

From: Collins, James K AGRI:EX
Sent: Friday, November 29, 2013 4:31 PM
To: 'Ron Kilmury'; 'Ron Bertrand'; 'Corey Van't Haaff'
Cc: Gorsuch, Wanda AGRI:EX
Subject: FW: Replis to November 22nd Submissions

IVCA response submission.

From: Ian Vantreight [mailto:ian@daffodil.com]
Sent: Friday, November 29, 2013 4:28 PM
To: Collins, James K AGRI:EX
Subject: Replis to November 22nd Submissions

Hello Jim,

In followup to your requests in your November 15th letter to VMC, VIP, VIFP and BC Fresh regarding the VMC decision of October 31st regarding a sub agency on Vancouver Island, we submit the following points in response to the initial November 22nd submissions made by same:

1. The BC Fresh / VIFP submission from Mr. M. Dreidiger appears to be merely appears be a cc of the original application submission, with some minor changes and additions of which, in the first case we disagreed with and hence with their submission of November 22nd is still something that we disagree with and will be happy dispute points raised.
2. Why is that VIFP has not submitted their own opinion, as this appears to IVCA as merely a BC Fresh submission that Mr. Siffert's signed?
3. With reference to the VIP submission of November 22nd, IVCA agrees with points made in this submission and hold a number of subsequent question related to these points.
4. On the VMC submission of November 22nd, there are a number of points we would like to make:
 - a) par 3 that their decision of "October 31st VMC decision regarding the joint application of BC Fresh and VIFP to operate in an agency-sub-agency structure addresses the me sure set

out in Paragraph 72 (c)...”, IVCA feels it address little if any of the noted subsection and does little to nothing in addressing the other 77.75 paragraphs in FIRB’s January 7, 2013 letter and directive.

b) par 4, lines 3&4, there were no other options considers at the Application Hearing, such one from ourselves as this was not part of the hearing

c) par 4, lines 5&6, were the VIFP member wholly committed when VIP was originally formed?

d) page 2, point 1, leaves out 2 other agencies in an area where there only needs to be one, and address the concerns of a small disgruntled group that represent less that half the islands growers and production.

e) page 2, points 3&4 that reads “will allow central VI...”, should read, “may allow some central Vancouver Island, based on past results. Not the follow 5 pages titled BC Vegetable Marketing Commission, Written Submission to the FC Farm Industry Review Board, in our mind appears to have little to nothing to do with what best for the island, and looks like a lot more rules, reg’s and legal rhetoric, and yet we still in the end have 3 agencies on Vancouver Island. Also, I’m not sure where they got their numbers from for Licensed Producers, but it certainly isn’t representative of our agency membership and production. Page 3 bullets at the bottom of the page, all of these could be provided by IVCA.

Black bullet at top of page 4 and sub bullets, we agree ‘MAY’, but in our opinion the numerous resulting issues will far outweigh these, if that come to reality.

5. We do not see that this decision by VMC of Oct 31 in the slightest manor fulfils requests of Jan 7 letter from FIRB.

6. We feel that there is a need for a in depth survey of the agencies under VMC to find out the opinions and experiences of the effectiveness of the BCVMC, and request that FIRB implement this review and survey so as to getting a clear picture here.

7. It is the opinion of the ICVA that the VMC decision of Oct 31 is not in the best interest of the island or its grower or the marketing of regulated product on Vancouver Island and should be over turned and the 3 current agencies on Vancouver Island be directed by FIRB to go into a room and don't come out without an agreement on the structure on ONE agency on Vancouver Island that all members will work under. There is no need for 3 agencies here. Let's simplify, not further complicate.

Thank you.

Ian Vantreight
President IVCA
250-652-0777