Conservation LEARNING CENTRE

2005 Project Summary

The Saskatchewan Conservation Learning Centre Inc. (CLC) is a producer-driven, non-profit corporation established in 1993, with the mission to conserve soil, water and wildlife. As such, the CLC demonstrates on-farm use of new technology, seed cultivars, forages, trees and other initiatives in agriculture pertinent to Saskatchewan. The CLC retains formal status as a registered charity. Below is a summary of projects at the CLC in 2005. ***Please note that the results are not replicated scientifically and based on the results of one year only.*** Read about our experiences and if you find what we do interesting, consider becoming a member.

Staff in 2005 included Manager Laurie Hayes, Mitchell Japp, Ilene Cantin, Gene Chovin, Karen DeMong-Elliott, Lane Bullied, Russell Wall, Taylor Mills, Pierre Benoit, and Ryland Bernier.

METEOROLOGICAL DATA

Lots of moisture in 2005 – too bad we didn't get any from July long weekend to August long weekend. We were thankful we didn't get the usual July heat this year, as we had crops running out of moisture during this time period. Actual growing season precipitation (May to August) was 307 mm (12.1").

Month	Precipitation	
	mm	inches
May	39.5	1.6
June	78.5	3.1
July	68.0	2.7
August	121.0	4.8
September	75.0	3.0
October	14.0	0.6
2005 Rainfall	396.0	15.6

SCHOOL PROGRAM

School program staff was very busy in 2005, giving presentations to **1,702** primary, secondary and high school students (with ~350 accompanying teachers / chaperones). In addition, ~200 students (10 groups) were unable to attend due to inclement weather or a fully booked tour schedule. This successful tour season brings our overall total to **15, 986** students visiting the Conservation Learning Centre since the school program was initiated in 1994. Notables for this year include Carlton Comprehensive High Outdoor School returning for its eighth visit, presentation of a new curriculum for Grade 9 called Risks and Limits, revitalization and expansion of the Wetland Wonder Trail, and installation of a dock enabling students to investigate water life more closely.

All school groups visiting the Centre in 2005 were given information on the One-Tonne Challenge and encouraged to become involved. Staff gave demonstrations on composting with worms (vermicomposting) as a simple way of reducing organic waste. In the winters of 2004 and 2005, a group of grade 4/5 students from a local school maintained a vermicomposter started at the CLC. The students not only learned first-hand the role of decomposers in the natural cycling of nutrients but also a way to be proactive in the reduction of waste in landfills and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Many other teachers have expressed interest in maintaining a vermicomposter in their classrooms over the winter and, consequently, a new two-year program (funding by EcoAction) will be initiated in 15 schools this winter. The worms will be returned to the CLC each spring.

Supported by Ducks Unlimited Canada, Community Initiatives Fund (Saskatchewan Culture, Youth and Recreation), PromoScience (National Sciences and Engineering Research Council), Saskatchewan Canola Development Commission, EcoACTION (Environment Canada), SaskEnergy, Canadian Adaptation and Rural Development Program in Saskatchewan (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada), Farm Credit Canada, Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food, Farm World Equipment. Some materials supplied by: DuPont Canada, Northern Metal Fab, Saskatchewan Flax Development Commission, SaskPower, Canadian Grain Commission, Canadian Wheat Board, Monsanto, Bunge Canada, Weyerhaeuser, McDonald's Restaurants, Native Plant Society of Saskatchewan, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Saskatchewan Watershed Authority, Brett-Young Seeds, Agrium, Syngenta

THE CLC "SITUATION"

This winter we took a very hard look at the CLC's financial situation and evaluated the profitability of our grain production. We discovered that the CLC is truly a microcosm of what is happening on all farms – funding from all the other CLC projects has been subsidizing the farm – just like producers who have off-farm income.

To really put things into black and white (or, as you will see in the table below, red), we did a gross margin analysis of the crops grown on the land we own. The basic calculations are:

Gross Product – Direct Costs = Gross Margin
Gross Margin – Overhead Costs = Net Profit / Loss

2005 Crop Year	HWW	Barley	Canola	Flax (projected)[1]
Gross Product				
Actual Yield (bu/ac)	50	67	32	20
Actual Prices ($/bu)	$1.92	$1.25	$5.00	$6.00
Total Gross Product ($/ac)	**$96**	**$84**	**$160**	**$120**
Direct Costs[2] ($/ac)				
Seed Costs	$18	$9	$32	$17
Chemical Costs	$33	$35	$23	$33
Fertilizer Costs	$43	$43	$43	$43
Fuel Costs	$9	$9	$9	$9
Miscellaneous[3]	$46	$49	$45	$41
Total Direct Costs ($/ac)	**$149**	**$144**	**$153**	**$142**
Gross Margin ($/ac)	**$(53)**	**$(60)**	**$7**	**$(22)**
Overhead Costs ($/ac)				
Land Rent / Payments	$30	$30	$30	$30
Equipment	$42	$36	$48	$36
Labour	$28	$28	$28	$28
Taxes	$5	$5	$5	$5
Interest	$2	$2	$2	$2
Total Overhead Costs ($/ac)	**$106**	**$100**	**$112**	**$100**
Net Profit / Loss ($/ac)	**$(159)**	**$(160)**	**$(105)**	**$(122)**
Total Acres of Crop	53	35	110	58
CLC Profit / Loss Per Crop	**$(7,919)**	**$(5,267)**	**$(11,098)**	**$(6,487)**
TOTAL PROFIT / LOSS		**$(30,771)**		

Notes:

[1] Flax income is 'projected' because it is still standing in the field.

[2] Direct and overhead costs are a total of actual cash costs as well as in-kind contributions received for seed, chemicals, fuel and equipment rent. While the CLC is not a 'typical' farm, most expenses (other than labour) will be similar to yours.

[3] 'Miscellaneous' direct costs include crop insurance, general insurance, equipment repairs and maintenance, field supplies, soil tests, custom applications and trucking.

As mentioned, we received in-kind sponsorship for some costs and that contribution totalled $9,516, reducing our actual total loss to $21,255 – not that that is any comfort to anyone who doesn't get sponsorship.

We also did projections for 2006. They did not look any better. We evaluated what we were doing, what it cost, and decided to stop doing what isn't working. Some of the solutions for the CLC: reduce cropped acres; rent out land; seed forages in 2007; cut projects and programs; and cut staff. Hard decisions. But, like already mentioned, we have to stop what isn't working.

2006 Projections	Wheat	Barley	Canola	Flax
Net Profit / Loss	$(107)	$(141)	$(173)	$(102)
Projected Yield	50	70	29	25
Projected Price	$3.50	$1.50	$5.00	$6.00
Break-even yield at projected price	81	164	64	42
Break-even price at projected yield	$5.65	$3.51	$10.98	$10.10

What about you? Does this look familiar? We hope not, but use these calculations to figure out your net profit / loss. What *is working* for you? Start looking at profit instead of production. Remember, it's not what you make, it's what you keep.

FARMING OPERATIONS IN 2005

Seeding got underway in decent time (May 15) – if only we had finished in good time! We rented extra rented land this year, bringing our total annual grain and oilseed acres up to 600. We had about 400 acres seeded when the rain came. We did not finish until June 13. The later seeding dates, combined with heavy August and September rains delayed maturity, especially in Snowbird wheat and Bethune flax. All crops (except flax) are in the bin but not all are sold. Therefore, accurate yields, dockage and grade are not available.

CDC Imagine hard red spring wheat treated with Gemini was seeded May 17, 20, 22 at 1.75 bpa with 50# N, 23# P and 9# K. Adrenalin was sprayed in-crop June 21, preharvest Touchdown iQ August 28. Yield 16 bpa; grade #3; dockage 1.2%; protein 14.5%. Seeded on new rented land. Missing the pre-emergent burnoff hurt yield, due to dense perennial, grassy weed problems. In addition, a dry July was hard on crops grown on lighter soil. *Supported by Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, BASF, Syngenta, Bayer, Farm World*

AC Intrepid hard red spring wheat treated with Raxil-T was seeded May 22-23 at 1.75 bpa with 50# N, 23# P and 9# K. Achieve Liquid and Mextrol were sprayed in-crop June 13, preharvest Touchdown iQ September 12. Yield ~31 bpa; grade #3; dockage 1.1%; protein 14.3%. The AC Intrepid tolerated the July moisture deficit longer than the CDC Imagine on similar soil texture, as the AC Intrepid was seeded on lower, flatter land that retained moisture longer. In addition, this crop received a spring burnoff that dramatically improved weed control. *Supported by Bayer, Monsanto, Syngenta, Nufarm, BASF, Farm World*

Snowbird hard white spring wheat treated with Raxil-T was seeded June 10 at 2.3 bpa (to account for poor seed germination) with 85# N, 28# P and 5# S. Triton and Refine Extra, with a demonstration of Triton and Horizon, were sprayed in-crop July 6; we did not preharvest because temperatures were too cool by the time the crop was ready. Yield 55 bpa; grade Feed; 58-59.9# weight; dockage 1.25%; protein 15%. Late August rains dramatically slowed the maturation of the crop. Pre-seed burnoff with Prepass provided dandelion control well into the growing season. *Supported by Dow, Bayer, DuPont, Syngenta, Farm World*

CDC Stratus barley (2003 bin-run seed) treated with Gemini was seeded May 20-22 at 1.75 bpa with 36# N, 40# P and 9# K. Achieve Liquid and Mextrol were sprayed in-crop June 13, preharvest Touchdown iQ August 28. Yield ~40 bpa; grade Feed. Missing the pre-emergent burnoff and insufficient moisture in July reduced yield. *Supported by BASF, Syngenta, NuFarm, Farm World*

CDC Copeland barley treated with Gemini was seeded June 11 at 2 bpa (to account for poor seed germination) with 50# N, 28# P, 10# K and 5# S. Refine Extra TNG and Puma Super were sprayed July 5. Straight cut for high moisture (20%) and sold directly to a local feedlot. Yield ~66 bpa; grade Feed. *Supported by Dow, Monsanto, SeCan, BASF, DuPont, Syngenta, Farm World*

AC Metcalfe barley treated with Gemini was seeded June 11 at 2 bpa (to account for poor seed germination) with 50# N, 28# P, 10# K and 5# S. Refine Extra TNG and Puma Super were sprayed July 5. Straight cut for high moisture (20%) sold directly to a local feedlot. Yield ~66 bpa; grade Feed. *Supported by Dow, Monsanto, SeCan, BASF, DuPont, Syngenta, Farm World*

Canola cultivar demonstration field treated with Helix (except Prairie 719 RR with Redcoat (P seed coating) and SW6802 RR with Helix XTra) was seeded at 5.5#/ac May 27, 29-30 with 65# N, 28# P and 18# S. A faulty control on the liquid cart resulted in us having to dribble band 8.3 gal/ac on 80 ac (first 6 cultivars listed below). Glyfos and Absolute were sprayed on the appropriate cultivars June 21-22. *Supported by Agricore United, SW Seed, Brett-Young, Prairie Seeds, Canterra Seeds, Monsanto, BASF, Farm World*

Cultivar	Average Yield	St. Dev. †
	---- bu/ac ----	
Prairie 719 RR	35.6	12.6
SW9803 RR	36.8	14.8
SW6802 RR	31.5	8.1
CS 7001C RR	29.7	7.0
1896 RR	33.9	14.3
45H72 CL	35.0	11.2

† *Standard Deviation is an indication of data variability*

Precision agriculture in 5070 Invigor canola treated with Prosper was seeded May 31 (dry season) and June 9 (wet season) at 4.5#/ac. Fertilizer applied and yield (from our yield monitor) are shown in the table below.

Treatment	Fertilizer				Harvest	
	N	P	K	S	Yield	St.Dev†
	---- # actual/ac ----				---- bu/ac ----	
Wet Season						
Conventional‡	80	30	9	20	35.3	13.5
Upper slope	70	30	9	20	36.7	18.3
Lower slope	65	30	9	20	53.9	24.7
Dry Season						
Conventional	35	20	9	15	26.3	11.6
Upper slope	35	20	9	15	30.2	19.6
Lower slope	35	20	9	15	31.5	15.1

† *Standard Deviation is an indication of data variability*

‡ *Conventional is a single rate application over one area. Upper and lower slopes are a variable rate application over another area, divided into separate management zones based on slope.*

The K was granular and seed placed. In the wet season treatment, liquid P and S were banded prior to seeding on May 31 and June 8. Liquid N was side-banded during seeding. In the dry season treatment, liquid N, P and S were side-banded, with 5 gal/ac dribble banded post-seeding. Liberty and Select were sprayed June 27. Canola from the wet season treatment was tough, graded #2, 4.5% dockage, 4.5% green. Produce from the dry season treatment has not been sold yet.

Supported by EcoACTION, Bayer, Arysta, Moker and Thompson, Farm World, Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Project for Canadian Agriculture

Specialty oil canola cultivar demonstration field treated with Helix was seeded at 5#/ac May 23, 27 with 65# N, 18# P and 13# S. The cultivars were IMC111 RR, v1030 RR, v1031 RR, and Nexera 828 CL. Glyfos and Absolute were sprayed on the appropriate cultivars June 21-22. We estimate the Cargill cultivars averaged ~20 bpa and the Nexera yielded ~13 bpa. Light soil on this field reduced the yield potential during July when moisture was limited. *Supported by Dow, Cargill, BASF, Monsanto, Farm World*

CDC Bethune flax was seeded at 43#/ac June 12-13 with 35# N, 28# P and 5# S. FlaxMax was sprayed July 5, giving excellent weed control. Due to late seeding and extended flowering during the wet August and September, the flax is still in the field. It was tested at the end of October but it was still off the moisture charts. We estimate yield at ~ 20bpa; grade #2. We look forward to yet another spring harvest! *Supported by Monsanto, BASF, Syngenta, Farm World*

Environmental Farm Planning: The CLC completed an environmental farm plan (EFP) in the spring of 2005. We found that, with our rolling pothole landscape, a high water table and many regulations we were unaware of, the CLC needs to consider some changes and improvements in order to mitigate or reduce potential risks. We realized that there are some situations that we have to accept because we cannot change some aspects of the farm such as the height of the water table. But, it is important that we are aware of these and can alter our activities to reduce any potential threat. We found that the process was valuable, but needed some fine tuning – especially when it came to implementing action plans. Much time was spent learning who to call and where to find the right answers to our questions. We have made this information available to the local producers who have approached us with questions.

PROJECTS

Monitoring Water Quality

Eight wetlands at the CLC were sampled for pesticides and nutrients from 2003 to 2005. The wetlands were located in four different fields and had four different riparian treatments. Treatment T1 was located within the dense nesting cover that was established in the early 1990s. The other treatments were within cultivated fields: T2 wetlands had established riparian buffers, T3 wetlands had developing riparian buffers and wetlands in Treatment T4 had no riparian buffers.

Herbicides

On average, 2,4-D was detected in 46% of the samples even although it was not applied to any of the fields between 2002 and 2005. The last recorded applications of 2,4-D were in 2000 on Field 2bE, 1998 on Field 3 and prior to 1993 on Field 1. In the cultivated fields, the proportions of 2,4-D detections decrease with length

of time since last application of the herbicide from 66% on Field 2bE to 35% on Field 1. However, 2,4-D was detected in 50% of samples from the dense nesting cover which had not been sprayed for as long as Field 1 – prior to 1993.

Sulfonylurea herbicides (including thifensulfuron-methyl and tribenuron) are extremely phytotoxic and are applied at very low rates. Given the low application rates, it is not surprising that these herbicides were not detected.

MCPA was the only herbicide detected more frequently than 2,4-D. It was applied to Field 3 in 2003 and 2004 and to Field 1 in 2004 and was detected in 27 of the 39 samples taken when there was significant water in the wetlands. Most of the samples that did not contain MCPA were taken prior to the 2003 herbicide application. The herbicide was detected more frequently in wetlands on the field that received MCPA twice (83%) than in those on the field that received only one application (64%), but was also detected in wetlands in the dense nesting cover (60%) and in the field where MCPA had not been applied since 2001 (66%). Riparian buffers had no clear effect on the frequency or magnitude of MCPA detections but the maximum concentration measured (23.6 ug L^{-1}) was found in a wetland with no riparian buffer in the field that received two MCPA applications.

There was no clear impact of riparian buffer on herbicide concentrations in the wetlands. Several herbicides that had not been recently applied at the sites were detected indicating that historic applications stored in wetland sediments and aerial transport are important sources of pesticides in wetlands. In the case of MCPA, the absence of the herbicide in May 2003 and its subsequent appearance in all of the wetlands suggest that riparian buffers were not successful in preventing herbicide entry to the wetlands.

Nutrients

Nutrient concentrations were quite variable but in 2005, when there was consistent wetland sampling, there appeared to be a pattern in phosphorus concentration. In 2005, concentrations of both total and ortho phosphorus appeared to increase with decreasing development of the riparian buffer. This suggests that riparian buffers can reduce phosphorus transport to wetlands but since the trend was only seen in one year of data, no firm conclusions can be drawn.

Funding provided by CARDS (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada) and supported by the National Hydrology Research Institute

Barley Fertilizer Trial: Three rates of N were applied to CDC Copeland and AC Metcalfe, two newer malting cultivars accepted by the brewing industry. The same agronomic practices were used with these plots as with the fields of the same varieties (presented above). Yields were measured with a yield monitor, but as we were unable to calibrate it, the yields were not representative of the field, but the magnitudes are correct. The AC Metcalfe 50# N/ac plot was set as the standard and results are presented as a percentage of that plot.

Cultivar	N Fertilizer Rate	Yield
	lb/ac	*%*
AC Metcalfe	25	113
	50	100
	100	137
CDC Copeland	25	158
	50	160
	100	173

Supported by SeCan, BASF, DuPont, Syngenta, Farm World Equipment

Centennial Wheat Project

The CLC showcased a selection of wheat cultivars from the past 100 or so years that have had a lasting impact on the provincial agriculture sector, and indeed the province itself. Pierre Hucl, a wheat breeder with the University of Saskatchewan, proposed and coordinated the project and provided us with seed. Five different cultivars were selected to represent different eras of wheat production in Saskatchewan: Red Fife (1885), Marquis (1909), Thatcher (1935), Neepewa (1970) and AC Superb (2005). We added CDC Imagine, a herbicide tolerant variety, as the potential future. Although the plots were only demonstration, it was interesting to watch the different cultivars respond to current growing conditions and practices.

Novel Crops demonstrated this year included fibre flax, four red lentil cultivars (including Clearfield varieties), soybean, annual forages (see below), and herbs and spices (including our herb garden). We were unable to seed PC Rye (perennial cereal rye) or pinto bean. Seeding annual crops was delayed by rain and many forages were not seeded. The red lentils and soybean grew, but were damaged by spray drift. *Supported by Agri-ARM (Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food), BASF, Monsanto*

Forage yields around the CLC were spectacular this year – 2307 small square bales (~60#/bale) on ~30 acres. That is over 2 tonnes per acre!

Forage demonstrations: We planted some annual forages for demonstration and were very pleased with ryegrasses – Crown and Royal Italian brands. They stayed very green after some hard frosts. Golden German millet had good growth, but did not stay green after frost. We also planted some Samson turnips, but they were too close to our big poplars to compete for moisture. *Supported by Agri-ARM (Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food), Prairie Seeds*

In the future, we look to experiment with taking some of our older forage plots out of rotation. Also, we have one area where foxtail barley is extremely problematic. We will be investigating control options for this weed, which appear to be limited.

Riparian forage barriers around wetlands had good growth this year. Although there was concern about establishment last year, this year's production put that to rest! There are weeds in the stand but the forages are taking over *(Funding provided by CARDS, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada).* We had intentions to further connect wetlands with forage buffers, to reduce inefficiency of cropping operations through overlap. However, rain delayed seeding and poor conditions after the rain resulted in poor emergence of the forages seeded. The remainder will be seeded next spring. *Supported by SW Seeds, Brett-Young, Prairie Seeds, Proven Seeds*

The project **"Riparian management in a cultivated landscape"** is progressing well. Project coordinator, Mitchell Japp, has met with nearly 60 people to discuss Beneficial Management Practices (BMPs) around riparian areas that are adjacent to annually cropped land. To date, three sites have been established at Kinistino, Melfort and Tisdale/Nipawin. Thanks to SW Seeds, Proven Seeds, SSCA and the producer cooperators, several forage species were planted as buffer strips and to 'square up' land. At the Melfort site, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) helped seed some annual crops which will be tested for erosion potential. The sites are intended for demonstration of BMPs during summer field days and winter workshops. One summer field day was held in conjunction with AAFC Melfort's summer field day. Japp presented at seven workshops, attended numerous tradeshows and workshops and is continuing to build relationships for more demonstration sites. An economic publication regarding the costs of farming sensitive areas is expected to be out by early 2006. *Funding for this project provided by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's GreenCover program and supported by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food, Saskatchewan Watershed Authority, Saskatchewan Soil Conservation Association, Ducks Unlimited Canada, Saskatchewan Conservation and Development Authority, demonstration site cooperators*

Dwarf sour cherries and blue honeysuckle were planted this spring. Dwarf sour cherries have been bred at the University of Saskatchewan and are popular fresh or in a wide array of products such as wine, pie filling, fruit juice, and canning. We planted 25 trees of the SK Carmine Jewel variety and five each of the SK7-7-5.8, Sk7-19-27.6, SK7-21-16.3, SK7-21-31.0 and SK7-32-19.1 varieties. Blue honeysuckle, although Russian in origin, was made for the Canadian prairies. The flowers will withstand a –7° C frost! We planted six trees each of Berel, Gerde, Goluboe Vereteno, Lazurnaya, Ognennyi Opal and Zolushka varieties. *Supported by Prairie Plant Systems, Agri-ARM (Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food), University of Saskatchewan*

GOAL2XL Trial: The Saskatchewan Forest Centre contracted the CLC as the Saskatchewan site for a research trial to assess herbicide efficacy and tree damage from GOAL2XL (oxyfluorfen). GOAL2XL is a popular herbicide for tree plantations in the USA, but it is not registered for use in Canada. This herbicide has

soil residual properties that reduce the need for secondary weed control. The trial was a randomized complete block design, with five treatments (outlined in the table below) and four sub-plots of Walker and Assiniboine poplars sprayed before and after planting. Treatments were applied before bud-break as contact with green leaves will kill the poplars. In the USA, the recommended rate is 1 kg of active ingredient per hectare. The trial at the CLC included rates of 0.5, 1.0, 2.0 and 4.0 kg a.i./ha, and weedy and weed-free checks (controlled by glyphosate). Several evaluations of weed species, weed cover, tree growth and herbicide damage to trees were made throughout the summer. The higher rates of herbicide provided longer weed control than the lower rates. The project will continue into 2006 to determine whether or not plots treated with the higher rates of GOAL2XL will remain weed-free long enough to be economical.

	Average % Ground Cover			
After	37 days	42 days	65 days	99 days
Weedy Check	56	59	84	74
0.5 kg/ha	6	7	30	42
1.0 kg/ha	2	2	20	31
2.0 kg/ha	1	1	6	8
4.0 kg/ha	0	0	2	2

CHANGING TIMES AT THE CLC

Since 1993, the Conservation Learning Centre has offered effective learning experiences for adults and youth. Through 40 demonstrations and projects and 25 extension activities each year, it has impacted countless producers, industry representatives, researchers and extension personnel. The school program has taught close to 16,000 students the role that producers play in conserving soil, water and wildlife resources while producing an ample source of quality, safe food.

The success of these programs is attributable to the strong and committed support we have had from our members, partners, sponsors, contributors, supporters and neighbours. This has been augmented with successful applications for project funding from varied sources.

Over the past year, the Board of Directors has been facing many challenges that have necessitated significant changes to the operations of the CLC. Poor crop quality and/or yield and low commodity prices over the last three years have resulted in $60,000 less income than expected. This, combined with diminished funding opportunities, has forced the re-evaluation of programs and staffing.

Difficult decisions have been made and, as a result, we will be renting out part of our cultivated acres, converting some acres to forage production and reducing participation in off-farm extension programs. On the positive side, our highly successful school program will proceed as in the past. We will continue to fulfill our commitment to stakeholders and ongoing projects. Tours of projects and demonstrations will continue.

The current Manager, Laurie Hayes, will be laid off mid-May 2006 and the position will remain vacant until further funding is secured. In the interim, a Management Committee will be put into place to handle major management issues and responsibilities. Mitchell Japp remains as Riparian Project Coordinator. As mentioned, the school program will continue. A bookkeeper will be hired to handle the financial reporting and some minor administrative duties.

Although the adjustments are major, we will continue to work together with you to maintain our strong history as a facility that educates adults and youth through field-scale demonstrations and hands-on activities.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact any Board member.

Saskatchewan Conservation Learning Centre Inc.
is a registered charity and non-profit corporation located 18 km south of Prince Albert on Highway #2.
Contact information: 800 Central Avenue PO Box 3003, PRINCE ALBERT SK S6V 6G1
Phone: 306-953-2796 Fax: 3006-956-3727 E-mail: sask.soil.conservation.assoc@sasktel.net
Website: www.conservationlearningcentre.com

PARTNER

Ducks Unlimited Canada

GOLD SPONSORS *($10,000+ per year)*

Saskatchewan Canola Development Commission

FARM WORLD

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Saskatchewan Agriculture and Food

SILVER SPONSORS *($5,000 - $9,999 per year)*

BASF

syngenta

BRONZE SPONSORS *($1,500 - $4,999 per year)*

Monsanto Canada
Bayer CropScience
SaskEnergy
Moker & Thompson Implements
Farm Credit Canada
Dow AgroSciences Canada
DuPont Canada

SUPPORTERS *(up to $1,499 per year)*

Saskatchewan Flax Development Commission
SeCan
Canterra Seeds
Arvesta
Nufarm
SW Seed Canada
SaskPower
K & K Seeds
Saskatchewan Soil Conservation Association
Saskatchewan Wheat Pool
Steen Agencies
Northern Metal Fab
Crop Life Canada
Prairie Plant Systems
Sunny Delight Ice Cream
Cargill Specialty Canola Oils
Shell Canada
Goodlife Foods
Agricore United
Brett-Young Seeds
Prairie Seeds
AgTron Enterprises
Mills - Wilcox - Zuk Law Office
Prince Albert Co-op
Royal Bank of Canada
Silhouette Seeds
Iogen Corporation
Weyerhaueser
Agrium