



**COMMUNICATING ABOUT SUSTAINABILITY:
2007 Survey Results from Local Governments in BC**

Prepared by:

Joanne de Vries, Founder & CEO

August 2007

Executive Summary P2 • Survey Response Summary P6 • Detailed Survey Responses P16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SURVEY RATIONALE

Incorporated in the spring of 2007, the Fresh Outlook Foundation is a non-profit organization that uses community-based social marketing to educate specific groups of British Columbians about sustainability. Its inaugural target audience is local governments through a program called Building SustainAble Communities (BSC).

BSC educates and engages elected officials and staff using communication products and services designed specifically to meet their wants and needs. To determine precisely what those needs are, the foundation conducted extensive market research to:

1. pinpoint the types, formats, and frequencies of sustainability information preferred by elected officials and staff; and to
2. identify other products and services the foundation could provide to help local governments better communicate with their colleagues and constituents about sustainability.

The resulting feedback will be used by the foundation to guide the development of its BSC products and services for local governments. It will also be shared with appropriate stakeholders to help them better communicate about sustainability, and to trigger discussion about opportunities for collaboration between and among these groups and the foundation.

A secondary goal of the research was to gather information about what local governments are doing to enable and encourage sustainability within their communities. The resulting data about sustainability tools, internal and external barriers to sustainability, and the importance of and satisfaction with relationships and partnerships will be helpful to all stakeholders, and could be considered a baseline against which subsequent statistics could be measured.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

In keeping with community-based social marketing principles, the foundation researched its audience thoroughly using qualitative findings to guide the development and delivery of a quantitative tool. This 'complete' research approach consisted of:

- a facilitated table exercise with about 150 delegates at the BSC conference in the fall of 2006;
- a facilitated focus group of ten Central Okanagan elected officials and local government staff in the spring of 2007; and
- an online survey distributed to more than 900 local government representatives throughout BC during the summer of 2007.

The 'Communicating About Sustainability Survey' was created, conducted, and compiled using *ZapSurvey*, an Internet-based research tool. Email requests, including the survey link, were distributed to local government representatives from BC municipalities, regional districts, First Nations, and irrigation/improvement districts between May 30th and July 15th, 2007.

Specifically, requests for participation were emailed to 146 municipal mayors, 27 regional chairs, and 101 First Nation chiefs; 270 municipal, regional, and First Nation administrators; 119 municipal and regional planning and development directors/managers; 152 municipal and regional engineering and public works directors/managers; 28 irrigation districts and water managers; and 108 local government representatives who attended last year's BSC conference.

As an incentive to participate, the foundation offered a draw for ten free BSC conference registrations (valued at \$500 each) to respondents completing their surveys before a given date. Winners were selected randomly and have been contacted.

SURVEY RESPONSES

Of the 951 emails distributed, about 15 percent were returned as “undeliverable,” likely due to spam protection. Of the 800 or so emails successfully delivered, 171 were responded to — indicating a 21 percent response rate. The margin of error for a sample this size is $\pm 8\%$ 19 times out of 20. While 171 responses were recorded, not everyone answered each question. Results, therefore, were tabulated based on the number of responses per question (see Detailed Survey Responses).

In addition to being statistically supportable, survey results represent the views of elected officials and staff from a good cross section of local governments throughout BC. Respondents represent jurisdictions of all types and sizes and in all areas of the province.

Interestingly, responses to subjective survey questions are: 1) shown as overall percentages; and 2) broken down by respondent positions (e.g., elected officials vs. administrators vs. planning directors vs. public works directors vs. others). These comparisons add yet another dimension to the already compelling results.

PRIMARY SURVEY FINDINGS (concerning communications)

Survey results indicate that:

- Most respondents receive information about sustainability only occasionally from the federal, provincial, and regional governments; other local governments; trade and education/advocacy organizations; academic institutions; environmental NGOs; and the media.
- Less than half of respondents are satisfied with the sustainability information they receive now from the provincial government, other local governments, education/advocacy organizations, and environmental NGOs.
- Less than a quarter of respondents are satisfied with the information they receive now from the federal government, regional governments, academic institutions, and the media.
- Respondents consider the following to be the most credible sources of information about sustainability (ranked according to the number of mentions):

1. Provincial government	6. Smart Growth BC
2. Academics/scientists	7. UBCM
3. Other local governments	8. Education/advocacy organizations
4. Federal government	9. NGOs
5. Trade/industry organizations	10. FCM
- Virtually all respondents are interested in receiving information about case studies from other BC communities, and about federal, provincial, and regional policies, programs, and projects. The vast majority would also like to receive briefing notes/fact sheets; summaries of studies and reports; case

studies from communities across Canada; recommended websites; coming events; and profiles of innovative organizations.

- Respondents are most interested in receiving information about the following sustainability topics (ranked according to the number of mentions):
 1. Water conservation
 2. Energy efficiency
 3. Green buildings
 4. Transportation demand management
 5. Sustainability planning
 6. Sustainability policies
 7. Solid waste management
 8. Implementation strategies
 9. Best practices
 10. Case studies
- The vast majority of respondents would use the following communications products and/or services provided by a non-profit organization (ranked according to the number of responses):
 1. Website devoted to sustainability issues from a local government perspective
 2. Regional workshops
 3. Sustainability planning
 4. Topic-specific research
 5. Public education and consultation
 6. Briefing note/Fact sheets
 7. Regular electronic newsletters
 8. Annual conference
 9. Communications planning

In summary, these findings reveal that communication between and among all levels of government and other key stakeholder groups is currently inconsistent and uninspiring. On a more positive note, results show that the overwhelming majority of local government representatives want regular, credible information about a wide range of sustainability topics through a variety of communication products and services. Results also indicate that they are interested in receiving this information from a non-profit organization.

SECONDARY SURVEY FINDINGS (concerning sustainability in general)

Survey results indicate the following:

Sustainability Tools:

- About 50% of local governments have sustainability plans or are developing them.
- About 60% have sustainability policies/regulations or are developing them.
- About 60% have sustainability programs or projects or are developing them.
- About 35% have sustainability indicators.
- About 60% have partnerships with other local governments or are developing them.
- About 45% have partnerships with the private, civic, and academic sectors or are developing them.
- About 35% use best practices or are developing them.
- About 30% have websites, annual reports, or newsletters (that include information about sustainability) or are developing them.
- About 40% are involved in public education and/or public consultation.
- About 45% have staff devoted to sustainability or are hiring them.
- About 45% provide opportunities for staff training or are developing them.

Top 10 Internal Barriers to Sustainability (ranked according to the number of responses)

1. Lack of human/financial resources
2. Information overload
3. Lack of understanding about sustainability
4. Lack of regional foresight/coordination
5. Lack of senior government support
6. Lack of simple and clear best practices
7. Lack of follow through
8. Resistance to change
9. Lack of helpful information about sustainability
10. Aversion to risk

Top 10 External Barriers to Sustainability (ranked according to the number of responses)

1. Lack of human/financial resources for public education and consultation
2. Lack of public understanding about sustainability
3. Lack of legislation
4. Lack of practical and affordable best practices
5. Business apathy/resistance
6. Lack of senior government support for public initiatives
7. Developer apathy/resistance
8. Lack of programs (e.g., transit)
9. Lack of long-term commitment
10. Public apathy/resistance

Relationships Important to Sustainability (ranked according to the number of responses)

1. With elected officials
2. With residents
3. With supervisors/managers
4. With developers
5. With representatives from other local governments
6. With colleagues from trade organizations
7. With colleagues within departments
8. With colleagues from other departments
9. With regional representatives
10. With business people
11. Provincial representatives
12. Representatives from education/advocacy groups
13. Media
14. Federal Representatives
15. Representatives from academic institutions
16. NGOs
17. First Nations

Satisfaction with Existing Relationships

- More than half of respondents are satisfied with their existing relationships with elected officials, supervisors/managers, colleagues within departments, and colleagues from other departments.
- Less than half of respondents are satisfied with their existing relationships with residents, developers, representatives from other local governments, colleagues from trade organizations, regional representatives, representatives from education/advocacy groups, and the media.
- Less than a quarter of respondents are satisfied with their existing relationships with developers, business people, provincial representatives, NGOs, federal representatives, representatives from academic institutions, and First Nations.

SURVEY RESPONSE SUMMARY

1. What TYPE of local government do you serve?

TYPE (167 responses)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Municipality	70%
Regional District	14%
Irrigation/Improvement District	5%
First Nation	9%
Other	2%

2. In what AREA of the province is your local government located?

AREA (167 responses)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Northeast BC	7%
Northwest BC	6%
Cariboo	4%
Thompson/Okanagan	37%
Kootenays	13%
Lower Mainland	11%
Vancouver Island and Coastal Region	20%
Other	2%

3. What POPULATION does your local government serve?

POPULATION (167 responses)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Up to 999	12%
1,000 to 4,999	24%
5,000 to 9,999	12%
10,000 to 24,999	19%
25,000 to 49,999	11%
50,000 to 99,999	9%
More than 100,000	11%
Other	2%

4. What POSITION do you hold within local government?

POSITION (165 responses)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Elected official	24%
Administrator/City Manager/CAO	22%
Director/Manager of Planning/Development Services	14%
Director/Manager of Engineering/Public Works	12%
Other	28%

5. Does your local government use the following TOOLS or have the following PARTNERSHIPS to enable and encourage sustainability?

TOOLS/PARTNERSHIPS: (158 responses)	YES	BEING DEVELOPED	BEING CONSIDERED
1. Partnership(s) with other local governments	55%	5%	10%
2. Sustainability programs or projects	42%	16%	18%
3. Public consultation regarding sustainability issues	38%	9%	15%
4. Staff devoted to sustainability	37%	11%	14%
5. Staff training about sustainability	36%	9%	15%
6. Sustainability policies/regulations	34%	24%	25%
7. Public education regarding sustainability issues	34%	9%	10%
8. Partnership(s) with the private sector	34%	9%	15%
9. Partnership(s) with the academic sector	29%	4%	16%
10. A website that includes information about sustainability	27%	9%	9%
11. Sustainability plan(s)	23%	26%	30%
12. An annual report that includes information about sustainability issues	22%	3%	11%
13. Enforcement of sustainability policies/regulations	22%	18%	17%
14. Partnership(s) with the civic sector	22%	2%	15%
15. A newsletter that includes information about sustainability issues	21%	3%	6%
16. Best practices for sustainable operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	21%	16%	22%
17. Best practices for sustainable construction of new facilities	20%	16%	25%
18. Sustainable purchasing policies/actions	20%	11%	20%
19. Sustainability indicators	18%	17%	18%
20. Monitoring and reporting of sustainability indicators	14%	10%	23%

6. How significant are the following INTERNAL BARRIERS (within local government) in preventing your organization from enabling and encouraging sustainability?

SIGNIFICANCE OF INTERNAL BARRIERS: (166 responses)	SIGNIFICANT	INSIGNIFICANT	NEUTRAL
1. Lack of human/financial resources	86%	6%	8%
2. Information overload	66%	8%	26%
3. Lack of understanding about sustainability	63%	21%	16%
4. Lack of regional foresight/coordination	62%	16%	22%
5. Lack of senior government support	60%	14%	26%
6. Lack of simple and clear best practices	56%	16%	28%
7. Lack of follow-through	54%	17%	29%
8. Resistance to change	54%	24%	22%
9. Lack of helpful information about sustainability	46%	20%	34%
10. Aversion to risk	45%	16%	39%
11. Lack of vision/leadership	45%	32%	23%
12. Lack of departmental cooperation/coordination	43%	26%	31%
13. Lack of political will	40%	29%	31%
14. Lack of communication between and among elected officials and staff	34%	30%	36%

SIGNIFICANCE OF INTERNAL BARRIERS: By Position (166 responses) ("Very significant" plus "Somewhat significant")	ELECTED OFFICIALS	ADMINS./ CITY MANAGERS/ CAOS	PLANNING/ DEVELOPMENT/ DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	ENGINEERING/ PUB. WORKS DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	OTHER
1. Lack of human/financial resources	84%	91%	82%	94%	84%
2. Information overload	44%	77%	82%	66%	69%
3. Lack of understanding about sustainability	68%	75%	60%	58%	52%
4. Lack of regional foresight/coordination	62%	64%	60%	73%	57%
5. Lack of senior government support	65%	65%	73%	49%	49%
6. Lack of simple and clear best practices	54%	56%	56%	60%	59%
7. Lack of follow-through	44%	61%	56%	38%	63%
8. Resistance to change	64%	45%	56%	49%	55%
9. Lack of helpful information about sustainability	36%	67%	37%	43%	44%
10. Aversion to risk	39%	42%	39%	38%	57%
11. Lack of vision/leadership	38%	48%	38%	38%	55%
12. Lack of departmental cooperation/coordination	55%	39%	30%	49%	40%
13. Lack of political will	41%	38%	39%	43%	42%
14. Lack of communication between and among elected officials and staff	43%	23%	17%	27%	45%

7. Other INTERNAL BARRIERS? (Top 10)

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. Lack of time | 6. Senior staff too busy to change |
| 2. Lack of money | 7. Size of community |
| 3. Lack of appropriate legislation/policies | 8. Poor communication |
| 4. Lack of implementation "know-how" | 9. Overlapping jurisdictions |
| 5. Competing priorities | 10. Lack of training |

8. How significant are the following EXTERNAL BARRIERS in preventing your organization from enabling and encouraging sustainability?

SIGNIFICANCE OF EXTERNAL BARRIERS: (162 responses)	SIGNIFICANT	UNSIGNIFICANT	NEUTRAL
1. Lack of human/financial resources for public education and consultation	85%	4%	11%
2. Lack of public understanding about sustainability	74%	9%	17%
3. Lack of legislation	69%	6%	25%
4. Lack of practical and affordable best practices	69%	11%	20%
5. Business apathy/resistance	64%	8%	28%
6. Lack of senior government support for public initiatives	62%	11%	27%
7. Developer apathy/resistance	60%	11%	29%
8. Lack of programs (e.g., transit)	58%	13%	29%
9. Lack of long-term commitment	54%	15%	31%
10. Public apathy/resistance	53%	17%	30%
11. Lack of cooperation between public, private, academic, and civic sectors	47%	11%	42%
12. Lack of community vision/leadership	46%	21%	33%
13. Lack of communication between your organization and the public	46%	18%	36%
14. Lack of political will	45%	24%	31%
15. Lack of media interest and support	36%	19%	45%

SIGNIFICANCE OF EXTERNAL BARRIERS: By Position (162 responses) ("Very significant" plus "Somewhat significant")	ELECTED OFFICIALS	ADMINS./ CITY MANAGERS/ CAOS	PLANNING/ DEVELOPMENT/ DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	ENGINEERING/ PUB. WORKS DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	OTHER
1. Lack of human/financial resources for public education and consultation	68%	96%	90%	83%	70%
2. Lack of public understanding about sustainability	68%	75%	64%	83%	82%
3. Lack of legislation	67%	46%	82%	78%	79%
4. Lack of practical and affordable best practices	62%	81%	68%	74%	65%
5. Business apathy/resistance	57%	64%	69%	61%	72%
6. Lack of senior government support for public initiatives	59%	57%	77%	60%	63%
7. Developer apathy/resistance	49%	56%	77%	66%	60%
8. Lack of programs (e.g., transit)	60%	63%	60%	55%	52%
9. Lack of long-term commitment	42%	53%	56%	38%	69%
10. Public apathy/resistance	45%	60%	34%	61%	61%
11. Lack of cooperation between public, private, academic, and civic sectors	44%	59%	34%	44%	48%
12. Lack of community vision/leadership	34%	48%	42%	44%	65%
13. Lack of communication between your organization and the public	41%	38%	38%	38%	66%
14. Lack of political will	42%	44%	47%	38%	52%
15. Lack of media interest and support	30%	45%	34%	16%	40%

9. Other EXTERNAL BARRIERS? (Top 7)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Lack of funding support from senior governments | 5. Lack of staff support |
| 2. Lack of public understanding and participation | 6. Lack of skilled personnel |
| 3. Lack of regional and inter-regional planning | 7. Unsustainability of current political and business systems |
| 4. Lack of coordinated planning and implementation by all levels of government | |

10. How FREQUENTLY do you receive information about sustainability from the following sources?

FREQUENCY/SOURCES OF INFORMATION: (142 responses)			
	FREQUENTLY	OCCASIONALLY	NEVER
1. Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	32%	59%	9%
2. Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., Smart Growth BC, The Natural Step, West Coast Environmental Law)	27%	60%	13%
3. Provincial government	18%	61%	21%
4. Regional government	11%	52%	37%
5. Environment NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Grasslands Council of BC)	11%	50%	39%
6. Academic institutions	9%	47%	44%
7. Media	9%	42%	49%
8. Federal government	8%	64%	28%
9. Other local governments	5%	59%	36%

11. How SATISFIED are you with the information you receive about sustainability from those same sources?

SATISFACTION WITH INFORMATION: (140 responses)			
	SATISFIED	DISSATISFIED	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE
1. Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	57%	13%	30%
2. Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., Smart Growth BC, The Natural Step, West Coast Environmental Law)	56%	13%	31%
3. Provincial government	32%	35%	33%
4. Other local governments	24%	18%	58%
5. Environment NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Grasslands Council of BC)	24%	20%	56%
6. Regional government	23%	26%	51%
7. Academic institutions	22%	25%	53%
8. Federal government	21%	37%	42%
9. Media	10%	28%	62%

SATISFACTION WITH INFORMATION: By Position (140 responses) ("Very satisfied" plus "Somewhat satisfied")	ELECTED OFFICIALS	ADMINS./ CITY MANAGERS/ CAOS	PLANNING/ DEVELOPMENT/ DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	ENGINEERING/ PUB. WORKS DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	OTHER
1. Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	59%	46%	71%	46%	59%
2. Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., Smart Growth BC, The Natural Step)	65%	25%	65%	33%	45%
3. Provincial government	46% ¹	22%	30%	31% ⁴	32%
4. Other local governments	28%	15%	25%	31%	27%
5. Environment NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited)	41%	15%	35%	0%	22%
6. Regional government	43%	9%	25% ³	18% ⁴	20%
7. Academic institutions	24%	16%	20%	18%	27%
8. Federal government	35%	16% ²	11%	25% ⁴	19%
9. Media	25%	0%	5%	13% ⁴	10% ⁵

- ¹ 0% of Elected Officials were “very satisfied” with information they receive from the provincial government
- ² 0% of Administrators/Managers were “very satisfied” with information they receive from the federal government
- ³ 0% of Planning Directors/Managers were “very satisfied” with information they receive from their regional governments
- ⁴ 0% of Public Works Directors/Manager were “very satisfied” with information they receive from the federal, provincial, and regional governments
- ⁵ 0% of ‘Other’ employees were “very satisfied” with information they receive from the media

12. Who or what do you consider to be the MOST CREDIBLE sources of information about sustainability? (Top 10)

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Provincial government | 6. Smart Growth BC |
| 2. Academics/scientists | 7. UBCM |
| 3. Local governments | 8. Education/advocacy organizations |
| 4. Federal government | 9. NGOs |
| 5. Trade/industry organizations | 10. FCM |

13. How INTERESTED are you in receiving sustainability information about the following?

INFORMATION INTERESTS: (139 responses)	INTERESTED	DISINTERESTED	NEUTRAL
1. Case studies from BC communities	95%	0%	5%
2. Provincial policies, programs, and projects	93%	2%	5%
3. Regional policies, programs, and projects	92%	2%	6%
4. Federal policies, programs, and projects	89%	3%	8%
5. Briefing notes/Fact sheets	88%	1%	11%
6. Studies/reports	84%	0%	16%
7. Case studies from communities across Canada	84%	3%	13%
8. Recommended websites	84%	2%	14%
9. Coming events	75%	5%	20%
10. Profiles of innovative organizations	73%	7%	20%
11. Case studies from communities around the world	69%	8%	23%
12. International sustainability news	61%	10%	29%
13. Editorials	60%	15%	25%
14. Book reviews	50%	17%	33%
15. Profiles of innovative individuals	49%	19%	32%
16. Quotable quotes	44%	19%	37%
17. Awards	35%	24%	41%

14. What SUSTAINABILITY TOPICS are you most likely to want information about? (Top 10)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Water conservation | 6. Sustainability policies |
| 2. Energy efficiency | 7. Solid waste management |
| 3. Green buildings | 8. Implementation strategies |
| 4. Transportation demand management | 9. Best practices |
| 5. Sustainability planning | 10. Case studies |

15. How likely would you be to use the following COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES provided by a non-profit organization?

LIKELIHOOD TO USE COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES: (141 responses)	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE
1. Website devoted to sustainability issues from a local government perspective	87%	5%	8%
1. Regional workshops	87%	5%	8%
2. Sustainability planning	82%	2%	16%
3. Topic-specific research	79%	6%	15%
4. Briefing notes/Fact sheets	76%	6%	18%
5. Public education	75%	6%	19%
6. Regular electronic newsletters	75%	4%	21%
7. Annual conference	70%	8%	22%
8. Public consultation	64%	6%	30%
9. Communications planning	62%	9%	29%
10. Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of workshops	58%	10%	32%
11. Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of focus groups	53%	12%	35%
12. Regular webinars (web-based presentations)	52%	18%	30%
13. Regular printed newsletters/magazines	51%	17%	32%
14. Mentorship program	44%	17%	39%

LIKELIHOOD TO USE COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES: By Position (141 responses) ("Very likely" plus "Somewhat likely")	ELECTED OFFICIALS	ADMINS./ CITY MANAGERS/ CAOS	PLANNING/ DEVELOPMENT/ DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	ENGINEERING/ PUB. WORKS DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	OTHER
1. Website devoted to sustainability issues from a local government perspective	91%	87%	75%	79%	92%
1. Regional workshops	100%	77%	75%	79%	92%
2. Sustainability planning	91%	84%	65%	71%	85%
3. Topic-specific research	82%	77%	75%	57%	90%
4. Briefing notes/Fact sheets	82%	77%	80%	50%	80%
5. Public education	85%	77%	60%	64%	80%
6. Regular electronic newsletters	82%	71%	70%	57%	79%
7. Annual conference	82%	68%	65%	64%	70%
8. Public consultation	82%	61%	45% ³	43% ⁷	68%
9. Communications planning	70%	68%	55%	50%	61%
10. Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of workshops	73%	48% ¹	50%	29% ⁸	71%
11. Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of focus groups	67%	45% ²	55%	21% ⁹	61%
12. Regular webinars (web-based presentations)	52%	58%	35% ⁴	36% ¹⁰	63%
13. Regular printed newsletters/magazines	66%	52%	40% ⁵	50%	45%
14. Mentorship program	61%	58%	10% ⁶	21% ¹¹	45% ¹²

¹ 40% of Administrators/City Managers/CAOs were "neutral" about using a non-profit for the coordination, facilitation, and documentation of workshops, meaning they might consider a proven, practical, and affordable service

² 37% of Administrators/City Manager/CAOs were “neutral” about using a non-profit for the coordination, facilitation, and documentation of focus groups, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

³ 25% of Planning/Development Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using a non-profit for public consultation services, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

⁴ 45% of Planning/Development Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using regular webinars, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

⁵ 40% of Planning/Development Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using regular printed newsletters, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable product

⁶ 45% of Planning/Development Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using a mentorship program, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

⁷ 30% of Engineering/Public Works Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using a non-profit for public consultation, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

⁸ 35% of Engineering/Public Works Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using a non-profit for the coordination, facilitation, and documentation of workshops, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

⁹ 42% of Engineering/Public Works Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using a non-profit for the coordination, facilitation, and documentation of focus groups, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

¹⁰ 42% of Engineering/Public Works Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using regular webinars, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

¹¹ 50% of Engineering/Public Works Directors/Managers were “neutral” about using a mentorship program, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

¹² 41% of ‘Other’ employees were “neutral” about using a mentorship program, meaning they might consider using a proven, practical, and affordable service

16. Please list ANY OTHER sustainability-related communications services you would like to see offered by a non-profit organization?

- Grant funding research and application assistance
- Local tours showcasing sustainable communities
- Joint ventures on local projects
- Club and interest group programs
- Cost-effective best practices and ideas
- Social events for sustainability practitioners

17. How frequently would you read or participate in the following?

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION: (142 responses)	MONTHLY	EVERY TWO MONTHS	EVERY THREE MONTHS	EVERY SIX MONTHS	EVERY YEAR	NEVER
Electronic newsletter	48%	22%	21%	4%	2%	3%
Printed newsletter/magazine	22%	19%	31%	12%	3%	13%
Webinar (web-based presentation)	13%	15%	23%	23%	7%	19%
Regional workshop	2%	4%	14%	33%	42%	5%
Conference	2%	0%	4%	6%	76%	12%

18. How IMPORTANT to sustainability are the relationships/partnerships you have, or could have, with the following people?

IMPORTANCE OF RELATIONSHIPS & PARTNERSHIPS: (135 respondents)	IMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE
1. Elected officials	96%	0%	4%
2. Residents	91%	1%	8%
3. Supervisors/managers	87%	0%	13%
4. Developers	84%	1%	15%
5. Representatives from other local governments	83%	2%	15%
6. Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	82%	4%	14%
7. Colleagues within your department	80%	0%	20%
8. Colleagues from other departments	79%	0%	21%
9. Regional representatives	79%	5%	16%
10. Business people	77%	5%	18%
11. Provincial representatives	77%	6%	17%
12. Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	74%	6%	20%
13. Media	68%	3%	29%
14. Federal representatives	66%	6%	28%
15. Representatives from academic institutions	64%	7%	29%
16. NGOs	63%	10%	17%
17. First Nations	63%	11%	26%

IMPORTANCE OF RELATIONSHIPS & PARTNERSHIPS: By Position (135 responses) ("Very important" plus "Somewhat important")	ELECTED OFFICIALS	ADMINS./ CITY MANAGERS/ CAOS	PLANNING/ DEVELOPMENT / DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	ENGINEERING/ PUB. WORKS DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	OTHER
1. Elected officials	97%	97%	100%	100%	94%
2. Residents	90%	93%	100%	79%	94%
3. Supervisors/managers	74%	80%	94%	100%	97%
4. Developers	81%	77%	100%	64%	
5. Representatives from other local governments	87%	93%	76%	50%	89%
6. Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	90%	80%	78%	64%	87%
7. Colleagues within your department	47%	73%	100%	100%	94%
8. Colleagues from other departments	55%	77%	94%	77%	94%
9. Regional representatives	87%	87%	71%	57%	80%
10. Business people	81%	73%	76%	54%	
11. Provincial representatives	84%	80%	76%	64%	75%
12. Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	87%	70%	76%	50%	77%
13. Media	73%	57%	53%	71%	80%
14. Federal representatives	77%	63%	59%	79%	60%
15. Representatives from academic institutions	84%	57%	59%	36%	67%
16. NGOs	69%	67%	59%	14%	75%
17. First Nations	81%	73%	41%	38%	60%

19. How SATISFIED are you that your EXISTING relationships/partnerships with the following people are helping you enable and encourage sustainability?

SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS & PARTNERSHIPS: (134 respondents) ("Very satisfied" plus "Somewhat satisfied")	SATISFIED	DISSATISFIED	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE
1. Colleagues within your department	60%	10%	30%
2. Elected officials	60%	20%	20%
3. Supervisors/managers	59%	10%	31%
4. Colleagues from other departments	51%	11%	28%
5. Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	38%	33%	29%
6. Residents	36%	18%	46%
7. Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	36%	13%	51%
8. Representatives from other local governments	34%	18%	48%
9. Regional representatives	27%	31%	42%
10. Media	26%	30%	44%
11. Representatives from academic institutions	21%	52%	27%
12. Provincial representatives	21%	39%	40%
13. NGOs	21%	20%	59%
14. Developers	20%	36%	44%
15. First Nations	17%	22%	61%
16. Federal representatives	16%	38%	46%
17. Business people	13%	34%	53%

SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS & PARTNERSHIPS: By Position (134 responses) ("Very satisfied" plus "Somewhat satisfied")	ELECTED OFFICIALS	ADMINS./ CITY MANAGERS/ CAOS	PLANNING/ DEVELOPMENT/ DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	ENGINEERING/ PUB. WORKS DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	OTHER
1. Colleagues within your department	33%	67%	82%	71%	62%
2. Elected officials	65%	66%	71%	71%	48%
3. Supervisors/managers	45%	67%	59%	77%	60%
4. Colleagues from other departments	35%	63%	71%	64%	46%
5. Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	39%	47%	53%	21%	35%
6. Residents	42%	52%	29%	14%	35%
7. Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	45%	30%	71%	21%	28%
8. Representatives from other local governments	29%	43%	50%	43%	19%
9. Regional representatives	45%	43%	24%	7%	12%
10. Media	40%	23%	12%	14%	31%
11. Representatives from academic institutions	26%	23%	24%	14%	19%
12. Provincial representatives	35%	27%	12%	14%	16%
13. NGOs	37%	17%	24%	0%	18%
14. Developers	19%	31%	18%	21%	13%
15. First Nations	29%	30%	12%	14%	4%
16. Federal representatives	39%	23%	0%	7%	6%
17. Business people	19%	23%	12%	0%	11%

20. How likely would you be to partner with the Fresh Outlook Foundation by doing the following?

POTENTIAL PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE FOUNDATION (133 responses)	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE
1. Provide photographs for website and/or newsletters	51%	25%	24%
2. Share your sustainability successes with colleagues in other communities through a mentorship program	50%	24%	26%
3. Provide story ideas for website and/or newsletters	48%	26%	26%
4. Help organize a workshop or conference	28%	47%	25%
5. Write stories for website and/or newsletters	27%	41%	32%
6. Review and summarize books, websites, reports, and studies for website and/or newsletters	23%	46%	31%
7. Help organize a webinar	7%	71%	22%
8. Help fundraise	5%	72%	23%

POTENTIAL PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE FOUNDATION: By Position (133 responses) ("Very likely" plus "Somewhat likely")	ELECTED OFFICIALS	ADMINS./ CITY MANAGERS/ CAOS	PLANNING/ DEVELOPMENT/ DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	ENGINEERING/ PUB. WORKS DIRECTORS/ MANAGERS	OTHER
1. Provide photographs for website and/or newsletters	41%	50%	52%	50%	60%
2. Share your sustainability successes with colleagues in other communities through a mentorship program	41%	48%	64%	50%	55%
3. Provide story ideas for website and/or newsletters	38%	47%	40%	35%	62%
4. Help organize a workshop or conference	22%	28%	41%	21%	12%
5. Write stories for website and/or newsletters	19%	24%	29%	14%	37%
6. Review and summarize books, websites, reports, and studies for website and/or newsletters	22%	18%	17%	21%	33%
7. Help organize a webinar	6%	6%	5%	0%	12%
8. Help fundraise	6%	9%	0%	0%	5%

DETAILED SURVEY RESPONSES

1. What TYPE of local government do you serve?

TYPE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Municipality	120	70%
Regional District	24	14%
Irrigation/Improvement District	8	5%
First Nation	16	9%
Other	4	2%
<i>TOTALS</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>100%</i>

2. In what AREA of the province is your local government located?

AREA	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Northeast BC	11	7%
Northwest BC	10	6%
Cariboo	7	4%
Thompson/Okanagan	63	37%
Kootenays	23	13%
Lower Mainland	19	11%
Vancouver Island and Coastal Region	35	20%
Other	4	2%
<i>TOTALS</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>100%</i>

3. What POPULATION does your local government serve?

POPULATION	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Up to 999	20	12%
1,000 to 4,999	41	24%
5,000 to 9,999	20	12%
10,000 to 24,999	33	19%
25,000 to 49,999	19	11%
50,000 to 99,999	16	9%
More than 100,000	19	11%
Other	4	2%
<i>TOTALS</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>100%</i>

4. What is your POSITION within local government?

POSITION	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
Elected official	42	24%
Administrator/City Manager/CAO	37	20%
Director/Manager of Planning/Development Services	24	16%
Director/Manager of Engineering/Public Works	21	14%
Other	48	26%
<i>TOTALS</i>	<i>172</i>	<i>100%</i>

POSITION: Other	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Planner	15
Appointed member of Sustainable Community Advisory Committee	1
Consultant to public works and related matters	1
Coordinator	1
Deputy director of planning	1
Deputy director of corporate administration	1
Director Community Redevelopment and Sustainability	1
Director of Engineering and Development Services	1
Director of Environmental Services	1
Economic development officer	1
Environmental educator	1
Manager of TDM	1
Manager Parks and Environment	1
Purchasing manager	1
Manager environmental services	1
Parks interpreter	1
Planning assistant	1
Planning technician	1
Planning, development, engineering, public works, parks, and utilities	1
Senior manager corporate administration	1
Solid waste and environment	1
Sustainability consultant	1
Sustainability manager	1
Development services tech	1
Technical staff, water	1
Traffic and Transportation Engineer	1
Urban designer	1
Water conservation coordinator	1

5. Does your local government use the following TOOLS or have the following PARTNERSHIPS to enable and encourage sustainability?

TOOLS/PARTNERSHIPS	YES	NO	BEING CONSIDERED	BEING DEVELOPED	DON'T KNOW	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Sustainability plan(s)	23% (37)	18% (29)	30% (48)	26% (41)	3% (5)	160
Sustainability policies/regulations	34% (54)	13% (21)	24% (39)	25% (40)	3% (6)	160
Enforcement of sustainability policies/regulations	22% (35)	37% (57)	17% (27)	18% (29)	5% (9)	157
Best practices for sustainable construction of new facilities	20% (32)	31% (49)	25% (39)	16% (25)	8% (13)	158
Best practices for sustainable operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	21% (33)	30% (46)	22% (35)	16% (26)	11% (17)	157
Sustainability programs or projects	42% (65)	20% (31)	18% (28)	16% (25)	3% (5)	154
Staff devoted to sustainability	37% (57)	34% (53)	14% (22)	11% (18)	3% (5)	155
Staff training about sustainability	36% (55)	33% (51)	15% (24)	9% (14)	5% (8)	152
Sustainable purchasing policies/actions	20% (32)	37% (58)	20% (31)	11% (18)	11% (17)	156
Sustainability indicators	18% (28)	39% (59)	18% (28)	17% (26)	8% (13)	154
Monitoring and reporting of sustainability indicators	14% (22)	45% (69)	23% (36)	10% (16)	7% (12)	155
<i>Continued on page 17...</i>						

TOOLS/PARTNERSHIPS	YES	NO	BEING CONSIDERED	BEING DEVELOPED	DON'T KNOW	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
A website that includes information about sustainability	27% (42)	50% (78)	9% (15)	9% (14)	3% (6)	155
A newsletter that includes information about sustainability issues	22% (34)	63% (98)	6% (10)	3% (6)	3% (6)	154
An annual report that includes information about sustainability issues	22% (35)	55% (85)	11% (17)	3% (6)	6% (10)	153
Public education regarding sustainability issues	34% (53)	40% (63)	10% (17)	9% (15)	5% (9)	157
Public consultation regarding sustainability issues	38% (60)	34% (53)	15% (24)	9% (14)	3% (6)	157
Partnership(s) with other local governments	55% (85)	23% (36)	10% (16)	5% (8)	5% (8)	153
Partnership(s) with the private sector	34% (53)	35% (54)	15% (24)	9% (14)	6% (10)	155
Partnership(s) with the civic sector	21% (33)	43% (65)	15% (23)	2% (4)	17% (26)	151
Partnership(s) with the academic sector	29% (44)	42% (64)	16% (24)	4% (7)	9% (14)	153

6. How significant are the following INTERNAL BARRIERS (within local government) in preventing your organization from enabling and encouraging sustainability?

INTERNAL BARRIERS	VERY SIGNIFICANT	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT INSIGNIFICANT	VERY INSIGNIFICANT	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Lack of political will	12% (21)	28% (46)	30% (49)	18% (30)	11% (18)	164
Lack of understanding about sustainability	22% (36)	41% (68)	14% (24)	17% (28)	4% (7)	163
Lack of helpful information about sustainability	10% (18)	36% (60)	31% (51)	16% (27)	4% (8)	164
Lack of human/financial resources	52% (87)	34% (58)	5% (9)	4% (8)	2% (4)	166
Lack of communication between and among elected officials and staff	11% (19)	23% (38)	33% (55)	25% (42)	5% (9)	163
Lack of simple and clear best practices	21% (36)	35% (59)	25% (41)	12% (21)	4% (7)	164
Lack of follow-through	18% (31)	36% (60)	26% (43)	12% (21)	5% (9)	164
Lack of departmental cooperation/coordination	9% (15)	34% (57)	28% (47)	20% (34)	6% (11)	164
Lack of senior government support	25% (41)	35% (58)	24% (39)	11% (18)	3% (6)	162
Lack of vision/leadership	14% (24)	31% (52)	22% (37)	20% (33)	12% (20)	166
Lack of regional foresight/coordination	24% (41)	38% (63)	21% (36)	14% (24)	2% (4)	168
Information overload	23% (39)	43% (71)	23% (38)	5% (9)	3% (6)	163
Aversion to risk	16% (27)	29% (47)	37% (60)	13% (22)	3% (6)	162
Resistance to change	18% (31)	36% (59)	20% (34)	18% (30)	6% (10)	164

7. Other INTERNAL BARRIERS?

- Lack of time (X11 mentions)
- Lack of money (X7)
- Lack of appropriate legislation/policies (X6)
- Lack of implementation “know-how” (X5)
- Reluctance of senior staff to change (X4)
- Competing priorities (X3)
- Lack of understanding/vision (X3)
- Size of community (X3)
- Pace of change/growth (X2)
- Poor communication (X2)
- Lack of training (X2)
- Lack of capacity (X2)

ANSWER #1	ANSWER #2	ANSWER #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of time (X5) ▪ Lack of money (X4) ▪ Senior staff too busy to change (X2) ▪ Size of community...limited opportunities and options for partnering (X2) ▪ Lack of councillors' understanding of big picture ▪ Current legislation ▪ Lack of appropriate legislative authority (e.g., green building codes) ▪ Overlapping jurisdictions ▪ Lack of implementation "know-how" ▪ Lack of training ▪ Elections ▪ Poor communication ▪ Divergent political and staff agendas ▪ Addiction to property taxes ▪ Car-oriented transportation standards ▪ Lack of capacity ▪ Sustainability pre-empted by work volume ▪ Lack of vision...a history of choosing least expensive infrastructure options ▪ Other significant priorities ▪ Growth ▪ Revising OCP...policy changes instream ▪ Lip service without vision ▪ Lack of communication on projects and their impacts ▪ Lack of implementation ▪ Lack of understanding of private-sector/developer issues ▪ Multi-jurisdictional nature of regional district ▪ Lack adequate technical manpower, but understand that the tax base must support a financially sustainable workforce ▪ Government vs. private operations ▪ Competing priorities for finite resources ▪ Push for economic growth through unplanned commercial and industrial developments ▪ Fear of implications ▪ Community attitude ▪ Personal conflict ▪ Lack of clear, concise, pre-written, blueprint policies that are legally permissible in BC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of time (X3) ▪ Lack of money (X2) ▪ Current policy ▪ Senior staff have convinced a majority of council of the above ▪ Lack of human resources a BIG issue ▪ Weak provincial policies ▪ Staff perception ▪ Unfair legislation ▪ Desire is high...understanding of where to start and resources is the most significant barrier ▪ Development catch-up ▪ Many pots without one fire to keep central ▪ Pace of change/response ▪ NIMBY resistance to density ▪ Lack of internal champions ▪ Location of the community...limited access to educational training tools/consultants ▪ Lack of implementation bylaws ▪ Focus on plans and policies, not implementation ▪ Lack of sense of urgency ▪ Increasing emergency response for environmental events ▪ It's all overwhelming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Difficult to change senior staff ▪ Lack to government funding to make inroads ▪ Not looking to the future ▪ We are the innovators...practical/affordable examples needed ▪ Political disincentives ▪ No triple-bottom-line analysis ▪ Rearrange existing priorities ▪ Lack of funding synchronization (int/ext) ▪ Priorities and diversion due to higher priority issues ▪ Limited community diversity...basically a single-industry town...limited developers to interact with ▪ Need demonstrated examples of success ▪ Mounting infrastructure debt for all municipalities ▪ No professional development for staff

8. How significant are the following EXTERNAL BARRIERS (within local government) in preventing your organization for enabling and encouraging sustainability?

EXTERNAL BARRIERS	VERY SIGNIFICANT	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT INSIGNIFICANT	VERY INSIGNIFICANT	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Lack of public understanding about sustainability	20% (32)	54% (86)	15% (24)	6% (10)	3% (5)	157
Public apathy/resistance	12% (20)	41% (65)	29% (47)	14% (22)	3% (5)	159
Developer apathy/resistance	18% (29)	42% (67)	27% (44)	8% (13)	3% (6)	159
Business apathy/resistance	17% (28)	47% (75)	25% (40)	7% (11)	1% (3)	157
Lack of political will	14% (23)	31% (49)	28% (44)	18% (29)	6% (10)	155
Lack of community vision/leadership	15% (25)	31% (50)	29% (47)	16% (26)	5% (9)	157
Lack of communication between your organization and the public	10% (17)	36% (58)	33% (53)	17% (27)	1% (3)	158
Lack of human/financial resources for public education and consultation	41% (66)	44% (71)	10% (16)	3% (5)	1% (2)	160
Lack of practical and affordable best practices	24% (39)	45% (73)	18% (30)	10% (17)	1% (2)	161
Lack of long-term commitment	21% (33)	33% (52)	29% (46)	14% (23)	1% (2)	156
Lack of senior government support for public initiatives	27% (43)	35% (56)	24% (38)	10% (17)	1% (3)	157
Lack of legislation	24% (38)	45% (71)	24% (39)	5% (8)	1% (2)	158
Lack of programs (e.g., transit)	22% (35)	36% (58)	27% (43)	11% (18)	2% (4)	158
Lack of media interest and support	10% (16)	26% (42)	44% (70)	15% (24)	4% (7)	159
Lack of cooperation between public, private, academic, and civic sectors	11% (18)	36% (57)	39% (62)	8% (13)	3% (6)	156

9. Other EXTERNAL BARRIERS?

- Lack of funding support from senior governments (X4 mentions)
- Lack of public understanding and participation (X3)
- Lack of regional and inter-regional planning (X2)
- Lack of coordinated planning and implementation by all levels of government (X2)
- Lack of staff support (X2)
- Lack of skilled personnel (X2)
- Unsustainability of current political and business systems (X2)
- Lack of understanding about sustaining water supplies (X2)

ANSWER #1	ANSWER #2	ANSWER #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ External barriers don't matter as we can create legislation ▪ Federal government support to province ▪ Role of taxation ▪ Minimal regional and inter-regional planning ▪ People not showing for consultation and info ▪ Priorities and values of general public are more immediate gratification ▪ Whole system is non-sustainable ▪ Eco-footprint analysis of top 10 decisions/choices ▪ Lack of funding synchronization (int/ext) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ External support is available if staff would buy into the principles of sustainable development ▪ Need funding and human resources to make it work ▪ Relationships of local and regional governance ▪ Programs aren't always targeting the right audience ▪ Car co-ops or other ideas ▪ Lack of understanding of what sustainable water supply is by region ▪ Rather than a sustainability plan (and it may be semantics), we are following closely an economic development vision to diversify 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Political will and leadership must be supported by senior staff ▪ Canada-based carbon credits to buy as a charitable donation for environment ▪ Coordinated approach at varying levels of government ▪ Development pressure not prepared for in terms of updated OCP with strong sustainability features ▪ Political system favours unsustainable business

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies developed and pushed away by municipal levels are not well developed with regard to water ▪ Pressures and lack of resources in small, isolated communities. We are still trying to develop the community to a standard expected in most parts of the province. More than half our roads are gravel, we have no doctor, no grocery store, no bank...therefore, what is there to sustain? ▪ Need to show examples of success ▪ Lack of foresight to take a chance on different style of development (e.g., now all vehicle-based) ▪ Low energy prices ▪ Senior government downloading ▪ Lack of general understanding of issues ▪ Resource-based economy ▪ Fear of the unknown ▪ Information overload, confusion, absence of common language ▪ No regional district leadership ▪ Insufficient program funding ▪ Resource competition 	<p>our economy and population. This has to be accomplished before we set other goals...and it is not a barrier or lack of flexibility to change!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Difficulty in finding skilled personnel ▪ Paternalistic attitude of senior government to local government ▪ Misconceptions about what it would mean ▪ Public apathy for political process ▪ Lack of vision from neighbouring communities 	
---	---	--

10. How FREQUENTLY do you receive information about sustainability from the following sources?

SOURCES OF INFORMATION	FREQUENTLY	OCCASIONALLY	NEVER	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Federal government	7% (11)	64% (91)	28% (40)	142
Provincial government	18% (26)	61% (87)	20% (29)	142
Regional government	10% (15)	52% (73)	37% (53)	141
Other local governments	4% (7)	58% (83)	36% (51)	141
Academic institutions	8% (12)	47% (67)	43% (61)	140
Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	32% (46)	59% (84)	9% (13)	143
Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., Smart Growth BC, The Natural Step, West Coast Environmental Law)	27% (39)	60% (85)	13% (18)	142
Environmental NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Grasslands Council of BC)	11% (16)	50% (71)	38% (55)	142
Media	9% (13)	42% (60)	49% (70)	143

11. How SATISFIED are you with the information you receive about sustainability from those same sources?

SOURCES OF INFORMATION	VERY SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED	VERY UNSATISFIED	NOT APPLICABLE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Federal government	2% (3)	19% (27)	28% (40)	21% (30)	16% (23)	11% (16)	139
Provincial government	2% (4)	30% (42)	23% (33)	21% (30)	14% (20)	7% (11)	140
Regional government	4% (6)	19% (27)	31% (44)	16% (23)	10% (15)	17% (24)	139
Other local governments	5% (8)	19% (27)	42% (60)	13% (19)	5% (7)	15% (21)	142
Academic institutions	6% (9)	16% (23)	33% (46)	15% (21)	10% (14)	18% (25)	138
Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	17% (24)	39% (54)	26% (36)	8% (12)	5% (7)	5% (7)	140
Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., Smart Growth BC, The Natural Step, West Coast Environmental Law)	15% (21)	32% (45)	28% (39)	11% (16)	4% (6)	7% (11)	138
Environment NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Grasslands Council of BC)	7% (11)	17% (24)	39% (55)	15% (21)	5% (8)	15% (21)	140
Media	0% (1)	10% (14)	41% (57)	17% (24)	11% (16)	19% (26)	138

12. Who or what do you consider to be the MOST CREDIBLE sources of information about sustainability?

- Provincial government (X24 mentions)
- Academics/scientists (X23)
- Local governments (X18)
- Federal government (X18)
- Trade/industry organizations (X17)
- Smart Growth BC (X15)
- UBCM (X11)
- Education/advocacy organizations (X11)
- NGOs (X9)
- FCM (X7)
- Professionals (e.g., LEED experts) and consultants (X5)
- Workshops and conferences (X4)
- Practitioners/suppliers/contractors (X3)
- AWWA/BCWWA (X3)
- LGMA (X3)
- Cascadia (X2)
- Media (X2)
- Regional governments (X2)
- David Suzuki Foundation (X2)
- LEED Reference Guide (X2)
- Sustainable Building Industry Council (X2)

Answer #1	Answer #2	Answer #3	Answer #4	Answer #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academics/scientists (X13) ▪ Prov. Govt. (X12) ▪ Local govts. (X11) ▪ Smart Growth BC (X9) ▪ Fed. Govt. (X8) ▪ Trade orgs. (X6) ▪ UBCM (X6) ▪ FCM (X5) ▪ NGOs (X3) ▪ Practitioners/suppliers/contractors (X3) ▪ Cascadia (X2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prov. Govt. (X10) ▪ Education/advocacy orgs. (X7) ▪ Trade orgs. (X7) ▪ Fed. Govt. (X4) ▪ Local govts. (X4) ▪ Academics/scientists (X3) ▪ LGMA (X3) ▪ Smart Growth BC (X3) ▪ UBCM (X3) ▪ Reg. Govts. (X2) ▪ NGOs (X2) ▪ FCM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fed. Govt. (X6) ▪ NGOs (X4) ▪ Smart Growth BC (X3) ▪ Trade orgs. (X3) ▪ Academics/scientists (X3) ▪ Education/advocacy orgs. (X3) ▪ Media (X2) ▪ Local govts. (X2) ▪ Prov. Govt. (X2) ▪ UBCM ▪ Multi-sectoral associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sustainable Building Industry Council (X2) ▪ Workshops and conferences (X2) ▪ Academics ▪ Collaborative partnerships ▪ Municipal staff ▪ Trade orgs. ▪ Academics and scientists ▪ Keynote speakers ▪ Science-based information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academics (X2) ▪ UBCM ▪ Local govts. ▪ Various xeriscape guides ▪ The Inconvenient Truth, Al Gore ▪ David Suzuki, Mark Holland, Mark Allison ▪ Consultants

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Media (X2) ▪ Professionals (e.g., LEED experts) and consultants (X2) ▪ AWWA (X2) ▪ Planning staff ▪ Fraser Institute ▪ Outside non-partisan literature ▪ Professional journals ▪ Private interest groups ▪ Canadian Research Council ▪ Workshops ▪ David Suzuki Foundation ▪ Niaka'pamux (Thompson) Elders ▪ Information that is usable by FNs ▪ Grass-roots organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research orgs. ▪ Visionary political leaders ▪ LEED Reference Guide ▪ Other board members ▪ Rocky Mountain Institute ▪ Planners ▪ Best-case reports ▪ Those who involve First Nations from the initiation of projects ▪ Environmental consultants ▪ Business leaders with green projects ▪ Developers ▪ Conservative think tanks ▪ UBC reports from Stuart Cohen ▪ UDI ▪ Conferences ▪ Victoria Transit Policy Institute ▪ BC Hydro ▪ Books on the subject ▪ Implementation programs with success rates ▪ WEF ▪ Green Building Council ▪ Sustainability planning consultants ▪ Municipal examples for our line of work ▪ Internet ▪ MMCD ▪ Niaka'pamux members ▪ Habitat for Humanity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rocky Mountain Institute ▪ LEED Reference Guide ▪ Fraser Valley Regional District ▪ Colleagues ▪ BCWWA ▪ FCM ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Environmental organizations ▪ David Suzuki Foundation ▪ Greater Vancouver Regional District ▪ International examples ▪ Private-sector ▪ Personal contacts and references 	<p>relevant to municipal functions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Education/advocacy groups ▪ Reference materials ▪ Consultants 	
---	---	--	--	--

13. How INTERESTED are you in receiving sustainability information about the following?

INFORMATION INTERESTS	VERY INTERESTED	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT DISINTERESTED	VERY DISINTERESTED	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Federal policies, programs, and projects	54% (75)	35% (49)	6% (9)	3% (5)	0% (0)	138
Provincial policies, programs, and projects	59% (83)	34% (48)	3% (5)	2% (3)	0% (0)	139
Regional policies, programs, and projects	58% (81)	34% (48)	4% (6)	2% (3)	0% (0)	138
Case studies from BC communities	66% (93)	29% (41)	2% (4)	0% (1)	0% (0)	139
Case studies from communities across Canada	46% (65)	38% (53)	11% (16)	3% (5)	0% (0)	139
Case studies from communities around the world	35% (49)	34% (48)	21% (30)	7% (10)	1% (2)	139
Book reviews	21% (30)	29% (41)	30% (43)	14% (20)	3% (5)	139
Recommended websites	42% (58)	42% (59)	11% (16)	2% (4)	0% (1)	138
Editorials	21% (29)	39% (54)	24% (33)	10% (14)	5% (7)	137
Studies/reports	30% (42)	54% (76)	13% (19)	0% (1)	0% (1)	139
Briefing notes/Fact sheets	50% (70)	38% (53)	10% (14)	1% (2)	0% (0)	139
Quotable quotes	22% (31)	22% (31)	35% (49)	12% (17)	7% (10)	138
Profiles of innovative individuals	20% (28)	29% (41)	29% (41)	13% (18)	6% (9)	137
Profiles of innovative organizations	24% (34)	49% (69)	17% (24)	5% (8)	2% (4)	139
Awards	14% (20)	21% (29)	39% (55)	17% (24)	7% (10)	138
Coming events	42% (59)	33% (46)	18% (25)	4% (6)	1% (2)	138
International sustainability news	26% (36)	35% (48)	28% (39)	7% (10)	2% (4)	137

14. What SUSTAINABILITY TOPICS are you most likely to want information about?

- Water conservation (X22)
- Energy efficiency (X17)
- Green buildings (X14)
- Transportation demand management (X13)
- Sustainability planning (X10)
- Sustainability policies (X9)
- Solid waste management (X8)
- Implementation strategies (X8)
- Best practices (X7)
- Case studies (X7)
- Climate change and greenhouse gases (X7)
- Water quality/treatment (X6)
- Green development standards (X6)
- Environment (X5)
- Air quality (X5)
- Wastewater management (X5)
- Rural and small communities (X5)
- Public education/engaging the public (X5)
- Affordable housing (X4)
- Education for elected officials and staff (X4)
- Infrastructure (X3)
- Economic sustainability (X3)
- Food supply (X3)
- Funding sources (X3)
- Sustainable agriculture (X3)
- OCP and zoning bylaws (X2)
- Growth management (X2)
- Urban design criteria (X2)
- Land-use planning (X2)
- LEED programs (X2)
- Planning frameworks (X2)

Answer #1	Answer #2	Answer #3	Answer #4	Answer #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water cons. (X12) ▪ Energy efficiency (X6) ▪ Sustainability policies (X5) ▪ Green buildings (X5) ▪ Sustainability planning (X4) ▪ Environment (X4) ▪ Best practices (X4) ▪ Rural and small communities (X4) ▪ Infrastructure (X3) ▪ Economic sustainability (X3) ▪ Climate change and green house gases (X3) ▪ Solid waste management (X2) ▪ OCP and zoning bylaws (X2) ▪ Growth management (X2) ▪ Urban design criteria (X2) ▪ Water treatment (X2) ▪ Implementation strategies (X2) ▪ Land development ▪ Wetlands ▪ Public action ▪ TDM ▪ Case studies ▪ Federal policies ▪ Funding support ▪ Practical solutions ▪ LEED ▪ The Natural Step or other frameworks ▪ Smart Growth ▪ Retrofitting suburbs ▪ Comprehensive infrastructure lifecycle management best practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Energy efficiency (X7) ▪ Water cons. (X5) ▪ Implementation strategies (X5) ▪ Green buildings (X5) ▪ TDM (X5) ▪ Sustainability planning (X4) ▪ Food supply (X3) ▪ Climate change and greenhouse gases (X3) ▪ Green development standards (X2) ▪ Land-use planning (X2) ▪ Sustainability policies (X2) ▪ Wastewater management (X2) ▪ Air quality (X2) ▪ Case studies (X2) ▪ Public education (X2) ▪ Water quality ▪ Triple bottom line ▪ Environment ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Motivating staff ▪ Best practices ▪ Solid waste management ▪ Ecosystems ▪ Sustainable initiatives that are affordable and easy to implement ▪ Provincial policies, programs, and projects ▪ Sustainability indicators ▪ Practical actions for mid-size communities ▪ Rural transportation ▪ LEED programs ▪ Summary of federal and provincial funding sources ▪ Increasing density ▪ Public process ▪ Municipal P3s ▪ Political leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TDM (X5) ▪ Solid waste (X4) ▪ Water cons. (X4) ▪ Air quality (X3) ▪ Green development standards (X3) ▪ Case studies (X3) ▪ Engaging the public (X3) ▪ Sustainability planning (X2) ▪ Sustainability policies (X2) ▪ Best practices (X2) ▪ Sustainable agriculture (X2) ▪ Wastewater management (X2) ▪ Energy efficiency (X2) ▪ Checklist of what SPECIFICALLY can be done within BC's Community Charter ▪ Partnerships ▪ Creative infill development ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Sprawl prevention ▪ Incentives for developers ▪ Education tools ▪ Stormwater management ▪ Affordable sustainability for local governments ▪ Implementation strategies ▪ Road materials ▪ Water quality ▪ New technologies ▪ Climate change and greenhouse gases ▪ Green buildings ▪ Environment ▪ Research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Green buildings (X3) ▪ TDM (X2) ▪ Water quality (X2) ▪ Energy efficiency ▪ Infrastructure ▪ Case studies ▪ Water cons. ▪ Green development standards ▪ Education ▪ Senior govt. funding ▪ Staff education ▪ Creative development design ▪ Rewarding first steps ▪ Habitat protection ▪ Solid waste management ▪ Wastewater management ▪ Support from media ▪ Business case for sustainability practices ▪ Growth alternatives ▪ Riparian management ▪ Legal mechanisms to protect environmentally sensitive areas ▪ Natural resources ▪ Economic and funding opportunities for FNs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Energy efficiency ▪ Creative building design ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Community safety ▪ Sample bylaws ▪ Green sources of supply/advice ▪ Monitoring tools ▪ Growth restriction pros and cons ▪ Water utility practices ▪ International sustainability news ▪ Sustainable forestry ▪ Sustainability in small communities ▪ Sustainable agriculture ▪ Education for elected officials ▪ Global issues

15. How likely would you be to use the following COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES provided by a non-profit organization?

COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES	VERY LIKELY	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT UNLIKELY	VERY UNLIKELY	NOT APPLICABLE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Website devoted to sustainability issues from a local government perspective	55% (77)	32% (45)	7% (10)	4% (6)	1% (2)	0% (0)	140
Regular electronic newsletters	30% (42)	45% (63)	20% (28)	4% (6)	0% (1)	0% (0)	140
Regular printed newsletters/magazines	14% (20)	37% (53)	28% (40)	12% (18)	5% (8)	0% (1)	140
Regional workshops	36% (51)	51% (72)	7% (10)	4% (7)	1% (2)	0% (0)	142
Annual conference	29% (41)	41% (59)	19% (28)	6% (9)	2% (4)	0% (0)	141
Regular webinars (web-based presentations)	18% (26)	34% (49)	27% (39)	12% (18)	6% (9)	0% (0)	141
Topic-specific research	25% (36)	54% (76)	15% (22)	2% (4)	1% (2)	0% (0)	140
Briefing notes/Fact sheets	29% (41)	47% (67)	16% (23)	4% (7)	2% (3)	0% (0)	141
Public education	24% (35)	51% (73)	17% (24)	4% (6)	2% (4)	0% (1)	143
Public consultation	22% (31)	42% (60)	27% (39)	5% (8)	1% (2)	0% (1)	140
Communications planning	25% (36)	37% (53)	26% (38)	7% (10)	2% (3)	0% (1)	141
Sustainability planning	36% (51)	46% (65)	14% (21)	1% (2)	1% (2)	0% (0)	141
Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of focus groups	17% (25)	36% (51)	31% (45)	8% (12)	4% (6)	2% (3)	142
Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of workshops	18% (26)	40% (57)	29% (41)	6% (9)	4% (7)	0% (1)	141
Mentorship program	18% (26)	26% (37)	35% (49)	11% (16)	6% (9)	1% (2)	139

16. Please list ANY OTHER sustainability-related communications services you would like to see offered by a non-profit organization?

ANSWER #1	ANSWER #2	ANSWER #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant funding research and application assistance ▪ Political training ▪ More visuals...photos of good ideas ▪ Local tours showcasing sustainable communities (e.g., economic transitions from forestry-based communities to eco-tourist type communities) ▪ Joint ventures on a local project ▪ There are already some decent organizations and consultants...don't duplicate, value add ▪ Finances and lack of people's time always seem to be an issue ▪ Organizing a lobby to the green-washing federal government ▪ Club and interest-group programs ▪ Research articles...too much fad material out there 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant and interesting workshops (X2) ▪ Cost-effective best practices and ideas ▪ The occasional social event for sustainability practitioners (e.g., organic food and drink) ▪ Websites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lobbying for change ▪ Draft policies, bylaws, resolutions, etc.

17. How FREQUENTLY would you read or participate in the following?

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION	MONTHLY	EVERY TWO MONTHS	EVERY THREE MONTHS	EVERY SIX MONTHS	EVERY YEAR	NEVER	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Electronic newsletter	48% (69)	22% (32)	21% (30)	4% (6)	2% (3)	2% (3)	143
Printed newsletter/magazine	22% (30)	19% (26)	31% (42)	12% (17)	3% (4)	12% (16)	135
Webinar (web-based presentation)	13% (18)	15% (22)	23% (33)	23% (32)	7% (11)	17% (24)	140
Regional workshop	2% (3)	4% (6)	14% (20)	33% (48)	42% (60)	6% (9)	146
Conference	2% (3)	0% (1)	4% (7)	6% (9)	76% (109)	10% (15)	144

18. How IMPORTANT to sustainability are the relationships/partnerships you have, or could have, with the following people?

IMPORTANCE OF RELATIONSHIPS	VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT	NOT APPLICABLE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Elected officials	76% (103)	20% (28)	2% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (1)	135
Colleagues within your department	63% (85)	17% (23)	10% (14)	0% (1)	0% (0)	8% (11)	134
Colleagues from other departments	55% (74)	24% (33)	9% (13)	0% (1)	0% (0)	10% (14)	135
Supervisors/managers	62% (85)	25% (34)	6% (9)	0% (1)	0% (0)	5% (8)	137
Federal representatives	33% (45)	33% (45)	23% (31)	6% (9)	0% (1)	2% (3)	134
Provincial representatives	35% (47)	42% (57)	14% (19)	5% (8)	1% (2)	0% (1)	134
Regional representatives	41% (56)	38% (51)	11% (15)	5% (7)	0% (0)	3% (5)	134
Representatives from other local governments	44% (60)	39% (53)	12% (17)	2% (3)	0% (0)	1% (2)	135
First Nations	39% (52)	24% (33)	22% (30)	8% (11)	3% (4)	2% (3)	133
Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	34% (46)	48% (65)	11% (15)	4% (6)	0% (1)	1% (2)	135
Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	37% (50)	37% (50)	17% (23)	5% (7)	1% (2)	2% (3)	135
Representatives from academic institutions	26% (35)	38% (52)	25% (34)	5% (7)	2% (3)	2% (4)	135
Developers	52% (70)	32% (44)	12% (17)	1% (2)	0% (0)	0% (1)	134
Business people	43% (57)	34% (46)	15% (21)	5% (7)	0% (0)	0% (1)	132
NGOs	32% (42)	31% (41)	25% (33)	10% (14)	0% (0)	1% (2)	132
Residents	59% (80)	32% (44)	5% (8)	1% (2)	0% (0)	0% (1)	135
Media	31% (42)	37% (49)	25% (34)	3% (5)	0% (1)	1% (2)	133

19. How SATISFIED are you that your EXISTING relationships/partnerships with the following people are helping you enable and encourage sustainability?

SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS	VERY SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED	VERY UNSATISFIED	NOT APPLICABLE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Elected officials	26% (35)	34% (46)	16% (22)	18% (24)	2% (3)	2% (3)	133
Colleagues within your department	27% (36)	33% (45)	17% (23)	8% (11)	2% (3)	11% (15)	133
Colleagues from other departments	13% (18)	38% (51)	22% (30)	9% (13)	2% (3)	14% (19)	134
Supervisors/managers	22% (30)	37% (50)	17% (23)	7% (10)	3% (5)	11% (15)	133
Federal representatives	2% (4)	14% (19)	38% (51)	24% (33)	14% (19)	5% (8)	134
Provincial representatives	2% (4)	19% (26)	33% (45)	25% (34)	14% (20)	3% (5)	134
Regional representatives	5% (7)	22% (30)	33% (45)	21% (29)	10% (14)	6% (9)	134
Representatives from other local governments	7% (10)	27% (37)	41% (56)	15% (21)	3% (5)	3% (5)	134
First Nations	3% (5)	14% (20)	48% (65)	14% (20)	8% (12)	9% (13)	135
Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	8% (12)	30% (41)	39% (53)	12% (17)	21% (4)	5% (7)	134
Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	7% (10)	29% (40)	44% (59)	11% (15)	2% (4)	4% (6)	134
Representatives from academic institutions	4% (6)	17% (23)	48% (65)	17% (24)	5% (7)	6% (9)	134
Developers	3% (4)	17% (23)	38% (51)	27% (37)	9% (12)	4% (6)	133
Business people	1% (2)	12% (17)	45% (61)	26% (36)	8% (12)	4% (6)	134
NGOs	6% (8)	15% (20)	49% (66)	15% (21)	5% (7)	8% (11)	133
Residents	6% (9)	30% (41)	39% (52)	15% (20)	3% (4)	5% (7)	133
Media	4% (6)	22% (30)	39% (52)	21% (28)	9% (12)	4% (6)	134

20. How likely would you be to partner with the Fresh Outlook Foundation by doing the following?

PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE FOUNDATION	VERY LIKELY	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT UNLIKELY	VERY UNLIKELY	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Provide story ideas for website and/or newsletters	9% (12)	39% (52)	26% (35)	12% (17)	14% (19)	135
Write stories for website and/or newsletters	6% (8)	21% (28)	31% (42)	25% (34)	16% (22)	134
Provide photographs for website and/or newsletters	9% (13)	42% (56)	23% (31)	15% (20)	10% (14)	134
Review and summarize books, websites, reports, and studies for website and/or newsletters	6% (9)	17% (23)	30% (40)	31% (41)	15% (20)	133
Help fundraise	3% (4)	2% (3)	21% (28)	36% (49)	36% (49)	133
Help organize a webinar	2% (3)	5% (7)	20% (27)	34% (46)	37% (50)	133
Help organize a workshop or conference	4% (6)	24% (32)	23% (31)	28% (38)	19% (26)	133
Share your sustainability successes with colleagues in other communities through a mentorship program	14% (19)	36% (49)	24% (32)	14% (19)	10% (14)	133

21. COMMENTS:

- Excellent survey.
- I am leaving Canada soon, so won't be able to participate in this exciting venture, but I'm full of admiration for what you're doing, and wish you great success. You're doing something really important! Don't get discouraged before you've reached your goals!!
- Good luck. Ensure organization works with other and not simply duplicates or competes.
- Due to overwhelming commitments within our own organization and territory, it would be hard to commit resources.
- Subject to staff resources.
- I am quite new to my role so am unsure where my interests will develop.
- Have never participated in a webinar...would need instruction.
- Would consider sitting on your board.
- The biggest challenge these days is not finding ideas or information, it is getting the funding and other resources to implement. We have much of the info, we need assistance in implementing.
- I see my challenge to be getting the capacity within my community's staff to move sustainability issues forward.
- Not familiar with Fresh Outlook Foundation.
- Not enough hours in the day to complete present workload.
- Cost is a consideration.
- My comments are based on our promotion of watering regulations, metering program, and residential irrigation monitoring program. At this time we do not have funds or personnel to implement a full-scale sustainability program. Perhaps when the turbidity program takes less time and energy, and when we secure additional water sources, we will be in a position to devote more time to this very important aspect of our mandate.
- My main interest is to help prepare my community for the big changes to come. We have a long way to go, but we are beginning.
- As you will see from my response, many of the questions were answered with a neutral response. This is not because we have little interest in the subject, but rather that it is a relatively new concept for our small rural community. The main reason for the lack of participation and interaction with various agencies is because our organization has a very high employee turnover so there is little time to work on a plan and to implement the recommendations. It is quite possible that we are inadvertently creating a sustainable community, but probably due to necessity. With tax funds scarce and government assistance programs slowly dying, we are forced to create a system where it's more user pay. This maintains our environment and reduces future maintenance costs.
- The survey assumes a certain level of involvement with the sustainability issue that largely does not exist yet. Although some departments may consider and apply sustainability principles, they have not become overarching principles that guide this organization. In other words, partnerships and relationships with other organizations do not have sustainability as a guiding principle or motivation. You could say there has been a lot of talk about sustainability, but nothing has been internalized at the institutional level. Being at that stage makes it difficult to answer a lot of your questions.
- While being a partner with the Fresh Outlook Foundation sounds like an interesting exercise, this would depend on staff time.

- We're too small...we have 2.5 employees in the office. No one here knows or cares what "sustainability" is, and most people think it's a buzzword. Sorry I couldn't be more help.
- Sustainability issues have become a fad. There is a need for a more scientific approach to this issue. Research-based evidence is required. Some of these questions could be interpreted in many ways. Not clear on how one can use this information.
- Unfortunately, there has been a large changeover in our staff recently. It will be quite hard to spend much time on developing strategies until after these people have been replaced.
- Due to staffing constraints, we have some barriers to being able to move into a more sustainability-focused decision pattern.
- The survey is suited to municipalities and not specifically suited to First Nations.
- First Nations require a Nation Building Approach in Community and Economic Development...one cannot be without the other.