. In addition, we need some

kind of grasslands reserve program to protect prairies, which do not currently qualify for any Farm Bill protection programs.

Again, stewardship payments are a great idea, and we need to seize this moment to move them ahead. We're probably not yet going to see nation-wide stewardship programs in this Farm Bill, but we could start with a smaller pilot program, maybe in the Upper Mississippi River Valley, so we can see how such a program would work and get the rules and processes in place so we can get the federal agencies geared up to take on a nation-wide stewardship program in the future. And obviously we need more support for the sustainable agriculture aspects of farming.

Finally, last year, Minnesota state agencies worked with various farm groups, soil and water conservation districts and federal agencies to develop a state position on the Farm Bill, which has been shared with all the representatives and senators. Please feel free to contact me if you'd like to see this position statement.

Thank you.

POLICY PANEL:

Gene Francisco

State Forester, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

“Forestry and the Farm Bill”

November 8, 2001

Forestry has always played an important role in Wisconsin's economy. In the 1890's, Wisconsin led the nation in white pine production. Today, forestry is the second largest industry in the state. Forestry is extremely important for the sustainability of our rural communities: forestry is the leading employer in 42 of Wisconsin's 72 communities. In addition to the economic value, forests provide tremendous ecological and social values to our state. Wisconsin's forests purify surface and ground water to recharge our abundant clear lakes and streams. They provide habitat for a wide variety of both game and non-game wildlife. Our forests also provide the recreational and scenic setting that attracts visitors and residents to our state.

The question is, can we sustain these economic, ecological and social values from our forests? From a resource perspective we can. Wisconsin and the Lake States are blessed with a climate, soils and topography where diverse forests thrive and reproduce. Our forested landscape is accessible to modern forest-harvesting equipment with little to no environmental damage. The majority of our tree species reproduce naturally with proper forest management. Forest inventory data indicate that forested acres are increasing in Wisconsin. We can also sustain the ecological and social values from our forests. That is where we look to the Farm Bill.

Changing land ownership and attitudes have created challenges toward sustaining Wisconsin's forests. Seventy percent of forests are privately owned, mostly by non-industrial private landowners. The number of private landowners has increased. There are more absentee forest landowners than there were before. Many people rank timber production low as a reason they own the land. These changes in forest ownership and attitudes have resulted in some significant challenges in providing landowners with technical forestry assistance and information about the importance of sustainable forest management of their lands. Studies have shown that less than 25% of non-industrial privately owned forested lands have a management program. We are also seeing a change in the attitude by major forest industries, from one where they feel they need to own the land to supply a steady source of wood to their mills to an attitude that it is more cost-effective to buy wood on the open market. In addition, increased land values and property taxes have caused many landowners to sell parts of their forest land for recreation and development to help pay the costs of keeping their remaining land. Our society is also becoming more urban than rural, creating a disconnect in the public's understanding of the connection between the forest products they use daily and the rural forests needed to produce these products.

In Wisconsin, we have a long-standing commitment to the sustainable management of our private forested lands, and as a result of things such the early Farm Bills and U.S. Forest Service policies we have adopted some of those concepts. For example, our Department of Natural

Resources provides on-site technical assistance to over 10,000 landowners a year. We have a managed forest law that provides property tax reductions to landowners who manage their forest lands with 2.5 million acres currently enrolled. We have a \$1.25 million state-funded grant program available to landowners to implement sustainable forestry practices. We contract with private consulting foresters to develop forest management plans. We produce 20 million tree seedlings at our tree nurseries to provide low cost seedlings for reforestation. We work with landowner groups to provide forest landowner workshops to educate new and existing forest landowners. We also provide incentives and assistance to establish forest landowner co-ops.

In response to our current forest management challenges, we are working with the forest industry to provide incentives for retaining their forest lands as working lands open to public recreation. We are working on a strategy to purchase access and development rights to prevent fragmentation of these ecologically- and economically-important lands. We are also attempting to reconnect our urban and rural residents to the forests and the need to sustain them by creating a K-12 forestry curriculum that will be implemented in schools next year, developing a forestry education awareness center and school forests to serve as outdoor classrooms, and providing \$400,000 worth of grants to develop forestry education programs.

But we still need a lot. In order to be sustainable, we need to continue on with some of these practices. We are looking to improvements in the Farm Bill to provide incentives. As a state forester and member of the National Association of State Foresters, we're working hard on some Farm Bill activities. One is the Sustainable Forestry Assistance program, which provides incentives to landowners toward retaining their working forests and managing them sustainably. We're also supporting a watershed grant program that provides incentives to landowners to manage the watersheds that their forests provide. We're looking at supporting a grant program to help mitigate some of the fire problems that we're having throughout the nation. We're also trying to build technical forestry assistance capacity and put more emphasis on public education and awareness.

POLICY PANEL:

Chuck Hassebrook
Executive Director, Center for Rural Affairs

“The Farm Bill and Rural Communities”

November 8, 2001

I want to make two main points before launching into the Farm Bill. The first is that we cannot fundamentally change what goes on on the working landscape; we cannot fundamentally change the direction of agriculture unless we win the hearts and minds of people on the land and engage them in making that change. The second is that if we can offer people a future that both protects the environment and provides genuine opportunities to rural people and a genuine future for their communities, they will join us.

What we are doing today in public policy has been nothing short of a disaster for our agricultural communities. Many people don't realize how bad the current situation is. The two lowest income counties in the United States are Nebraska farm and ranch counties. Half of the nation's lowest income counties are farm and ranch counties in Nebraska and the Dakotas. If we look at poverty, the poverty rate in farm and ranch communities in the Upper Midwest exceeds that of urban areas by 50%. We have a problem here.

If we look closely at this, we find that many of the policy approaches and production system approaches that have contributed to or failed to account for environmental decline are the very same ones that are contributing to the social decline in rural America. We have long criticized commodity programs for their effects on the environment, but neither have they worked for family farms or rural communities.

We spent \$29 billion last year on direct payments to farmers. It did provide needed relief, but by and large we spent that money in ways that did little or nothing to contribute to the long-term solution to these problems. In one respect it made the problems worse by subsidizing the nation's largest farms to drive their neighbors out of business by bidding their land away from them. What's particularly problematic about these programs is that they are based on the notion that the bigger you get, the more money you get – the more land you can acquire, the more money you receive from the government. What this guarantees is that most of the benefit gets bid into higher land prices, particularly into higher cash rents, so on rental land it doesn't even support the income of farm operators. And of course there are environmental impacts – discouraged crop rotation, encouraged production for maximum yield, money diverted from conservation efforts, etc.

Public research programs are similarly misguided. Research has largely focused on developing expensive new products to sell to farmers that enable fewer people to produce the nation's food, that enable companies to sell more things to farmers, and in some cases that allow us to override natural systems. We've shifted toward using more purchased inputs rather than farmers'

management. Farmers don't control weeds anymore, Monsanto does. Farmers don't get paid to control weeds, Monsanto does. The share of profits captured by farmers is shrinking while that of the input sector is growing. Stuart Smith demonstrated that this trend has become so strong that if we extend the trend line out to about 2030, the farm and ranch share of the profits from the food system would be zero.

So what can be done? We have to restore integrity to farm income support payments so that they target small and medium-sized farmers. We need to divert a portion of our support payments toward rewarding good stewardship. We are making some progress in those directions in the Farm Bill debate. However, there are still problems with how conservation money might be spent, for example by using federal money to pay for projects required by regulatory laws such as large farm waste lagoons. There are also political issues. Senator Harkin is being criticized by others in the Senate Agriculture Committee for spending too much on conservation and not enough on commodity programs. This is instructive in terms of how to do politics around conservation. Part of the problem is that conservation programs are defined as regional issues, not national issues. They are a way of taking money away from the traditional production areas that are getting too much money and giving it to those areas that are not getting enough. There are a couple of problems with this. One, the Agriculture Committee is almost entirely made up of people who come from areas that produce a lot of commodities, so that turns the Committee against conservation if it is a way to take money away from their states and give it to others. Second, farm programs are seen by some members of Congress not as a way to bring money home to their districts but rather as a way to keep their party in control of the Senate or the House. No one wants to cut farm programs if it means losing one or two seats, because that's enough to shift the balance of power.

Another thing we need do in reforming public policy is invest more in initiatives that increase the farm and ranch share of farm profits *as* they reward good stewardship. One of the great opportunities to support sustainable development and agriculture is the growing market for products that are produced in an environmentally-sound way. Many consumers are willing to pay a premium for such products but the problem is that we haven't had the market infrastructure to link those consumers with the farmers and ranchers who have the products they want. One of the good parts of the current Farm Bill is that it commits \$75 million a year for a value-added program that focuses on strengthening medium-sized family farms and rewarding conservation. That money could be used not only to build processing plants but also to organize marketing alliances and create market infrastructure to enable producers who produce products in an environmentally-sound way to link together and receive a premium for doing that.

REPORTS ON KEY THEMES AND OBSERVATIONS:

Laurel Kieffer

*Sheep Dairy Farmer and Citizen Advisor, University of Wisconsin
Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems*

November 9, 2001

It is a delight to be here and to have the opportunity to reflect. First, I think it is important for me to share the filters that I am looking through and that I will be reflecting upon. My upbringing was on a small dairy farm in Dane County, Wisconsin. It was a very small, family-based farm. I loved it, but I sure didn't like the 365-days-a-year, 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week work. So when I went off to college, I wasn't quite sure that farming was something to which I wanted to return.

As I reflect back on my filters and my value system, another really important part of my farm upbringing was a father who was incredibly and passionately in love with the land. Among other things, he was a political activist, he was trying to do sustainable agriculture, he was on the rural planning commission for Dane County when that was first beginning, and he started a grassroots campaign to keep power lines from running through prime farmland and was successful in making that happen. His love for his family, his farm and his country helped to formulate in my mind what responsibilities we have as individuals to sustain those kinds of values. As I grew up and got married and had children, I realized that I wanted my kids to have that kind of an upbringing, to understand the interconnectedness between the land and between them, between each other and this world and between food and the environment. So I convinced my city husband to become a farmer. We purchased a very run-down farm and started to make a dream happen. We called it Dream Valley Farm because there was nothing there but dreams when we first started.

So that's one of my filters. Another is having this dream that there is a place for family farming somewhere out there in that maze of corporate agriculture. I wasn't sure what that place was, but when the idea of sheep dairy came up I realized that this was something you could do on a small area of land, with which you could do value-added, that didn't belong to the commodity market, and that was not going to be controlled by big business (I hope). Doing sheep dairy looked like a way to take our values and make a difference. Part of our goal with this farm we now have is to see how can we take the risks so that other people can follow and also have an opportunity for such a dream.

Another filter I have is as a University instructor of women's studies. Prior to that position, I worked as the executive director of a domestic violence and sexual assault program, which introduced me to a lot of information about grassroots movements and to the poverty issues and disparity of wealth issues we have in this country. Taking this filter of feminism, and viewing feminism as a big-picture perspective – defined as appreciation for diversity, where everybody counts and everybody has voice – those are the things that I reflect upon today.

Yesterday we had an intertwining of the past, the present and the future. I would like to frame my comments in this context.

Looking back, how did we get to where we are today, what's the history? I also happen to have background in university extension and grew up with the benefits of 4-H and cooperative extension education. The message that we were given to spread was one of high tech and high production. We were told that it was our mission to feed the world and to use technology to do so. The piece that we kept overlooking was that we had limited resources. We had this mentality that the fuel, the land and the human capital were ours to use as much as we needed, without regard for what our children would inherit. Our success in agriculture was based on being big and on learning how to take advantage of all of the subsidy programs that were out there.

So our current situation is that we're caught in the middle of a paradigm shift. And I believe that this paradigm shift began in the late seventies/early eighties. That paradigm shift began to talk about things like renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, walking lightly upon the earth, and the concept of *Ghia*, the concept of mother earth. We're now starting to recognize the flaws and the potential future crises of our current and past models. There are many groups of people who are attempting to make change. We heard about a lot of examples yesterday.

The farmers out there are people who are committed to that change. Because the drive to stay on the land is so strong and so much a part of who we are, we will do anything to maintain our connection with the land. We will take our families and live in poverty, without health insurance, without having enough boots for our kids, with having to go to Goodwill and Savers to outfit our children. We will do that because we are so committed to the cause. Are you that committed to the cause? That's the first challenge I want to ask you.

As we become the mother of invention, this passion to retain the land and to love and nurture it becomes a driving force. So as educators, politicians and professional voices calling out for change, we need to understand the core of that passion of the people who stay on that land. We also have the issue of the legislative changes that sometimes appear to be too much or too little, that side-step the issues or let partisan politics get in the middle of them.

I'd like to talk a bit more about the current situation and move toward the future and a definition of working landscapes. I think it really helped when Al Appleton, at lunch yesterday, differentiated between working lands and working landscapes. I challenge us to think about working landscapes not only in the context of agricultural lands. We spent a lot of time yesterday talking about agricultural landscapes, but we have landscapes in our urban areas as well. Al Appleton urged us to think big – that everything is a working landscape. We must include the economic end of it, the environmental end, and especially the people. We must ensure that the people have equal value to the land. That seems pretty obvious, but if we think about our politics and how we have put forth our values in terms of actions, I would question whether we have always given people the same value as the land.

Another thing that Al Appleton said, and that I believe, is that we must trust that people will make good choices when provided information and opportunity. Both of those things must be there. We can give people all the information they need, but if they don't have the opportunity to

make change, change isn't going to happen. Most farmers will do the right thing if they have the capacity to do so. So how do we provide them with those opportunities?

This leads me some feminist theory. In the early 1960s, Betty Friedan wrote a book entitled "The Feminine Mystique" and she put forth the thought that "the personal is political." I would like to extrapolate from that and make the connection of where we are today in terms of working landscapes and how we put forth a framework for big-picture processing. We have to look at things from all levels of perspectives – the micro (personal), meso (community), macro (state) and global levels.

So when we talk about future planning, how do we ensure, on the micro level, that we include those who are to receive the so-called benefits of our services and planning efforts, or better yet how do we let them design the plans themselves? We need to understand that the people out there on the land have spent many years being told how to do things, with promises of a better life that often didn't materialize. We need to recognize the deficits in our system and how they affect individuals.

On the meso level, we need to provide education about working landscapes and sustainability, and exposure and experience from the soul to all people. We need to talk on a blatantly honest level so that people in the grocery stores, the churches, the schools and the banks understand the intricacies of our communities. We need to link consumers not only with food sources but with the reality of what it takes to produce that food. Our CSAs are doing that.

On the macro and global level, we must continue and increase communication with elected officials. We need exchange on all levels about the WTO, about the impacts of GATT and about what's happening with NGOs across the nation. Lastly, we also need to utilize systems like the land grant universities and other large organizations to transfer new information and to get it out with as much zest, and passion and vigor as we did with "Big Agriculture."

REPORTS ON KEY THEMES AND OBSERVATIONS:

Timothy Bowser
Executive Director, Fires of Hope

November 9, 2001

The Political is Personal: Reflections on Working Landscapes Day One

by Timothy Bowser

(with apologies to Gary Snyder and John Trudell)

Shifting Realities

Zach vs. Lewis

Appeal vs. function

Who did YOU think had the better looking presentation?

Style vs. substance

Who did you think had the more important message?

Seduced by appearance, Hi-Techyness,
“Killer Graphics” dude!

What are we saying??!! What does the Landscape hear?

The Future → If we don't keep up, we will get passed by,
we are going to lose.

Passed by by whom?? Lose What???

Emerson - “The Excellent is new Forever”!!
Lewis!!!

Don't get me wrong, I am all for the future.
Hell, I have the same computer as Zach, a groovy
little cell phone, and access to TWO fax
machines!

I gained much from the Futurist.

Janine Benyus Biomimicry IS our Future!!
Many answers lurking in Natural Systems
Superior Natural Technologies everywhere in the
Landscape.

Are we sophisticated enough to see them???

Imitating Natural Systems.

Shifting Realities

If you need a computer
to find a STARBUCKS
your eyes ain't open!!

Are our eyes open to Natural Systems and the
problems we have wrought on the
Landscape?

Natural Systems → Ecosystems →
Watersheds + humans & economy =

Bioregions

That's what I'm talking about
People living WITH natural systems
Bioregionalism -- last week's Working
Landscapes??

The Political + Indigenous knowledge =
Ecological Restoration → Sustainable
Economies → Working Landscapes

Al Appelton and the NYC watershed farmers
showed us this
Shifting Realities!

Sometimes The Political Gets Personal

End of yesterday, Gentleman stood before
panel:

Reforms are badly needed
Reforms are very doubtful
Political parties more concerned
about seats than
Rural People, Communities,
Environment.

But Not ALL Politics is Local →
Our own Mark Ritchie – Loss of Family Farms
20 years ago, Devastating!!
Copies of papers
Documenting a process / decisions / a Plan
By Council on Foreign Relations to move people
off the land.
Political?? Yes
The Unaccountable Political → Corporate
Kings, Foundation Officers, University Presidents
Their Plan leads to the depopulation of rural
America
→ labor to fuel the Industrial Jihad in urban
American
→ we know the cost to the environment
→ But as Chuck H. pointed out, the 2 most
impoverished counties in America aren't in
Brooklyn or South Central or the South Side,
But Nebraska!! Heartland of America!!
Landscapes ain't working
For Rural People
Shifting Realities

But The Political Can be Good

Kathleen Falk
My new Landscape Hero
She went to the Farmers First.

She said things...political things, personal things

“First thing I did, was talk to the Farmers.”
“Sustainable ag has sure made a lot of progress,
thanks to people in this room.”
“I belong to a CSA, eat local food, all year round.”
“We established a Farmers Market in poorest
neighborhood.”

If she became Governor,
It would be a great day for whole US Landscape.
She went to the Farmers First.
Al Appleton and his NYC Watershed

Ideas DO matter
Landscape + Indigenous Knowledge =
more than \$\$\$\$ + technology
But, you Gotta Dream It Before You Can Do
It

Wayne Edgerton – Pay Farmers to Do The
Right Thing
Spike Lee pervades agricultural
consciousness,
Working Landscapes can pervade our
consciousness!!
Shifting Realities

The Personal is Political

Many breakout sessions yesterday provided
fine examples of what can happen when
people are determined to

Shift their Realities.

Engaging Rural Communities in policy and
Planning.

Eco-Labeling.

Pastureland Cheese.

Project H.O.P.E.

Wild Farms!!

Work for the Landscape

Showing how we can, how we must reinvent
the infrastructure that rewards farmers in the
marketplace
for the benefits they provide in our Foodshed.

Working Landscapes will happen at
Watershed Level

when we have informed Personal Politics
leading to robust Bioregional Economies.

Working Landscapes, Working for Water,
Soil and People

Managing the Chicken AND the Egg.

Shifting Realities

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE:

Breakout Discussions on Needs and Opportunities for Advancing Sustainable Working Landscapes

November 9, 2001

The Harvesting Ideas for Change session provided participants with the opportunity to continue their exploration of advancing the working landscapes concept through small group discussions on one of five broad topics. Breakout groups were asked to identify barriers, needs and opportunities for each topic and to develop, if possible, concrete strategies that could be implemented in participants' own communities.

The Harvesting Ideas for Change discussion topics were:

1. Innovating smart growth to include multi-generational rural and urban sustainability goals
2. Exploring cutting-edge stewardship options for backyards, farms, forests, and landscape partnerships
3. Measuring success and selecting appropriate sustainability indicators
4. Experimenting with new products and market innovations to support sustainable working landscapes
5. Community dialoguing, visioning, organizing and decision-making that promote sustainable policies and working landscapes

An additional group met during the Harvesting Ideas for Change session to discuss the possibility of establishing an ongoing discussion of land use and resource management issues pertinent to the area known as the Driftless Area or Blufflands Region in southwest Wisconsin, southeast Minnesota, northwest Illinois and northeast Iowa. This group continues to meet, illustrating some of the many connections that were made during the Working Landscapes conference.

The diverse interests, perspectives and experiences of the conference participants were evident throughout the Harvesting Ideas for Change session. The following discussion summaries were written by session participants and reflect the different formats of and approaches to the discussion sessions.

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Innovating Smart Growth to Include Multi-Generational Rural and Urban Sustainability Goals

November 9, 2001

The “Innovating Smart Growth” session focused on ways to address the root causes of current growth patterns and tools for achieving desired land use patterns and “smart growth.” Some of the many comments from the participants in this session included:

- We must build coalitions and partnerships. To do this, we need everyone at the table – even adversaries. True dialogue will have conflict.
- We must ask ourselves what is important to us and act accordingly. We must take responsibility for our personal beliefs but also be open to debate about and challenges to those beliefs.
- We need greater civic participation in land-use (and other) issues. Business and government have thus far been the primary players in development and land use decisions. The WTO protests in Seattle were an example of a re-emergence of power by individuals and society.
- We need to re-invest in areas that have already been developed and focus on rural infill and revitalization, not just on continually growing outward.
- We need to consider options for using landscapes in new ways. We need to find ways to preserve environmental corridors and look at what extension services can do to encourage farming alternatives. For example, extension services can assist with marketing, education, value-added products, agritourism and bringing people together.
- We must approach development with a perspective of comprehensive planning. Comprehensive planning includes encouraging, managing and discouraging growth, depending on the area.
- Growth is dynamic. Situations change and landowner perspective may also change.
- It will take time to address difficult land use issues. We should start now, before the bulldozers come.
- There is an inter-relationship between smart growth and rural issues.
- Policy initiatives are often the outcome of citizen initiatives. We need to build capacity by strengthening citizen groups and civic organizations and get those groups involved in policy.

- Education is part of the policy development process. We must consider the implications of the status quo and educate others about growth issues.
- We need to connect to schools, such as by holding arbor day celebrations and establishing agriculture magnet programs like the one in St. Paul, Minnesota.
- We must link rural and urban residents. CSAs, agritourism and websites for farmers to connect with customers are some of the many ways to accomplish this.
- We must elevate farm business to same level as other business.
- We need to hold corporations responsible for their actions and encourage them to behave in a civic-minded way.
- We must find ways to engage citizens in the planning process.

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Exploring Cutting-Edge Stewardship Options for Backyards, Farms, Forests and Landscape Partnerships (Session 1)

November 9, 2001

Many good things are happening on the landscape. Federal programs and initiatives such as Forest Legacy, Forest Stewardship, Partners for Wildlife, Conservation Reserve Program, Urban Forestry and others provide much needed financial and technical resources. In local communities and on larger landscape levels, land use and community planning efforts are continuing and increasing, often involving partnerships of many stakeholders. Landowner alliances such as organic and forestry co-ops and the Wisconsin Family Forests are bringing landowners with common goals and values together. Community-supported agriculture is helping to make a connection between urban and rural communities, and farmers and consumers. Eco-labeling of forestry and organic food products is proving to be an important, recognizable marketing tool.

There are some things that could be improved or done away with. In Wisconsin, grazing of forest land is still encouraged. Nationwide, biodiversity continues to dwindle despite efforts to the contrary. Tax laws at all levels undermine efforts toward sustainable land management. While land use and community planning were noted as positive activities, implementation often fails due to a lack of funding or other barriers. Competition between organizations striving towards similar goals is also a concern.

Part-time farmers, absentee landowners, and limited interest and knowledge by the public in sustainable land management are thought to be neither good nor bad, but rather considerations when addressing issues related to sustainable land management.

A number of things are changing. Many public agencies and organizations are reducing budgets or shifting priorities, resulting in decreased technical services to landowners. However, the demand for these services is increasing. Agritourism and volunteerism are on the rise. Demographics within cities and in rural communities are changing. Population continues to increase, affecting land use, transportation systems, technological developments and energy demands.

Recommendations:

1. Establish education and outreach programs designed for all levels of education, from preschool through college and beyond, that address sustainable land management topics covering the spectrum of disciplines (agriculture, forestry, community/urban, etc.). Also create programs designed to meet the needs of individuals not attending college.

2. Design and provide low-cost, accessible technical and continuing education training programs for consultants and landowners to fill the gap created with budget cuts and shifting priorities of public agencies.
3. Provide small-scale (regional, state, and local) working landscapes conferences to reach more people from many different backgrounds and perspectives.
4. Develop an evaluation process to identify successful and effective sustainable land management strategies, but design it to avoid cookie-cutter solutions since each problem and question has its own context, opportunities and constraints.

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Exploring Cutting-Edge Stewardship Options for Backyards, Farms, Forests and Landscape Partnerships (Session 2)

November 9, 2001

What's Happening?

- Value-added, direct marketing
- Community forestry – landowner co-ops
- Cultivating medicinal herbs
- Food co-ops
- Permaculture
- Agroforestry
- Renewable energy
- Prairie restoration
- Using GIS for sustainable agriculture and landscape planning
- Alternative construction and materials, training students in construction trades in alternative (ecological) design
- Particular programs:
 - USDA/NRCS in Illinois – Southern Cherokee, American Indian liaison: habitat protection and restoration, outreach to urban populations, urban gardening and forestry – greenhouses for sacred plants, sweetgrass/tobacco restoration, village with cultural-ecological education center
 - Iowa Natural Heritage (non-profit land trust): trading lands, easements, restoration
 - Ho-Chunk Nation, Wisconsin Lands Division: identifying improved land use alternatives, Egress and Mississippi River water rights protection
 - Rural Renewable Energy Alliance – recycled materials for low-income people (Minnesota Materials Exchange)
 - CSAs, greenhouses
 - Marketing/Extension for Hmong farmers

What's Needed:

- Alternatives to private land ownership
- Creative, non-traditional alliances such as between low-income housing groups, urban groups and land trusts
- Networking: bringing local communities and local groups together to guide individuals and form visions
- Community organizing: connect ideas to local leadership, connect communities to land

- Two levels of action:
 - Policy reform
 - Grassroots education (for example, CSA offering food, recipes and cooking classes)
- Three types of landscapes: working landscapes/agricultural landscapes, life-sustaining landscapes, and urban landscapes
- Clear understanding of global trends such as oil, climate change, farm demographics, regional permaculture
- Allies among consumers and consumer groups
- Certified sustainable forestry
- Explosion of myths
- A proactive rather than reactive approach to working with private landowners

Strategies and Policies for Moving Forward:

- Create diverse forums to discuss problems and brainstorm solutions
- Engage local governments, policy people, zoning officials, urban recreation groups, urban planners, realtors and others
- Network and share experiences
- Create local alliances
- Provide insurance against risk to encourage innovative experiments
- Explore new products, for example hazelnuts, organic potatoes
- Organize markets, market structures, marketing infrastructures
- Connect producers with consumers
- Integrate customer base with financing and support
- Harvest knowledge from the past, conserve traditional knowledge and plant varieties
- Connect tribal lands to people (e.g. Hmong) who need land to grow natural foods
- Create capacity and infrastructure to restore the land
- Educate - for example, hold workshops for realtors and real estate developers
- Explore creative and cooperative ownership and financing, for example urban/rural partnerships as an alternative to land trusts
- Get involved in land use policy and zoning changes
- Not just sustain, but restore
- Deer, Bear and other clans charged with responsibility to the land and the future

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Measuring Success and Selecting Appropriate Sustainability Indicators

November 9, 2001

The “Measuring Success and Selecting Appropriate Sustainability Indicators” breakout session focused on such questions as, “How do we measure our progress toward achieving sustainable working landscapes?” and “What indicators can we use to ‘measure’ sustainability?” The initial question asked was, “What is the current foundation on which we can build?” Discussion was wide-ranging and thoughtful from a variety of perspectives. Ultimately the group focused on process and the necessary functions or pieces to be considered in the design of a system of appropriate sustainability indicators.

We had a good general discussion on indicators with the following comments:

- There are mega-lists of indicators already compiled. Examples of indicators include the University of Michigan’s Life Cycle Indicators (earth-food-waste) and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization’s Well Being of Nations Indicators.
- We should learn from what already exists. Performing literature searches for publications about existing sustainability indicators and their applications, coordinating efforts and sharing resources with others such as NGOs and universities will help prevent us from re-inventing the wheel.
- Not all existing indicators are useful. For example, some environmental indicators are not accepted or they cannot measure the impacts of actions. Often there are no data to support particular indicators.
- There is no cookbook for indicators. Indicators may be social/vision based and therefore qualitative (society need) or they may be measured and therefore quantitative (managerial need). Some questions to consider when developing sustainability indicators include:
 - Is an indicator a goal or vision?
 - If indicators are used to measure success, how is “success” defined?
 - How do environmental and social justice fit into the equation?
 - How do you account for different time and spatial scales?
- Indicators have several functions:
 - Feedback, evaluation and redesign
 - Accountability
 - Priority setting
 - Monitoring and testing the validity of the indicator itself

- Choosing indicators should be a community decision and should involve everyone who is affected or interested, including community members, experts and decision makers. Choice and dialogue are important.
- Precautions must be taken when developing sustainability indicators. For example, some characteristics may be difficult to measure. What you can measure may drive the process more than asking the right question.

After our initial discussion we tried to answer the question, “What process or items would we suggest be included in developing a system of indicators for environmental sustainability?”

1. Set goals of where you want to go and what you want to achieve
2. Determine who is affected
3. Determine the scale or scope of the project
4. Determine whether you need an indicator or an array of indicators depicting economic, social, and environmental concern in an index
5. Inclusiveness is important – ask people who live in the community, people who are affected, subject experts, and those who are interested for input
6. Search for information about what already exists
7. Indicators that have a common thread are most likely to be adopted

We then asked participants what they thought were the most useful geographical scales for sustainability indicators. (Participants could vote as many times as they wished.)

Scale	Number of votes
Backyard or farm	2
Community or watershed	7
State	6
Regional or multi-state	4
National	3
Global	3

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Experimenting with New Products and Market Innovations to Support Sustainable Working Landscapes

November 9, 2001

The “New Products and Markets” breakout session focused on the use of alternative products and markets as one way of contributing to sustainable working landscapes. Progress is already being made in developing and promoting new products and markets but there are a number of additional needs and changes that need to be made to increase the effectiveness of these mechanisms.

Participants began by identifying existing initiatives that encourage new products and markets. Regional- and local-level examples include eco-labeling, regional food systems, food cooperatives and the support of community development by foundations. Larger-scale examples include alternative energy production, the inclusion of value-added products in discussions about food and agriculture policy and the development of markets for resources such as nutrients and greenhouse gases. Farm-level examples include agritourism and the use of crops for multiple benefits, such as planting perennial crops to reduce erosion.

The majority of the discussion focused on what more is needed and what needs to change in order for new products and markets to be an effective tool for supporting working landscapes. A number of participants mentioned the need to reconnect with the land. Many people these days do not know where or how the products they buy are produced and are thus unaware of the impacts such production might have. Using farms as teaching sites, incorporating rural issues into classroom curricula and providing information at places such as cooperatives are ways to help teach people who do not usually come in contact with rural livelihoods about the economic, ecological and social aspects of farms and food production. Similar methods could be used for educating people about non-farm products.

Along the same lines, participants stressed the need to educate consumers about the benefits of local and sustainably grown products and about what options are available to them. Recommendations as to how to do this included expanding eco-labeling to include more information about consumer products and outreach to city residents by farmers and cooperatives. Many participants agreed that face-to-face communication is the best way spread a message, however they also recognized the need to reach people with limited time.

On a larger scale, environmental costs (and benefits) must be incorporated into the pricing of goods and services. Many people base their purchasing decisions on price, yet the true costs (and benefits) of most products are not reflected in their price. Consumption trends should also be taken into consideration in order to promote sustainable products through meeting consumer demands. For example, many consumers want quick, easy-to-prepare meals. While changing

consumer preferences may be difficult, it is possible to provide the products consumers want using sustainably-grown foods. Most importantly, consumers must have access to sustainably-produced products. Several participants cited Minnesota cooperatives as a good example of connecting farmers and consumers.

While much of the discussion focused on the environmental aspects of sustainable production, participants also emphasized the need to bring social standards into discussions of sustainable agriculture and sustainable development. Some suggestions to this effect included passing laws about living wages and expanding certification programs to include social factors.

From an economic perspective, generated wealth must be retained in rural communities. This can be achieved through such actions as cooperative ownership, buying locally and reducing the impacts of multi-national corporations on rural communities. Communities should also try to create a base to facilitate the development of “green” businesses, such as through green incubator programs.

To encourage alternative products, pilot programs to explore and promote products and services that farmers can produce and provide, such as energy, tourism and water quality, need to be developed. Increasing the flexibility of grant programs to allow for alternative farming practices would help support farmers in pursuing new ventures. Training and technical assistance for farmers to develop business plans and help with grant writing would also encourage the production of alternative products. While some of this does occur on an individual farm level, structures to enable technical assistance on a community level would be beneficial.

From a policy perspective, many participants identified national policies, including tax policy, carbon policy, subsidy policy and transportation policy, as one of the key factors that must change if we are to achieve sustainable working landscapes. Participants also identified the need for communication with government officials who are trying to support small farmers and the need for state and federal agencies to support the idea of working landscapes. On a global policy scale, participants suggested initiating an international dialogue about fair trade issues.

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Community Dialoguing, Visioning, Organizing and Decision-Making that Promote Sustainable Policies and Working Landscapes

November 9, 2001

Summary statement: We are interested in systemic change to the processes that control the use of land. This presents a challenge in that there is not a single, acute and imminent threat against which people can coalesce. We need to broaden the involvement of the public, and perhaps working landscapes is a useful image or paradigm for this. While broad, public participation is at the heart of our vision, work must continue at all levels of political organization.

Community dialoguing, visioning, organizing and decision-making need to happen at local, regional and national levels. There are many initiatives at all these levels that are relevant to working landscapes. They deal with both rural and urban areas and are developed by federal or state government agencies, non-governmental organizations and communities. Participants in this discussion saw great need for greater coordination and interaction between all of these different initiatives. They suggested that Extension Agents can serve as a resource for coordination between agency and community activities, and recommended that communities organize annual or semi-annual planning meetings with federal, state and local government agencies to improve coordination.

Citizens need to be provided with education and information on working landscapes issues. They need to be empowered to participate and need to be provided with an opportunity to participate in discussions on these issues (for example, by providing a forum for collaboration and developing a process that is inclusive).

Many community groups face the challenge of developing and maintaining community involvement. Participants in the discussion recommended:

- Defining a positive goal that a community can work towards (instead of fighting against the negative)
- Making meetings fun and connecting with the topic or issue of discussion. For example, having a meeting in a community garden if you are going to talk about challenges facing community gardeners
- Responding to community needs and developing measurable goals
- Making use of marketing and other strategies to package educational messages (make the message attractive, use your wording carefully).

Other recommendations for increasing community dialoguing, visioning, organizing, and decision-making focused on the roles played by those who catalyze community initiatives. Participants suggested that community initiatives need to work closely with government and university scientists to obtain or develop credible scientific information and need to translate that information to a form that the general public can understand. Community initiatives need to

show progress by measuring, documenting and distributing the results of their actions and need to communicate this information to the community, funding organizations, and government agencies.

Participants also identified the need for organizations that provide “coaches” to help communities communicate more effectively with decision-makers. They also stressed the importance of involving communities early in a decision-making process. Community initiatives can take a pro-active approach to public involvement in decision-making, for instance by creating a citizen congress that develops and communicates the community’s message. Planners and designers have effective tools that can help communities communicate their vision.

Finally, participants emphasized the importance of building personal relationships with government staff and community members, and the need to be persistent (change does not happen over night).

HARVESTING IDEAS FOR CHANGE:

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Driftless Region/Greater Blufflands Region Proposed Forum for Landscape/Environmental Issues

November 9, 2001

A group of interested individuals met during the Harvesting Ideas for Change session to discuss the possibility of establishing an ongoing discussion of land use and resource management issues pertinent to the area known as the Driftless or Karst or Blufflands Region. This area includes southeast Minnesota, southwest Wisconsin, northeast Iowa and part of northwest Illinois.

We discussed the Driftless Area/Blufflands Region as a landscape that is rich with ecological and economic opportunities but threatened by land use trends that have serious consequences for water quality of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. The fragmentation of this landscape by political (state) boundaries, and separation and distrust between land users and resource management agencies are among the factors that are impeding progress toward more sustainable land uses. We discussed the idea of a forum or communication network as a means of overcoming this fragmentation, identifying common goals, and finding a unified voice with which to speak about this landscape with its unique opportunities and challenges. This should lead to the development of synergies among different groups in the region.

Our discussion included a listing of Concerns and Challenges in the Driftless Area/Blufflands Region, and how best to establish an ongoing framework or network for discussion and information-sharing among interested in a manner that would help us to do a better job of advancing land use changes that are sustainable. We concluded with a decision to continue our discussion – first through a conference call and secondly at an initial Forum to take place in La Crosse as early as January, 2002.

Two additional topics that we discussed at some length concerned defining the nature and the boundaries of the Driftless Area/Blufflands Region and providing incentives to motivate positive land use changes. Our discussion of land use incentives ranged from the general and philosophical to the practical and specific. For example, why do people participate in groups? It may be because of a felt debt to society, or a sense of grief over having lost something. How does this relate to the motivation to join a group to try to affect land use in a specific landscape? More to the practical side of things, individuals need to take ownership and responsibility for land use decisions. This is most likely to happen when the landowner finds a way to earn a satisfactory profit from how the land is used. This is challenging for land uses such as forestry, where the return on investment usually is extremely long – up to a century. In such cases, we need to consider how to offer payments for environmental services provided by the land use, such as water quality and wildlife habitat. The carbon sequestration program from Wisconsin Power and Light, though very new, may offer this kind of economic incentive for growing trees on fragile parts of the landscape. Wood cooperatives also are exploring how to develop

economic incentives to sustain small-scale forestry. IATP is involved with four such groups of woodland owners in the region.

In the field of agriculture, the federal farm program provides powerful incentives to raise “program” row crops. This, combined with major structural changes in the livestock sector, has led to a shift in land use from hay and pasture to row crops, especially soybeans, throughout the region, including slopes with high soil erosion potential. This is one example where a Forum could raise an important national issue (federal farm program) that has a major effect on agricultural land use across the Driftless Area/Blufflands Region.

Following are several lists of ideas and suggestions we developed around the key topics of Challenges, Concerns, and Action Items.

Challenges

1. Expanding the choir (in the Big Tent) across social groupings.
2. Providing economic incentives for positive land uses.
3. Connecting science, business and agricultural policy to “bridge the disconnect.” Finding ways to use science to guide land use decisions to improve water quality.
4. Attending to security, minimizing risk.
5. Bridging political boundaries, such as boundaries between states and counties.
6. Restoring health to the landscape, with attention given to forests, food economies and regional identities.
7. Planting more prairies – keeping CRP lands in prairie grasses.
8. Modeling success.
9. Emphasizing the art of husbandry and stewardship – not just science.
10. Learning how to sort, select and process information.
11. Exploring and sharing values.
12. Building trust – between landowners and government agencies, for example.
13. Influencing federal policies and programs in ways beneficial to the region’s special needs and opportunities.

Driftless Area Concerns

1. The driftless area is a unique and distinct geologic and geographic area that borders the Mississippi River from Pool 4 through Pool 13.
2. Shallow, fractured and partially dissolved bedrock makes the area sensitive to groundwater contamination and intimately connects surface- and ground-water flows.
3. Since European settlement, the loss of thousands of acres of timber has drastically changed land use, soil erosion potential and hydrology.
4. For the past two decades, agricultural land has been shifting from hay and forage to increased soybean production. Thousands of acres of CRP native grassland are disappearing. These trends, which are related to a declining and consolidating livestock industry, have serious implications for the health of land and the environment, as well as rural communities.
5. Karst topography makes the region very susceptible to nitrogen losses to groundwater and surface water. An estimated ninety percent of the nitrogen lost from this area is

delivered to the Northern Gulf of Mexico where it contributes to the problem of hypoxia (low dissolved oxygen and related impairments of aquatic life).

6. There is a disconnect between landowners and agency/land resource personnel.
7. Natural resource conservation and restoration work is decentralized, fragmented and limited by political boundaries.

Suggested Action Items

1. Write a grant to hire a coordinator for the Driftless Area/Blufflands Region.
2. Declare ourselves a Steering Committee for the Driftless Area to begin a Forum.
3. Consider the followup “Tool Box” session planned for the Wells Creek Watershed this coming February in SE Minnesota as a site for our initial meeting. (It was decided that our presence at an event that is intended to be a local activity would be disruptive.)
4. Have each state in the Blufflands Region/Driftless Area host a quarterly Forum to share information with people from the other three states in the region as a way to begin learning about each other and dissolving political boundaries that fragment the region. Try to meet on the land.
5. Norman Senjem and Bill Franz will write up and distribute the meeting notes, and convene a conference call of the steering committee to help organize the first Forum.
6. When details are finalized, announce the start of this Forum throughout the Blufflands Region/Driftless Area.

Finally, we came up with the following five near-term Goals and Objectives:

1. Establish a framework for information-sharing and networking.
2. Meet on the land
3. Find a sponsor group
4. Plan the next meeting
5. Honor inefficiency (don't get over-organized or -logical)

LUNCH ADDRESS:

Jim Drescher
Windhorse Farms

“Generosity in the Working Landscape”

November 9, 2001

I would like to acknowledge that we are in the territory and on the traditional trading routes of the Sauk and Fox, the Ho-Chunk, and the Patawatami. I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Also, I'm happy to say that my father is here today. Bill Drescher is a groundwater hydrologist, and he's been working on the underlying issues in this landscape since 1946. I remember when I was a child in the fifties hearing from him that water would become one of the most critical issues for this region in the future. There probably were only a few people, perhaps Phil Lewis, who shared that view 50 years ago.

I live in an area of Nova Scotia where the fields and clearings are as small and scattered as the woodland fragments are around here. However, as communities of human and non-human beings, we face the same sorts of workability questions.

Early in 1994, a neighbor across the valley died and left his beautiful woodlot to a nephew from the big city of Halifax. This woodland had provided innumerable services to the community for 150 years. Within weeks of Lee's death, it was sold to a timber broker and liquidated. This caused considerable stress in the community. Families who had walked or ridden horses there for many decades felt real loss. Local people who had been seasonally employed in the woodlot no longer had that work close to home. After the cutting, residents downstream had flooded basements whenever it rained. A road washed out in the next spring flood, which had never happened before. Silt washed into the LaHave River, prime salmon habitat. No one was happy about the clearcut, but harsh arguments arose between neighbors about whether the owner had the right to do what he did. It was a time of great turmoil in our community, and the emotional residue lingers on. For our Canada Day celebration that year I wrote this poem, which was not well received by everyone:

Break the Momentum

*"It's my land;
I can do whatever I want with it.
If I want to destroy the forest,
that's my business, not yours.
If I want to strip off the topsoil,
that's my business, not yours.
If I want to liquidate the homes of a thousand animals,
that's my business, not yours.
I own the land;
the law says I can do whatever I want with it."*

*Who owns a forest that took 10,000 years to develop?
Who owns the soil formed by that forest?
Who owns the plants and animals?
How can you own a tree that was already old in this place
when your grandfather was not yet born?
How can you own the topsoil which has accumulated naturally
for thousands of years from the bodies of untold trillions of beings.
How can you own the animals
each of whom has been your mother?
What kind of law says you can?
Whose law?
We need legal assistance in this dark age
if we are to avoid total destruction
in the name of the law,
the law that makes legal all manner
of arrogance, greed, and stupidity
if you "own the land."*

*Perhaps there is a higher law
based on gentleness, intelligence and fearlessness:
gentleness to find one's natural place
in the community of all other beings;
intelligence to recognize that we can be sustained by nature
only if we minimize our impacts on it;
fearlessness to break the momentum
of anthropocentric law.*

*Is there the possibility of enlightened society?
Is it legal?*

Working Landscapes ----- working for whom?

I ask this question not to be obtuse concerning the meaning of the conference rubric, but because I think it may be useful to look from a different angle.

As I flew into Madison a few days ago, across Northern Illinois and Southeastern Wisconsin, I asked myself about the workability of this landscape. I looked down and saw farmland, lakes, water-filled ditches, widely scattered fragments of woodland, gravel pits, golf courses, roads, and many fresh houses. I did not see prairie, savannah, natural wetland, or connected woodland.

I tried to imagine how many of the million or so species of beings, native to this place, are doing well here today. My guess is, "Not many." The habitat has been drastically altered in a time period too short to allow for adaptation of most species. In other words, this landscape is not working for the vast majority of species and beings that were here a short time ago.

But is it working for the ones that remain, for the survivors? If population density is a measure of well being, we can point to some real success stories: humans, cattle, chickens, some rodents, swine, dogs, and white tailed deer.

Let's look at how it's working for our favorite species, Homo sapiens. While it may seem to be working well, in terms of sheer numbers, there are many indications it's not working all that well. As has been mentioned many times over the past two days, family farms are disappearing, urban sprawl is sprawling, commuters are increasing in density and are increasingly burdened by

debt and stress. Rural communities, as well as families, are fragmenting. The gap between rich and poor is widening.

To the extent that the landscape is not working for human or non human beings, what is the problem? Is it government policy, soil degradation, water and air pollution, landscape homogenization, pesticide poisoning, crime, forest liquidation, television, central heating, the automobile, free trade, terrorism, or what?

Perhaps we have to look behind, or beneath, those symptomatic-type answers. Maybe we should look at hatred, greed, pride, lust, jealousy, ambition, speed, and ignorance. When we think of these aspects of confusion, do we think of how they manifest in others or in ourselves?

Let's get real personal. We all value peace and want to be happy, right? Anyone here not like peace or not want to be happy? Good. Unfortunately, most of us believe, or at least act as if we believe, that happiness will result from protecting our territory, acquiring more money and things, merging with an attractive mate, gaining more influence in our organization or community, or ignoring everything that doesn't contribute directly to our own comfort and security.

Well, guess what? That's not working very well. Acting as though I am the center of the world, that my security and comfort come first, does not seem to lead to happiness. Exploring various strategies to confirm our existence, to protect our territory, to gain riches for ourselves, to be entertained, to increase our power, and so on has only brought more stress and suffering to our lives. This acknowledgment is a basic foundation for making our landscapes work.

On the other hand, helping others, employing the strategy of generosity, seems more apt to result in happiness. Don't take my word for it. Examine this with an open mind. My guess is that everyone here cares about the well being of others. The problem is that most of us care even more about the well being of ourselves. If we didn't, if we actually cared as much about others as ourselves, then we would employ very different strategies in how we make the landscape work.

We all understand that the resources for life (habitat) on this planet are finite, and we know that whatever one being uses up, or makes unavailable, cannot be used by another being. So if we really are concerned for the welfare of other beings, and we translate that concern into intelligent action, we will reduce our consumption to the level of our real needs.

This poem came to me as I was flying Northwest Airlines over the Great Eastern Forest a few years ago:

Holding A Smaller Seat

The Great Eastern Forest is gone.

Chopped down,

chopped up,

ground to a pulp

so we can read about the global economy while

we wipe our asses on the Great Eastern Forest.

Flushing it down the toilet bowl watersheds of our setting sun civilization,

we barely give a shit;

just call for more from the exhausted forest.

*Damn the obstructionist environmentalists.
Damn the smaller-footprint freaks.
Damn the social justice junkies.
I need a new car
and a bigger house
and cheap convenient shopping at Superstore and Walmart.
I want my share.
I deserve it.
I work for it.
It isn't my fault if I exacerbate a few problems in the forest.
It's the government's business
to control those nasty forestry companies . . .
but I need their products and
the job that spins off from what they do.
They are contributing to the economy.*

*I'm caught.
Too bad if it's all going,
but what can I do about it?
I have to have what I have to have.
I have a family to feed,
kids to take to hockey practice,
shopping to do at the mall.
I'm working my heart out.
Weekends are the only time I have for golf . . .
maybe one ski trip at Christmas.
Don't talk to me about disappearing forests.
Besides, they're into sustainable forestry these days;
they're doing lots of replanting;
the trees will grow back;
it's a renewable resource, you know.*

*What do you want me to wipe my ass on, comfrey leaves?
And what do bananas have to do with the Great Eastern Forest?
You try to make everything connect.
Don't you think that's a bit extreme?*

*Next time you're up in an airplane,
on one of those necessary business trips,
take a window seat,
hold your head against the window plastic,
peer down over the beauty strip
into the devastation that was the Great Eastern Forest.
Tilt your head;
take a broad and long view.
Imagine the forest that covered this land only a short time ago.*

*Next time you find your feet on the earth,
walk into one of those clearcuts,
taste the intimacy of destruction.
Now remember the vast landscape you witnessed from the air.*

*Make the connections.
Don't die in denial.
Wake Up!*

*It may be possible to restore the Great Eastern Forest.
It will take all our gentle effort.
No more weekends of golf,
no more consumption sprees,
no more ski holidays,
only genuine and effective caring for other beings.
Is the Great Eastern Forest worth the cost of our personal comfort,
and that of our family and friends?*

*Waking up is not pleasurable.
Encouraging others to wake up is not always well received.
On the other hand,
committing our lives to avoiding controversy,
to warding off death,
is futile.*

*Forest restoration is opening the heart,
honing one's discriminating awareness, and
moving into a smaller seat.
The earth's touch is painless only to the insensitive.*

Let's look at another example of limited resources, closer to home. If we have a big plate of apple dumplings served for desert, with just 200 pieces, there is enough for one piece for each of us. But the pieces are quite small, and I love apple dumplings. Unfortunately for my appetite, I know that the only way I can get a bigger piece, or two pieces, is for one of you to get a smaller piece or no piece at all. The inner conflict this presents is exactly as it is with all my desires to consume in this world. Consuming beyond my real needs reduces habitat for others, directly eliminating the possibility for other beings to live. How does this fit with my caring for the well being of others? What is the generous response? What are the results of generosity?

Most of us are not reducing our consumption to the level of our real needs. Let's check. How many of you have reduced your consumption (food, shelter, clothing, etc.) to that level? One person over there. That's fantastic. Your example is an inspiration. The other 199 of us have not. Why not?

There are three possibilities:

1. We don't care about others as much as ourselves.
2. We don't believe that the earth's habitat is limited.
3. We don't know how to cut through our habitual patterns

I suspect that it's mostly number 3. I choose to believe that, fundamentally, we do care about others and that we do recognize the limitation of the earth's resources. Perhaps we need to practice generosity more ----- until we get good at it. Perhaps this practice of generosity, at the individual level, is both the personal and societal path to restoration of workability in our lives and our landscapes.

Generosity in the way we act.
Generosity in what we say and how we say it.
Generosity in how we think.

Generosity means awakening our hearts to the difficulties and suffering of others. It means more listening and less talking. It means accurate and gentle speech. It means acting as if all other beings are as important as ourselves. *An open heart recognizes that the perceived boundaries between I and other are illusory.* This is the most important point.

We have heard lots of good ideas for great initiatives and policies over the past day or two. We will come upon many more interesting ones. However, in every case, without a genuine heart of generosity, at the individual level, our clever strategies will pervert even the best ideas. Our landscapes never will be workable as long as those working in them do not value peace, and as is said, “Generosity is the virtue that produces peace.”

HARVEST FESTIVAL:

Needs and Opportunities, Recommendations and Strategies for Sustainable Working Landscapes

November 9, 2001

The Harvest Festival brought all of the conference participants together to reflect on the conference as a whole and share their ideas on what to do next. Comments and questions from participants included:

- Working landscapes is a powerful image that can help us bring together people on the landscape. Is it a powerful new image we can use? I think of it in the context of smart growth and the push for planning and growth: maybe the time has come that regional planning and landscape planning can come to be. Maybe a lot of things are coming together all of a sudden and the working landscapes imagery or paradigm is a powerful thing that we can rally around. One of the important things that means is that we can facilitate grassroots discussion and visioning. We can and need to bring in a broader public to share a vision of a better-managed landscape and make fundamental systemic changes.
- How do we give the concept of working landscapes momentum? To what extent are we going to pick up this idea and begin to drive it ourselves within our organizations? Most of us came here with experience in working landscapes-related issues. Are we going to start talking about them as “working landscapes” and change the vocabulary?
- I was a little discouraged in the small discussion groups to hear people say “we can’t do that.” If there’s one thing about the sustainable agriculture movement it is that if you believe in something, you can do it, because you’ve been swimming upstream for a long time. Why stop now? For the most part, we have an idea of how to do what we want to do, we just don’t know how to implement it.
- How much work needs to be done to build a strong coalition and when do you reach out those groups who might not share the same values?
 - The coalition is already strong. We need to move beyond preaching to the choir and bring in more people from the public so that we can make a fundamental systemic change to land use practices. Several participants expressed a desire to include more diverse interests, including retailers, producers, developers, planners, insurance companies, private interests and representatives from corporate agriculture. One participant suggested we invite everyone and see who shows up.
- We need to focus more on harmony and respect for balance. Technical advice alone is not the answer – having the heart and speaking the right words are critical for us to go in the right direction. Beliefs and values are critical. The small group discussions really built energy.

- We need to organize-smaller scale conferences to reach out to more people.
- We need to bring the concept of working landscapes into schools. Imagine what will happen in the future if children start out at age 10 knowing what working landscapes are. Numerous resources about sustainability exist that are good for children. For example, the Adopt a Watershed program has resource materials for all ages: kindergartners plant trees and follow them through the years; high schoolers learn about the physics and chemistry of water. While the existing curricula are good, many teachers do not have someone with expertise in these issues who can teach their class. Those of us with expertise in these areas could do a great service by making ourselves available to schools.
- Is it wise to do this meeting again in year? Majority show of hands. Does it need to be elevated to the national level?
 - Another meeting of this type would be very worthwhile in a year or two. Next time, we need to be sure to include representatives from congress – if we can bring these people in to champion these principles it will go a long way. We need to get on the radar screen and attract attention at least from key staff.
 - There is no discussion of working landscapes issues in Congress. In order to raise national awareness, we have to have a national discussion. We also need to have bioregional level discussion. We need to have a lot of feelers out – here we’re missing the communication systems. To get to congress folks, a national conference won’t do that. We must meet them in D.C. – special appointment in D.C. or special delegations.
 - I would be disappointed if *all* of the focus went to a national level. I want to see more groups and individuals come and talk about new forms of ownership such as multi-stakeholder arrangements. We not ready for such things at the policy level yet. We first need to figure out local systems from place to place, biome to biome.
- National organizations could play a great role in learning about and supporting working landscapes. For example, the Smart Growth Network focuses not only on revitalizing urban and suburban areas, but also on preserving open spaces. Much of the rural emphasis has been on easements and setting land aside for conservation - there is not much knowledge of *working* landscapes and how to make rural areas economically self-sustainable. People working on smart growth would do well to learn from everyone here to bolster both their movement and our own.
- We need to look at what the future of the landscapes will be in 20 years. The future faces major problems such as aging farmers, pesticide problems, oil dependency. I hope we get a futurist looking at environmental issues to discuss the landscapes in the next 20, 50, 100 years.

CLOSING PLENARY ADDRESS:

George Boody
Executive Director, Land Stewardship Project

“Challenges and Pathways to Create Working Landscapes”

November 9, 2001

I am honored to be asked to share a few closing remarks. During our time together we have heard from those who shared inspiring accomplishments, and who have hopeful new ideas. Many participants have told me they experienced a sense of renewal, excitement and enthusiasm from this conference.

One of the overarching ideas to come out of this conference that is particularly exciting to me is a widely shared understanding that healthy working landscapes include people who are independent farm families, forestry landowners, local cheese factory owners, and merchants in town, just to name a few. Some of our farmer leaders have felt in the past that they were not part of a vision that the broader community had for a healthy landscape. The inclusion of people in a definition of a healthy working landscape is necessary and vitally important to me, and to the organization I work for. I have also heard during this meeting that a healthy working landscape includes plants and animals and where they live, wildness, playfulness, and spiritual beliefs. It includes social and economic justice, and stewardship. And, as we heard so profoundly this noon, it is based on internal truth telling. We have shared wonderful and inspiring visions to take back home with us.

As the conference ends, it is also useful to reflect on the degree to which we achieved the goals set for the conference. The first goal was to create a new mindset for integrating rural and urban economic, environmental and social problems and solutions among participants. Developing a new mindset for working landscapes will take time, but we have made a fine start here. It is clear from presentations and conversations that we are doing this hard work in our projects and businesses, on the farm, and in our lives.

The second goal of the conference was to establish a foundation for regional and national dialogue about working landscapes. We've got a solid foundation both in the way that we came together here and with the tools that people are pursuing in their work. We can strengthen the foundation by broadening participation – by including the choir, but going beyond the choir. It was a working partnership that planned this conference and brought us together. Partnerships will carry us forward if we keep in mind some principles. Our partnerships should be focused on genuine and effective caring of other beings and human beings. We should keep in mind as we continue to work with each other that we can communicate about working landscapes in words, in visuals, in circles, and in poetry. As we develop our partnerships we will benefit by keeping in mind the idea of balance, between individual and community rights, between people and other beings.

The third goal of the conference was to create a groundswell for action on working landscapes. I believe we have barely scratched the surface underlying this goal. For example, we have a long way to go in terms of thinking about new land ownership arrangements and how farms are going to evolve as we move into the future. We also need to use policy more effectively for systematic change. As you leave here I encourage you to call your representatives. The Conservation Security Act will be decided soon and other important conservation measures need your support.

I would like to encourage you to think about the longer term. We had a participant from Australia who asked, "When will your farm policy change?" If we have another conference in five or ten years, I want to be able to look him in the eye and say, "it has changed." This is not going to happen if we do not set a goal calling for fundamental reform of our farm policy. If we don't think it can be done, it won't be done. We need to create a comprehensive Farm Bill in the future that really does foster healthy working landscapes. I am hopeful that such a goal is possible because I see convergence taking place. A number of organizations are beginning to call for major changes in our farm policy. We need to take advantage of that convergence. Kathleen Falk's eloquent declaration comes to mind. She said: "I reject the notion that it can't be done." I reject the notion that we can't change farm policy and get more people on the land. These are powerful words. We can take heart from them and from many others like hers, and, we must step up to meet the challenge.

Another important way to achieve change is through the connection food consumers can make with those who grow the food. Consumers are telling us that they want healthy landscapes and wholesome food. They are buying organic foods, buying directly from farmers, are involved in community supported agriculture farms (CSA), and purchase eco-labeled products. We who are deeply involved in the conceptualization and the actual creating of working landscapes can help food consumers understand the role that policy plays in supporting landscape appropriate farming systems. We have an opportunity to use our expertise to provide the education and relationship building that will accomplish this.

On a personal note about buying food, I belong to a CSA. It is a wonderful thing for my family and me. It helps connect us to the people who grow at least some of our food. My teenage kids come out to the farm and they work, and even enjoy it. It's about building community and building relationships between our food, the earth, and us. Buying food directly from farmers is an important way to form a direct connection to the food that can come from healthy working landscapes. I encourage all of us to do as much of this as we can. I also challenge us to talk to our colleagues, our schools and our neighbors and ask them to vote for healthy landscapes by voting with their pocketbook as they buy food. It will lead to substantial change.

There has been a tremendous flurry of relationships being formed here at this conference. The new found colleagues or renewed friendships we take away from here today will continue to strengthen us in our own locales and also when we come together again.

It has been a wonderful two days. Let's thank the conference planning team and our facilitators for their hard work. I hope that we are able carry the commitment and inspiration forward as we keep thinking about working landscapes. Let's agree to share our ideas with each other. We have a special opportunity to converge the different areas of work that are needed to move our country forward on the path of creating productive, functional and beautiful working landscapes. The time is right. Let us be about the task. Thank you.

CLOSING PLENARY ADDRESS:

Jean Buffalo-Reyes
Red Cliff Tribe

November 9, 2001

Regretfully, Jean Buffalo-Reyes, who was slated to give the final address, was unable to attend the conference due to extenuating circumstances.

APPENDIX I.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF PLENARY SPEAKERS

Albert F. Appleton

Albert F. Appleton is currently a Senior Fellow at the Regional Plan Association (RPA) in New York City, America's oldest non-profit regional planning and public policy group. His work concentrates on developing and obtaining the implementation of public policies that innovatively integrate infrastructure and environmental investment in mutually supportive ways. Mr. Appleton also occasionally consults nationally and internationally on issues of environment, infrastructure and economic investment, particularly on issues of landscape preservation and ecosystem services. He is currently working with a network of Great Lakes organizations (NGOs) on developing more robust non-regulatory tools for protecting Great Lake watersheds.

Prior to joining RPA, Mr. Appleton served as Commissioner of the New York City Department of Environmental Protection and Director of the New York City Water and Sewer system. During his tenure, Mr. Appleton established New York City's watershed protection program, which saved New York City ratepayers billions of dollars in by cost-effective investing in environmental landscape management and pollution prevention that eliminated the need to build enormous filtration facilities to purify New York's drinking water. His innovations included the New York City whole farm planning program, a nationally acclaimed model for non-point source pollution prevention through urban-rural partnership, one which is now developing a model watershed forestry program.

Mr. Appleton has served as an officer or director of many Tri-State conservation organizations, most notably as President of the New York City Audubon Society and as a member of the National Advisory Board of Trust for Public Land. He is also a former member of the National Academy of Sciences National Research Commission's Committee on Better Management of the World's Rapidly Growing Cities. Mr. Appleton is a graduate of Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, with a double major in Mathematics and Political Science, and of Yale Law School in New Haven, Connecticut.

Sandra S. Batie

Sandra S. Batie came to Michigan State in 1993 to become the first holder of the Elton R. Smith Professorship in Food and Agricultural Policy, and she conducts research on food, agricultural, and environmental policy issues at the state, federal and international level. Prior to joining MSU, Dr. Batie was on the faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University since 1973. She took one sabbatical leave with the Conservation Foundation, where she studied and wrote about federal conservation policy and a second with the National Governors' Association, where she specialized in state policy with respect to rural development and groundwater management. Dr. Batie has actively served on commissions and boards that are related to her expertise, including the National Academy of Science, Board of Agriculture; the Academy's Center for Central Europe and Eurasia Affairs; and the Office of Technology Assessment. She was a trustee of both Winrock International and the International Rice Research Institute, and she is currently chair of the Board of Winrock. Dr. Batie is past president of the American Agricultural Economics Association as well as the Southern Agricultural Economics Association. She is also a Fellow of the American Agricultural Economics Association. Recent research projects include (a) implementation of agro-environmental water quality standards, (b) corporate environmental management strategies in the agricultural sector and (c) examining the influence of agricultural contractual arrangements on producer's financial, and environmental performance. In

addition to research activities, Dr. Batie teaches a graduate course in environmental economics and conducts extension programming on food, agricultural and environmental policies.

George Boody

George Boody has served as Executive Director of the Land Stewardship Project (LSP) since 1994, and was the General Manager of LSP from 1990 to 1993. In addition to leadership, management and fund raising responsibilities at LSP, George directs the Economic Analysis of Agriculture for Multiple Benefits project and the Monitoring Project. These research, education and policy projects identify ecological, social and financial benefits from farms employing a variety of production methods, including management intensive rotational grazing. During the past twenty years he has worked with farmers and professionals on sustainable agriculture, community development and energy conservation. His background includes a master's degree in agriculture and human nutrition from the University of Minnesota and an undergraduate degree in biology from the University of Minnesota.

Timothy Bowser

Timothy Bowser is the Executive Director of Fires of Hope. He also currently serves as Co-Chair of the National Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture. Prior to joining Fires Hope, Tim founded the Pennsylvania Association for Sustainable Agriculture and served as its Executive Director from 1991-2000. He also served on the Pennsylvania Governor's Select Board on Smart Growth (1998-99) and the Department of Environmental Resources, Citizens Advisory Committee (1992-1998). Other positions include Small Farm Extension Agent (1982-1988) and IPM Extension Specialist (1989-1991). Tim was raised on a Lake Erie grape operation and received an MS in Rural Sociology from Penn State University.

Jean Buffalo-Reyes

Jean is a Lake Superior Chippewa and a member of the Red Cliff Tribe with Reservation offices in Bayfield, WI. Jean has worked hard for Tribal sustainability in natural resources, community health, and other areas. She was appointed as an Associate Tribal Judge in 1991 and re-appointed as Chief Judge in 1994. She held this office until elected Tribal Chair in 1999. As Chair, Jean influenced and led the development of the first state-level Tribal Conservation Advisory Council in the nation. This Council is the principal mechanism Tribes can use for advising the Natural Resources Conservation Service and USDA in matters relating to federal policy. Although Jean lost her 2001 bid for re-election as Tribal Chair, she remains dedicated to her Tribe and currently serves as the Chair of the Red Cliff Tribal Conservation Advisory Council, Chair of the Wisconsin Tribal Conservation Advisory Council, and is seated on the Bayfield School Board.

Jim Drescher

Jim Drescher is the Director of The Maritime Ecoforestry School and the caretaker and forester for Windhorse Farm, a 160-year experiment in low-impact forestry. This 144-acre woodlot has been harvested every year since its beginning as a farm and commercial woodlot in 1840. During that time, over 8 million board feet of high quality timber have been harvested, and the merchantable timber standing today is over 2 million board feet, the same as in 1840, before any cutting had been done. The method for selecting trees for harvest was designed, practiced and taught by Conrad Wentzell, then

Steven Wentzell, then Paul Wentzell, then Carroll Wentzell. In 1990, Drescher received the transmission from Carroll, agreed to continue the experiment, and became the 5th caretaker.

'Ecoforestry', a nickname for ecosystem-centred economic forestry, was a useful term for a period of time in the late 80's and early 90's, and it has been used often in descriptions of the forestry practiced at Windhorse Farm. However, Drescher feels the word has lost its meaning through over use, much as the word 'sustainability' has become useless for anything except industry/government PR releases. The terms 'forest restoration' and 'restoration forestry' have been used in The Maritime Ecoforestry School, but because the very concept of restoration arises from guilt and arrogance, Drescher prefers to talk about, and practice, 'enrichment forestry', which is based on the principles of "nothing missing" and concern for the welfare of all living beings.

Although one might conclude that Drescher's approach to farming and forestry is fundamentally spiritual, it is also a simple common sense thing: economically, socially and ecologically. Exploring what leads to peace in one's personal ecology and home economics is intimately connected with what causes peace in our societal relationships within ecosystems. It is these explorations of the causes of war and peace that inspire continuity at Windhorse Farm.

Wayne Edgerton

Agricultural Policy Director for the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Wayne was born and raised on a dairy farm near Tomah, Wisconsin. He graduated with a B.S. degree in Natural Resources Management and a minor in Biology from the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. His career has included being the Resource Conservationist for the Monroe County Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) in Sparta, Wisconsin; State Conservationist for the Wyoming Conservation Commission in Cheyenne, Wyoming; SWCD Liaison with the Minnesota DNR; Reinvest in Minnesota (RIM) Reserve Coordinator with the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources; and presently Agricultural Policy Director with the Minnesota DNR Commissioner's Office in St. Paul.

Wayne's interests include gardening, camping and bowhunting. He and his wife Bonnie have two children, a daughter who married in 2001 and a son who is attending the University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

Kathleen Falk

Kathleen Falk serves as County Executive, the chief elected officer, for Dane County in south central Wisconsin. The second largest county in Wisconsin, Dane County has a population of approximately 420,000, encompassing 60 different local governments of towns, villages and cities. Its county seat is Madison, the state capitol and home of the internationally-renowned University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Ms. Falk's major initiatives include passing a citizen referendum to invest \$30 million over 10 years to conserve land and water resources, establishing partnerships with communities to preserve farms and redevelop downtowns and expanding high quality services to families, the disabled and senior citizens.

Before her election in April 1997 and re-election in 2001, Ms. Falk served as an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Wisconsin. For most of those years (1983-1995), she was Wisconsin's Public Intervenor, charged with protecting public rights in natural resources. In that capacity, she won precedent-setting cases to protect the public interest in Wisconsin's environment. From 1977 to 1983, Ms. Falk was the Co-Director and General Counsel of Wisconsin's Environmental Decade, a statewide

nonprofit environmental protection organization. While holding this position, she also won nationally significant litigation to protect citizen rights in utility rate cases.

Ms. Falk received her law degree from the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School in 1976 and a B.A. degree in Philosophy from Stanford University in 1973. Ms. Falk has received many awards for her effective advocacy for citizens and the environment. In 1997, she was elected to the Board of Directors of the County Executives of America. An avid baseball fan, Ms. Falk lives in Madison with her 20-year-old son, Eric.

Gene Francisco

Gene Francisco is State Forester for Wisconsin. A 30+-year veteran of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Mr. Francisco oversees a program that manages five northern State forests and three tree nurseries. He helps 28 counties manage 2.3 million forest acres, provide wildlife protection for 18 million acres, and work with landowners, businesses, government agencies, outdoor enthusiasts and many other citizens and organizations on forestry issues that affect wildlife, water quality, soil protection, outdoor recreation and forest products.

Chuck Hassebrook

Chuck Hassebrook is the Executive Director of the Center for Rural Affairs. Located in Walthill, Nebraska, the Center is a nationally recognized research, advocacy and rural development organization that promotes family farming and ranching and small business and sustainable development for agricultural communities. Hassebrook serves on the University of Nebraska Board of Regents and is its immediate past chair. He served on former Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman's National Commission on Small Farms and was vice chair of the USDA Agricultural Science and Technology Review Board. Hassebrook is a University of Nebraska graduate and a native of Platte Center, Nebraska, where his family is engaged in farming.

Laurel Kieffer

Laurel and Tom Kieffer, and children Cassandra (age 17), Melissa (15) and David (14), operate a 300 ewe flock sheep dairy in West-Central Wisconsin. Laurel grew up on a small cow dairy farm and her commitment to preserving opportunities for sustainable, family-based farming led the family to be part of developing the sheep dairy industry in the Midwest. In addition to farming, Laurel also teaches part-time at UW-Eau Claire and operates a consulting business that provides strategic planning, group facilitation and community-based needs assessments to nonprofit and government agencies.

Phillip H. Lewis, Jr.,

Phil Lewis has spent more than fifty years as a regional designer studying the life-sustaining qualities of the Upper Midwest landscape. He is Professor Emeritus of Landscape Architecture and Director of the Environmental Awareness Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and is currently President of the Marshall Erdman Academy of Sustainable Design, a non-profit foundation dedicated to sustainable futures, based in Madison. His studies have included inventories of the Wabash River Valley, the states of Illinois and Wisconsin, and the Mississippi River Valley and the Great Lakes Basin. Professor Lewis is currently focusing on a design concept for the megacity that stretches from Chicago to Madison,

Wisconsin, emphasizing greenways and waterways as form determinants. He stresses that saving the working landscape will require the design of “higher livable densities” that involve green architecture and sustainable technologies such as solar power.

Professor Lewis’s work centers on regional design. He fostered the building of an interdisciplinary faculty in the Landscape Architecture department, with the goal of developing new growth strategies for the future and teaching the basics of landscape architecture history design principles and methods, as well as new technologies and methods for contemporary problem-solving. His work has involved regional and local resources analysis and planning programs involving urban freeways, rural freeway alignments, power transmission alignments, recreation site designs, and community environmental awareness and education. He is presently interested in regional urbanization patterns in the Great Lakes Basin, rail-line preservation and utilization for both transit and development nodes that reduce energy use and conserve non-renewable resources, and preservation and development of urban form potential as typified by his “urban constellation” concept.

Earlier posts in a fifty-year career include member of the Bureau of Community Planning, Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of Illinois, director of the Recreation Resource and Design Section of the Wisconsin Department of Resource Development under Governor Gaylord Nelson, and principal in his own landscape architecture firm in Wisconsin. He has also served as Visiting Professor at the University of Minnesota and University of Montana and as visiting lecturer at Harvard University. He has contributed to programs at Iowa State University, Michigan State University, and to international conferences in Canada, England, Ireland, Poland and Taiwan.

In 1987, Phil Lewis was the recipient of the Society of Landscape Architecture’s medal. One nominating statement for the medal said: “There is no doubt that Phil Lewis has served as one of the grandest and most visionary thinkers in landscape architecture. He has created a legacy that is recognized throughout North America and beyond.”

Phil holds a Bachelor’s of Arts in Landscape Architecture from the University of Illinois and a Master’s degree in Landscape Architecture from Harvard University. He has over 100 publications, the latest of which is titled *Tomorrow by Design: Sustainability and Regeneration Through a Regional Design Process*.

Bonnie McGregor

Bonnie McGregor is the Regional Director for the Eastern Region of the U.S. Geological Survey. She is responsible for leadership in strategic planning, development and implementation of bureau and regional integrated and interdisciplinary natural science programs and scientific activities in the Eastern Region. She serves as the regional representative for the USGS with Federal, State, and local governments, the private sector, academic institutions, and to customer and constituent groups.

Dr. McGregor served as Associate Director for Programs of the USGS from 1993-2000, as Assistant Chief Geologist for Programs from 1992-93, and as Associate Chief for Marine Programs in the Office of Energy and Marine Geology from 1989-92. Prior to joining the USGS, her employment experience has included working as an oceanographer for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and as a research associate at the University of Miami, at Texas A & M University, and at the University of Rhode Island. She has authored or co-authored over 100 papers and abstracts which have been published in professional journals and books. She has received numerous science and management awards, including the Department of Interior’s Meritorious Service Award and the 1999 Secretary’s Executive Leadership Award.

Her educational background includes a B.S. in Geology from Tufts University, an M.S. in Oceanography from the University of Rhode Island, and a Ph.D. in Marine Geology and Geophysics from the University of Miami, Miami, Florida.

David Zach

David Zach is one of the few professionally-trained futurists in the United States, with a Master's degree in Studies of the Future from the University of Houston-Clear Lake. As a futurist, Dave has worked with over 1000 corporations, schools and associations offering insights on the personal and professional impact of strategic trends. As a speaker, he guides his audience on an entertaining, futuristic tour of technology, economics, business, education, and society. Dave gets his facts and ideas from a daily study of books, magazines, newspapers, coffee shop discussions, and on-line explorations.

Dave previously worked at Johnson Controls and Northwestern Mutual Life in the roles of environmental scanning and strategic planning. He has also taught Future Studies in the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Dave is a member of the Wisconsin Small Business Development Center Advisory Council, Future Milwaukee Advisory Board, Rotary Club of Milwaukee, the Medical College of Wisconsin Council, the Global Trends Committee for the Metropolitan Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, the Irish Fest Strategic Planning Committee, and the Milwaukee Forum, a leadership group for discussion of community concerns. He formerly served as chairman of the Goals for Greater Milwaukee 2000 Education Committee and co-chair for Design Milwaukee.

APPENDIX II.

CONFERENCE CO-SPONSORS

This conference was a result of cooperation and sponsorship from many organizations, agencies, businesses and individuals. We extend our gratitude to the following organizers and sponsors:

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy	www.iatp.org
Meridian Institute	www.merid.org
Fires of Hope	www.firesofhope.org
Land Stewardship Project	www.landstewardshipproject.org
Minnesota Project	www.mnproject.org
Midwest Organic and Sustainable Education Services	www.mosesorganic.org
Trees Forever	www.treesforever.org
Sustainable Farming Association of Minnesota	www.misa.umn.edu/~sfa
University of Minnesota Institute for Sustainable Agriculture	www.misa.umn.edu
The Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture	www.leopold.iastate.edu
National Agroforestry Center	www.unl.edu/nac
University of Wisconsin Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems	www.wisc.edu/cias
Community Alliances for Interdependent Agriculture	www.caia.net
American Farmland Trust	www.farmland.org
NC Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts	www.nacdnet.org
Minnesota Office of Environmental Assistance	www.moea.state.mn.us
Delta Waterfowl Foundation	www.deltawaterfowl.org
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	www.dnr.state.wi.us
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	www.dnr.state.mn.us
Center for Rural Affairs	www.cfra.org
Rural Action	www.ruralaction.org
USDA Forest Service Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry, Minnesota	www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo
Midwest Natural Resources Group (MNRG)	www.mnrg.gov
The Midwest Natural Resources Group is a partnership effort to bring focus and excellence to federal activities in support of the health, vitality and sustainability of natural resources and the environment. Fourteen federal agencies make up the MNRG:	
Bureau of Indian Affairs Midwest Region, Great Plains Regions	www.doi.gov/bureau-indian-affairs.html
Bureau of Land Management Milwaukee Field Office, Great Plains Region	www.doi.gov/bia/aberdeen
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Midwest Regional Office, Northern Plains Regional Office	www.mw.nrcs.usda.gov
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 5, Region 7	www.epa.gov

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Great Lakes-Big Rivers, Mountain-Prairie	www.fws.gov
USDA Forest Service Eastern Region	www.na.fs.fed.us
U.S. Geological Survey	www.usgs.gov
National Park Service Midwest Region	www.nps.gov
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Great Lakes, Ohio River, Mississippi & Northwest Divisions	www.usace.army.mil
U.S. Department of Energy	www.doe.gov
Federal Highway Administration Eastern and Central Federal Lands Highway Divisions	www.fhwa.dot.gov
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	www.noaa.gov
Office of Surface Mining Midcontinent Regional Coordinating Center	www.osmre.gov
U.S. Coast Guard Eighth District, Ninth District	www.uscg.mil

A special thank you to the following businesses who donated food, beverages and at-cost services to this event and whose products were enjoyed at meals, receptions and breaks.

Peace Coffee, of Minneapolis, Minnesota, for their contribution of coffee for breakfast and breaks.
Website: www.peacecoffee.com

Cedar Grove Cheese, Inc. of Plain, Wisconsin, for their donation of delicious gourmet and specialty cheeses. Website: www.execpc.com/~cgcheese

Summit Brewing Company, of St. Paul, Minnesota, for their donation of micro-brewed regional beer.
Website: www.summitbrewing.com

Future Fruit Farm, of Ridgeway, Wisconsin, for their at-cost contribution of organic apples and pears and their volunteer time.

Nokomis Bakery, of East Troy, Wisconsin, for their home-baked pastries and breads used in the meals.

Lake Lawn Resort, of Delavan, Wisconsin, for their cooperation, flexibility and great staff support for this event. Website: www.lakelawnresort.com

APPENDIX III.

CONFERENCE EXHIBITORS

Agroforest Wisconsin - Geoff King

American Farmland Trust - Ed Minihan

Website: www.farmland.org

CROPP/Organic Valley - Allen Moody

Website: www.organicvalley.com

Cuyahoga Countryside Conservancy - Darwin Kelsey

Dream Valley Farm - Laurel Kieffer

Hearth Light - Mary Meyer

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Community Forestry Resource Center - Phil Guillery

Website: www.forestrycenter.org

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy and Great Plains Institute for Sustainable Development, Renewing the Countryside - Mark Ritchie

Websites: www.iatp.org, www.mncountryside.org

Land Stewardship Project - Audrey Arner

Website: www.landstewardshipproject.org

Land Stewardship Project - George Boody

Website: www.landstewardshipproject.org

Midwest Food Alliance/Land Stewardship Project - Ray Kirsch

Websites: www.landstewardshipproject.org, www.thefoodalliance.org/midwest.html

Midwest Organic and Sustainable Education Services - Faye Jones

Website: www.mosesorganic.org

Midwest Sustainable Agriculture Working Group - Teresa Opheim

Minnesota Department of Agriculture - Barbara Weisman

Website: www.mda.state.mn.us

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Beth Knudsen

Website: www.dnr.state.mn.us

Minnesota Institute for Sustainable Agriculture - Helen Murray
Website: www.misa.umn.edu

National Park Service / America's Outdoors - Mark Weaver
Websites: www.nps.gov/rtca, www.americasoutdoors.gov

PastureLand Co-op - Dan French

Peace Coffee - Melanee Meegan
Website: www.peacecoffee.com

Trees Forever - Del Christensen
Website: www.treesforever.org

University of Nebraska, Department of Agronomy & Horticulture - Charles A. Francis
Website: agronomy.unl.edu

University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension, Agriculture & Applied Economics/Center for Commercial Economic Development - Gerald R. Campbell
Website: www.uwex.edu/ces/cced/gcnewpg.html

USDA National Agroforestry Center - Gary Bentrup
Website: www.unl.edu/nac/conservation/index.html

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, - Jim Maetzold
Website: www.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov/RESS/econ/ressd.htm

Wildrose Farm Organics - Charles and Karen Knierim
Website: www.wildrosefarm.com

Windustry - Lisa Daniels
Website: www.windustry.org

World Wildlife Fund/Wisconsin Potato and Vegetable Growers Association/University of Wisconsin Collaborative - Deana Sexson
Website: ipcm.wisc.edu/bioipm

For contact information of the conference exhibitors, please consult the participant list in Appendix IV
--

APPENDIX IV.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Nancy Adams
Blazing Star Farm
13194 765th Ave
LeRoy MN 55951
Phone: (507) 324-5984
nadams@smig.net

Valerie Adamski
Full Circle Farm
W2407 Hofa Park Rd
Seymour WI 54165
Phone: (920) 833-6704
hello@fullcirclefarm.net

Kostas Alexandridis
Michigan State University
1231 Ferndale Ave
East Lansing MI 48823
Phone: (517) 355-1227
alexa191@msu.edu

Roscoe Allen
USDA-Natural Resources
Conservation Service
109 Shiloh Drive
Mt. Vernon IL 62864
Phone: (618) 244-0773 x111
Fax: (618) 244-5942
roscoe.allen@il.usda.gov

Rodolfo Alvarez
Guatemala Latino United Efforts
1527 E. Lake St
Minneapolis MN 55407
Phone: (612) 724-1668
Fax: (612) 724-5461
gluelake@hotmail.com

Jason Anderson
Trees Forever
770 7th Avenue
Marion IA 52302
Phone: (319) 373-0560
Fax: (319) 373-0528
janderson@treesforever.org

Albert Appleton
Regional Plan Association
4 Irving Place, 7th Floor
New York NY 10003
Phone: (212) 253-2727 x371
Fax: (212) 256-5666
afa@rpa.org

Audrey Arner
Land Stewardship Project
103 W. Nichols
Montevideo MN 56265
Phone: (320) 269-2105
aarner@landstewardshipproject.org

Bruce Bacon
Greensprawl Working
Group/Garden Farme CSA
15150 Nowthen Blvd
Ramsey MN 55303
Phone: (763) 427-1410 x113
Fax: (763) 427-5543
bbacon@mtn.org

Larry Balber
Red River Tribe
Chief Blackbird Center
Planning Office
PO Box 39
Odanah WI 54861
Phone: (715) 682-7111 x111

Traci Barkley
University of Illinois, Dept. of Natural
Resources & Environmental Sciences
1101 W. Peabody
MC-635
Urbana IL 61801
Phone: (217) 367-5235
tbarkley@uiuc.edu

Sandra Batie
Michigan State University
204 Agricultural Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing MI 48824-1039
Phone: (517) 355-4705
Fax: (517) 432-1800
batie@pilot.msu.edu

Charles Beachnau
Michigan State Univ., College of
Agriculture and Natural Resources
214 Moores River Drive
Lansing MI 48910
Phone: (517) 432-0732
Fax: (517) 702-0662
Beachna8@msu.edu

David Beck
USDA- Natural Resources Conservation Service
210 Walnut
693 Federal Bldg
Des Moines IA 50309
Phone: (515) 284-4135
Fax: (515) 284-4394
david.beck@ia.usda.gov

Gary Bentrup
USDA National Agroforestry Center
East Campus - UNL
Lincoln NE 68583-0822
Phone: (402) 437-5178 x18
Fax: (402) 437-5712
gbentrup@fs.fed.us

Jeri Berc

USDA- Natural Resources
Conservation Service
PO Box 2890, Rm 5234
Washington DC 20013
Phone: (202) 690-4979
Fax: (202) 690-4390
jeri.berc@usda.gov

Bill Bland

University of Wisconsin-Madison,
Dept. Soil Science
1525 Observatory Dr.
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-0221
Fax: (608) 265-2595
wlbland@facstaff.wisc.edu

George Boody

Land Stewardship Project
2200 4th Street
White Bear Lake MN 55110
Phone: (651) 653-0618
Fax: (651) 653-0589
boody002@tc.umn.edu

Thomas Bradley

National Park Service
Vaughn Road
Brecksville OH 44122
Phone: (440) 546-5901
Fax: (440) 546-5905
tom_bradley@nps.gov

Joan Brzezinski

University of Minnesota China Center
290 Hubert H. Humphrey Center
301 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55455
Phone: (612) 625-1002
Fax: (612) 625-0045
brzez@umn.edu

Dave Butcher

3998 67th Street SW
Pequot Lakes MN 56472
Phone: (218) 568-8624
davidb@uslink.net

Sara Bergan

Great Plains Institute
2801 21st Ave S., Suite 230
Minneapolis MN 55407
Phone: (612) 278-7153
sbergan@wavetech.net

Kristen Blann

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (218) 829-3053

Timothy Bowser

Fires of Hope
PO Box 443
Millheim PA 16854
Phone: (814) 349-6000

Greg Brown

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1 Federal Drive
Fort Snelling MN 55082
Phone: (612) 713-5475
Fax: (612) 713-5287
greg-brown@fws.gov

Denise Buckbee

Valley Stewardship Network
521 E. South St.
Viroqua WI 54665
Phone: (608) 637-8330
kickapoo@frontiernet.net

Marin Byrne

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3436
mbyrne@iatp.org

Elizabeth Bird

Farm*A*Syst
Rm 303 Hiram Smith
1545 Observatory Drive
Madison WI 53714
Phone: (608) 265-3727
Fax: (608) 265-2775
eabird@facstaff.wisc.edu

Dorie Bollman

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
PO Box 2004
Rock Island IL 61265
Phone: (309) 794-5590
Fax: (309) 794-5157
Dorene.A.Bollman@usace.army.mil

Zoe Bradbury

Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Fax: (612) 870-4846
zbradbury@iatp.org

Perry Brown

Wisconsin Dept of Agriculture, Trade
and Consumer Protection
2811 Agriculture Dr
Madison WI 53718
Phone: (608) 224-5114
Fax: (608) 224-5114
perry.brown@datcp.state.wi.us

Robert Burke

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
4155 Clay Street
Vicksburg MS 39183
stoneburke@mvk02.usace.army.mil

Reggie Cadotte

Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior
Chippewa
88385 Pike Rd.
Bayfield WI 54814
Phone: (715) 779-3700
wrc4pres@yahoo.com

Gerald Campbell
UW-Madison, Agricultural and
Applied Economics
427 Taylor Hall, 427 Lorch St.
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 265-8137
Fax: (608) 262-4376
campbell@aae.wisc.edu

Cris Carusi
University of Wisconsin - Center for
Integrated Agricultural Systems
1450 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-8018
Fax: (608) 264-3020
cecarusi@facstaff.wisc.edu

Mark Christenson
Wisconsin Milk Marketing Board
8418 Excelsior Drive
Madison WI 53717
Phone: (920) 648-2224
fourcsns@jefnet.com

Kristen Corselius
Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3421
Fax: (612) 870-4846
kcorselius@iatp.org

Jose Diaz Lopez
Guatemala Latino United Efforts
2821 Bloomington Ave #2
Minneapolis MN 55407
Phone: (612) 721-0067
Fax: (612) 724-5461
gluelake@hotmail.com

Barry Drazkowski
Dept. of Resource Analysis,
St. Mary's University
Box 7, 700 Terrace Heights
Winona MN 55987
Phone: (507) 457-6925
Fax: (507) 457-6604
bdrazkow@smumn.edu

Jerry Carlson
LandOwner Newsletter
1527 South Union Road
Cedar Falls IA 50613
Phone: (319) 277-1904
Fax: (319) 277-7456
landownder@profarmer.com

Dave Carvey
USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service
Madison WI
Phone: (608) 224-3009
Fax: (608) 224-3010
Dcarvey@mw.nrcs.usda.gov

Jody Christiansen
USDA- Natural Resources Conservation Service
2820 Walton Commons West, Ste 123
Madison WI 53718
Phone: (608) 224-3006
Fax: (608) 224-3010
jchristi@mw.nrcs.usda.gov

Kay Craig
Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems
N600 Plymouth Tr.
New Holstein WI 53061
Phone: (920) 894-4201
Fax: (920) 894-4185
kwcraig@dotnet.com

Colin Donohue
Rural Action
PO Box 15
Trimble OH 45732
Phone: (740) 767-4938
Fax: (740) 767-4957
colind@ruralaction.org

Dennis Dreher
Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
222 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1800
Chicago IL 60606
Phone: (312) 454-0400
Fax: (312) 454-0411
dreher@nipc.org

Richard Cartwright
Hearth Light
PO Box 210
Oldenburg IN 47036
Phone: (812) 933-0067
hearthlight9@netscape.net

Del Christensen
Trees Forever
770 7th Avenue
Marion IA 52302
Phone: (319) 373-0650
Fax: (319) 373-0528
dchristensen@treesforever.org

Kate Clancy
Henry A. Wallace Center for Ag.
& Environmental Policy
1621 N. Kent St.
Suite 1200
Arlington VA 22209-2134
Phone: (703) 525-9430
Fax: (703) 525-9505
kclancy@winrock.org

Lisa Daniels
Windustry
2104 Irving Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55405
lisadaniels@windustry.org

Ivan Dozier
USDA-Natural Resources
Conservation Service
300 Carlinville Plaza
Carlinville IL 62626
Phone: (217) 854-2626 x110
Fax: (217) 854-4102
ivan.dozier@il.usda.gov

Jim Drescher
Windhorse Farm
RR2
New Germany, Nova Scotia
BORIEO
Nova Scotia CANADA
Phone: (902) 543-0122
jim@windhorsefarm.org

Owen Dutt
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1222 Spruce Street
St. Louis MO 63103-2833
Phone: (314) 331-8450
Fax: (314) 331-8774
owen.d.dutt@mvs02.usace.army.mil

Kathy Fairchild
Valley Stewardship Network
206 Highland St.
Westby WI 54667
Phone: (608) 634-4487
pfairchild@mwt.net

Sebastien Fevrier
General Consulate of France,
Office of Sci. &Tech.
737 North Michigan Ave, Ste 1170
Chicago IL 60611-2694
Phone: (312) 642-7438
Fax: (312) 642-5998
sebastien.fevrier@consulfrance-chicago.org

Charles Francis
Univ. of Nebraska, Dept of
Agronomy & Horticulture
225 Keim Hall, UNL
Lincoln NE 68563-0915
Phone: (402) 472-1581
cfrancis2@unl.edu

Dan French
Patureland Co-op
RR1 Box 152
Dodge Center MN 55927
Phone: (507) 635-5619
dfrench@aol.com

Richard Gauger
Wisconsin Farmland Conservancy
500 Main St. Suite 301
Menomonie WI 54751
Phone: (715) 235-8850
Fax: (715) 235-8910
wfc@discover-net.net

Wayne Edgerton
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Rd.
Box 13
St. Paul MN 55155
Phone: (651) 297-8341
Fax: (651) 296-4799
wayne.edgerton@dnr.state.mn.us

Kathleen Falk
Dane County Executive Office
Room 421, City-County Building
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
Madison, WI 53709
Phone: (608) 266-4114
falk@co.dane.wi.us

Wildon Fontenot
USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service
700 Cojandome
Lafayette LA 70506
Phone: (337) 291-3098
Fax: (337) 291-3085
wildon.fontenot@usda.gov

Gene Francisco
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Division of Forestry
P.O. Box 7921
Madison WI 53707
Phone: (608) 266-2694
frandg@dnr.state.wi.us

Lora Friest
Resource Conservation & Development
for Norwest Iowa, Inc.
PO Box 916
101 E. Greene St
Postville IA 52162
Phone: (563) 864-7112
Fax: (513) 864-7113
lora.friest@ia.usda.gov

Deanna Glosser
Illinois Department of Natural Resources
524 S. Second St
Springfield IL 62561
Phone: (217) 785-4988
Fax: (217) 524-9640
dglosser@dnrmail.state.il.us

Marlene Ehresman
Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation
505 5th Ave, Suite 444
Des Moines IA 50309
Phone: (505) 288-1846
mehresman@inhf.org

Genny Fannucchi
Wisconsin Department of Natural
Resources - Forestry
101 S. Webster
Madison WI 53707-7921
Phone: (608) 267-3120
Fax: (608) 266-8576
fannug@dnr.state.wi.us

John Foss
Nuffield Scholar
PO Box 123
Wickepin, Western Australia
AUSTRALIA
johnwfoss@hotmail.com

Bill Franz
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago IL 60604
Phone: (312) 886-7500
Fax: (312) 886-0957
franz.william@epa.gov

Warren Gaskill
Sustainable Woods Cooperative
10405 Bell Rd
Black Earth WI 53515
Phone: (608) 347-8400
Fax: (608) 767-3642
wgaskill@rapid-improvement.com

Elisa Graffy
U.S. Geological Survey
8505 Research Way
Middleton WI 53562
Phone: (608) 821-3836
Fax: (608) 821-3817
egraffy@usgs.gov

Suzie Greenhalgh
World Resources Institute
10 G St. NE
Suite 800
Washington DC 20002
Phone: (202) 729-7786
Fax: (202) 729-7686
suzieg@wri.org

Dave Gutknecht
Rural Action
270 Highland Ave
Athens OH 45701
Phone: (800) 878-7333
Fax: (740) 594-4504
coopg@frognet.net

Jeff Harris
Boone County Planning Department
601 N. Main St. Suite 301
Belvidere IL 61008
Phone: (815) 544-5271
Fax: (815) 547-9274

Bruce Hawkinson
MN Dept of Natural Resources -
Division of Ecological Services
Box 25, 500 Lafayette Rd
St. Paul MN 55155
Phone: (651) 296-0776
Fax: (651) 296-1811
bruce.hawkinson@dnr.state.mn.us

Pat Henry
Resource Conservation & Development
for Northeast Iowa, Inc.
PO Box 916
101 E. Greene St
Postville IA 52612
Phone: (569) 864-7112
Fax: (563) 864-7113
pat.henry@ia.usda.gov

Kary Howard
Michigan State University
509 East Owen
Michigan State University
East Lansing MI 48825
Phone: (517) 355-4128
howard19@msu.edu

Douglas Gucker
University of Illinois Extension
214 E. 1700 North Road
Cisco IL 61830
Phone: (217) 669-2192
Fax: (801) 705-0326
guckerd@usa.net

Roger Hansen
USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service
Parkade Center, Suite 250
Columbia MO 65203
Phone: (573) 876-0901
Fax: (573) 876-0913
roger.hansen@mo.usda.gov

Chuck Hassebrook
Center for Rural Affairs
101 S. Tallman St.
PO Box 406
Walthill NE 68067
Phone: (402) 846-5429 x28
chuckh@cfra.org

Mary Hendrickson
University of Missouri
105 Sociology
Columbia MO 65211-1100
Phone: (573) 882-7463
Fax: (573) 882-1473
HendricksonM@missouri.edu

Sara Hewbaker
Vermont Valley Community Farm
331 Russel #1
Madison WI 53704
Phone: (608) 240-0319
sarahawbaker@yahoo.cojm

Brian Huberty
USDA-Natural Resources Conservation
Service, Midwest Region Office
2820 Walton Commons
Suite 123
Madison WI 53718
Phone: (608) 224-3014
bhuberty@mw.nrcs.usda.gov

Phil Guillery
Community Forestry Resource Center
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3456
Fax: (612) 870-4846
pguillery@iatp.org

Todd Hanson
Wisconsin Stewardship Network
122 State St., Ste 510
Madison WI 53703
Phone: (608) 268-1218
Fax: (608) 268-1218
wsn@chorus.net

Tex Hawkins
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
51 East 4th Street
Winona MN 55987
Phone: (507) 494-6236
Fax: (507) 452-0851
tex_hawkins@fws.gov

Mark Henning
PO Box 892
Dubuque IA 52004
Phone: (563) 556-0576
henningm@netexpress.net

Bill Horvath
National Association of
Conservation Districts
1052 Main Street
Suite 204
Stevens Point WI 54481
Phone: (715) 341-1022
bill-horvath@nacdn.net

Roger Hunt
Trees Forever
770 7th Avenue
Marion IA 52302
Phone: (319) 373-0650
Fax: (319) 373-0528
rhunt@treesforever.org

Greg Igl

USDA-Natural Resources
Conservation Service
225 O'Connor Dr
Elkhorn WI 53121
Phone: (262) 723-3216 x3
Fax: (262) 723-3252
greg_igl@wi.usda.gov

Michael Jacob

University of Wisconsin-Madison,
Center on Wisconsin Strategy
1180 Observatory Drive
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-5176
mjacob@cow.s.org

Jan Joannides

Renewing the Countryside
St. Paul MN 55104
Phone: (651) 293-0782
joann001@umn.edu

Margaret Jones

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Mail Code DT-8J
Chicago IL 60604
Phone: (312) 353-5790
Fax: (312) 353-4788
jones.margaret@epa.gov

Darwin Kelsey

Cuyahoga Countryside Conservancy
2179 Everett Road
Peninsula OH 44264
Phone: (330) 657-2532
Fax: (330) 657-2198
darwin_kelsey@nps.gov

Darcy Kind

WI Dept of Natural Resources
Bureau of Endangered Resources
101 S. Webster St., Box 7921
Madison WI 53707
Phone: (608) 267-9789
kindd@dnr.state.wi.us

Dan Imhoff

Watershed Media
451 Hudson Street
Healdsburg CA 95448
Phone: (707) 431-2936
Fax: (707) 431-2938
danimhoff@pacific.net

Andrea Jensen

Andrea Fox Jensen
19860 623rd Avenue
Litchfield MN 55355
Phone: (320) 693-9123
foxjensen@att.net

Steve John

Environmental Planning and Economics, Inc.
1329 w. Macon St.
Decatur IL 62522
Phone: (217) 429-3290
Fax: (217) 429-3442
epeinc2@aol.com

Dennis Keeney

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
3402 Eisenhower Ave
Ames IA 50010
Phone: (515) 232-1531
drkeeney@iastate.edu

Laurel Kieffer

CIAS/Dream Valley Farm
N50768 County Rd D
Strum WI 54770
Phone: (715) 695-3617
kieftl@trivest.net

Geoff King

AgroForest Wisconsin
N2889 Highway W
Cascade WI 53011
Phone: (920) 528-8773
gking.sai@excel.net

Mrill Ingram

University of Wisconsin-Madison
217 W. Third
Madison WI 53704
Phone: (608) 242-1836
mrill@earthlink.net

Steve Jensen

19860 623rd Avenue
Litchfield MN 55355
Phone: (320) 693-6527
rasminde@hutchtel.net

Faye Jones

Midwest Organic and Sustainable
Education Services
N7834 County Road B
PO Box 339
Spring Valley MN 54767
Phone: (715) 772-3153
Fax: (715) 772-3162
moses@wwt.net

Tammy Keith

Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
4740 33rd Avenue N.
Golden Valley MN 55422
Phone: (763) 522-9449
keithwings@aol.com

Mark Kieser

Kieser and Associates
310 Michigan Ave. Suite 505
Kalamazoo MI 49007
Phone: (616) 344-7117
Fax: (616) 344-2493
mkieser@kieser-associates.com

Ray Kirsch

Midwest Food Alliance
c/o LSP
2200 4th St
White Bear Lake MN 55110
Phone: (651) 653-0618
rkirsch@landstewardshipproject.org

Jim Kleinschmit
Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 Ist Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3430
Fax: (612) 870-4846
jkleinschmit@iatp.org

Charles Knierim
Wildrose Farm
7073 Nickel Road
Breezy Point MN 56472
Phone: (218) 562-4864
Fax: (218) 562-4864
knierim@uslink.net

Fred Kollmann
USDA-Natural Resources
Conservation Service
575 Lester Ave.
Onalaska WI 54650
Phone: (608) 783-7550 x711
Fax: (608) 783-8058
fkollman@umesc.er.usgs.gov

Leah La Pointe
Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior
Chippewa
88385 Pike Rd
Bayfield WI 54814
Phone: (715) 779-3700 x22
leahla2001@yahoo.com

Phil Lewis
Marshall Erdman Academy of
Sustainable Design
2809 Columbia Rd
Madison WI 53701
Phone: (608) 238-7219
phlewis@facstaff.wisc.edu

Mary Ann Litfin
Land Stewardship Project Member
5090 Granada Ave North
Oakdale MN 55128
Phone: (651) 770-6356
maryann509@qwest.net

Linda Kleinschmit
Community Alliances of Interdependent
Agriculture (CAIA)
56149 Hwy 12
Harlington NE 68739
Phone: (402) 254-3314
Fax: (815) 371-3628
caia@hartel.net

Karen Knierim
Wildrose Farm
7073 Nickel Road
Breezy Point MN 56472
Phone: (218) 562-4864
Fax: (218) 562-4864
knierim@uslink.net

Corinne Krebs
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Apt. 204
431 W. Main St
Madison WI 53703
Phone: (608) 257-0519
ck_krebs@hotmail.com

Tom Larson
Wisconsin Association of Realtors
Phone: (608) 240-8254
tlarson@wra.org

Sharon Lezberg
Friends of Troy Gardens
Phone: (608) 238-9902
troygardens@yahoo.com

Robert Livingston
Crane Landscape and Design
PO Box 267
Wilmot WI 53192
Phone: (262) 889-8802

Martin Kleinschmit
Center for Rural Affairs
Box 736, 104 East Main
Hartington NE 68739
Phone: (402) 254-6893
Fax: (402) 254-6891
martink@cfra.org

Beth Knudsen
Minnesota Dept of Natural Resources
1801 S. Oak
Lake City MN 55041
Phone: (651) 345-5601
Fax: (651) 645-3975
beth.knudsen@dnr.state.mn.us

Margaret Krome
Michael Fields Agricultural
Institute
2524 Chamberlain Avenue
Madison WI 53705
Phone: (608) 238-1440
Fax: (608) 238-1569
mkrome@inxpress.net

David Lentz
Wisconsin Department of Natural
Resources
101 S. Webster Street, Box 7921
Madison WI 53707-7921
Phone: (608) 261-6451
Fax: (608) 266-8576
lentzd@dnr.state.wi.us

Steve Light
Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3474
Fax: (612) 870-4846
stlight@iatp.org

James Maetzold
USDA-Natural Resources
Conservation Service
PO Box 2890
Washington DC 20013
Phone: (202) 720-0132
Fax: (202) 720-6473
jim.maetzold@usda.gov

Mike Majeski
USDA - Forest Service
1992 Folwell Ave
St. Paul MN 55108
Phone: (651) 649-5240
Fax: (651) 649-5238
mmajeski@fs.fed.us

Timothy Marema
Center for Rural Strategies
PO Box 867
Norris TN 37828
Phone: (865) 494-7980
Fax: (865) 494-7980
tim@ruralstrategies.org

Gina McAndrews
Iowa State University
1126 Agronomy Hall
Iowa State University
Ames IA 50011
Phone: (515) 294-7832
Fax: (515) 294-8146
gina@iastate.edu

Dan McCandless
Macoupin County SWCD
300 Carlinville Plaza
Carlinville IL 62626
Phone: (217) 854-2628
Fax: (217) 854-4102
soilsurfers@ctnet.net

B.J. McCormack
Leech Lake Reservation Ojibway
PO Box 1359
Cass Lake MN 56633
Phone: (218) 556-5616

Bonnie McGregor
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston VA 20192
Phone: (703) 648-4557
Fax: (703) 648-4588
bmcgrego@usgs.gov

Kevin McGuire
Chippewa Co. UW-Extension
Courthouse, Room 13
711 N. Bridge St.
Chippewa Falls WI 54729-1876
Phone: (715) 726-7950
Fax: (715) 726-7958
kevin.mcguire@ces.uwex.edu

Melanee Meegan
Peace Coffee
2105 1st Ave. South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-7106
mmeegan@iatp.org

Linda Meschke
Blue Earth River Basin Initiative
923 North State St.
Suite 140
Fairmont MN 56031
Phone: (507) 238-5449
meschkel@berbi.org

Mary Meyers
Hearth Light
PO Box 210
Oldenburg IN 47036
Phone: (812) 933-0067
hearthlight9@netscape.net

Tamara Milbourn
Guatemala Latino United Efforts
482 Salem Place
Mahtomedi MN 55155
Phone: (612) 770-3556
Fax: (612) 724-5461
gluelake@hotmail.com

Clark Miller
University of Wisconsin-Madison,
La Follette School of Public Affairs
1225 Observatory Drive
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 265-6017
miller@lafollette.wisc.edu

David Miller
Minnesota Forest Resources Council
5013 Miller Trunk Hwy
Duluth MN 55811
Phone: (218) 720-4256
Fax: (218) 720-4219
dmiller@nrri.umn.edu

Michelle Miller
Pesticide Use and Risk Reduction Project
Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems
146 Agriculture Hall
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-7135
Fax: (608) 265-3020
mmmille6@facstaff.wisc.edu

Ed Minihan
American Farmland Trust
135 Enterprise Drive
Verona WI 53593
Phone: (608) 848-7000
Fax: (608) 848-7040
eminihan@farmland.org

Wayne Monson
Minnesota Department of Agriculture
90 W. Plato Blvd
St Paul MN 55107
Phone: (651) 282-2261
wayne.monsen@state.mn.us

Allen Moody
Coulee Region Organic Produce Pool
(CROPP)
507 W. Main St.
La Farge WI 54639
Phone: (608) 625-2602
Fax: (608) 625-2062
allen.moody@organicvalley.com

Barbara Morford
S11691 Badger Rd
Spring Green WI 53588
Phone: (608) 544-2965
bmorford@speagle.com

Alyssa Morin
Leech Lake Tribal College
916 Minnesota Ave
Bemidji MN 56601
Phone: (218) 335-4228
alyssa_morin@hotmail.com

Helene Murray
Minnesota Institute for Sustainable
Agriculture
University of Minnesota
411 Borlaug Hall
1991 Buford Circle
St. Paul MN 55108
Phone: (612) 625-0220
Fax: (612) 625-1268
murra021@umn.edu

Brian Ohm
UW-Madison, Dept. of Urban &
Regional Planning
925 Bascom Mall
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-2098
Fax: (608) 262-9307
bwohm@facstaff.wisc.edu

Michelle Peach
Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 1st Avenue Soth
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3433
Fax: (612) 870-4846
mpeach@iatp.org

Jennifer Pratt-Miles
Meridian Institute
PO Box 1829
Dillon CO 80435
Phone: (970) 513-8340 x213
Fax: (970) 513-8348
jprattmiles@merid.org

Rex Raimond
Meridian Institute
PO Box 1829
Dillon CO 80435
Phone: (970) 513-8340 x230
Fax: (970) 513-8348
rraimond@merid.org

Mark Muller
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
2105 1st Ave S.
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3420
Fax: (612) 870-4846
mmuller@iatp.org

Donna Myers
U.S. Geological Survey
6480 Doubletree Ave
Columbus OH 43229
Phone: (614) 430-7768
Fax: (614) 430-7777
dnmyers@usgs.gov

Teresa Opheim
Midwest Sustainable Agriculture Working
Group
4625 Beaver Ave.
Des Moines IA 50310
Phone: (515) 270-2634
Fax: (515) 270-9447
msawg@aol.com

David Perkins
Vermont Valley Community Farm
4628 City Highway FF
Blue Mounds WI 53517
Phone: (608) 767-3860
vvalley@hotmail.com

Renae Prell-Mitchell
Geneva Lake Conservancy
PO Box 588
Fontanna WI 53125
Phone: (262) 275-5700
renae@genevalakeconservancy.org

Christine Ribic
Univ. of Wisconsin Dept. of Wildlife Ecology
204 Russell Labs
1630 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 263-6556
Fax: (608) 263-4519
caribic@facstaff.wisc.edu

Robert Mulqueen
Iowa State Association of Counties
701 E. Court Avenue
Des Moines IA 50309
Phone: (515) 244-7181
Fax: (515) 244-6397
bmulqueen@iowacounties.org

Sonya Newenhouse
Madison Environmental Group, Inc.
22 North Carroll St. Suite 310
Madison WI 53703
Phone: (608) 280-0800
Fax: (608) 280-8108
sonya@madisonenvironmental.com

Jim Patchett
Conservation Design Forum, Inc.
375 W. 1st St
Elmhurst IL 60126
Phone: (630) 559-2025
Fax: (630) 559-2030
patchett@cdfinc.com

Mark Pingnot
Trees Forever
770 7th Avenue
Marion IA 52302
Phone: (319) 373-0560
Fax: (319) 373-0528
mpingnot@treesforever.org

Will Quackenbush
Ho Chunk Nation Division of
Natural Resources
PO Box 726
Black River Falls WI 54615
Phone: (715) 284-2852 x1121

Pieter Roele
Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404

Mark Roffers
Vandewalle & Associates
120 E Lakeside St.
Madison WI 53715
Phone: (608) 255-3988
Fax: (608) 255-0814
mroffers@vandewalle.com

Lina Rosengren
Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3460
Fax: (612) 870-4846
lrosengren@iatp.org

Brita Sailer
Sailer Environmental
13578 146th St
Park Rapids MN 56470
Phone: (218) 732-4562
bsailer@wcta.net

David Schinke
Natural Rhythms, Living Systems
138 N Cherry Street
Whitewater WI 53190
Phone: (262) 473-5663
nrls012@hotmail.com

Andy Scott
Salix Grain/Willow Lake Farm
Willow Lake Farm
Windom MN 56101

Norm Senjem
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
18 Wood Lake Drive SE
Rochester MN 55904
Phone: (507) 280-3592
Fax: (507) 250-3592
norman.senjem@pca.state.mn.us

Curt Rohland
Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems
Wisconsin Farmland Conservancy
20546 Highway X
Chippewa Falls WI 54729
Phone: (715) 723-3981
Fax: (715) 723-3981
curland@wwt.net

Rodney Rovang
Effigy Mounds National Monument
151 Hwy 76
Harpers Ferry IA 52146
Phone: (563) 873-3491
Fax: (563) 873-3743
Rodney_D_Rovang@nps.gov

Clyde Samsel
Wisconsin Family Forests
W10420 Beechnut Dr.
Hancock WI 54943
Phone: (715) 249-5602
samsel@uniontel.net

Heather Schoonover
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3450
Fax: (612) 870-4846
hschoonover@iatp.org

Ann Seaver
Town of Richmond
2121 N. Shore Dr.
Delavan WI 53115
Phone: (262) 728-9314

Deana Sexson
University of Wisconsin-Madison,
NPM Program
1575 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 265-9798
dlsexson@facstaff.wisc.edu

Martha Roldan
Dept. of Resource Analysis,
St. Mary's University
Box 7, 700 Terrace Heights
Winona MN 55987
Phone: (507) 457-6925
Fax: (507) 457-6604
mrolda00@smumn.edu

James Ruwaldt
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
4511 Helgesen Dr
Madison WI 53718
Phone: (608) 221-1206
Fax: (608) 221-1357
James_Ruwaldt@fws.gov

Martin Sanchez
Guatemala Latino United Efforts
1527 E. Lake St
Minneapolis MN 55407
Phone: (612) 724-1668
Fax: (612) 724-5461
gluelake@hotmail.com

Mary Schulz
Michigan State University
Dept of Agricultural Economics
East Lansing MI 48824-1039
Phone: (517) 355-2160
Fax: (517) 432-1800
schulzm2@msu.edu

Dale Secher
Carandale Farm
5683 Lincoln Rd.
Oregon WI 53575
Phone: (608) 835-5871
carandal@chorus.net

Lauren Sharfman
Environmental Law and Policy Center
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1300
Chicago IL 60601
Phone: (312) 795-3732
Fax: (312) 195-3730
lsharfman@elpc.org

Bennie Shobe

Public Policy Center, University of
Nebraska - Lincoln
121 S. 13th St, Suite 303
Lincoln NE 68588
Phone: (402) 472-1191
Fax: (402) 472-5679
bshobe@unlnotes.unl.edu

Joseph Standing Bear Schranz

Midwest SOARRING Foundation
5158 S. Mobile
Chicago IL 60638
Phone: (773) 585-8613

Lorrie Stromme

Minnesota Shade Tree Advisory
Committee
417 North 5th St., Suite 320
Minneapolis MN 55401
Phone: (612) 348-2152
Fax: (612) 348-9710

Nigatu Tadesse

University of Minnesota Extension
Service
1605 160th Street West
Rosemount MN 55068
Phone: (651) 423-2413
Fax: (651) 423-1491
tades002@umn.edu

Patrick Troy

The Agricultural Land-Based
Training Association
PO Box 5415
Salinas CA 93915
Phone: (831) 758-1469
Fax: (831) 758-3665
benechin@yahoo.com

Mark Weaver

National Park Service/America's
Outdoors
310 West Wisconsin Avenue,
Room 100-E
Milwaukee WI 53203
Phone: (414) 297-3617
Fax: (414) 297-3660
mark_weaver@nps.gov

Barb Spears

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404-2505
Phone: (612) 870-3407
Fax: (612) 870-4846
bspears@iatp.org

Steve Stevenson

UW - Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems
1450 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-5202
Fax: (608) 265-3020
stevenson@facstaff.wisc.edu

Kristin Stuchis

University of Minnesota-Duluth-
Environmental Education
3705 1/2 Lake Ave S
Duluth MN 55802
Phone: (218) 724-0244
kstuchis@d.umn.edu

Scott Taylor

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources –
Forestry
101 S. Webster St.
Madison WI 53707
Phone: (608) 264-9237
tayloso@dnr.state.wi.us

Caroline Van Schaik

Land Stewardship Project
2200 4th St.
White Bear Lake MN 55110
Phone: (651) 653-0618
Fax: (651) 653-0589
caroline@landstewardshipproject.org

Rosemary Wehnes

Sierra Club
7922 Jackson Park
Wauwatosa WI 53213
Phone: (414) 453-3127
Rosemary.Wehnes@sierraclub.org

Leigh Ann Spence

Michigan State University
1231 Ferndale Ave
East Lansing MI 48823
Phone: (517) 355-1227
spencele@msu.edu

Barbara Stinson

Meridian Institute
PO Box 1829
Dillon CO 80435
Phone: (970) 513-8340 x203
Fax: (970) 513-8348
bstinson@merid.org

Tim Swedberg

USDA Forest Service - North
Central Research Station
1992 Folwell Ave.
St. Paul MN 55108
Phone: (651) 649-5257
tswedberg@fs.fed.us

Tony Thompson

Willow Lake Farm
PO Box 128
Windom MN
Phone: (507) 831-3483
Fax: (507) 831-0478
salix@rconnect.com

Dalia Varanka

U.S. Geological Survey
1400 Independence Rd
Rolla MO 65401
Phone: (573) 308-3897
dvaranka@usgs.gov

Barbara Weisman

Minnesota Department of Agriculture
90 West Plato Blvd
St. Paul MN 55107
Phone: (651) 282-6831
Fax: (651) 297-7678
barbara.weisman@state.mn.us

Barbara Wells
Northeast Midwest Institute
218 D Street SE
Washington DC 20003
Phone: (202) 544-5200
Fax: (202) 544-0043
bwells@nemw.org

Jon Winsten
Wallace Center
101 Tom's Lane
Port Matilda PA 16870
Phone: (814) 692-7437
Fax: (814) 692-7437
jwinsten@winrock.org

Kyla Zaro-Moore
Institute for Agriculture and Trade
Policy
2105 1st Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55404
Phone: (612) 870-3438
Fax: (612) 870-4846
kzaro@iatp.org

Don William
Corps of Engineers
210 Longwood
Clinton MS 39056
Phone: (601) 634-5839
donald.william@mvd02.usace.army.mil

Vicheye Young
University of Minnesota Extension Service
1605 160th West
Rosemount MN 55608
Phone: (651) 423-2455
Fax: (651) 423-1491
young153@umn.edu

Lydia Zepeda
University of Wisconsin - Center for
Integrated Agricultural Systems
1450 Linden Drive
Madison WI 53706
Phone: (608) 262-5201
Fax: (608) 265-3020
lzepeda@facstaff.wisc.edu

Bob Wills
Cedar Grove Cheese, Inc.
PO Box 185
Plain WI 53577
Phone: (608) 546-5284
Fax: (608) 546-2805
mail@cedargrovecheese.com

David Zach
Futurist
20 North Wacker Drive #1900
Chicago IL 60606
Phone: (312) 641-6362
Fax: (312) 641-0791

Yue-dong Zhou
University of Minnesota China Center
290 Hubert H. Humphrey Center
301 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis MN 55455
Phone: (612) 624-1002
Fax: (612) 625-0045
zhou051@umn.edu

APPENDIX V.

UPCOMING EVENTS

“Creating the Future” Workshop

Date: February 23, 2002

Location: Frontenac, MN (Wells Creek Watershed)

Contact: Caroline van Schaik, Land Stewardship Project, Phone: 651-653-0618; Email: caroline@landstewardshipproject.org

12th International Soil Conservation

Organization (ISCO) Conference: Sustainable Utilization of Global Soil and Water Resources

Dates: May 26-31, 2002

Location: Beijing, People's Republic of China

Contact: China National Administration Center for Seabuckthorn Development

Phone: +86-10-6320-4362/6320-4363; Fax +86-10-6320-4359/6320-2841; Email:

isco2002@swcc.org.cn

Website: <http://www.swcc.org.cn/isco2002>

Landowners' Conference

Date: June 2002

Location: Ohio

Contact: Colin Donohue, Rural Action, Phone: 740-767-4938; Email: colind@ruralaction.org

Cultivating Communities - The 14th Organic

World Congress of the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements

Dates: August 16-21, 2002

Location: Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

Phone: 250-655-5662; Email: ifoam2002@cog.ca

Website: <http://www.cog.ca/ifoam2002>

World Summit on Sustainable Development

Date: September 2002

Location: Johannesburg, South Africa

Contact: Jeri Berc, Phone: 202-690-4979; Email: jeri.berc@usda.gov

Website: <http://www.earthsummit2002.org>

National Extension Tourism Conference 2002: *Changing Places - Changing Faces*

Dates: September 16-19, 2002

Location: Traverse City, Michigan

Contact: Phil Alexander, Email:

alexande@msue.msu.edu; or Dan Erkkila,

Email: erkkila@umn.edu

Website: <http://tourism.msu.edu/NET-2002.htm>

Rocky Mountain Summit: Sustaining

Ecosystems and Their People

Dates: September 22-26, 2002

Location: Whitefish, Montana

Contact: Julia Rodriguez, Phone: 573-882-929;

Email: CARES@Missouri.edu

<http://www.cares.missouri.edu/rms2002>

Changing Faces of Conservation & Agriculture - the Future of Working Lands: A Conference of the West North Central Region Soil & Conservation Society

Dates: October 8-10, 2002

Location: Moline, Illinois

Contact: Chris Murray, chrism@agrBiz or Lynn Betts, lynn.betts@ia.usda.gov

http://www.iaswcs.org/west_north_central.htm

International Farming Systems Association 17th Symposium - *Small Farms in an Ever-Changing World: Meeting the Challenges of Sustainable Livelihoods and Food Security in Diverse Rural Communities*

Dates: November 17-20, 2002

Location: Lake Buena Vista, Florida

Contact: Peter Hildebrand, Conference

Organizer, University of Florida/IFAS,

Phone: 352-392-1965; Email: peh@ufl.edu

Website: <http://conference.ifas.ufl.edu/ifsa>

This list includes working landscapes-related events that were posted at the Working Landscapes Conference, some of which took place prior to the publication of these proceedings.

