



Community Sustainability Snapshot

2010 Survey Results from Local Governments

Prepared by:

Joanne de Vries, Founder & CEO

Fresh Outlook Foundation

Email: jo@freshoutlookfoundation.org

Website: www.freshoutlookfoundation.org

Sponsored by:

- Federation of Canadian Municipalities
- Columbia Basin Trust
- Smart Planning for Communities (A Partnership Program of Fraser Basin Council)

JANUARY 2011

© Copyright Fresh Outlook Foundation 2011

Thank-you to our Sponsors...

The Fresh Outlook Foundation thanks the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Columbia Basin Trust, and Fraser Basin Council (Smart Planning for Communities), for their kind and generous support of the *2010 Community Sustainability Snapshot*. Their financial contributions and input to survey design were invaluable and very much appreciated!

FCM | Green Municipal Fund
Fonds municipal vert



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SURVEY RATIONALE

Incorporated in the spring of 2007, the Fresh Outlook Foundation (FOF) is a registered charity that uses community-based social marketing to develop and deliver sector-specific programs that promote sustainable ways in people's communities, workplaces, homes, and recreational activities.

Given that FOF founder and CEO Joanne de Vries has extensive communications consulting experience with provincial, regional, municipal, and First Nations jurisdictions throughout BC, local governments became the foundation's inaugural target audience.

To ensure FOF programs reflected local governments' information wants and needs, the foundation conducted a comprehensive survey of BC's regional, municipal, and First Nations governments in 2007. The primary objectives were to: 1) pinpoint the types, formats, and frequencies of sustainability information preferred by elected officials and staff; and 2) to 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 has been used to develop a variety of events and programs, including regional workshops, electronic magazines, and FOF's signature event — the Building SustainAble Communities (BSC) conference.

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 was helpful to many organizations, and is now considered a baseline against which subsequent statistics can be measured.

For this follow-up survey — conducted jointly by FOF, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), Columbia Basin Trust (CBT), and Fraser Basin Council (FBC) — the research goals were reversed. Primary findings indicate various levels of participation in and opinions about community sustainability, while secondary results reflect local government representatives' communication wants and needs regarding sustainability. Both sets of statistics are invaluable in helping us build more sustainable communities in the short, medium, and long terms.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Conducted between July and September of 2010, the survey was made available to all local governments in Canada. In BC, email requests (including the survey link) were sent twice to all local government elected officials, administrators, planning managers, and public works managers. The distribution list included multiple representatives from each of BC's 28 regional districts and 154 municipalities, and from 120 First Nations.

Across Canada, the survey was promoted through FCM's electronic newsletter.

There were two surveys — both created, conducted, and compiled using *ZapSurvey*, an Internet-based research tool. The survey for administrators included performance- and opinion-based questions, while the survey for elected officials and staff included only opinion-based questions. The results were combined and documented in this report, the *2010 Community Sustainability Snapshot*.

SURVEY RESPONSES

Considering the numbers of local government representatives approached, and the distribution method used, it's impossible to calculate an accurate response rate. There was, however, an eight percent increase in the total number of responses from 2007 (171) to 2010 (213). And survey findings reflect the views of elected officials and staff from jurisdictions of all types and sizes, and from all areas of BC and a few communities across Canada.

PRIMARY FINDINGS

The survey indicated top-five rankings in the following categories:

TOP 5 SUSTIANABILITY INITIATIVES IN PLACE

1. Water efficiency / conservation
2. Solid waste reduction
3. Energy efficiency
4. Active transportation
5. Recreation planning / strategies

TOP 5 RESOURCES, SERVICES & FRAMEWORKS USED

1. Local government planning and legislative tools (e.g., OCPs, RGSs)
2. Consultants
3. Provincial government
4. FCM
5. Local government associations

TOP 5 SUSTAINABILITY TOOLS & TECHNIQUES USED

1. Sustainability programs / projects
2. Public consultation regarding sustainability issues
3. Staff training about sustainability
4. Sustainability policies / regulations
5. Staff devoted to sustainability

** Sustainability plans were 6th*

TOP 5 INTERNAL BARRIERS TO SUSTAINABILITY

1. Lack of financial resources
2. Lack of human resources
3. Lack of senior government support
4. Information overload
5. Resistance to change

TOP 5 EXTERNAL BARRIERS TO SUSTAINABILITY

1. Lack of financial resources for public education and engagement
2. Inadequate funding (e.g., taxation)
3. Lack of human resources for public education and engagement
4. Lack of public understanding about sustainability
5. Public apathy / resistance

TOP 5 FUNDING SOURCES

1. Provincial government
2. Gas Tax Agreement Fund
3. Federal government
4. FCM Municipal Green Fund
5. Utility

TOP 5 FUNDING CHALLENGES

1. For cultural planning
2. For affordable housing
3. For transportation demand management
4. For social planning
5. For wastewater management

TOP 5 SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIPS IN PLACE

1. With regional government
2. With other local governments
3. With the provincial government
4. With First Nations
5. With the nonprofit sector

TOP 5 MOST IMPORTANT PARTNERSHIPS / RELATIONSHIPS

1. With elected officials
2. With residents
3. With supervisors / managers
4. With colleagues in same department
5. With colleagues from other departments

TOP 5 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS & TECHNIQUES USED

1. Open houses / town hall meetings
2. Advisory committees / task forces
3. Facilitated focus groups
4. Public events (e.g., at grocery stores / cafes)
5. Facilitated meetings / workshops

TOP 5 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CHALLENGES

1. Lack of funding
2. Lack of public understanding about sustainability
3. Public skepticism about local government projects
4. Lack of support from the private sector
5. Lack of public interest

TOP 5 OUTREACH / EDUCATION MATERIALS & ACTIVITIES USED

1. For the general public
2. For students
3. For key community stakeholders (e.g., ICI)
4. For developers
5. For the private sector

SECONDARY FINDINGS

The survey indicated top-five rankings in the following categories:

TOP 5 MOST CREDIBLE SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT SUSTAINABILITY

1. Other municipalities
2. Academic institutions
3. Provincial government
4. NGOs
5. FCM

TOP 5 MOST WANTED SUSTAINABILITY TOPICS

1. Energy
2. Water / wastewater
3. Transportation
4. Environment / natural resources
5. Planning

TOP 5 MOST WANTED TYPES OF INFORMATION

1. Case studies from other communities in same province
2. Regional policies, programs, and projects
3. Provincial policies, programs, and projects
4. Case studies from communities across Canada
5. Federal policies, programs, and projects

TOP 5 MOST WANTED COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS & SERVICES

1. Regional workshops
2. Website devoted to sustainability from a local government perspective
3. Sustainability planning
4. Topic-specific research
5. Public education / community based social marketing

COMPARING 2007 & 2010 RESULTS

A comparison of the survey results shows that, in general, participating local governments are making marked headway in their commitments to community sustainability.

SUSTAINABILITY TOOLS

- 44% of respondents have sustainability plan(s), compared with 23% in 2007
- 59% have sustainability programs and projects, compared with 42% in 2007
- 58% have embarked on public consultation regarding sustainability issues, compared with 38% in 2007
- 53% have conducted staff training about sustainability, compared with 36% in 2007
- 52% have sustainability policies and/or regulations, compared with 34% in 2007
- 51% have staff devoted to sustainability, compared with 37% in 2007.

SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIPS / RELATIONSHIPS

- 73% of respondents are satisfied with the partnerships / relationships they have with elected officials, compared with 60% in 2007
- 70% are satisfied with the partnerships / relationships they have with colleagues within their departments, compared with 60% in 2007
- 43% are satisfied with the partnerships / relationships they have with representatives from regional organizations, compared with 27% in 2007
- 41% are satisfied with the partnerships / relationships they have with representatives from other local governments, compared with 34% in 2007
- 34% are satisfied with the partnerships / relationships they have with the media, compared with 26% in 2007.

INTERNAL BARRIERS

Lack of human and/or financial resources continues to top the list of internal barriers (within local government). Resistance to change and aversion to risk appear to be greater barriers now than in 2007, while lack of regional foresight and coordination, lack of understanding about sustainability, and lack of follow-through seem to be less problematic.

EXTERNAL BARRIERS

Lack of human and/or financial resources for public education and consultation continues to top the list of external barriers. Public apathy / resistance, lack of long-term commitment, and lack of cooperation between public, private, nonprofit, and academic sectors seem more significant now than in 2007, while lack of legislation appear to be less significant.

INFORMATION FREQUENCY & SATISFACTION

The majority of respondents receive information about sustainability only occasionally from the federal, provincial, and regional governments; regional organizations; other local governments; trade / industry organizations; NGOs; academic institutions; and the media. Satisfaction with the information respondents received from these same sources is up in some cases and down in others. For instance, 38% are satisfied with the information they receive from regional governments (compared with 23% in 2007), while 45% are satisfied with the information they get from trade / industry organizations (compared with 57% in 2007).

SPECIFIC INFORMATION WANTS & NEEDS

Results show that the overwhelming majority of respondents continue to want regular, credible information about a wide range of sustainability topics through a variety of communication products and services.

- 100% of respondents are interested in learning about case studies from other communities, compared with 95% in 2007
- 95% want information about provincial and regional policies, programs, and projects, compared with 92% in 2007
- 88% want information about federal policies, programs, and projects, compared with 89% in 2007
- 88% would be likely to participate in regional workshops about sustainability, compared with 87% in 2007
- 85% would use a website devoted to sustainability issues from a local government perspective, compared with 87% in 2007.

These statistics are being used to drive the ongoing development of Fresh Outlook Foundation events, products, and services for local governments and related organizations, ideally in collaboration with other groups committed to continued awareness building and positive behaviour change.

IN CLOSING...

I am pleased and proud to present this information, in hopes that it will help you and your organization expedite the move toward community sustainability. More specifically, I encourage you to use what you learn to increase awareness among all stakeholders and to build the partnerships and relationships within and across governments and sectors that you'll need to find innovative, timely, practical, and affordable solutions.

Please share this report with your colleagues and friends, who too can benefit from the information and insights it contains.

Respectfully submitted:

*Joanne de Vries
Founder & CEO
Fresh Outlook Foundation
12510 Ponderosa Road
Lake Country, BC V4V 2G9
Phone: 250-766-1777
Email: jo@freshoutlookfoundation.org
Website: www.freshoutlookfoundation.org*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The first page number refers to the information in the Survey Response Summary, while the second number indicates where Detailed Survey Responses can be found.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
SURVEY RESPONSE SUMMARY	7/19
<i>QUESTIONS REGARDING COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHICS</i>	
1. In what PROVINCE / TERRITORY is your local government located?	7/19
2. If your local government is LOCATED IN BC, where is it situated?	7/19
3. What TYPE of local government do you serve?	7/19
4. What is the NAME of your local government?	7/19
5. What POPULATION does your local government serve?	7/20
6. What POSITION do you hold within local government?	8/21
<i>QUESTIONS REGARDING COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PRACTICES</i>	
7. Does your local government use the following TOOLS to enable and encourage sustainability?	8/21
8. Which TOOLS have been particularly HELPFUL in enabling and encouraging sustainability? (Top 10)	9/23
9. Has your local government used any of the following RESOURCES, SERVICES, and/or FRAMEWORKS in the development of a sustainability plan?	9/25
10. Have you used any OTHER RESOURCES, SERVICES, and/or FRAMEWORKS in the development of a sustainability plan?	9/25
11. Which RESOURCES, SERVICES, and/or FRAMEWORKS have been particularly HELPFUL in the development of a sustainability plan? (Top 10)	10/26
12. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS and/or TECHNIQUES have you used to help develop your community sustainability plan?	10/27
13. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CHALLENGES have you faced or are facing in sustainability planning?	10/27
14. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS and/or RESOURCES would be HELPFUL in the development of your sustainability plan?	10/27
15. Has your local government provided OUTREACH / EDUCATION MATERIALS and/or ACTIVITIES for the following target audiences to enable and encourage community sustainability?	11/28
16. Which OUTREACH / EDUCATION MATERIALS and/or ACTIVITIES have been particularly HELPFUL? (Top 10)	11/28
17. Has your local government developed PARTNERSHIPS with any of the following to enable and encourage community sustainability?	11/29
18. Which PARTNERSHIPS have been particularly HELPFUL? (Top 10)	11/30
19. Has your local government embarked on the following COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVES?	12/31
20. How difficult is it to obtain FUNDING for the following initiatives?	12/32

21.	How difficult is it to obtain FUNDING SUPPORT from elected officials for community sustainability?	13/33
22.	Which of the following FUNDING SOURCES have provided support for your community sustainability initiatives?	13/33
23.	How IMPORTANT to sustainability are the PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS you have, or could have with the following people?	13/33
24.	How SATISFIED are you that your EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS with the following people are helping you enable and encourage sustainability?	14/34
25.	How significant are the following INTERNAL BARRIERS (within local government) in preventing your organization from enabling and encouraging sustainability?	14/35
26.	Other INTERNAL BARRIERS? (Top 10)	14/36
27.	How significant are the following EXTERNAL BARRIERS in preventing your organization from enabling and encouraging sustainability?	15/38
28.	Other EXTERNAL BARRIERS? (Top 10)	15/38

QUESTIONS REGARDING COMMUNICATION FOR COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY

29.	How FREQUENTLY do you receive INFORMATION about sustainability from the following sources?	16/40
30.	How SATISFIED are you with the INFORMATION you receive about sustainability from those same sources?	16/40
31.	Who or what do you consider to be the MOST CREDIBLE SOURCES of information about sustainability? (Top 10)	16/41
32.	How INTERESTED are you in receiving sustainability INFORMATION about the following?	17/45
33.	What SUSTAINABILITY TOPICS are you most likely to want information about? (Top 10)	17/46
34.	How likely would you be to use the following COMMUNICATION PRODUCTS and/or SERVICES provided by a nonprofit organization?	17/51
35.	Please list any OTHER COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS and/or SERVICES you would like to see offered by a nonprofit organization?	18/53
36.	How FREQUENTLY would you READ or PARTICIPATE in the following?	18/53

COMMENTS	53
----------	----

SURVEY RESPONSE SUMMARY

1. In what PROVINCE / TERRITORY is your local government located?

PROVINCE / TERRITORY (213 respondents)	% OF TOTAL 2007	% OF TOTAL 2010
British Columbia	N/A	90%
Saskatchewan	N/A	2%
Ontario	N/A	2%
Alberta	N/A	1.5%
Nova Scotia	N/A	1.5%
Quebec	N/A	1%
New Brunswick	N/A	1%
Manitoba	N/A	0.5%
PEI	N/A	0.5%
Yukon	N/A	0.5%
Newfoundland & Labrador	N/A	0%
Northwest Territories	N/A	0%
Nunavut	N/A	0%

2. If your local government is LOCATED IN BC, where is it situated?

AREA (209 respondents)	% OF TOTAL 2007	% OF TOTAL 2010
Vancouver Island and Coastal Region	20%	25%
Thompson / Okanagan	37%	20%
Lower Mainland	11%	20%
Kootenays	13%	14%
Northeast BC	7%	9%
Northwest BC	6%	7%
Cariboo	4%	2%
Northern Interior	N/A	2%
Other	2%	1%

3. What TYPE of local government do you serve?

TYPE (213 respondents)	% OF TOTAL 2007	% OF TOTAL 2010
Municipal	70%	84%
Regional	14%	11%
First Nation	9%	5%
Irrigation / Improvement District	5%	0%
Other	2%	0%

4. What is the NAME of your local government? (See page 19)

5. What POPULATION does your local government serve?

POPULATION (213 respondents)	% OF TOTAL 2007	% OF TOTAL 2010
Up to 999	12%	9%
1,000 to 4,999	24%	31%
5,000 to 9,999	12%	15%
10,000 to 24,999	19%	18%
25,000 to 49,999	11%	7%
50,000 to 99,999	9%	12%
More than 100,000	11%	8%
Other	2%	0%

6. What POSITION do you hold within local government?

POSITION (213 respondents)	% OF TOTAL 2007	% OF TOTAL 2010
Elected official	24%	36%
Administrator / City Manager / CAO	22%	17%
Director / Manager of Planning / Development Services	14%	17%
Other	28%	15%
Sustainability Manager / Coordinator	N/A	8%
Director / Manager of Engineering / Public Works	12%	7%
Community Energy Manager	N/A	0%

7. Does your local government use the following TOOLS to enable and encourage sustainability?

EXISTING TOOLS (74 respondents)	YES 2007	YES 2010	NO 2007	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2007	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2007	BEING CONSIDERED 2010
1. Sustainability programs / projects	42%	59%	20%	13%	16%	14%	18%	10%
2. Public consultation regarding sustainability issues	38%	58%	34%	21%	9%	6%	15%	12%
3. Staff training about sustainability	36%	53%	33%	22%	9%	11%	15%	12%
4. Sustainability policies/regulations	34%	52%	13%	10%	24%	21%	25%	16%
5. Staff devoted to sustainability	37%	51%	34%	31%	11%	6%	14%	11%
6. Sustainability plan or plans	23%	44%	18%	9%	26%	29%	30%	17%
7. Best practices for solid waste reduction, reuse, and recycling in the operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	N/A	44%	N/A	14%	N/A	19%	N/A	19%
8. Public education regarding sustainability issues	N/A	43%	N/A	34%	N/A	12%	N/A	10%
9. Municipal fleet replacement	N/A	41%	N/A	28%	N/A	11%	N/A	18%
10. User-pay pricing	N/A	37%	N/A	41%	N/A	9%	N/A	12%
11. Financial incentives	N/A	36%	N/A	42%	N/A	2%	N/A	16%
12. Best practices for energy efficiency in the operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	N/A	35%	N/A	15%	N/A	20%	N/A	28%
13. Best practices for transportation demand management in the operation and maintenance of existing local government fleets and transportation services	N/A	35%	N/A	15%	N/A	20%	N/A	28%
14. Enforcement of sustainability policies/regulations	22%	32%	37%	27%	18%	10%	17%	29%
15. Best practices for water efficiency in the operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	N/A	31%	N/A	19%	N/A	19%	N/A	25%
16. A website that includes information about sustainability issues	27%	29%	50%	45%	9%	13%	9%	12%
17. Planning / building incentives (e.g., density, bonuses, certification)	N/A	28%	N/A	29%	N/A	18%	N/A	20%
18. An annual report that includes information about sustainability issues	22%	25%	55%	42%	3%	16%	11%	13%
19. Sustainable purchasing policies/actions	20%	24%	37%	22%	11%	20%	20%	29%
20. Sustainability benchmarks / indicators	18%	23%	39%	26%	17%	32%	18%	14%
21. A newsletter that includes information about sustainability issues	21%	22%	63%	55%	3%	5%	6%	17%

EXISTING TOOLS (continued)	YES 2007	YES 2010	NO 2007	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2007	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2007	BEING CONSIDERED 2010
22. Best practices for sustainable construction of new facilities	20%	20%	31%	31%	16%	15%	25%	30%
23. Monitoring and reporting of sustainability indicators and trends	14%	18%	45%	26%	10%	32%	23%	20%
24. Community-based social marketing campaign(s)	N/A	18%	N/A	53%	N/A	10%	N/A	1%

8. Which TOOLS have been particularly HELPFUL in enabling and encouraging sustainability? (Top 10)
This question was not asked in 2007.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Community programs | 6. GHG plans |
| 2. Community sustainability plans | 7. Media partnerships |
| 3. Development | 8. Grants |
| 4. Collaboration | 9. Policies |
| 5. Education | 10. Sustainability checklists |

9. Has your local government used any of the following RESOURCES, SERVICES and/or FRAMEWORKS in the development of a sustainability plan? This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING RESOURCES, SERVICES and/or FRAMEWORKS (71 respondents)	YES 2010	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2010
1. Local government planning and legislative tools (e.g., OCPs, RGSSs)	74%	11%	8%	5%
2. Consultant	69%	23%	4%	1%
3. Provincial government	64%	13%	17%	2%
4. FCM	52%	27%	10%	2%
5. Local government association	48%	30%	13%	1%
6. Smart Growth BC (recently integrated with the Canadian Green Building Council)	43%	32%	19%	1%
7. Smart Planning for Communities (Fraser Basin Council)	39%	36%	18%	1%
8. Federal government	37%	32%	25%	0%
9. Integrated Community Sustainability Planning	36%	30%	24%	5%
10. The Natural Step (Framework for Strategic Sustainable Development)	15%	60%	16%	0%
11. UBC Design Centre for Sustainability	10%	67%	12%	0%
12. PLUS Planning (Sustainability Cities)	6%	77%	7%	0%

10. Have you used any OTHER RESOURCES, SERVICES and/or FRAMEWORKS in the development of a sustainability plan? This question was not asked in 2007.

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Columbia Basin Trust (x2) ▪ CMHC grants ▪ Pilot with Ministry and CRD ▪ Green Heat Initiative ▪ Resilient Cities ▪ Plans of other First Nations ▪ Some locally developed engagement and communications tools ▪ Best practices from other countries ▪ Urban sustainability directors network ▪ AAMDC/AUMA template ▪ Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute ▪ AUMA Guidebook for Sustainability Planning ▪ Other municipalities ▪ BC Climate Action Toolkit ▪ Urban Systems ▪ Various green building frameworks to create our green building strategy ▪ OBAC ▪ Developed customized framework ▪ BCSEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bio Energy Conference ▪ Towns for Tomorrow ▪ Whistler Centre for Sustainability ▪ University (UNBC) – City Collaboration (major resource) ▪ Sustainability checklists ▪ Consultants ▪ ICLEI ▪ Previous local government plans and visions ▪ Comprehensive Community Planning ▪ BC Community Energy Association ▪ Green Heat Initiative ▪ Academic resources in BC and US ▪ Cascadia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BC Hydro (x2) ▪ West Coast Environmental Law Group ▪ Fresh Outlook Foundation ▪ Tom Osdoba ▪ SFU ▪ Whistler ▪ Yellow Road and Bridge ▪ Metro Van resources ▪ NDI ▪ BC Ministry of Community Services

11. Which RESOURCES, SERVICES, and/or FRAMEWORKS have been particularly HELPFUL in the development of a sustainability plan? (Top 10) This question was not asked in 2007.

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Other communities | 6. Provincial / federal governments |
| 2. Consultants | 7. The Natural Step framework |
| 3. FCM | 8. Academic support |
| 4. Smart Growth BC | 9. Community plans |
| 5. Fraser Basin Council | 10. Climate Action Toolkit |

12. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS / TECHNIQUES have you used to help develop your sustainability plan? Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS / TECHNIQUES (73 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES PER TOOL / TECHNIQUE
1. Open Houses, Town hall meeting	81%
2. Advisory committee(s), Task force(s)	62%
3. Facilitated focus group(s)	60%
4. Going out to the public (public events, grocery stores, cafes)	60%
5. Facilitated meeting, workshops (e.g., world café, citizen jury, design charrette)	54%
6. Website survey	44%
7. Printed survey (e.g., newspaper or newsletter)	44%
8. Interactive website (e.g., blog)	35%
9. Social Media (e.g., facebook, Twitter)	27%
10. Other	13%
11. EarthCAT (Community Action Toolkit)	01.5%

13. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CHALLENGES have you faced or are you facing in sustainability planning? Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CHALLENGES (207 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES PER CHALLENGE
1. Lack of funding	74%
2. Lack of public understanding about sustainability	72%
3. Public skepticism about local government project(s)	60%
4. Lack of support from the private sector	53%
5. Lack of public interest	46%
6. Lack of support from senior governments	43%
7. Lack of community sustainability champions	43%
8. Investment in the status quo	40%
9. Lack of staff knowledge about and skilled in public engagement	31%
10. Lack of media support	25%
11. Lack of support from elected officials	20%
12. Lack of access to particular groups of residents (e.g., youth, seniors)	17%
13. Lack of support from the academic sector	14%
14. Lack of support from the nonprofit sector	8%
15. Other	7%

14. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS / RESOURCES would help facilitate the development of your sustainability plan? Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

HELPFUL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS / RESOURCES (71 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES PER HELPFUL TOOL
1. More financial capacity	87%
2. Templates (e.g., newsletters, print ads)	73%
3. Guest speakers knowledgeable about sustainability planning	69%
4. Information about what other communities have done	66%
5. More internal human resources	65%
6. Survey tools (e.g., online and mail-in)	55%
7. Guest speakers trained in modern engagement techniques	52%
8. Peer support and mentoring from communities that have been through the process	52%
9. Other	3%

15. Has your local government provided OUTREACH / EDUCATION MATERIALS and/or ACTIVITIES for the following target audiences to enable and encourage community sustainability? This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING OUTREACH / EDUCATION (73 respondents)	YES 2010	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2010
1. Outreach / activities for the general public	61%	28%	6%	4%
2. Outreach / education for students	39%	46%	7%	4%
3. Outreach / education for key community stakeholders (e.g., industrial, commercial institutional)	33%	51%	9%	5%
4. Outreach / education for developers	27%	46%	19%	6%
5. Outreach / education for the private sector	22%	55%	17%	4%
6. Outreach / education for the academic sector (e.g., colleges, universities)	16%	70%	8%	4%
7. Outreach / education for the nonprofit sector	15%	61%	20%	2%
8. Other	11%	61%	5%	21%

16. Which OUTREACH / EDUCATION MATERIALS and/or ACTIVITIES have been particularly HELPFUL? (Top 5) This question was not asked in 2007.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Community events | 4. Funding programs |
| 2. Partnerships with academia | 5. Internet |
| 3. Outreach with developers | |

17. Has your local government developed PARTNERSHIPS with any of the following to enable and encourage community sustainability? Some of these questions were not asked in 2007.

EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS (71 respondents)	YES 2007	YES 2010	NO 2007	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2007	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2007	BEING CONSIDERED 2010
1. Partnership(s) with regional government	N/A	54%	N/A	28%	N/A	7%	N/A	11%
2. Partnership(s) with other local governments	55%	49%	23%	36%	5%	4%	10%	11%
3. Partnership(s) with the provincial government	N/A	47%	N/A	36%	N/A	5%	N/A	8%
4. Partnership(s) with First Nation(s)	N/A	36%	N/A	48%	N/A	2%	N/A	12%
5. Partnership(s) with the nonprofit sector	22%	35%	43%	43%	2%	2%	15%	16%
6. Partnership(s) with the academic sector (e.g., educational institutions)	29%	31%	42%	52%	4%	2%	16%	13%
7. Partnership(s) with key stakeholders (e.g., industrial, commercial institutional)	N/A	31%	N/A	42%	N/A	1%	N/A	18%
8. Partnership(s) with the federal government	N/A	28%	N/A	56%	N/A	2%	N/A	7%
9. Partnership(s) with developer(s)	N/A	21%	N/A	50%	N/A	4%	N/A	23%
10. Partnership(s) with the private sector	N/A	20%	N/A	48%	N/A	5%	N/A	19%
11. Other	N/A	9%	N/A	73%	N/A	3%	N/A	3%

18. Which PARTNERSHIPS have been particularly HELPFUL? (Top 10) This question was not asked in 2007.

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Local government | 6. Nonprofit groups |
| 2. Academia | 7. Local organizations |
| 3. Federal government | 8. School districts |
| 4. Provincial government | 9. BC Hydro |
| 5. First Nations | 10. Developers |

19. Has your local government embarked on the following COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVES?
This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING INITIATIVES (73 respondents)	YES 2010	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2010
1. Water efficiency / conservation	73%	12%	9%	6%
2. Solid waste reduction	72%	13%	8%	5%
3. Energy efficiency	68%	9%	12%	11%
4. Active transportation (e.g., bike lanes, walking trails)	66%	8%	16%	8%
5. Recreation planning / strategies	67%	11%	9%	13%
6. Recreation infrastructure upgrades	65%	12%	8%	16%
7. Parks infrastructure upgrade	65%	13%	7%	13%
8. Water treatment	64%	26%	2%	7%
9. Parks planning / strategies	61%	12%	8%	19%
10. Source water protection	60%	27%	1%	11%
11. GHG reduction	60%	15%	15%	6%
12. Wastewater treatment	59%	24%	3%	9%
13. Youth engagement	57%	23%	6%	13%
14. Transit	55%	30%	0%	13%
15. Tourism planning / strategies	50%	25%	8%	13%
16. Tourism infrastructure upgrades	46%	38%	5%	9%
17. Business retention and expansion	45%	26%	8%	14%
18. Seniors aging in place	45%	22%	9%	19%
19. Affordable housing	39%	23%	12%	26%
20. Downtown revitalization	40%	38%	11%	11%
21. Social planning / strategies	40%	29%	6%	25%
22. Attracting families	39%	29%	4%	21%
23. Culture planning / strategies	37%	30%	5%	22%
24. Air quality	35%	48%	1%	13%
25. Heritage planning / strategies	32%	37%	6%	20%
26. Green economic development planning strategies	27%	23%	12%	32%
27. Septic tank management	26%	58%	4%	8%
28. Cultural infrastructure upgrades	26%	37%	5%	22%
29. Green economic development infrastructure upgrades	25%	32%	4%	33%
30. Child care and early childhood development	25%	54%	5%	11%
31. Renewable energy (e.g., solar, wind)	24%	33%	13%	29%
32. Arts planning / strategies	22%	45%	4%	19%
33. Social infrastructure upgrades	21%	43%	5%	24%
34. Arts infrastructure upgrades	21%	50%	2%	18%
35. Water-rated building retrofits (e.g., grey water, rain barrels)	21%	51%	5%	20%
36. Heritage infrastructure upgrades	21%	48%	4%	20%
37. Brownfield Development	15%	47%	8%	18%
38. District energy	13%	44%	11%	26%
39. Energy generation from waste	10%	47%	10%	30%

20. How difficult is it to obtain FUNDING for the following initiatives? This question was not asked in 2007.

FUNDING DIFFICULTIES (73 respondents)	VERY DIFFICULT	SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT	NOT DIFFICULT	HAVEN'T APPLIED FOR FUNDING	NOT AWARE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES
1. Cultural planning	21% (15)	30% (21)	4% (3)	28% (20)	14% (10)
2. Affordable housing	20% (14)	27% (19)	8% (6)	31% (22)	12% (9)
3. Transportation demand management	19% (13)	20% (14)	5% (4)	42% (29)	11% (8)
4. Social planning	18% (13)	30% (21)	4% (3)	26% (18)	20% (14)
5. Wastewater management	17% (12)	32% (22)	14% (18)	28% (19)	5% (4)
6. Green economic development	15% (11)	28% (20)	2% (2)	34% (24)	17% (12)
7. Sustainability planning	14% (10)	40% (28)	20% (14)	17% (12)	8% (6)
8. Environmental planning	14% (10)	44% (30)	13% (9)	17% (12)	8% (6)
9. Economic development planning	14% (10)	33% (23)	23% (16)	28% (14)	7% (5)
10. Community Energy & Emissions planning (BC)	14% (10)	33% (23)	17% (12)	22% (15)	11% (8)
11. Brownfield development	14% (10)	17% (12)	1% (1)	44% (30)	20% (14)
12. Solid waste reduction	14% (10)	28% (20)	7% (5)	39% (27)	10% (7)
13. Water supply and conservation	11% (8)	31% (21)	19% (13)	26% (18)	10% (7)

FUNDING DIFFICULTIES (continued)	VERY DIFFICULT	SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT	NOT DIFFICULT	HAVEN'T APPLIED FOR FUNDING	NOT AWARE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES
14. Air quality	10% (7)	26% (18)	7% (5)	39% (27)	17% (12)
15. Water quality	10% (7)	36% (25)	20% (14)	26% (18)	5% (4)
16. Energy efficiency	8% ((6)	40% (28)	24% (17)	20% (14)	7% (5)

21. How difficult is it to obtain FUNDING SUPPORT from elected officials for community sustainability?

This question was not asked in 2007.

FUNDING SUPPORT FROM ELECTED OFFICIALS (70 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES
Very difficult	6%
Somewhat difficult	37%
Not difficult	43%
Haven't asked	10%
Not applicable	4%

22. Which of the following FUNDING SOURCES have provided support for you community sustainability initiatives? Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

FUNDING SOURCES (66 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER SOURCE
1. Provincial government	76%	50
2. Gas Tax Agreement Fund	66%	44
3. Federal government	64%	42
4. FCM Municipal Green Fund	30%	20
5. Utility	29%	19
6. Other	27%	18
7. Local government association	26%	17
8. Regional development trust	24%	16
9. Foundation(s)	24%	16
10. Crown Corporation	17%	11
11. CMHC	15%	10

23. How IMPORTANT to sustainability are the PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS you have, or could have, with the following people?

IMPORTANCE OF PARTNERSHIPS & RELATIONSHIPS (210 respondents) Important = "Very important" plus "Somewhat important." Unimportant = "Somewhat unimportant plus "Very unimportant."	IMPORTANT 2007	IMPORTANT 2010	UNIMPORTANT 2007	UNIMPORTANT 2010
1. Elected officials	96%	94%	0%	3%
2. Residents	91%	93%	1%	3%
3. Supervisors/managers	87%	87%	0%	7%
4. Colleagues within your department	80%	85%	0%	1%
5. Colleagues from other departments	79%	85%	0%	2%
6. Developers	84%	84%	1%	3%
7. Business people	77%	84%	5%	3%
8. Provincial representatives	77%	84%	6%	6%
9. Representatives from other local governments	83%	83%	2%	7%
10. Media	68%	77%	3%	5%
11. Federal representatives	66%	73%	6%	14%
12. NGO representatives	63%	73%	10%	7%
13. Representatives from regional organizations (e.g., Fraser Basin Council and Columbia Basin Trust in BC)	79%	71%	5%	8%
14. Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, Provincial equivalents, professional organizations)	82%	69%	4%	8%
15. Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)	N/A	65%	N/A	10%
16. First Nations	63%	65%	11%	7%
17. Representatives from academic institutions	64%	58%	7%	15%
18. Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., David Suzuki Foundation, Pembina Institute, Sierra Club)	74%	55%	6%	15%

24. How SATISFIED are you that your EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS with the following people are helping you enable and encourage sustainability?

SATISFACTION WITH PARTNERSHIPS & RELATIONSHIPS (208 respondents) Satisfied = "Very satisfied" plus "Somewhat satisfied." Dissatisfied = "Somewhat dissatisfied" plus "Very dissatisfied."	SATISFIED 2007	SATISFIED 2010	DISSATISFIED 2007	DISSATISFIED 2010
1. Elected officials	60%	73%	20%	13%
2. Colleagues within your department	60%	70%	10%	6%
3. Supervisors/managers	59%	63%	10%	9%
4. Colleagues from other departments	60%	60%	11%	10%
5. Representatives from regional organizations (e.g., Fraser Basin Council, Columbia Basin Trust in BC)	27%	43%	31%	12%
6. Representatives from other local governments	34%	41%	18%	21%
7. Media	26%	34%	30%	23%
8. Residents	36%	34%	18%	30%
9. Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)	N/A	33%	N/A	15%
10. Provincial representatives	21%	29%	39%	41%
11. Representatives from academic institutions	21%	28%	52%	19%
12. NGOs	21%	28%	20%	12%
13. Colleagues from trade / industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)				
14. Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., David Suzuki Foundation, Pembina Institute, Sierra Club)	36%	24%	13%	13%
15. Businesses	13%	24%	34%	32%
16. Federal representatives	16%	23%	38%	38%
17. Developers	20%	20%	36%	33%
18. First Nations	17%	19%	22%	21%

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

SIGNIFICANCE OF INTERNAL BARRIERS (210 respondents) Significant = "Very significant" plus "Somewhat significant." Insignificant = "Somewhat significant" plus "Very insignificant."	SIGNIFICANT 2007	SIGNIFICANT 2010	INSIGNIFICANT 2007	INSIGNIFICANT 2010
1. Lack of financial resources	N/A	84%	N/A	7%
2. Lack of human resources	N/A	77%	N/A	10%
3. Lack of senior government support	60%	66%	14%	14%
4. Information overload	66%	63%	8%	14%
5. Resistance to change	54%	59%	24%	20%
6. Aversion to risk	45%	58%	16%	16%
7. Lack of simple and clear best practices	56%	51%	16%	26%
8. Lack of regional foresight / coordination	62%	50%	16%	25%
9. Lack of understanding about sustainability	63%	46%	21%	33%
10. Lack of follow-through	54%	41%	17%	32%
11. Lack of political will	40%	37%	29%	47%
12. Lack of vision / leadership	45%	33%	32%	45%
13. Lack of departmental cooperation / coordination	43%	33%	26%	43%
14. Lack of communication between and among elected officials and staff	34%	30%	30%	40%
15. Lack of helpful information about sustainability	46%	28%	20%	43%
16. Lack of human/financial resources	86%	N/A	6%	N/A

26. Other INTERNAL BARRIERS? (Top 10) 2007 choices appear in brackets.

1. Lack of time and human resources (*lack of time*)
2. Lack of money (*lack of money*)
3. Lack of leadership by elected officials (*lack of appropriate legislation / policies*)
4. Organizational structure (*lack of implementation "know-how"*)

5. Competing interests (*competing priorities*)
6. Lack of coordination between departments (*senior staff too busy to change*)
7. Lack of appropriate legislation / policies (*size of community*)
8. Difficult to define sustainability (*poor communication*)
9. Lack of training (*overlapping jurisdictions*)
10. Communication with community (*lack of training*)

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

SIGNIFICANCE OF EXTERNAL BARRIERS <i>(211 respondents)</i> Significant = "Very significant" plus "Somewhat significant." Insignificant = "Somewhat significant" plus "Very insignificant."	SIGNIFICANT 2007	SIGNIFICANT 2010	INSIGNIFICANT 2007	INSIGNIFICANT 2010
1. Lack of financial resources for public education and engagement	N/A	85%	N/A	6%
2. Inadequate funding (e.g., taxation)	N/A	83%	N/A	4%
3. Lack of human resources for public education and engagement	N/A	82%	N/A	8%
4. Lack of public understanding about sustainability	74%	78%	9%	10%
5. Public apathy / resistance	53%	72%	17%	11%
6. Lack of senior government support for public initiatives	62%	68%	11%	11%
7. Lack of long-term commitment	54%	66%	15%	11%
8. Lack of programs (e.g., transit)	58%	65%	13%	8%
9. Developer apathy / resistance	60%	63%	11%	10%
10. Lack of practical and affordable best practices	69%	60%	11%	12%
11. Lack of cooperation between public, private, academic, and civic sectors	47%	58%	11%	14%
12. Private sector apathy / resistance	N/A	58%	N/A	11%
13. Lack of legislation	69%	56%	6%	13%
14. Lack of communication between your organization and the public	46%	43%	18%	23%
15. Lack of community vision / leadership	46%	42%	21%	31%
16. Lack of political will	45%	41%	24%	36%
17. Lack of media interest and support	36%	34%	19%	25%
18. Business apathy / resistance	64%	N/A	8%	N/A
19. Lack of human/financial resources for public education and engagement	85%	N/A	4%	N/A

28. Other EXTERNAL BARRIERS? (Top 10) 2007 choices appear in brackets.

1. Lack of funding (*lack of funding support from senior governments*)
2. Lack of senior government policies (*lack of public understanding and participation*)
3. Lack of leadership by province (*lack of regional and inter-regional planning*)
4. Lack of interest by public (lack of coordinated planning and implementation by all levels of government)
5. Issue complexity (*lack of staff support*)
6. Lack of human resources (*lack of skilled personnel*)
7. Resistance to change (*unsustainability of current political and business systems*)
8. Lack of agreements between communities
9. Flawed definition / understanding of sustainability
10. Economy

29. How FREQUENTLY do you receive INFORMATION about sustainability from the following sources?

FREQUENCY / SOURCES OF INFORMATION (211 respondents)	FREQUENTLY 2007	FREQUENTLY 2010	OCCASIONALLY 2007	OCCASIONALLY 2010	NEVER 2007	NEVER 2010
1. Provincial government	18%	31%	61%	61%	21%	8%
2. Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, provincial equivalents, professional organizations)	32%	28%	59%	57%	9%	15%
3. Regional government	11%	25%	52%	52%	37%	23%
4. Regional organizations (e.g., Fraser Basin Council and Columbia Basin Trust in BC)	N/A	21%	N/A	57%	N/A	22%
5. Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., David Suzuki Foundation, Pembina Institute, Sierra Club)	27%	11%	60%	56%	13%	33%
6. Other local governments	5%	11%	59%	63%	36%	26%
7. Media	9%	9%	42%	53%	49%	38%
8. Federal government	8%	9%	64%	69%	28%	22%
9. Environment NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Canadian Wildlife Fund)	11%	8%	50%	59%	39%	33%
10. Academic institutions	9%	8%	47%	50%	44%	42%

30. How SATISFIED are you with the INFORMATION you receive about sustainability from those same sources?

SATISFACTION WITH INFORMATION (208 respondents) Satisfied = "Very satisfied" plus "Somewhat satisfied." Unsatisfied = "Somewhat unsatisfied" plus "Very unsatisfied."	SATISFIED 2007	SATISFIED 2010	UNSATISFIED 2007	UNSATISFIED 2010	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE	NEUTRAL OR NOT APPLICABLE
1. Regional organizations (e.g., Fraser Basin Council and Columbia Basin Trust in BC)	N/A	47%	N/A	13%	N/A	40%
2. Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, provincial equivalents, professional organizations)	57%	45%	13%	11%	30%	44%
3. Provincial government	32%	38%	35%	34%	33%	28%
4. Regional government	23%	38%	26%	18%	51%	44%
5. Other local governments	24%	35%	18%	15%	58%	50%
6. Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., David Suzuki Foundation, Pembina Institute, Sierra Club)	56%	32%	13%	17%	31%	51%
7. Academic institutions	22%	30%	25%	18%	53%	52%
8. Federal government	21%	27%	37%	30%	42%	43%
9. Environment NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Canadian Wildlife Fund)	24%	26%	20%	15%	56%	59%
10. Media	10%	21%	28%	20%	62%	59%

31. Who or what do you consider to be the MOST CREDIBLE SOURCES of information about sustainability? (Top 10) 2007 choices appear in brackets.

1. Other municipalities (*provincial government*)
2. Academic institutions (*academics / scientists*)
3. Provincial government (*local governments*)
4. NGOs (*federal government*)
5. FCM (*trade / industry organizations*)
6. Federal government (*Smart Growth BC*)
7. Consultants (*UBCM*)
8. Media (*education / advocacy organizations*)
9. Fraser Basin Council (*NGOs*)
10. Trade / industry organizations (*FCM*)

32. How INTERESTED are you in receiving sustainability INFORMATION about the following?

INFORMATION INTERESTS <i>(209 respondents)</i> Interested = "Very interested" plus "Somewhat interested." Uninterested = "Somewhat uninterested" plus "Very uninterested."	INTERESTED 2007	INTERESTED 2010	UNINTERESTED 2007	UNINTERESTED 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010
1. Case studies from other communities in your province	N/A	100%	N/A	0%	N/A	0%
2. Regional policies, programs, and projects	92%	96%	2%	2%	6%	2%
3. Provincial policies, programs, and projects	93%	95%	2%	1%	5%	4%
4. Case studies from communities across Canada	84%	95%	3%	3%	13%	2%
5. Federal policies, programs, and projects	89%	88%	3%	3%	8%	9%
6. Profiles of innovative individuals	49%	81%	19%	5%	32%	14%
7. Studies / reports	84%	81%	0%	2%	16%	17%
8. Briefing notes/Fact sheets	88%	78%	1%	3%	11%	19%
9. Recommended websites	84%	77%	2%	5%	14%	18%
10. Case studies from communities around the world	69%	76%	8%	8%	23%	16%
11. Coming events	75%	73%	5%	3%	20%	24%
12. International sustainability news	61%	60%	10%	11%	29%	29%
13. Profiles of innovative organizations	73%	50%	7%	16%	20%	34%
14. Quotable quotes	44%	48%	19%	17%	37%	35%
15. Editorials	60%	47%	15%	19%	25%	34%
16. Book reviews	50%	43%	17%	35%	33%	22%
17. Awards	35%	38%	24%	26%	41%	36%
18. Other	N/A	15%	N/A	19%	N/A	66%
19. Case studies from BC communities	95%	N/A	0%	N/A	5%	N/A

33. What SUSTAINABILITY TOPICS are you most likely to want information about? (Top 10) 2007 choices appear in brackets.

1. Energy (*water conservation*)
2. Water / wastewater (*energy efficiency*)
3. Transportation (*green buildings*)
4. Environmental / natural resources (*transportation demand management*)
5. Planning (*sustainability planning*)
6. Sustainable development (*sustainability policies*)
7. Funding (*solid waste management*)
8. Policies / legislations (*implementation strategies*)
9. Solid waste management (*best practices*)
10. Food (*case studies*)

34. How likely would you be to use the following COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS and/or SERVICES provided by a nonprofit organization?

LIKELIHOOD TO USE COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES (205 respondents) Likely = "Very likely" plus "Somewhat likely." Unlikely = "Somewhat unlikely" plus "Very unlikely."	LIKELY 2007	LIKELY 2010	UNLIKELY 2007	UNLIKELY 2010	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE 2007	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE 2010
1. Regional workshops	87%	88%	5%	6%	8%	6%
2. Website devoted to sustainability issues from a local government perspective	87%	85%	5%	6%	8%	9%
3. Sustainability planning	82%	84%	2%	4%	16%	11%
4. Topic-specific research	79%	83%	6%	5%	15%	11%
5. Public education/ community based social marketing	75%	72%	6%	10%	19%	17%
6. Briefing notes/Fact sheets	76%	73%	6%	10%	18%	17%
7. Public consultation / engagement	64%	70%	6%	9%	30%	20%
8. Communications planning	62%	65%	9%	11%	29%	24%
9. Regular electronic newsletters	75%	64%	4%	11%	21%	24%

LIKELIHOOD TO USE COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES (205 respondents) Likely = "Very likely" plus "Somewhat likely." Unlikely = "Somewhat unlikely" plus "Very unlikely."	LIKELY 2007	LIKELY 2010	UNLIKELY 2007	UNLIKELY 2010	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE 2007	NEUTRAL or NOT APPLICABLE 2010
10. Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of workshops	58%	65%	10%	11%	32%	25%
11. Regular webinars (web-based presentations)	52%	64%	18%	18%	30%	19%
12. Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of focus groups	53%	56%	12%	15%	35%	29%
13. Regular printed newsletters/magazines	51%	55%	17%	20%	32%	24%
14. Annual conference	70%	54%	8%	16%	22%	30%
15. Mentorship program	44%	47%	17%	20%	39%	34%

35. Please list any OTHER sustainability-related COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS and/or SERVICES you would like to see offered by a nonprofit 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

36. How FREQUENTLY would you READ or PARTICIPATE in the following?

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION (208 respondents)	MONTHLY 2007	MONTHLY 2010	EVERY TWO MONTHS 2007	EVERY TWO MONTHS 2010	EVERY THREE MONTHS 2007	EVERY THREE MONTHS 2010	EVERY SIX MONTHS 2007	EVERY SIX MONTHS 2010	EVERY YEAR 2007	EVERY YEAR 2010	NEVER 2007	NEVER 2010
Electronic newsletter about sustainability	48%	46%	22%	22%	21%	21%	4%	5%	2%	2%	3%	2%
Printed newsletter/magazine	22%	33%	19%	23%	31%	23%	12%	9%	3%	4%	13%	8%
Social media (e.g., YouTube, blog, Facebook, Twitter)	N/A	30%	N/A	8%	N/A	5%	N/A	6%	N/A	2%	N/A	49%
Other	N/A	13%	N/A	5%	N/A	7%	N/A	13%	N/A	2%	N/A	60%
Webinar (web-based presentation)	13%	12%	15%	25%	23%	26%	23%	15%	7%	8%	19%	14%
Provincial workshops	N/A	3%	N/A	4%	N/A	11%	N/A	23%	N/A	47%	N/A	12%
Regional workshops	2%	2%	4%	9%	14%	20%	33%	36%	42%	29%	5%	4%
National Conference	2%	1%	0%	0%	4%	1%	6%	3%	76%	54%	12%	41%

DETAILED SURVEY RESPONSES

1. In what PROVINCE / TERRITORY is your local government located?

PROVINCE / TERRITORY (213 respondents)	% OF TOTAL 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2010	% OF TOTAL 2010
British Columbia	N/A	192	90%
Saskatchewan	N/A	4	2%
Ontario	N/A	4	2%
Alberta	N/A	3	1.5%
Nova Scotia	N/A	3	1.5%
Quebec	N/A	2	1%
New Brunswick	N/A	2	1%
Manitoba	N/A	1	0.5%
PEI	N/A	1	0.5%
Yukon	N/A	1	0.5%
Newfoundland & Labrador	N/A	0	0%
Northwest Territories	N/A	0	0%
Nunavut	N/A	0	0%

2. If your local government is LOCATED IN BC, where is it situated?

AREA (209 respondents)	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2007	% OF TOTAL 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2010	% OF TOTAL 2010
Vancouver Island and Coastal Region	35	20%	51	25%
Thompson / Okanagan	63	37%	41	20%
Lower Mainland	19	11%	41	20%
Kootenays	23	13%	29	14%
Northeast BC	11	7%	19	9%
Northwest BC	10	6%	14	7%
Cariboo	7	4%	5	2%
Northern Interior	N/A	N/A	5	2%
Other	4	2%	4	1%

3. What TYPE of local government do you serve?

TYPE (213 respondents)	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2007	% OF TOTAL 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2010	% OF TOTAL 2010
Municipal	120	70%	178	84%
Regional	24	14%	23	11%
First Nation	16	9%	12	5%
Irrigation / Improvement District	8	5%	0	0%
Other	4	2%	0	0%

4. What is the NAME of your local government?

- Adams Lake Indian Band
- Alberni-Clayoquot Reg. Dist.
- Athabasca County
- Blueberry River First Nations
- Bowen Island Municipality (x2)
- Burns Lake
- Cache Creek
- Chehalis Indian Band
- Chetwynd
- City of Abbotsford
- City of Burlington
- City of Burnaby
- City of Castlegar
- City of Colwood
- City of Coquitlam
- City of Courtenay
- City of Cranbrook (x2)
- City of Dawson Creek
- City of Dryden
- City of Duncan
- City of Fort St. John (x2)
- City of Grand Forks (x2)
- City of Grande Prairie
- City of Greenwood
- City of Kamloops (x2)
- City of Kelowna (x2)
- City of Langford (x2)
- City of Merritt
- City of Nelson (x2)
- City of North Vancouver
- City of Penticton (x2)
- City of Pitt Meadows
- City of Port Alberni

- City of Powell River (x2)
- City of Prince George
- City of Prince Rupert
- City of Regina
- City of Revelstoke (x2)
- City of Richmond
- City of Salmon Arm
- City of Selkirk
- City of St. John
- City of Surrey (x2)
- City of Terrace (x2)
- City of Trail
- City of Victoria (x2)
- City of Whitehorse
- City of Williams Lake (x2)
- Colwood
- Comox Valley Reg. Dist. (x2)
- Corp. of the City of White Rock
- Corp. of the Village of Hazelton
- Cowichan Valley Reg. Dist. (x2)
- CSRD (x2)
- District of Chetwynd (x2)
- District of Clearwater (x3)
- District of Elkford (2)
- District of Fort St. James
- District of Highlands
- District of Houston
- District of Kent (x2)
- District of Lake Country
- District of Lantzville
- District of Mackenzie
- District of Maple Ridge (x2)
- District of Mission (x2)
- District of New Hazelton
- District of North Cowichan
- District of North Saanich
- District of North Vancouver (x2)
- District of Peachland (x2)
- District of Port Hardy
- District of Sechelt
- District of Shelburne
- District of Sicamous (x3)
- District of Sparwood
- District of Stewart
- District of Summerland (x6)
- District of Taylor
- District of Tofino (x3)
- Fraser-Fort George
- Grand forks
- Harrison Hot Springs (x2)
- Islands Trust
- Keremeos
- Lytton First Nation
- Maple Ridge
- Moricetown Indian Band
- Municipality of Clare
- Municipality of Hunter River
- N' Quatqua
- Nelson
- North Okanagan Regional District
- Northern Rockies Regional Municipality
- Okanagan Indian Band
- Osoyoos
- Pitt Meadows
- Port Coquitlam
- Puslinch Township
- Quesnel
- Reg. Dist. Central Kootenay (x2)
- Reg. Dist. East Kootenay (x2)
- Reg. Dist. of Mt. Waddington
- Reg. Dist. of Okanagan Similkameen
- Reg. Dist. of the Kootenay Boundary
- RM of Meadow Lake
- Saanich and Capital Reg. Dist.
- SLRD (x2)
- Squiala First Nation
- Sunshine Coast Reg. Dist. (x3)
- Surrey
- Telkwa (x2)
- Thompson-Nicola Reg. Dist.
- Tobacco Plains Indian Band
- Town of Bromont
- Town of Collingwood
- Town of Comox
- Town of Creston
- Town of Gibsons
- Town of Golden (x3)
- Town of Ladysmith (x5)
- Town of Mulgrave
- Town of Oliver (x2)
- Town of Qualicum Beach (x2)
- Town of Rocky Mountain House
- Town of View Royal
- Township of Esquimalt
- Township of Langley (x4)
- Tseshaht First Nations
- Tzeachten First Nation
- Ucluelet First Nation
- Vile Saint Basile le Grand
- Village of Belcarra
- Village of Burns Lake
- Village of Canal Flats
- Village of Clinton
- Village of Cumberland (x3)
- Village of Fruitvale
- Village of Keremeos
- Village of Lumby
- Village of Memramcook
- Village of Midway
- Village of Pemberton (x2)
- Village of Pouce Coupe
- Village of Rama
- Village of Sayward
- Village of Telkwa (x2)
- Village of Valemount (x2)
- Village of Vanguard
- West Vancouver
- White Rock

5. What POPULATION does your local government serve?

POPULATION (213 respondents)	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2007	% OF TOTAL 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2010	% OF TOTAL 2010
Up to 999	20	12%	19	9%
1,000 to 4,999	41	24%	66	31%
5,000 to 9,999	20	12%	31	15%
10,000 to 24,999	33	19%	39	18%
25,000 to 49,999	19	11%	15	7%
50,000 to 99,999	16	9%	25	12%
More than 100,000	19	11%	18	8%
Other	4	2%	NA	NA

6. What POSITION do you hold within local government?

POSITION (213 respondents)	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2007	% OF TOTAL 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 2010	% OF TOTAL 2010
Elected official	42	24%	74	36%
Administrator/City Manager/CAO	37	22%	37	17%
Director/Manager of Planning/Development Services	24	14%	37	17%
Other	48	28%	32	15%
Sustainability Manager / Coordinator	N/A	N/A	16	8%
Director/Manager of Engineering/ Public Works	21	12%	15	7%
Community Energy Manager	N/A	N/A	2	0%

7. Does your local government use the following TOOLS to enable and encourage sustainability?

EXISTING TOOLS / PARTNERSHIPS (74 respondents)	YES 2007	YES 2010	NO 2007	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2007	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2007	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DON'T KNOW 2007	DON'T KNOW 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Sustainability programs or projects	42% (65)	59% (44)	20% (31)	13% (10)	16% (25)	14% (10)	18% (28)	10% (8)	3% (5)	2% (2)	154	74
Public consultation regarding sustainability issues	38% (60)	58% (43)	34% (53)	21% (16)	9% (14)	6% (5)	15% (24)	12% (9)	3% (6)	1% (1)	157	74
Staff training about sustainability	36% (55)	53% (39)	33% (51)	22% (16)	9% (14)	11% (8)	15% (24)	12% (9)	5% (8)	2% (2)	152	74
Sustainability policies/regulations	34% (54)	52% (38)	13% (21)	10% (8)	25% (40)	21% (15)	24% (39)	16% (12)	3% (6)	1% (1)	160	74
Staff devoted to sustainability	37% (57)	51% (37)	34% (53)	31% (22)	11% (18)	6% (5)	14% (22)	11% (8)	3% (5)	1% (1)	155	73
Best practices for solid waste reduction, reuse, and recycling in the operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	N/A	44% (32)	N/A	(14% (11)	N/A	19% (14)	N/A	19% (14)	N/A	4% (3)	N/A	74
Sustainability plan(s)	23% (37)	44% (32)	18% (29)	9% (7)	26% (41)	29% (21)	30% (48)	17% (13)	3% (5)	1% (1)	160	74
Public education regarding sustainability issues	34% (53)	43% (31)	40% (63)	34% (25)	9% (15)	12% (9)	10% (17)	10% (8)	5% (9)	1% (1)	157	74
Municipal fleet replacement	N/A	41% (28)	N/A	28% (19)	N/A	11% (8)	N/A	18% (13)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	70
User-pay pricing	N/A	37% (26)	N/A	41% (29)	N/A	9% (7)	N/A	12% (9)	N/A	1% (1)	N/A	72
Financial incentives	N/A	36% (26)	N/A	42% (31)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	16% (12)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	73

EXISTING TOOLS / PARTNERSHIPS (continued)	YES 2007	YES 2010	NO 2007	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2007	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2007	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DON'T KNOW 2007	DON'T KNOW 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Best practices for energy efficiency in the operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	N/A	35% (25)	N/A	15% (11)	N/A	20% (15)	N/A	28% (20)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	73
Best practices for transportation demand management in the operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	21% (33)	35% (25)	30% (46)	15% (11)	16% (26)	20% (15)	22% (35)	28% (20)	11% (17)	2% (2)	157	73
Enforcement of sustainability policies / regulations	22% (35)	32% (23)	37% (57)	27% (19)	18% (29)	10% (8)	17% (27)	29% (21)	5% (9)	2% (2)	157	73
Best practices for water efficiency in the operation and maintenance of existing local government facilities	N/A	31% (23)	N/A	19% (14)	N/A	19% (14)	N/A	25% (18)	N/A	5% (4)	N/A	73
A website that includes information about sustainability	27% (42)	29% (22)	50% (78)	45% (32)	9% (14)	13% (10)	9% (15)	12% (9)	3% (6)	1% (1)	155	74
Planning / building incentives (e.g., density, bonuses, certification)	N/A	28% (20)	N/A	29% (21)	N/A	18% (13)	N/A	20% (15)	N/A	4% (3)	N/A	72
An annual report that includes information about sustainability issues	22% (35)	25% (19)	55% (85)	42% (30)	3% (6)	16% (12)	11% (17)	13% (10)	6% (10)	4% (3)	153	74
Sustainable purchasing policies / actions	20% (32)	24% (17)	37% (58)	22% (16)	11% (18)	20% (15)	20% (31)	29% (21)	11% (17)	5% (4)	156	73
Sustainability benchmarks / indicators	18% (28)	23% (17)	39% (59)	26% (19)	17% (26)	32% (23)	18% (28)	14% (11)	8% (13)	5% (4)	154	74
A newsletter that includes information about sustainability issues	22% (34)	22% (16)	63% (98)	55% (40)	3% (6)	5% (4)	6% (10)	17% (12)	3% (6)	1% (1)	154	73
Best practices for sustainable construction of new facilities	20% (32)	20% (14)	31% (49)	31% (23)	16% (25)	15% (11)	25% (39)	30% (22)	8% (13)	4% (3)	158	73
Monitoring and reporting sustainability indicators	14% (22)	18% (14)	45% (69)	26% (19)	10% (16)	32% (23)	23% (36)	20% (15)	7% (12)	4% (3)	155	74
Community-based social marketing campaign(s)	N/A	18% (13)	N/A	53% (39)	N/A	10% (8)	N/A	16% (11)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	73

8. Which TOOLS have been particularly HELPFUL in enabling and encouraging sustainability?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Community programs | 6. GHG plans |
| 2. Community sustainability plans | 7. Media partnerships |
| 3. Development | 8. Grants |
| 4. Collaboration | 9. Policies |
| 5. Education | 10. Sustainability checklists |

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3	RESPONSE #4	RESPONSE #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sustainability plan (x3) ▪ Ministry webinars ▪ Water rates set by usage (metered) ▪ Grant for geo-exchange system ▪ Financial incentives ▪ Corporate GHG plans ▪ Kootenays Carbon Neutral project ▪ User-pay solid waste policies ▪ Community working groups ▪ New OCP with sustainability incentives ▪ Environmental Charter ▪ BC Climate Action Tool Kit ▪ Support of the elected body ▪ Property tax incentive for land conservation ▪ Metro Vancouver Regional Initiatives ▪ Comox Valley Sustainability Strategy Document ▪ ICSP ▪ Community plans ▪ Media partnerships ▪ Development permits ▪ Bill 27 ▪ Victoria Sustainability Framework Plan ▪ Social marketing campaigns ▪ Municipal Capacity Program ▪ Recycling programs ▪ Sustainability plan ▪ Community meetings ▪ Public community forums ▪ Density bonusing ▪ Zoning ▪ ICSP ▪ Bathroom fixture replacement program (incentives) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conferences ▪ Toilet replacement program ▪ Grant for solar panels ▪ Education of management ▪ Wild fire mitigation plan ▪ WaterSmart (both CBT and provincial) ▪ One-stop recycling, composting ▪ Newsletter ▪ Community Energy and Emissions Inventory ▪ OCP ▪ Community Works Fund (Gas Tax) used to fund sustainable projects throughout the region ▪ Sustainable construction in new facilities ▪ Federal and provincial supporting initiative grants ▪ Ride-share boards, designated pick-up spots ▪ BC hydro grants and incentives ▪ Fixture rebate program ▪ Music in the park engagement events ▪ Solid waste management plans ▪ University – City collaborations ▪ OCP ▪ Sustainability checklist ▪ Triple bottom line assessment ▪ Incentives ▪ Land Fill Gas Energy Project ▪ Solid waste management ▪ Planning ▪ Working with the Northern Environmental Action Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Website information ▪ Compost bin programs ▪ Carbon tax rebate ▪ Planning / – sustainability checklist ▪ OCP toolkit ▪ Lifecycle costing for buildings and vehicles ▪ Annual report with sustainability initiatives ▪ Sustainability policy ▪ Public campaigns ▪ Municipal fleet replacement ▪ Committed admin team ▪ Sustainability checklist for applicants for building permits ▪ CAEE ▪ Community outreach program on water reduction ▪ Working with the Food Policy Council ▪ Recycling programs ▪ ICSP leading to revised OCP ▪ Planning charrettes ▪ Environmental protection DPs ▪ Lifecycle and full costing ▪ Sustainability plan (and planning process) ▪ Riparian enhancement ▪ Recycling program ▪ Policy development ▪ Website advertising ▪ Low-cost housing ▪ Planning – urban forest strategy ▪ Mayors Idle Free campaign ▪ External funding (provincial and federal) ▪ Planning, design charrettes ▪ Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultants ▪ PowerSmart Challenge ▪ Zoning ▪ Safer buildings website and tools ▪ Planning that encourages development within existing communities ▪ Building Code (green building guidelines) ▪ CEEI ▪ Provincial incentives for building retrofits ▪ Recycling initiatives ▪ Information network accessibility ▪ Density transfer to protect natural areas and concentrate growth in core ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Community Outreach Program for reusable shopping bags ▪ Local food ▪ Collaboration with other organizations leading toward sustainability ▪ Subdivision Servicing Standards ▪ Density transfer policies ▪ Facilities management software ▪ Sewage Discharge Prohibition Bylaw ▪ Management plan ▪ Working with local business ▪ OCP ▪ Engaging children ▪ Other sustainability staff in the area ▪ Digital stories ▪ Energy and emissions data ▪ Government information ▪ Lidar mapping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General awareness ▪ Active transportation plan ▪ Monitoring: energy, solid wastes, water use ▪ Agricultural food coalition plans ▪ Social development plan ▪ Our own regional website ▪ Energy conservation in city facilities ▪ Buy-in from the community ▪ Community-led public process ▪ RCACT ▪ Council presentation ▪ UBCM Gas Tax support and framework, including Fraser Basin Council ▪ Building Bylaw ▪ Green Infrastructure Funds ▪ E3 Fleet program ▪ User-pay for entire solid waste program ▪ Partnerships ▪ Working with nonprofits ▪ Costs/financial projecting ▪ FCM research and funding ▪ Local media (newspapers) ▪ Bylaws ▪ Information ▪ “12 Big Ideas Campaign” to promote environmental awareness and stewardship ▪ Solid waste management magazine ▪ New housing ▪ Robust background analysis ▪ Recycling incentives ▪ Education ▪ Wood stove

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Newsletter ▪ CV sustainability strategy process ▪ Internet ▪ Development Application Checklist ▪ Incorporation of green technologies in new building projects ▪ Sustainability conferences ▪ The Natural Step training ▪ User rates ▪ Toilet rebate program ▪ Education and Community engagement – workshops, social media ▪ Provincial government GHG calculations ▪ Green Bylaw Toolkit ▪ Greener building code (not green enough though) ▪ Community leaders working group ▪ Corporate GHG reduction plan ▪ Hiring and working with a great planning team ▪ Sustainability plan ▪ Council term Goals that identify sustainability ▪ Energy management ▪ Water pricing ▪ Sustainability charter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wastewater treatment and management ▪ Dev. permits ▪ Public meetings ▪ Membership with regional sustainability group ▪ Recycling outreach ▪ Rezoning ▪ Media coverage of sustainability issues ▪ Other municipalities ▪ State of the Environment Report measuring a variety of environmental indicators ▪ Existing OCPs with sustainability / climate change policies ▪ UBCM and FCM conventions ▪ EcoAction Calculator ▪ OCP Policies ▪ LED traffic lights ▪ Training ▪ Working with citizens ▪ UBCM Gas Tax \$ ▪ GHG reduction targets in OCP (got issues in front of Council) ▪ MOU with partners ▪ Sustainability policies ▪ Community GHG reduction plan ▪ Development of ICSP ▪ BC hydro energy manager program ▪ Provincial legislation ▪ Enabling policies and regulations ▪ Organics collection ▪ Performance indicators / targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Municipal help organizations ▪ Establishment of the Cowichan Watershed Board in advance interests of the Cowichan river and watershed ▪ OCP with sustainability focus ▪ Personal interest, reading, research ▪ Municipal sustainability plans ▪ Energy-efficient lighting ▪ Road safety ▪ Design charrettes ▪ Carbon emission vehicle analysis ▪ BC hydro / Terasen public education ▪ Sustainability projects ▪ ICSP ▪ Development of Team Telkwa ▪ FCM funding ▪ External funding support ▪ Trained and committed staff ▪ Alternative transportation plan ▪ Climate smart workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contacts made at exhibitions and conferences ▪ Conversation cafes ▪ Cultural events ▪ Speakers ▪ Provincial survey data ▪ Best practices ▪ Community info workshops ▪ Update of OCP ▪ Dedicated staff ▪ Supportive council ▪ Community visioning document ▪ Climate Change Showdown (schools) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> replacement incentive rebate ▪ Discussions with other communities ▪ Development of sustainability framework ▪ A good network ▪ Community Energy Plan ▪ Sustainability House (Olympic Event)
---	---	--	--	--

9. Has your local government used any of the following RESOURCES, SERVICES and/or FRAMEWORKS in the development of a sustainability plan? This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING RESOURCES, SERVICES and/or FRAMEWORKS (71 respondents)	YES 2010	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DON'T KNOW	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Local government planning and legislative tools (e.g., OCPs, Regional Growth Strategies)	74% (52)	11% (8)	5% (4)	8% (6)	1% (1)	71
Consultant	69% (48)	24% (17)	1% (1)	4% (3)	2% (2)	71
Provincial government	63% (43)	13% (9)	2% (2)	17% (12)	4% (3)	69
FCM	52% (36)	28% (19)	2% (2)	10% (7)	8% (6)	70
Local government association	48% (33)	31% (21)	1% (1)	13% (9)	7% (5)	69
Smart Growth BC (recently integrated with the Canadian Green Building Council)	43% (36)	33% (23)	1% (1)	19% (14)	4% (3)	70
Smart Planning for Communities (Fraser Basin Council)	39% (27)	37% (26)	1% (1)	18% (13)	5% (4)	71
Federal government	37% (26)	33% (23)	0% (0)	25% (18)	5% (4)	71
Integrated Community Sustainability Planning	36% (25)	31% (21)	5% (4)	24% (17)	4% (3)	70
The Natural Step (Framework for Strategic Sustainable Development)	14% (10)	60% (43)	0% (0)	16% (12)	8% (6)	71
UBC Design Centre for Sustainability	9% (7)	69% (48)	0% (0)	12% (9)	9% (7)	71
PLUS Planning (Sustainability Cities)	5% (4)	79% (55)	0% (0)	7% (5)	9% (7)	71

10. Have you used any OTHER RESOURCES, SERVICES and/or FRAMEWORKS in the development of a Sustainability plan? This question was not asked in 2007.

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Columbia Basin Trust (x2) ▪ CMHC grants ▪ Pilot with Ministry and CRD ▪ Green Heat Initiative ▪ Resilient Cities ▪ Plans of other First Nations ▪ PCP ▪ Some locally developed engagement and communications tools ▪ Best practices from other countries ▪ Urban sustainability directors network ▪ AAMDC/AUMA template ▪ Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute (University of Denver) ▪ AUMA Guidebook for Sustainability Planning ▪ Other municipalities ▪ BC Climate Action Toolkit ▪ Urban Systems ▪ Various green building frameworks to create our green building strategy ▪ OBAC ▪ Developed customized framework ▪ BCSEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bio Energy Conference ▪ Towns for Tomorrow ▪ Whistler Centre for Sustainability ▪ University (UNBC) – City Collaboration (major resource) ▪ Sustainability checklists ▪ Consultants ▪ ICLEI ▪ Previous local government plans and visions ▪ Comprehensive Community Planning ▪ BC Community Energy Association ▪ Green Heat Initiative ▪ Academic resources in BC and US ▪ Cascadia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BC Hydro (x2) ▪ West Coast Environmental Law Group ▪ Fresh Outlook Foundation ▪ Tom Osdoba ▪ SFU ▪ Whistler ▪ Yellow Road and Bridge ▪ Metro Van resources ▪ NDI ▪ BC Ministry of Community Services

11. What RESOURCES, SERVICES, and/or FRAMEWORKS have you found to be particularly HELPFUL in the development of a sustainability plan? *This question was not asked in 2007.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Other communities 2. Consultants 3. FCM 4. Smart Growth BC 5. Fraser Basin Council | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Provincial / federal governments 7. The Natural Step framework 8. Academic support 9. Community plans 10. Community Action Toolkit |
|---|---|

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3	RESPONSE #4	RESPONSE #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UBCM Staff ▪ OCP ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Provincial CEEI website ▪ All ▪ The Natural Step Framework ▪ LGMA Educational sessions ▪ Fed. and Prov. ▪ FCM ▪ FCM grant utilized for Sustainability Strategy ▪ Natural Step Framework ▪ Federal Government and UBCM ICSP Guide and funding ▪ Specialized consultants ▪ Other local govts. ▪ Smart Planning for Communities ▪ AAMDC/AUMA template ▪ Consultants (Northern Rockies Engineering) ▪ Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute ▪ New Brunswick ETF Fund ▪ FCM (GMF) ▪ Saanich ▪ Federal government ▪ Alberta Urban Municipalities Ass. ▪ Smart Growth ▪ Consultants/analyst ▪ BC Climate Action Toolkit ▪ Urban Systems ▪ FCM/GMF ▪ Green Heat Initiative ▪ Consultant ▪ ICSP ▪ Hired planning consultants ▪ FCM ▪ Customized Framework ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Fraser Basin Ann. Rep. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Energy Association ▪ Smart Growth of BC ▪ Columbia Basin Trust ▪ Smart Growth ▪ Provincial publications ▪ Plus planning ▪ Smart Growth BC ▪ Examples from other communities ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Broad community engagement ▪ BC hydro funding program ▪ UBCM ▪ FCM Green Municipal Fund ▪ Previous/existing local plans ▪ Whistler ▪ Provincial Government ▪ The Natural Step Framework ▪ The Climate Action Toolkit ▪ BCCEA ▪ Local Government Association ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Smart Planning for Communities ▪ Academic support ▪ BC Climate Action Toolkit ▪ Consultant (corporate action plan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pacific Carbon Trust ▪ Local Government ▪ Provincial bulletins and staff ▪ Smart Planning for Communities FBC ▪ Green Bylaws Toolkit ▪ Consultant (HB Lanarc) ▪ FCM/GMF Funding ▪ Sustainability plans from other communities ▪ Local Government Associations ▪ Metro Van resources ▪ Legislative tools ▪ GMF ▪ Consultant ▪ BC Hydro ▪ FCM Municipal Green Fund ▪ Provincial Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FCM Staff ▪ Consultant ▪ Consultant ▪ UBC Design Centre for Sustainability ▪ Conferences ▪ ICSC (Plus) ▪ FCM ▪ UBC DCS ▪ Provincial Government ▪ Consultants ▪ Natural Step 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MCRD Staff ▪ Staff expertise ▪ Smart Growth of BC ▪ FCM PCP Programs ▪ Community Developed ICSP ▪ Strong local Organizations ▪ First Nations ▪ Internet ▪ Smart Growth ▪ Federal Government ▪ Smart Growth

12. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS and/or TECHNIQUES have you used or plan to use to help develop your sustainability plan? Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS & TECHNIQUES (73 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES PER TOOL / TECHNIQUE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER TOOL / TECHNIQUE
Open Houses, Town hall meeting	81%	51
Advisory committee(s), Task force(s)	62%	39
Facilitated focus group (s)	60%	38
Going out to the public (public events, grocery stores, cafes)	61%	38
Facilitated meeting, workshops (e.g., world café, citizen jury, design charrette)	54%	34
Website survey	44%	28
Printed survey (e.g., newspaper or newsletter)	44%	28
Interactive website (e.g., blog)	35%	22
Social Media (e.g., facebook, Twitter)	27%	17
Other	13%	8
EarthCAT (Community Action Toolkit)	2%	1

13. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CHALLENGES have you faced or are you facing in sustainability planning. Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CHALLENGES (207 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES PER CHALLENGE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CHALLENGE
Lack of funding	74%	154
Lack of public understanding about sustainability	72%	148
Public skepticism about local government project(s)	60%	124
Lack of support from the private sector	53%	40
Lack of public interest	46%	96
Lack of support from senior governments	43%	89
Lack of community sustainability champions	43%	90
Investment in the status quo	40%	82
Lack of staff knowledge about and skilled in public engagement	31%	64
Lack of media support	25%	51
Lack of support from elected officials	20%	41
Lack of access to particular groups of residents (e.g., youth, seniors)	18%	37
Lack of support from the academic sector	14%	30
Lack of support from the nonprofit sector	8%	17
Other	7%	16

14. What COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS and/or RESOURCES would help facilitate the development of your sustainability plan? Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

HELPFUL COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS & RESOURCES (71 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES PER TOOL / RESOURCE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER TOOL / RESOURCE
More financial capacity	87%	62
Templates (e.g., newsletters, print ads)	73%	52
Guest speakers knowledgeable about sustainability planning	69%	49
Information about what other communities have done	66%	47
More internal human resources	65%	46
Survey tools (e.g., online and mail-in)	55%	39
Guest speakers trained in modern engagement techniques	52%	37
Peer support and mentoring from communities that have been through the process	52%	37
Other	3%	2

15. Has your local government provided OUTREACH / EDUCATION MATERIALS and/or ACTIVITIES for the following target audiences to enable and encourage community sustainability? This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING OUTREACH / EDUCATION MATERIALS and/or ACTIVITIES (73 respondents)	YES 2010	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DON'T KNOW	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Outreach / activities for the general public	61% (43)	28% (20)	6% (5)	4% (3)	1% (1)	72
Outreach / education for students	39% (27)	46% (33)	7% (5)	4% (3)	4% (3)	71
Outreach / education for key community stakeholders (e.g., industrial, commercial institutional)	33% (23)	51% (36)	9% (7)	5% (4)	2% (2)	72
Outreach / education for developers	27% (19)	46% (33)	19% (14)	6% (5)	2% (2)	73
Outreach / education for the private sector	22% (15)	55% (39)	17% (12)	4% (3)	2% (2)	71
Outreach / education for the academic sector (e.g., colleges, universities)	16% (11)	70% (49)	8% (6)	4% (3)	2% (2)	71
Outreach / education for the nonprofit sector	15% (10)	61% (43)	20% (14)	2% (2)	2% (2)	71
Other	11% (4)	61% (23)	5% (2)	2% (1)	21% (8)	37

16. Which OUTREACH / EDUCATION materials and/or activities have been particularly HELPFUL? This question was not asked in 2007.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Community events | 4. Funding programs |
| 2. Partnerships with academia | 5. Internet |
| 3. Outreach with developers | |

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3	RESPONSE #4	RESPONSE #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Climate Action Bootcamp ▪ Public engagement workshops ▪ CBT Material ▪ Coordinated Workforce Strategy ▪ Public engagement at public events ▪ None ▪ Attending community events ▪ Outreach/education for the nonprofit sector ▪ Outreach for key stakeholders ▪ Community meetings ▪ Sustainability checklist required as part of application ▪ Earth Day ▪ Power of R waste reduction initiative ▪ Public engagement sessions ▪ ICSP format, what organizations can do, what individuals can do to help reach sustainability goals ▪ Planning Charrettes ▪ Open house re Bill 27 ▪ Available funding programs ▪ SEEDS program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Energy Assessment ▪ Public meetings and articles Fire Smart ▪ Community Health Network ▪ Outreach for developers ▪ Home website ▪ OCP GHG target open house ▪ Compost education demonstration garden ▪ Performance in the park ▪ Youtube, facebook, Mall for reaching youth ▪ Coffee talks about Energy and Sustainability ▪ Environmental advisory commission ▪ Sustainability capacity building sessions ▪ WESCAN project ▪ Contract with the Northern Environmental Action Team ▪ On-line survey ▪ Government funding programs ▪ Phantom energy campaign ▪ Outreach/education for key community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C to C forum attended by politicians ▪ Solid waste campaigns ▪ Water use Education trailer/display ▪ Kitchen table meetings ▪ UNBC partnerships for student classroom projects and community work ▪ Movie nights about sustainability/energy ▪ TBL – closing the loop ▪ Newsletters ▪ Outreach to development community ▪ General Public charrettes ▪ Outreach with students ▪ Use of commissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee selection criteria includes all levels ▪ Subsidized Rain Barrels and Composters ▪ Community Educators for solid waste and waste reduction ▪ Sustainability committee meetings ▪ Internet ▪ Climate change, infrastructure deficit and again populations = 3 major impending changes ▪ Website ▪ General public outreach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Career Days ▪ Great Canadian Shore Line Clean Up ▪ Other public events talking about the future of Williams Lake and how it relates to sustainability ▪ Outreach with key community stakeholders

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public design event for climate action plan ▪ Community open house ▪ Public consultations ▪ Tree distribution campaign for Acadian Forest Awareness ▪ New zero waste curriculum for grade 7 students ▪ Open house ▪ City Cleanup activities ▪ Nenas ▪ Community Outreach ▪ Public meetings ▪ Don't know – haven't measured impact ▪ All the outreach workshops connected to the development of the ICSP ▪ Kamloops ECOsmart Team ▪ Community level group meetings ▪ Partnerships with Academia ▪ Fresh Outlook movie ▪ Community visioning document ▪ Climate change showdown ▪ None at this time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ stakeholders ▪ Booth at events ▪ Booth at the farmers market talking to residents ▪ Northern Lights College ▪ Outreach with local societies ▪ Meeting with developers ▪ Planning/developer group meetings ▪ Outreach with developers ▪ Community Energy Plan ▪ Climate change workshops 			
---	--	--	--	--

17. Has your local government developed PARTNERSHIPS with any of the following to enable and encourage community sustainability? *Some of these questions were not asked in 2007.*

EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS (71 respondents)	YES 2007	YES 2010	NO 2007	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2007	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2007	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DON'T KNOW 2007	DON'T KNOW 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
	Partnership(s) with regional government	N/A	54% (37)	N/A	28% (19)	N/A	7% (5)	N/A	11% (8)	N/A	0% (0)	N/A
Partnership(s) with other local governments	55% (85)	49% (34)	23% (36)	36% (26)	5% (8)	4% (3)	10% (16)	11% (8)	5% (8)	0% (0)	153	71
Partnership(s) with provincial government	N/A	47% (33)	N/A	36% (25)	N/A	5% (4)	N/A	8% (6)	N/A	4% (3)	N/A	71

EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS (continued)	YES 2007	YES 2010	NO 2007	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2007	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2007	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DON'T KNOW 2007	DON'T KNOW 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Partnership(s) with First Nation(s)	N/A	36% (24)	N/A	48% (33)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	12% (9)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	70
Partnership(s) with the nonprofit sector	21% (33)	35% (24)	43% (65)	43% (30)	2% (4)	2% (2)	15% (23)	16% (12)	17% (26)	4% (3)	151	71
Partnership(s) with the academic sector (educational institutions)	29% (44)	31% (22)	42% (64)	52% (36)	4% (7)	2% (2)	16% (24)	13% (9)	9% (14)	2% (2)	153	71
Partnership(s) with key stakeholders (e.g., industrial, commercial institutional)	N/A	31% (22)	N/A	42% (29)	N/A	1% (1)	N/A	18% (12)	N/A	8% (6)	N/A	70
Partnership(s) with the federal government	N/A	28% (19)	N/A	56% (39)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	7% (5)	N/A	7% (5)	N/A	70
Partnership(s) with developer(s)	N/A	21% (14)	N/A	50% (34)	N/A	4% (3)	N/A	23% (16)	N/A	2% (2)	N/A	69
Partnership(s) with the private sector	34% (53)	20% (14)	35% (54)	48% (34)	9% (14)	5% (4)	15% (24)	19% (13)	6% (10)	8% (6)	155	71
Other	N/A	9% (3)	N/A	73% (22)	N/A	3% (1)	N/A	3% (1)	N/A	12% (4)	N/A	31

18. Which PARTNERSHIPS have been particularly HELPFUL?

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Local government | 6. Nonprofit groups |
| 2. Academia | 7. Local organizations |
| 3. Federal government | 8. School districts |
| 4. Provincial government | 9. BC Hydro |
| 5. First Nations | 10. Developers |

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3	RESPONSE #4	RESPONSE #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial support from FCM ▪ Carbon Neutral Kootenays Plan ▪ Thompson Rivers University ▪ With NIEFS, Comm Futures ▪ BC Government ministry of Forests ▪ School District ▪ With other local governments ▪ Partnerships with FHA ▪ Federal Agricultural partnerships ▪ Nonprofit/advocacy groups ▪ Regional ▪ Partnerships with Chamber of Commerce on re-useable shopping bags ▪ With community groups such as BIA, Water Wise, Cariboo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wildrie mitigation strategy ▪ Thompson Nicola Regional District ▪ North Island Regional Protocol (1st nations) ▪ Regional District ▪ With other nonprofits ▪ Provincial forestry and agriculture ▪ Academic/research groups ▪ Other local governments ▪ Message/advertising at community events like Vancouver Island Music Festival ▪ Partnerships with food policy council ▪ LTFN (local first nations) ▪ BC Hydro ▪ Other municipalities ▪ Education sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Village of Lytton ▪ VIHA ▪ With the Federal Government ▪ With other first nations RTS and forestry ▪ School District ▪ Partnerships with Interior Health ▪ Media (some local media are supporters and partners) ▪ Local retailers/hardware ▪ Capital Regional District ▪ Huupacasath First Nations ▪ Developer ▪ First Nations ▪ BC Hydro ▪ Ministry of community and rural development ▪ Province ▪ Solar BC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ministry of Forests ▪ With the provincial government ▪ Several mining and Alt. energy partnerships ▪ Partnerships with the credit union and community futures ▪ Regional District ▪ Private developers ▪ City of Port Alberni ▪ Other local governments ▪ First nations ▪ BC hydro 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Several forest development partnerships ▪ Partnerships with the Williams Lake Indian Band and the local high schools ▪ School District, although not finalized the support has been there ▪ WESCAN project ▪ Federal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food Cooperatives and farmers ▪ University (UNBC) ▪ NEAT (Northern Environmental Action Team) ▪ University of Victoria ▪ Enterprise Region ▪ Municipal partnerships ▪ North Island College ▪ First Nations partnerships (informal) ▪ Nonprofit sector ▪ Partnerships with prov. and fed. governments ▪ Nonprofit sustainability groups ▪ Regional ▪ Province ▪ Affordable Housing Strategy with Oliver ▪ Local College ▪ Other local governments ▪ CNRL ▪ LEED building under construction (shared 50/50 with SPCA) ▪ College ▪ Local Government ▪ All community sectors ▪ Partnerships with regional district on solid waste reduction ▪ University ▪ Other local governments ▪ Climate change showdown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> partnerships ▪ Vast alternate school ▪ Horn River Basin Producers Group (informal) ▪ Local School ▪ Educational institution ▪ DFO ▪ Provincial ▪ INAC ▪ Ministry of Forests ▪ Regional Government ▪ Partnerships private utilities on infrastructure projects ▪ Organizations BCSEA, PIBC ▪ Other regional governments ▪ Climate change workshops 			
--	--	--	--	--

19. Has your local government embarked on the following COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVES?
This question was not asked in 2007.

EXISTING INITIATIVES (73 respondents)	YES 2010	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DON'T KNOW	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Water efficiency / conservation	73% (52)	12% (9)	9% (7)	6% (5)	0% (0)	72
Solid waste reduction	72% (50)	13% (10)	8% (6)	5% (4)	2% (2)	72
Energy efficiency	68% (48)	9% (7)	12% (9)	11% (8)	0% (0)	72
Active transportation (e.g., bike lanes, walking trails)	66% (48)	8% (6)	16% (11)	8% (6)	2% (2)	73
Recreation planning / strategies	67% (47)	11% (8)	9% (7)	13% (10)	0% (0)	72
Recreation infrastructure upgrades	65% (46)	12% (9)	8% (6)	16% (12)	0% (0)	73
Parks infrastructure upgrade	65% (46)	13% (10)	7% (5)	13% (9)	2% (2)	72
Water treatment	64% (45)	26% (18)	6% (5)	2% (2)	2% (2)	72

EXISTING INITIATIVES (continued)	YES 2010	NO 2010	BEING DEVELOPED 2010	BEING CONSIDERED 2010	DONT KNOW	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Parks planning / strategies	61% (43)	12% (9)	8% (6)	19% (14)	0% (0)	72
Source water protection	60% (42)	27% (20)	1% (1)	11% (8)	1% (1)	72
GHG reduction	60% (43)	15% (11)	15% (11)	6% (5)	4% (3)	73
Wastewater treatment	59% (41)	24% (17)	3% (2)	9% (7)	5% (4)	71
Youth engagement	57% (40)	23% (17)	6% (5)	13% (10)	1% (1)	73
Transit	55% (38)	30% (22)	0% (0)	13% (10)	2% (2)	72
Tourism planning / strategies	50% (35)	25% (18)	8% (6)	13% (10)	4% (3)	72
Tourism infrastructure upgrades	46% (31)	38% (28)	5% (4)	9% (7)	2% (2)	72
Business retention and expansion	45% (31)	26% (19)	8% (6)	14% (10)	7% (5)	71
Seniors aging in place	45% (31)	22% (16)	9% (7)	19% (14)	5% (4)	72
Affordable housing	39% (28)	23% (17)	12% (9)	26% (19)	0% (0)	73
Downtown revitalization	40% (28)	38% (28)	11% (8)	11% (8)	0% (0)	72
Social planning / strategies	40% (28)	29% (21)	6% (5)	25% (18)	0% (0)	72
Attracting families	39% (27)	29% (20)	4% (3)	21% (15)	7% (5)	70
Culture planning / strategies	37% (25)	30% (22)	5% (4)	22% (16)	6% (5)	72
Air quality	35% (24)	48% (35)	1% (1)	13% (10)	2% (2)	72
Heritage planning / strategies	32% (22)	37% (27)	6% (5)	20% (15)	4% (3)	72
Green economic development planning strategies	27% (19)	23% (17)	12% (9)	32% (23)	4% (3)	71
Septic tank management	26% (18)	58% (42)	4% (3)	8% (6)	4% (3)	72
Cultural infrastructure upgrades	26% (18)	37% (27)	5% (4)	22% (16)	9% (7)	72
Green economic development infrastructure upgrades	25% (18)	32% (24)	4% (3)	33% (24)	5% (4)	73
Child care and early childhood development	25% (17)	54% (38)	5% (4)	11% (8)	4% (3)	70
Renewable energy (e.g., solar, wind)	24% (16)	33% (24)	13% (10)	29% (21)	1% (1)	72
Arts planning / strategies	22% (16)	45% (33)	4% (3)	19% (14)	9% (7)	72
Social infrastructure upgrades	21% (15)	43% (31)	5% (4)	24% (17)	5% (4)	71
Arts infrastructure upgrades	21% (15)	50% (35)	2% (2)	18% (12)	8% (6)	70
Water-rated building retrofits (e.g., grey water, rain barrels)	21% (15)	51% (37)	5% (4)	20% (15)	1% (1)	72
Heritage infrastructure upgrades	21% (15)	48% (35)	4% (3)	20% (15)	5% (4)	72
Brownfield Development	15% (10)	47% (34)	8% (6)	18% (13)	11% (8)	71
District energy	13% (9)	44% (32)	11% (8)	26% (13)	5% (4)	72
Energy generation from waste	10% (7)	47% (34)	10% (7)	30% (21)	2% (2)	71

20. How difficult is it to obtain FUNDING for the following initiatives? This question was not asked in 2007.

FUNDING DIFFICULTIES (73 respondents)	VERY DIFFICULT	SOMEWHAT DIFFICULT	NOT DIFFICULT	HAVEN'T APPLIED FOR FUNDING	NOT AWARE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Cultural planning	21% (15)	30% (21)	4% (3)	28% (20)	14% (10)	69
Affordable housing	20% (14)	27% (19)	8% (6)	31% (22)	12% (9)	70
Transportation demand management	19% (13)	20% (14)	5% (4)	42% (29)	11% (8)	68
Social planning	18% (13)	30% (21)	4% (3)	26% (18)	20% (14)	69
Wastewater management	17% (12)	32% (22)	14% (18)	28% (19)	5% (4)	67
Green economic development	15% (11)	28% (20)	2% (2)	34% (24)	17% (12)	69
Sustainability planning	14% (10)	40% (28)	20% (14)	17% (12)	8% (6)	70
Environmental planning	14% (10)	44% (30)	13% (9)	17% (12)	8% (6)	67
Economic development planning	14% (10)	33% (23)	23% (16)	28% (14)	7% (5)	68
Community Energy & Emissions planning (BC)	14% (10)	33% (23)	17% (12)	22% (15)	11% (8)	68
Brownfield development	14% (10)	17% (12)	1% (1)	44% (30)	20% (14)	67
Solid waste reduction	14% (10)	28% (20)	7% (5)	39% (27)	10% (7)	69
Water supply and conservation	11% (8)	31% (21)	19% (13)	26% (18)	10% (7)	67
Air quality	10% (7)	26% (18)	7% (5)	39% (27)	17% (12)	69
Water quality	10% (7)	36% (25)	20% (14)	26% (18)	5% (4)	68
Energy efficiency	8% (6)	40% (28)	24% (17)	20% (14)	7% (5)	70

21. How difficult is it to obtain FUNDING SUPPORT from elected officials for community sustainability?
This question was not asked in 2007.

FUNDING SUPPORT (70 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Very difficult	6%	4
Somewhat difficult	37%	26
Not difficult	43%	30
Haven't asked	10%	7
Not applicable	4%	3

22. Which of the following FUNDING SOURCES have provided support for you community sustainability initiatives? Check all that apply. This question was not asked in 2007.

FUNDING SOURCES (66 respondents)	% OF RESPONSES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER SOURCE
Provincial government	76%	50
Gas Tax Agreement Fund	66%	44
Federal government	64%	42
FCM Municipal Green Fund	30%	20
Utility	29%	19
Other	27%	18
Local government association	26%	17
Regional development trust	24%	16
Foundation(s)	24%	16
Crown Corporation	17%	11
CMHC	15%	10

23. How IMPORTANT to sustainability are the PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS you have, or could have, with the following people?

IMPORTANCE OF PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS (210 respondents)	VERY IMPORTANT 2007	VERY IMPORTANT 2010	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 2007	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT 2007	SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT 2010	VERY UNIMPORTANT 2007	VERY UNIMPORTANT 2010	NOT APPLICABLE 2007	NOT APPLICABLE 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Elected officials	76% (103)	85% (176)	20% (28)	9% (19)	2% (3)	2% (5)	0% (0)	1% (2)	0% (0)	2% (4)	0% (1)	1% (2)	135	208
Colleagues within your department	63% (85)	67% (134)	17% (23)	18% (36)	10% (14)	7% (13)	0% (1)	0.5% (1)	0% (0)	1% (2)	8% (11)	7% (14)	134	200
Colleagues from other departments	55% (74)	60% (121)	24% (33)	23% (47)	9% (13)	5% (11)	0% (1)	1% (3)	0% (0)	1% (3)	10% (14)	8% (17)	135	202
Supervisors / managers	62% (85)	60% (123)	25% (34)	25% (52)	6% (9)	7% (15)	0% (1)	0.5% (1)	0% (0)	1% (3)	5% (8)	5% (11)	137	205
Federal representatives	33% (45)	47% (96)	33% (45)	26% (54)	23% (31)	13% (26)	6% (9)	9% (18)	0% (1)	5% (10)	2% (3)	0.5% (1)	134	205
Provincial representatives	35% (47)	54% (113)	42% (57)	29% (61)	14% (19)	9% (19)	5% (8)	4% (9)	1% (2)	2% (4)	0% (1)	2% (4)	134	208
Representatives from other local governments	44% (60)	48% (99)	39% (53)	36% (74)	12% (17)	10% (21)	2% (3)	4% (8)	0% (0)	3% (6)	1% (2)	0% (0)	135	208
First Nations	39% (52)	34% (70)	24% (33)	31% (63)	22% (30)	23% (47)	8% (11)	5% (10)	3% (4)	3% (6)	2% (3)	5% (10)	133	206
Federation of Canadian Municipalities	N/A	27% (56)	N/A	38% (78)	N/A	23% (46)	N/A	7% (14)	N/A	3% (6)	N/A	2% (4)	N/A	204
Representatives from regional organizations	41% (56)	25% (51)	38% (51)	45% (93)	11% (15)	15% (30)	5% (7)	6% (13)	0% (0)	2% (5)	3% (5)	6% (13)	134	205

IMPORTANCE OF PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS (210 respondents)	VERY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	NEUTRAL	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010
Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	34% (46)	30% (62)	48% (65)	39% (80)	11% (15)	22% (46)	4% (6)	7% (15)	0% (1)	1% (2)	1% (2)	1% (3)	135	208
Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	37% (50)	17% (35)	37% (50)	38% (79)	17% (23)	27% (55)	5% (7)	12% (25)	1% (2)	3% (7)	2% (3)	2% (5)	135	206
Representatives from academic institutions	26% (35)	23% (47)	38% (52)	35% (71)	25% (34)	27% (56)	5% (7)	12% (24)	2% (3)	3% (7)	2% (4)	0.5% (1)	135	206
Developers	52% (70)	47% (98)	32% (44)	37% (76)	12% (17)	12% (24)	1% (2)	2% (4)	0% (0)	1% (3)	0% (1)	1% (3)	134	208
Business people	43% (57)	50% (102)	34% (46)	34% (70)	15% (21)	11% (23)	5% (7)	2% (5)	0% (0)	1% (2)	0% (1)	2% (4)	132	206
NGOs	32% (42)	28% (56)	31% (41)	45% (90)	25% (33)	19% (38)	10% (14)	5% (10)	0% (0)	2% (3)	1% (2)	2% (3)	132	200
Residents	59% (80)	67% (136)	32% (44)	26% (53)	5% (8)	4% (8)	1% (2)	1% (2)	0% (0)	2% (4)	0% (1)	0.5% (1)	135	204
Media	31% (42)	40% (81)	37% (49)	37% (76)	25% (34)	17% (35)	3% (5)	3% (6)	0% (1)	2% (4)	1% (2)	2% (2)	133	204

24. How SATISFIED are you that your EXISTING PARTNERSHIPS and/or RELATIONSHIPS with the following people are helping you enable and encourage sustainability?

SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS (208 respondents)	VERY SATISFIED	VERY SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	NEUTRAL	NEUTRAL	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED	VERY UNSATISFIED	VERY UNSATISFIED	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010	2007	2010
Elected officials	26% (35)	26% (55)	34% (46)	48% (99)	16% (22)	11% (22)	18% (24)	8% (16)	2% (3)	5% (10)	2% (3)	3% (6)	133	208
Colleagues within your department	27% (36)	34% (69)	33% (45)	36% (74)	17% (23)	13% (26)	8% (11)	5% (10)	2% (3)	1% (2)	11% (15)	11% (23)	133	204
Colleagues from other departments	13% (18)	21% (43)	38% (51)	39% (80)	22% (30)	18% (37)	9% (13)	8% (17)	2% (3)	2% (4)	14% (19)	11% (23)	134	204
Supervisors / managers	22% (30)	25% (52)	37% (50)	37% (76)	17% (23)	20% (42)	7% (10)	7% (15)	3% (5)	2% (4)	11% (15)	8% (16)	133	205
Federal representatives	2% (4)	7% (15)	14% (19)	16% (32)	38% (51)	36% (74)	24% (33)	25% (52)	14% (19)	13% (27)	5% (8)	3% (6)	134	206
Provincial representatives	2% (4)	7% (15)	19% (26)	22% (45)	33% (45)	29% (60)	25% (34)	27% (55)	14% (20)	13% (28)	3% (5)	2% (4)	134	207
Representatives from regional organizations	5% (7)	11% (23)	22% (30)	32% (66)	33% (45)	33% (68)	21% (29)	9% (18)	10% (14)	3% (7)	6% (9)	12% (25)	134	207
Representatives from other local governments	7% (10)	7% (15)	27% (37)	34% (71)	41% (56)	35% (73)	15% (21)	17% (36)	3% (5)	4% (8)	3% (5)	2% (5)	134	208
First Nations	3% (5)	3% (6)	14% (20)	16% (33)	48% (65)	48% (98)	14% (20)	14% (29)	8% (12)	7% (15)	9% (13)	11% (23)	135	204
Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM)	N/A	9% (18)	N/A	24% (49)	N/A	44% (89)	N/A	9% (19)	N/A	6% (12)	N/A	8% (16)	N/A	203

SATISFACTION WITH RELATIONSHIPS (continued)	VERY SATISFIED 2007	VERY SATISFIED 2010	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED 2007	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED 2007	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED 2010	VERY UNSATISFIED 2007	VERY UNSATISFIED 2010	NOT APPLICABLE 2007	NOT APPLICABLE 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Colleagues from trade/industry organizations (e.g., UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	8% (12)	5% (10)	30% (41)	31% (63)	39% (53)	46% (97)	12% (17)	8% (17)	21% (4)	2% (5)	5% (7)	7% (14)	134	206
Representatives from education/advocacy groups (e.g., Smart Growth BC, West Coast Environmental Law)	7% (10)	4% (9)	29% (40)	20% (42)	44% (59)	53% (110)	11% (15)	9% (18)	2% (4)	4% (9)	4% (6)	9% (18)	134	206
Representatives from academic institutions	4% (6)	8% (16)	17% (23)	20% (41)	48% (65)	47% (97)	17% (24)	13% (27)	5% (7)	6% (13)	6% (9)	7% (14)	134	208
Developers	3% (4)	2% (5)	17% (23)	18% (36)	38% (51)	40% (80)	27% (37)	22% (45)	9% (12)	11% (23)	4% (6)	6% (13)	133	202
Business people	1% (2)	2% (5)	12% (17)	22% (45)	45% (61)	39% (79)	26% (36)	23% (47)	8% (12)	9% (18)	4% (6)	5% (11)	134	205
NGOs	6% (8)	4% (9)	15% (20)	24% (49)	49% (66)	53% (107)	15% (21)	10% (21)	5% (7)	2% (4)	8% (11)	6% (13)	133	203
Residents	6% (9)	2% (5)	30% (41)	32% (66)	39% (52)	33% (67)	15% (20)	23% (47)	3% (4)	7% (14)	5% (7)	3% (6)	133	205
Media	4% (6)	4% (8)	22% (30)	30% (60)	39% (52)	38% (77)	21% (28)	15% (30)	9% (12)	9% (18)	4% (6)	5% (10)	134	203

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

INTERNAL BARRIERS (210 respondents)	VERY SIGNIFICANT 2007	VERY SIGNIFICANT 2010	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT 2007	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT INSIGNIFICANT 2007	SOMEWHAT INSIGNIFICANT 2010	VERY INSIGNIFICANT 2007	VERY INSIGNIFICANT 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Lack of financial resources	N/A	60% (125)	N/A	24% (49)	N/A	9% (19)	N/A	3% (7)	N/A	4% (8)	N/A	208
Lack of human resources	N/A	42% (87)	N/A	35% (73)	N/A	13% (27)	N/A	6% (12)	N/A	4% (8)	N/A	207
Resistance to change	18% (31)	25% (51)	36% (59)	34% (70)	20% (34)	21% (44)	18% (30)	16% (33)	6% (10)	4% (9)	164	207
Lack of regional foresight/coordination	24% (41)	19% (40)	38% (63)	31% (64)	21% (36)	25% (52)	14% (24)	17% (36)	2% (4)	8% (16)	168	208
Information overload	23% (39)	18% (37)	43% (71)	45% (92)	23% (38)	23% (47)	5% (9)	10% (21)	3% (6)	4% (9)	163	206
Aversion to risk	16% (27)	18% (38)	29% (47)	40% (80)	37% (60)	26% (54)	13% (22)	13% (22)	3% (6)	3% (6)	162	206
Lack of senior government support	25% (41)	34% (70)	35% (58)	32% (67)	24% (39)	20% (42)	11% (18)	8% (16)	3% (6)	6% (13)	162	208
Lack of simple and clear best practices	21% (36)	13% (26)	35% (59)	38% (79)	25% (41)	23% (47)	12% (21)	20% (41)	4% (7)	6% (15)	164	208
Lack of understanding about sustainability	22% (36)	11% (23)	41% (68)	35% (73)	14% (24)	21% (44)	17% (28)	24% (49)	4% (7)	9% (19)	163	208
Lack of helpful information about sustainability	10% (18)	8% (17)	36% (60)	20% (41)	31% (51)	29% (60)	16% (27)	29% (61)	4% (8)	14% (29)	164	208

INTERNAL BARRIERS (continued)	VERY SIGNIFICANT 2007	VERY SIGNIFICANT 2010	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT 2007	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT INSIGNIFICANT 2007	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT 2010	VERY INSIGNIFICANT 2007	VERY SIGNIFICANT 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Lack of vision/leadership	14% (24)	8% (16)	31% (52)	25% (52)	22% (37)	22% (45)	20% (33)	30% (64)	12% (20)	15% (31)	166	208
Lack of political will	12% (21)	7% (14)	28% (46)	30% (61)	30% (49)	16% (33)	18% (30)	26% (53)	11% (18)	21% (43)	164	204
Lack of communication between and among elected officials and staff	11% (19)	7% (14)	23% (38)	23% (48)	33% (55)	30% (62)	25% (42)	25% (52)	5% (9)	15% (31)	163	207
Lack of departmental cooperation/coordination	9% (15)	6% (13)	34% (57)	27% (56)	28% (47)	24% (50)	20% (34)	26% (53)	6% (11)	17% (36)	164	208
Lack of human/financial resources	52% (87)	N/A	34% (58)	N/A	5% (9)	N/A	4% (8)	N/A	2% (4)	N/A	166	N/A

26. Other INTERNAL BARRIERS (2007 choices appear in brackets)

1. Lack of time and human resources (*lack of time*)
2. Lack of money (*lack of money*)
3. Lack of leadership by elected officials (*lack of appropriate legislation / policies*)
4. Organizational structure (*lack of implementation "know-how"*)
5. Competing interests (*competing priorities*)
6. Lack of coordination between departments (*senior staff too busy to change*)
7. Lack of appropriate legislation / policies (*size of community*)
8. Difficult to define sustainability (*poor communication*)
9. Lack of training (*overlapping jurisdictions*)
10. Communication with community (*lack of training*)

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant programs that encourage parochialism vs. cooperation ▪ No funding available for First Nations ▪ Lack of strategic planning overall ▪ Too many other urgent projects ▪ Lack of training ▪ Integration between departments ▪ Smart growth implies growth ▪ Staff time to carry out research ▪ Competing demands ▪ The size of our community- very small- 85 people ▪ Short term elected office a barrier to long range sustainability planning ▪ The idea that we are being forced by the province ▪ Money ▪ Lack of a champion at Staff/Council ▪ Shortage of time and human resources ▪ Cooperation ▪ Repeat – lack of human resources and money for small communities ▪ Workload volume ▪ Too much work – everyone is not in the game ▪ Split council – some very anti sustainability ▪ Coordination between other local governments ▪ We do not have time to reinvent the wheel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No easy to follow measurement tools ▪ Departments and staff integrating sustainability planning into their operations and work plans ▪ Little development constituency ▪ Lack of staff time to carry out project ▪ Workload/competing priorities ▪ Integration of plans (OCP, transportation, energy) ▪ Time ▪ Making it a bigger priority ▪ Staff absenteeism ▪ Integrated decision making (limited experience) ▪ Lack of good communication tools with public ▪ Lack of funding to engage in ways to improve ▪ Financial constraints are critical. We need to talk to experts who can answer the tough questions. They cost money. ▪ None ▪ Opposing agendas ▪ Reorganization/training of staff ▪ Understanding of real meaning of sustainability ▪ Community control issues ▪ Green or nothing ▪ Limited capacity of elected officials ▪ Regional/Local government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of resources (time and money) ▪ Inability to take plans to the implementation stage without someone paying attention to everything in the city that happens ▪ Myths regarding the impact of development on property values ▪ Government red tape makes project hard to complete ▪ Staff wearing too many hats detracts focus ▪ Outdated bylaws ▪ Politicians see this as an add on not integral to the community – too busy worrying about failing infrastructure to look at nice green stuff (e.g., sustainability is all very nice as long as we don't have to do it) ▪ Complexity of issue ▪ Lack of meaningful performance measures ▪ None ▪ Staff requirements ▪ Leaks of information from staff to nasties ▪ No balance ▪ Low community participation ▪ Legislation ▪ Three year term of office ▪ Lack of experience for work force ▪ Co-ordination between levels of government ▪ No time to write grant proposals especially when success is slim ▪ Low staff morale

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed agendas of councillors ▪ None ▪ Thinking of how things were or should be as compared to reality of a situation ▪ Divided community ▪ Increase in work load for staff ▪ Small village large area ▪ Building working partnerships with neighbouring local governments ▪ Nasty, controlling community members ▪ No middle ground ▪ Lack of human resources ▪ Competing jurisdictions ▪ Considering us same as urban centre ▪ No access to GIS ▪ Competing interests ▪ Organizational structure ▪ Federal Government ▪ Lack of senior government regulations ▪ Strategic planning ▪ Lack of staff ▪ Difficult to define what is or is not sustainable ▪ Internal Communications – poor strategy ▪ Staff time to obtain training ▪ Lack of funding for education ▪ Funding for human resources ▪ Ignorance of electorate (i.e. stupid and hidebound) ▪ Economy ▪ Inability to converse with community on sustainability ▪ Lack of organizational capacity ▪ Red tape ▪ Heavy internal workloads ▪ Lack of mayoral leadership ▪ No planning department ▪ Understanding what sustainability is ▪ Sustainability is a much over used word in these times and consequently losses the impact. Breaking down components would be more significant (economic, social, environmental etc.) ▪ Capacity ▪ No change in council for many years ▪ Conflicting “best practices” ▪ Lack of staff knowledge training ▪ Too many other higher priorities ▪ Workload for other issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mandate ▪ New OCP ▪ Lack of funds ▪ Public works need vs. sustainable development (street size) ▪ Lack of funding for trades training ▪ Lack of long term thinking- true cost accounting ▪ Declining families ▪ Disconnect with what the community perceives ▪ Too much for staff to do already due to downloads from senior government ▪ “NIMBY” not in my back yard ▪ No matching funds to take advantage of grant money ▪ Political fiscal budget funding ▪ No planning committees ▪ Council has small town vision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Follow through documents sit on shelves once they are completed
---	--	---

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

EXTERNAL BARRIERS (211 respondents)	VERY SIGNIFICANT 2007	VERY SIGNIFICANT 2010	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT 2007	SOMEWHAT SIGNIFICANT 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT INSIGNIFICANT 2007	SOMEWHAT INSIGNIFICANT 2010	VERY INSIGNIFICANT 2007	VERY INSIGNIFICANT 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Inadequate funding (e.g., taxation)	N/A	50% (104)	N/A	33% (67)	N/A	14% (30)	N/A	3% (7)	N/A	.5% (1)	N/A	209
Lack of financial resources for public education and engagement	N/A	49% (103)	N/A	36% (75)	N/A	9% (19)	N/A	5% (10)	N/A	1% (3)	N/A	210
Lack of human resources for public education and engagement	N/A	42% (87)	N/A	40% (83)	N/A	10% (22)	N/A	7% (15)	N/A	1% (3)	N/A	210
Lack of senior government support for public initiatives	27% (43)	31% (64)	35% (56)	37% (76)	24% (38)	21% (44)	10% (17)	9% (19)	1% (3)	2% (4)	157	207
Lack of programs (e.g., transit)	22% (35)	28% (58)	36% (58)	37% (75)	27% (43)	11% (18)	11% (18)	6% (13)	2% (4)	2% (5)	158	207
Lack of long-term commitment	21% (33)	25% (51)	33% (52)	41% (85)	29% (46)	23% (47)	14% (23)	8% (17)	1% (2)	3% (7)	156	207
Lack of public understanding about sustainability	20% (32)	25% (52)	54% (86)	53% (111)	15% (24)	12% (26)	6% (10)	9% (19)	3% (5)	1% (2)	157	210
Public apathy / resistance	12% (20)	22% (46)	41% (65)	50% (105)	29% (47)	17% (36)	14% (22)	10% (21)	3% (5)	1% (2)	159	210
Developer apathy / resistance	18% (29)	21% (44)	42% (67)	42% (88)	27% (44)	27% (56)	8% (13)	9% (19)	3% (6)	1% (2)	159	209
Business apathy / resistance	17% (28)	N/A	47% (75)	N/A	25% (40)	N/A	7% (11)	N/A	1% (3)	N/A	157	N/A
Lack of practical and affordable best practices	24% (39)	20% (41)	45% (73)	40% (84)	18% (30)	28% (59)	10% (17)	11% (24)	1% (2)	1% (3)	161	211
Lack of legislation	24% (38)	20% (42)	45% (71)	36% (73)	24% (39)	31% (65)	5% (8)	10% (20)	1% (2)	3% (7)	158	207
Lack of cooperation between public, private, academic, and civic sectors	11% (18)	18% (38)	36% (57)	40% (81)	39% (62)	28% (58)	8% (13)	12% (25)	3% (6)	2% (5)	156	207
Private sector apathy / resistance	17% (28)	13% (28)	47% (75)	45% (93)	25% (40)	31% (65)	7% (11)	10% (20)	1% (3)	1% (2)	157	208
Lack of media interest and support	10% (16)	12% (25)	26% (42)	22% (45)	44% (70)	41% (85)	15% (24)	22% (46)	4% (7)	3% (7)	159	208
Lack of community vision/leadership	15% (25)	10% (21)	31% (50)	32% (67)	29% (47)	27% (56)	16% (26)	21% (44)	5% (9)	10% (20)	157	208
Lack of political will	14% (23)	9% (18)	31% (49)	32% (67)	28% (44)	23% (48)	18% (29)	22% (45)	6% (10)	14% (30)	155	208
Lack of communication between your organization and the public	10% (17)	9% (18)	36% (58)	34% (71)	33% (53)	34% (71)	17% (27)	20% (42)	1% (3)	3% (7)	158	209
Lack of human/financial resources for public education and consultation	41% (66)	N/A	44% (71)	N/A	10% (16)	N/A	3% (5)	N/A	1% (2)	N/A	160	N/A

28. Other EXTERNAL BARRIERS? (2007 choices appear in brackets.)

1. Lack of funding (*lack of funding support from senior governments*)
2. Lack of senior government policies (*lack of public understanding and participation*)
3. Lack of leadership by province (*lack of regional and inter-regional planning*)
4. Lack of interest by public (*lack of coordinated planning and implementation by all levels of government*)
5. Issue complexity (*lack of staff support*)

6. Lack of human resources (*lack of skilled personnel*)
7. Resistance to change (*unsustainability of current political and business systems*)
8. Lack of agreements between communities
9. Flawed definition / understanding of sustainability
10. Economy

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contradictory senior govt. policies ▪ Province should be providing a coordinating role for local governments ▪ Changing measurement tools and practices by the province ▪ Priorities and human resources for this type of work ▪ Resistance to change from developers and builders ▪ Understanding integration of fiscal, environmental, and social issues = debt servicing current service levels isn't sustainable ▪ Lack of interest in other communities ▪ Lack of trust in government ▪ How first nation communities are perceived ▪ Without partnership dollars it is very difficult to access any kind of funding from outside resources ▪ Lack of holistic training, thinking ▪ Funding for pilot projects ▪ Variable response – ex. Some developers supportive, some not ▪ Staff does not have time to reinvent the wheel ▪ Confused message from province ▪ None ▪ Climate change buy in by public ▪ Service download from senior governments ▪ Trend for government to fund through programs with very short life-spans ▪ Sr. Government subsidize wrong initiatives ▪ Flawed definitions of sustainability ▪ Everyone seems to have their own silo ▪ Lack of clear agreement on cause and effect ▪ NIMBY attitudes ▪ Car culture ▪ Lack of provincial funding programs ▪ Business owner reluctance ▪ Sustainability as an issue is rarely something individual members of the public concern themselves with. Just not a priority in relation to other issues people are facing ▪ No federal government support ▪ Town needs to give more teeth to its Commissions which will get more work done faster and for less ▪ Apathy – business as usual for many ▪ Poor communication ▪ Developer resistance would disappear if financial benefits were clear ▪ Lack of governments partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knee jerk senior funding programs ▪ We are all competing for the same scare funding resources ▪ The bar keeps moving, so focus is difficult ▪ Fear of environmental protection when discussing sustainability ▪ Duplication of information causes confusion ▪ Minimum code not met in order to exceed in housing ▪ Very small communities just don't have the money ▪ Issue complexity ▪ Lack of the ability to go beyond provincial requirements such as the BC building code ▪ The City cannot afford to hire the experts that are needed ▪ Is there even a federal government ▪ None ▪ Down turn in economy ▪ Huge competition to make the list for grant funding ▪ Invested self interest of consultants ▪ Everyone is talking ▪ Lack of good solutions which do not impact ▪ Public support for the theory, but don't adopt the behaviours ▪ For many, sustainability is limited to recycling ▪ I've yet to see a government official visit ▪ Lack of funding for education ▪ Centralization ▪ Private sector needs to know that it is cost effective ▪ Proximity to trades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flavour of the day programs ▪ Too many light weight workshops, not enough in depth ones ▪ Everything is important, so sustainability often takes the back burner ▪ Parochialism ▪ Systematic program funding ▪ This is another download and there is no staff to deal with it ▪ None ▪ Lack of living wage jobs in community ▪ Complete absence of industry in the area ▪ Invested self interest of organizations ▪ Very little listening ▪ Inadequate cost accounting for negative externalities ▪ Poverty ▪ Economy ▪ Enabling legislation downloads the responsibility – need clear direction and flexible resources to implement – need longer time frame to use resources

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No federal participation ▪ Prov and Fed govts. often verbally support the process of sustainable communities and then reduce funding ▪ Location ▪ Lack of federal government support and leadership 		
--	--	--

29. How FREQUENTLY do you receive INFORMATION about sustainability from the following sources?

FREQUENCY OF INFORMATION <i>(211 respondents)</i>	FREQUENTLY 2007	FREQUENTLY 2010	OCCASIONALLY 2007	OCCASIONALLY 2010	NEVER 2007	NEVER 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Provincial government	18% (26)	31% (65)	61% (87)	61% (128)	20% (29)	8% (18)	142	211
Trade/industry organizations (e.g., FCM, provincial equivalents, professional organizations)	32% (46)	28% (58)	59% (84)	57% (120)	9% (13)	15% (32)	143	210
Regional government	10% (15)	25% (50)	52% (73)	52% (108)	37% (53)	23% (48)	141	206
Regional organizations (e.g., Fraser Basin Council and Columbia Basin Trust in BC)	N/A	21% (44)	N/A	57% (12)	N/A	22% (45)	N/A	209
Education/advocacy organizations (e.g., David Suzuki Foundation, Pembina Institute, Sierra Club)	27% (39)	11% (23)	60% (85)	56% (118)	13% (18)	33% (68)	142	209
Other local governments	4% (7)	11% (23)	58% (83)	63% (130)	36% (51)	26% (53)	141	206
Federal government	7% (11)	9% (20)	64% (91)	69% (145)	28% (40)	22% (46)	142	211
Environmental NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Canadian Wildlife Fund)	11% (16)	8% (17)	50% (71)	59% (125)	38% (55)	29% (61)	142	210
Academic institutions	8% (12)	8% (17)	47% (67)	50% (105)	43% (61)	42% (88)	140	210
Media	9% (13)	0.5% (1)	42% (60)	20% (41)	49% (70)	41% (83)	143	203

30. How SATISFIED are you with the INFORMATION you receive about sustainability from those same sources?

SATISFACTION WITH SOURCES <i>(208 respondents)</i>	VERY SATISFIED 2007	VERY SATISFIED 2010	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED 2007	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED 2007	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED 2010	VERY UNSATISFIED 2007	VERY UNSATISFIED 2010	NOT APPLICABLE 2007	NOT APPLICABLE 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Federal government	2% (3)	3% (7)	19% (27)	24% (49)	28% (40)	33% (69)	21% (30)	19% (40)	16% (23)	11% (22)	11% (16)	10% (20)	139	207
Provincial government	2% (4)	6% (12)	30% (42)	32% (44)	23% (33)	24% (49)	21% (30)	25% (51)	14% (20)	9% (19)	7% (11)	5% (10)	140	208
Regional government	4% (6)	6% (13)	19% (27)	32% (65)	31% (44)	31% (63)	16% (23)	13% (26)	10% (15)	5% (11)	17% (24)	13% (27)	139	205
Other local governments	5% (8)	6% (12)	19% (27)	29% (57)	42% (60)	37% (74)	13% (19)	13% (25)	5% (7)	3% (6)	15% (21)	13% (26)	142	200

SATISFACTION WITH SOURCES (continued)	VERY SATISFIED 2007	VERY SATISFIED 2010	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED 2007	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED 2007	SOMEWHAT UNSATISFIED 2010	VERY UNSATISFIED 2007	VERY UNSATISFIED 2010	NOT APPLICABLE 2007	NOT APPLICABLE 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Academic institutions	6% (9)	4% (8)	16% (23)	26% (52)	33% (46)	36% (72)	15% (21)	14% (28)	10% (14)	4% (9)	18% (25)	16% (32)	138	201
Trade / industry organizations (e.g., FCM, UBCM, LGMA, BCWWA, PIBC)	17% (24)	7% (15)	39% (54)	38% (76)	26% (36)	36% (72)	8% (12)	9% (18)	5% (7)	2% (5)	5% (7)	8% (17)	140	202
Education / advocacy organizations (e.g., Smart Growth BC, The Natural Step, West Coast Envir. Law)	15% (21)	7% (15)	32% (45)	25% (50)	28% (39)	37% (76)	11% (16)	12% (25)	4% (6)	5% (10)	7% (11)	14% (28)	138	204
Regional organizations (e.g. Fraser Basin Council and Columbia Basin Trust in BC)	N/A	11% (22)	N/A	36% (74)	N/A	25% (52)	N/A	9% (18)	N/A	2% (5)	N/A	15% (30)	N/A	205
Environment NGOs (e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Grasslands Council of BC)	7% (11)	4% (9)	17% (24)	21% (44)	39% (55)	42% (87)	15% (21)	10% (21)	5% (8)	5% (11)	15% (21)	16% (33)	140	205
Media	0% (1)	1% (3)	10% (14)	20% (41)	41% (57)	41% (83)	17% (24)	10% (20)	11% (16)	10% (20)	19% (26)	18% (30)	138	204

31. Who or what do you consider to be the MOST CREDIBLE SOURCES OF INFORMATION about sustainability?

1. Other municipalities (*provincial government*)
2. Academic institutions (*academics / scientists*)
3. Provincial government (*local governments*)
4. NGOs (*federal government*)
5. FCM (*trade / industry organizations*)
6. Federal government (*Smart Growth BC*)
7. Consultants (*UBCM*)
8. Media (*education / advocacy organizations*)
9. Fraser Basin Council (*NGOs*)
10. Trade / industry organizations (*FCM*)

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3	RESPONSE #4	RESPONSE #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Foundation ▪ Most literature through province of BC ▪ Other municipalities ▪ Federal ▪ NGOs ▪ Regional Organizations ▪ Don't know 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NGOs ▪ Municipal Associations ▪ Provincial Government ▪ Provincial FCM ▪ NGOs ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Federal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultants ▪ Academic Institutions ▪ FCM ▪ International Magazines/websites ▪ Columbia Basin ▪ Provincial government ▪ Regional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CBT ▪ Province ▪ Regional Organizations ▪ Other local government ▪ Provincial government ▪ Regional Organizations ▪ Academic sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional ▪ Academics ▪ Education/advocacy organizations ▪ Regional organizations ▪ Provincial government ▪ ENGOS ▪ Consultants

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Province ▪ FCM ▪ Academic Institutions ▪ Other local governments ▪ Regional organization ▪ ENGOs ▪ Trade/industry organizations ▪ Education and advocacy groups ▪ Federal governments ▪ Case studies – real example around the world ▪ Smart growth BC ▪ USDN ▪ Education/advocacy organizations ▪ Pembina Institute ▪ Provincial Government ▪ FCM ▪ FCM ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Consultant ▪ FCM ▪ FCM ▪ Federal Government ▪ Provincial Government ▪ Northern Lights College ▪ Credible reports ▪ FCM Sustainability conference ▪ David Suzuki Foundation ▪ Regional Organizations ▪ Regional Government ▪ Other communities ▪ Academia ▪ Professional journal ▪ Province ▪ Provincial Government ▪ Cascadia Region Green Building Council ▪ Province ▪ Scientists ▪ BC Government website ▪ CBT ▪ Province of BC ▪ Info about practical examples that worked elsewhere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government ▪ Provincial government ▪ Trade/industry ▪ Professional organizations ▪ Federal Governments ▪ Post secondary and education sector ▪ Regional organizations ▪ Academic and educational institutions ▪ Academia ▪ United Nations ▪ University Sources ▪ Trade organizations ▪ UNSM ▪ Environmental NGOs ▪ Federation of Canadian Municipalities ▪ Federal Government ▪ Province ▪ AUMA ▪ Fraser Basin Water Board ▪ Trade/industry ▪ Associations ▪ Urban Systems ▪ Professionals ▪ Pembina Institute ▪ Other local governments ▪ Provincial governments ▪ Education organizations ▪ Conferences ▪ Organizations ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Other local governments ▪ Pembina Institute ▪ Federal ▪ Academia ▪ FCM ▪ Other regional districts ▪ Academia ▪ Other governments that have had success ▪ Advocacy groups ▪ Consultants who have actually done it ▪ Permaculture movement ▪ David Suzuki Foundation ▪ Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> government ▪ Federal and Provincial government ▪ Consultants ▪ Academic Institutions ▪ Local government ▪ Other local governments through their experience ▪ Advocacy/Support organizations ▪ CIP ▪ UCLEI ▪ FCM ▪ Newspaper ▪ Federal government ▪ Universities and academic journals ▪ Think tanks ▪ Smart Growth ▪ PCP ▪ Environmental Workshops ▪ INAC ▪ Peers ▪ FCM ▪ Province ▪ Trade/industry organizations ▪ Books ▪ Other local governments ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ West Coast Environmental Law ▪ Other elected officials ▪ Other level of local governments ▪ UBCM ▪ Federal government ▪ Provincial agencies ▪ FCM ▪ Planning Professionals ▪ Island Trust ▪ FCM/UBCM ▪ Canadian Universities ▪ Groups like Fraser Basin Council ▪ Federal government ▪ Case studies ▪ Universities ▪ Vancouver Island Health Authority ▪ Provincial government ▪ Trade publications and websites ▪ FCM and UBCM newsletters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and studies ▪ Other local governments ▪ Environment Canada ▪ Television ▪ Sustainability magazines ▪ Local governments ▪ Pembina Institute ▪ UBC Centre ▪ Fostering Sustainable behaviour ▪ Regional District ▪ Credible Interest groups ▪ Educational Organizations ▪ Provincial and federal governments ▪ Journal publications ▪ FCM ▪ BC government ▪ Blogs ▪ NGOs ▪ Credible NGOs ▪ Studies and reports ▪ Media Journalists ▪ Professional Associations (Engineers, planners) ▪ First Nations ▪ International Sustainability news ▪ BC local government Asset management Committee ▪ Education, advocacy organizations ▪ Other municipal governments ▪ Newspaper reports ▪ Reputable science journals ▪ Forum for the Future ▪ Our MP and MLA ▪ Province ▪ Province of BC ▪ David Suzuki ▪ Other similar local governments ▪ Television media ▪ Other municipalities' best practices ▪ ICLEI ▪ Provincial government ▪ Private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ecology Action Centre ▪ Federal government ▪ Innovative technology practitioners ▪ Provincial government ▪ BC real estate foundation ▪ City of Fort St. John ▪ Academia ▪ Federal NGOs ▪ Experts ▪ Regional government ▪ Federal government ▪ Economic/academic reports ▪ Provincial government ▪ Other local government ▪ Websites of interest ▪ Academic community ▪ Colleagues within and in other local governments ▪ Council of Canadians ▪ FCM ▪ FCM ▪ Trade/industry organizations ▪ Other regional government ▪ TV/radio news ▪ Other communities ▪ Globe foundation ▪ Federal government ▪ Federal government ▪ Media ▪ Internet media ▪ Equiterre ▪ Federal government ▪ Best Practices ▪ Centre for Policy Alternatives ▪ Residents ▪ Professional Planners ▪ Environmental Network ▪ Collingwood ▪ Pembina Institute ▪ Academic ▪ International communities ▪ Professional colleagues ▪ Federal government ▪ Knowledge network/discovery/Suzuki
--	--	---	--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People who have done innovative work ▪ Innovative organizations ▪ Information received from staff ▪ Scientists ▪ Regional Organizations ▪ Other government who have been successful ▪ Transition towns ▪ Centre for Civic Governance ▪ Scientific studies ▪ Those who actually do it ▪ Province ▪ I feel that little faith can be put in either side of the issue ▪ Not sure ▪ Federal Government ▪ Our community Advisory Committees ▪ Natural Resources Canada ▪ The source itself ▪ Columbia Basin Trust ▪ NGOs ▪ Academic Institutions and researchers ▪ Other Municipalities ▪ UBCM and FCM ▪ Province of BC ▪ Academic institutions ▪ SFU ▪ Related professions ▪ Provincial government ▪ UBCM ▪ The Natural Step Canada ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ BC Government ▪ Vancouver Island Economic Alliance has been working with us ▪ First Nation beliefs ▪ FCM ▪ Suzuki Foundation ▪ Other local governments ▪ The city's official community plan ▪ Local Government ▪ NGOs like the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> research ▪ Not Whistler ▪ Provincial government ▪ Provincial Agencies ▪ FCM ▪ Other local governments ▪ Provincial government ▪ Academics ▪ Regional Governments ▪ Innovative organizations ▪ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change ▪ Regional governments ▪ UBC ▪ Professional Publications/websites ▪ Other municipal governments ▪ Columbia Basin Trust ▪ International Centre for Sustainable Cities ▪ Gaining Ground ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Academic Institutions ▪ UBCM Reports ▪ Educational Institutions ▪ Regional ▪ Some academics ▪ CBC ▪ Government ▪ Academic ▪ FCM ▪ FCM ▪ Provincial government ▪ CBT ▪ The Natural Step ▪ Mid-sized communities in region ▪ Industry Canada ▪ FCM ▪ Greenpeace ▪ Avi Freeman ▪ Provincial government ▪ Conservation ▪ Municipal network ▪ GMF ▪ International Institute for Sustainable Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> newsletters ▪ Provincial government departments ▪ David Suzuki Foundation ▪ Sightline Institute ▪ Columbia River Council ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Academic organizations ▪ Some media sources ▪ Not the Fraser Institute ▪ Provincial government ▪ Provincial Agencies ▪ Newspaper, media ▪ Books by environmental authors ▪ Novae ▪ UBCM and FCM ▪ AMO ▪ Municipal government ▪ My sustainability staff ▪ Media ▪ Federal government ▪ Federal government ▪ ACT ▪ FCM ▪ Conferences and annual meetings ▪ Local ▪ Cascadia Region ▪ NGOs ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ WWF ▪ Provincial ▪ Provincial practitioners ▪ NGOs ▪ Other local government ▪ LGMA ▪ David Suzuki Foundation ▪ NGO reports ▪ BC Law Foundation ▪ Other communities ▪ Media, book authors ▪ Federal government ▪ Professional conference presenters if topics are applicable to implement ▪ Federal government ▪ Other foundations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> partners ▪ Federal government ▪ Green party of Canada ▪ Local news ▪ Private sector experts ▪ AMO ▪ Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities ▪ Provincial ▪ PIBC ▪ Provincial government ▪ NGOs ▪ Senior level government ▪ Media ▪ Common sense ▪ Educational Facilities ▪ Other communities ▪ Businesses with a track record for installing proven technology ▪ Provincial government ▪ Our town planning department ▪ Transition Towns ▪ Regional Organizations ▪ NGOs ▪ Regional Groups ▪ Institution of Civic Engineers UK ▪ FCM ▪ US and International NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suzuki ▪ Independent consultants ▪ Regional government ▪ Simon Fraser University ▪ Private Industry ▪ Trade and industry groups ▪ Media re.success stories ▪ Natural Step
--	--	--	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suzuki foundation ▪ Academic ▪ Scientific Community ▪ Other municipalities leading the way ▪ NGOs ▪ Regional Government (FVRD) ▪ Environmental think tanks ▪ FCM ▪ Academic organizations ▪ FCM ▪ Academia ▪ Suzuki Foundation ▪ David Suzuki ▪ Federal Government ▪ FCM ▪ FCM ▪ FCM ▪ The Natural Step ▪ FCM ▪ FCM ▪ CagBC ▪ Sustainability Champions ▪ Other local governments ▪ Bill Reese ▪ Academic Practitioners ▪ Community advocates ▪ Academia ▪ FCM ▪ UBCM ▪ Peer reviewed Academic literature ▪ University of BC ▪ FCM ▪ Municipal World magazine ▪ Provincial Government ▪ NGOs ▪ NGOs ▪ Regional government ▪ Financial expert to prove that sustainable development will save money or cost less to run the home as a selling point ▪ Academic institutions ▪ Province ▪ NGOs ▪ Ducks Unlimited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Best Practice Awards ▪ Federal ▪ USGBC ▪ Studies and reports ▪ UBCM ▪ Fraser Basin Council ▪ Federal ▪ Canadian Practitioners ▪ Other local governments ▪ NGOs ▪ UBCM ▪ Cowichan Valley ▪ Governmental Reports ▪ Western Canada Wilderness Committee ▪ BC Economic Development Association ▪ Regional District ▪ Academic Institutions ▪ Provincial government ▪ Province if the information is practical to implement ▪ Trade/industry organizations ▪ Academia ▪ Wildlife Federation ▪ Island Corridor Foundation ▪ Other municipal governments ▪ BC Transit Authority ▪ Province ▪ Federal government ▪ Provincial government ▪ Regional government ▪ SFU ▪ Province – Livesmart, Climate Action Toolkit ▪ APWA ▪ Government reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Federal government ▪ Other local governments ▪ ENGOS ▪ Federal government ▪ Agencies providing professional service for sustainability ▪ FCM ▪ International Centre for Sustainable Cities ▪ Canadian NGOs ▪ CWWA ▪ Academic studies 		
--	---	---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ University of Vancouver Island ▪ Scientists ▪ Pembina Institute ▪ UN ▪ Provincial government ▪ Regional government ▪ Other LGs ▪ Other local governments ▪ Other municipalities ▪ UBC ▪ Academia ▪ Technical papers ▪ Case studies methodology information 				
--	--	--	--	--

32. How INTERESTED are you in receiving INFORMATION about the following?

INFORMATION INTERESTS (209 respondents)	VERY INTERESTED 2007	VERY INTERESTED 2010	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED 2007	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMMWHAT UNINTERESTED 2007	SOMEWHAT UNINTERESTED 2010	VERY UNINTERESTED 2007	VERY UNINTERESTED 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Case studies from communities within your province	66% (93)	80% (166)	29% (41)	19% (40)	2% (4)	0% (1)	0% (0)	1% (3)	1% (2)	0% (0)	139	207
Regional policies, programs, and projects	58% (81)	68% (140)	34% (48)	29% (60)	4% (6)	2% (3)	0% (0)	2% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	138	208
Provincial policies, programs, and projects	59% (83)	59% (122)	34% (48)	36% (75)	3% (5)	2% (3)	0% (0)	1% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	139	207
Case studies from communities across Canada	46% (65)	54% (112)	38% (53)	40% (83)	11% (16)	3% (5)	0% (0)	2% (4)	0% (0)	1% (2)	139	206
Federal policies, programs, and projects	54% (75)	47% (97)	35% (49)	41% (85)	6% (9)	3% (5)	0% (0)	3% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	138	207
Briefing notes/Fact sheets	50% (70)	42% (88)	38% (53)	36% (75)	10% (14)	1% (2)	0% (0)	2.5% (5)	0% (0)	1% (2)	139	208

INFORMATION INTERESTS (209 respondents)	VERY INTERESTED 2007	VERY INTERESTED 2010	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED 2007	SOMEWHAT INTERESTED 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT UNINTERESTED 2007	SOMEWHAT UNINTERESTED 2010	VERY UNINTERESTED 2007	VERY UNINTERESTED 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
	Profiles of innovative organizations	24% (34)	41% (84)	49% (69)	40% (82)	17% (24)	5% (8)	2% (4)	5% (10)	2% (4)	0.5% (1)	139
Recommended websites	42% (58)	37% (77)	42% (59)	40% (83)	11% (16)	2% (4)	0% (1)	5% (11)	0.5% (1)	0.5% (1)	138	207
Studies/reports	30% (42)	32% (65)	54% (76)	49% (101)	13% (19)	0% (1)	0% (1)	2% (4)	0.5% (1)	0.5% (1)	139	206
Coming events	42% (59)	32% (66)	33% (46)	41% (85)	18% (25)	24% (49)	1% (2)	3% (7)	1% (2)	0.5% (1)	138	208
Case studies from communities around the world	35% (49)	27% (56)	34% (48)	49% (101)	21% (30)	16% (32)	7% (10)	6% (12)	1% (2)	2% (5)	139	206
Profiles of innovative individuals	20% (28)	20% (42)	29% (41)	30% (61)	29% (41)	34% (69)	13% (18)	12% (25)	6% (9)	4% (9)	137	206
International sustainability news	26% (36)	19% (40)	35% (48)	41% (84)	28% (39)	7% (10)	2% (4)	8% (16)	2% (4)	3% (7)	137	206
Quotable quotes	22% (31)	19% (38)	22% (31)	30% (60)	35% (49)	12% (17)	7% (10)	11% (23)	7% (10)	6% (12)	138	205
Editorials	21% (29)	15% (26)	39% (54)	34% (69)	24% (33)	10% (14)	5% (7)	13% (27)	5% (7)	7% (14)	137	205
Book reviews	21% (30)	13% (27)	29% (41)	30% (62)	30% (43)	14% (20)	3% (5)	17% (35)	3% (5)	5% (11)	139	206
Awards	14% (20)	13% (26)	21% (29)	25% (50)	39% (55)	17% (24)	7% (10)	19% (39)	7% (10)	7% (15)	138	204
Other	NA	7% (8)	NA	8% (9)	NA	66% (74)	NA	5% (6)	NA	14% (16)	NA	113

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

1. Energy (*water conservation*)
2. Water / wastewater (*energy efficiency*)
3. Transportation (*green buildings*)
4. Environmental / natural resources (*transportation demand management*)
5. Planning (*sustainability planning*)
6. Sustainable development (*sustainability policies*)
7. Funding (*solid waste management*)
8. Policies / legislations (*implementation strategies*)
9. Solid waste management (*best practices*)
10. Food (*case studies*)

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3	RESPONSE #4	RESPONSE #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy Tools for Municipalities ▪ Regulations ▪ Grants to help offset costs of Sustainability initiatives ▪ On the ground projects from similar communities ▪ Taxation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mandatory legislation ▪ Resources ▪ Water use and consumption ▪ Sustainable economic development ▪ Sustainability plans ▪ Substitution in the market place ▪ Sustainable tourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Best Practices ▪ New building materials ▪ Alternative transportation in rural/suburban areas ▪ Water conservation ▪ Return to the 1st R: reduce, re thinking growth ▪ Green 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Density, infill ▪ Biodiversity ▪ Transportation ▪ Transit for smaller communities ▪ Community resilience ▪ Rethinking small town living ▪ Funding strategies ▪ Environmental protection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brownfield mediation ▪ Land use management ▪ Agricultural support ▪ Walkable, healthy communities ▪ City services ▪ Policing ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Reducing

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resource Protection ▪ Moving beyond the targets, what's next ▪ Best ways to achieve results at minimum cost (affordable best practices) ▪ Climate Adaptation ▪ Transportation ▪ GHG ▪ Water best practices ▪ Financial ▪ Information on what it means and how it can be done ▪ Secondary Manufacturing ▪ Transition towns movement ▪ Land development ▪ Distributed energy ▪ Dealing with reality ▪ General Topics ▪ Oil and gas, timber, wildlife ▪ A sustainable economy ▪ Solid waste ▪ Infrastructure ▪ Human health – Canadian Social Network ▪ Success stories ▪ All topics ▪ Water ▪ Demand side water management ▪ Community Based social marketing ▪ Local food production ▪ Asset management ▪ Forestry ▪ GHG emission reduction ▪ Balanced growth ▪ Energy and climate change ▪ Storm water management ▪ Environment ▪ Transit ▪ Green house gas reduction ▪ Definitions, frameworks, systems thinking ▪ Sustainable development ▪ Responsibilities of local governments ▪ Sustainability for resource based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waste water ▪ Water conservation ▪ Sustainable policies and initiatives for rural communities ▪ Solid water management ▪ Alternative energy ▪ Water conservation ▪ Legislated changes ▪ Organizational changes ▪ Innovative small scale technologies ▪ Ongoing reporting and governance ▪ Energy efficiency in buildings ▪ Energy efficient rural residential construction ▪ TBL tools ▪ Community development ▪ Retrofit/energy efficiencies ▪ Sustainable building practices ▪ Alternative energy creation ▪ Sources of funding ▪ Economic development ▪ Sustainability plans ▪ If we know all this, why do we still get such bad developments ▪ GHG emission reduction ▪ Alternative energy systems ▪ Waste reduction ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Energy management ▪ How to implement new legislation ▪ Water ▪ Biodiversity ▪ Plan implementation ▪ Green economy ▪ Watershed ▪ Model bylaws ▪ Developer engagement ▪ "Green" building best practices ▪ Affordability ▪ Different "green" measuring systems ▪ How to finance sustainability projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ infrastructure ▪ Recycling ▪ Motivating the public ▪ Examples of sustainability plans ▪ Hydro management ▪ Green construction technology ▪ Shoreline protection ▪ How can I do it (with no money or resources) ▪ Implementation strategies ▪ Food productions ▪ Measures, indicators, monitoring ▪ District energy ▪ Water conservation ▪ Social housing ▪ Lifestyle conservation ▪ Revenue producing projects ▪ Sustainable housing developments ▪ Canadian case studies ▪ Energy and emissions ▪ Innovative technologies ▪ Tools for municipal planners ▪ Composting ▪ Transportation systems for small communities ▪ Wetland protection ▪ Cultural ▪ Community planners ▪ Templates, sample bylaws ▪ Waste ▪ Land use – sustainable development ▪ Action items ▪ TBL decision making ▪ Land use planning ▪ Top 10 hit list for small communities ▪ Business engagement ▪ Sustainability project funding sources ▪ Conservation ▪ How other communities define 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mobility without pollution ▪ Education delivery opportunities ▪ Community policing-bylaw enforcement ▪ Food supplies ▪ Waste management ▪ Transportation ▪ GHG management and reductions ▪ Alternative energy sources ▪ Local food production ▪ Regional collaboration ▪ Urban transportation ▪ Air ▪ Practical applications ▪ Community ▪ Sustainability action plans ▪ Funding opportunities ▪ Forestry ▪ Shift to green business economy ▪ Public work BMP ▪ Transportation ▪ Green technology ▪ Landfill ▪ Alternative energy ▪ How to sell environment to our citizens ▪ Forestry ▪ Sustainable development ▪ Communication with public ▪ Community engagement ▪ Municipal funding alternatives ▪ Development ▪ Liveable, accessible communities ▪ Case studies from other BC local governments ▪ Recycling ▪ City planning and sustainability ▪ Habitat ▪ Technological change ▪ Composting ▪ Environmental topics ▪ Transportation ▪ Food sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ consumption ▪ Health and care facilities for the aged ▪ Reduction of energy use ▪ Urban forest stewardship strategies ▪ Indicators and targets ▪ Climate change ▪ Energy conservation ▪ Inducing individual behaviour change ▪ Environment ▪ Waste ▪ Sustainability checklists ▪ Best practices with limited resources ▪ Mining ▪ Water management ▪ Policies ▪ Social determinants of health ▪ Program for our waste ▪ Infrastructure ▪ Conservation and preservation ▪ Education for staff ▪ Climate change adaptation ▪ New innovative techniques and ideas ▪ Health, education, post secondary ▪ Green neighbourhoods ▪ Local transit ▪ Food security ▪ Carbon ▪ Increased food production efficiency ▪ Planning ▪ Land use ▪ Regional policies ▪ User pay (road and transit) initiatives ▪ Climate change and wildlife ▪ Funding programs ▪ Air quality ▪ Sewer ▪ Land-use, water conservation, energy conservation ▪ Best practices, debugging liability issues ▪ Fleet management
---	---	--	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> communities who have lost theirs ▪ Fish ▪ The Natural Step ▪ Green building materials ▪ Energy ▪ Success: significant GHG reductions achieved ▪ Energy ▪ Energy ▪ Innovative practices ▪ Clean water, wastewater treatment ▪ Climate change ▪ GHG emission reduction ▪ Air quality issues ▪ Relocalization ▪ Sustainable cities ▪ Sustainable infrastructure ▪ Waterfront development ▪ Local possibilities- small populations ▪ Solid waste management ▪ Planning and urban design ▪ Quality of our Air ▪ PSW ▪ Energy efficiency ▪ Implementing policies ▪ Renewable Energy and Energy efficiency ▪ Water/wastewater ▪ Energy ▪ Community planning ▪ Greenhouse Gas ▪ The economy and prosperity ▪ Energy resilience ▪ GHG reductions ▪ Energy ▪ Housing density ▪ Transportation ▪ Food supply ▪ Training funds for first nations ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Behavioural change strategies – research ▪ Water ▪ Sewer and water ▪ Applying for grants ▪ Tourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grant funding ▪ Food production ▪ How to convince developers to go green ▪ Stories about other communities who have done good things ▪ Community change projects ▪ Energy ▪ Watershed improvement initiatives ▪ Community involvement ▪ Tourism ▪ Transportation ▪ Energy from waste ▪ Not Whistler ▪ Doing business better ▪ Liquid waste ▪ Development ▪ Protection of Canadian water resources ▪ Simple changes ▪ Agriculture ▪ Eliminating waste ▪ Locally based industry ▪ Vulnerability to climate change ▪ Clean air ▪ Energy reduction ▪ Green building design ▪ Sustainable communities ▪ Water quality ▪ Water conservation ▪ Building capacity of elected officials ▪ Urban environment ▪ Moving forward from resource base to other for small communities ▪ Wildlife ▪ Water conservation in suburban residential and urban areas ▪ Water ▪ Significant changes in financial management to achieve GHG reductions ▪ Waste ▪ GHG reductions ▪ Success stories ▪ GHG ▪ How to engage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustainability ▪ Environment ▪ Species at risk ▪ Performance measures ▪ Construction products and services ▪ Environmental leadership ▪ Recreation ▪ Green house gas reduction ▪ Partnerships ▪ Air pollution ▪ Environment ▪ Transportation planning ▪ Techniques for reducing transportation related GHGs ▪ GHG reduction ▪ Conservation ▪ Health and recreation programs ▪ Strategies for adaptability to climate change ▪ Water ▪ Water quality ▪ Land use planning ▪ Transportation Management alternatives ▪ Recycling ▪ Solar power ▪ Communicating sustainability ▪ Buildings ▪ Water ▪ Transportation ▪ Housing ▪ Significant and financially feasible energy reduction programs ▪ Parks ▪ Solar ▪ How to motivate change ▪ Economic development ▪ Recycling handling ▪ Food security ▪ Transportation ▪ Urban agriculture ▪ Rural community applications ▪ Geothermal ▪ Forestry ▪ Community contributions – low hanging fruit ▪ All new program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I don't think municipalities can afford not to be more sustainable – what actions are needed specifically ▪ Community capacity ▪ River quality, water ways, fishing ▪ Provincial policies ▪ Local light rail initiatives ▪ Health and fitness ▪ The extent- limitations- for local governments role ▪ Interconnectivity between three pillars ▪ Water ▪ Bio-fuel, transportation, electric vehicles ▪ Costs of adopting alternatives ▪ Low impact plantings ▪ Community energy plan ▪ Civic education that counters marketing propaganda ▪ Economic development planning ▪ Water conservation, drought planning ▪ Power management ▪ Water management ▪ Climate change adaptation ▪ Super easy how to ▪ Legislative updates ▪ Waste water management ▪ Coordination of and developing partnerships with other community organizations ▪ Sewage and garbage management ▪ Green procurement ▪ Human resources based projects ▪ Sustainable local government practices ▪ Zero waste ▪ Funding sources ▪ How to sell sustainability to politicians ▪ Alternative energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regions water carrying capacity ▪ Water treatment ▪ Grant opportunities ▪ Conservation ▪ Maintenance and renewal process for sustainability plans ▪ Alternative transportation and transit ▪ Renewable district energy ▪ Water and sewer efficiencies ▪ Cumulative effects ▪ Water demand management ▪ Public engagement strategies ▪ More economical ▪ Parks and public places ▪ Integrated waste management ▪ Energy and emissions ▪ Economic ▪ Energy from waste ▪ Institutional health and wellbeing ▪ Pollution
--	--	---	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Food/land base values/ sustaining agricultural base ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Development guidelines ▪ Taxation changes ▪ Community energy ▪ Water and wastewater ▪ Green buildings ▪ Case studies in BC or Canada ▪ Waste to Energy initiatives ▪ Deep geothermal ▪ Financial ▪ Water ▪ That provide value make sense and ones that the public will embrace ▪ Urban Agro Culture ▪ Climate Action Charter Initiatives ▪ Alternative heating/cooling ▪ Solar heating ▪ Transit alternatives ▪ Easy to implement ▪ Alternative Development standards ▪ Rural green initiatives ▪ Renewable energy ▪ Buildings ▪ Influencing behaviours to sustainability (CBSM) ▪ Renewable Energy ▪ Case studies of implementation ▪ Water reuse ▪ Financial management of utilities ▪ Funding ▪ Funding opportunities ▪ Bio energy ▪ Climate change ▪ GHG plans ▪ Green incentives for development ▪ Long term impact/life cycle ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Implementation in small communities ▪ Water conservation ▪ Energy/GHG reduction ▪ GHG reduction tools 	<p>public to adopt new behaviours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic planning ▪ Garbage handling ▪ Regional transit ▪ Local environmental conservation issues ▪ Community utilities ▪ Off the grid appliances ▪ Waste to energy ▪ Watershed protection ▪ Building green ▪ Quality of our river ▪ WHPA ▪ Forests ▪ Funding for projects ▪ Sustainable Economic Development ▪ Climate change adaptation ▪ Water ▪ Green building ▪ Sustainability projects ▪ Economic development ▪ Climate change ▪ Gaining public support ▪ Water quality ▪ Public/alternative transport ▪ Air quality ▪ Solid waste ▪ Legalizing of suites ▪ Organizational change stories ▪ All wildlife ▪ Affordable housing ▪ Timing of the transition to sustainability ▪ Small business ▪ Water resources ▪ Quality of life measurements ▪ Water conservation ▪ Attracting business ▪ What can the property owner do to be sustainable ▪ Public safety ▪ What residents can do to contribute ▪ Funding opportunities ▪ Water conservation education initiatives ▪ Energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wildlife ▪ Renewable energy ▪ Communication with developers ▪ Natural Resources Management ▪ Urban design ▪ Wastewater ▪ Private-public partnerships ▪ Reduction initiatives ▪ Green communities ▪ Gaining broad public support ▪ Waste disposal ▪ Local food production ▪ Water quality ▪ Transportation ▪ Government funding initiatives ▪ Climate change ▪ Transit ▪ Training for municipal staff to make change ▪ Agricultural opportunities ▪ Air quality ▪ Carbon reduction ▪ Diversification ▪ What can a municipality and business owner do ▪ Sustainable energy ▪ Solid waste reduction ▪ Federal policies ▪ GHG reduction initiatives ▪ Healthy communities ▪ Program to promote farming ▪ Transportation options and opportunities when one has rural components ▪ Storm water management ▪ Alternative fuels ▪ Public education and consultation initiatives ▪ Food policy and security ▪ Workforce attraction and retention ▪ Solid waste ▪ Integrated initiatives – Federal, Provincial, Municipal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Energy efficiency ▪ Transportation ▪ Transportation plans ▪ Anything to help us do more for less time and money ▪ Social ▪ Energy ▪ Effectiveness of action items ▪ Sustainability leadership ▪ Transportation ▪ Green building ▪ Performance measurements
--	---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recycling ▪ Economic development ▪ Transportation ▪ Standards ▪ Best Practice ▪ Local sustainability community development ▪ Implementation of sustainability plans ▪ Urban planning ▪ Rural economic development ▪ Infrastructure deficits for local government ▪ How regional districts can undertake and be successful in ICSPing ▪ Planning and development ▪ Education ▪ Agriculture/food safety ▪ Sewage treatment ▪ Best practices ▪ Governance ▪ Energy projects ▪ Land use planning ▪ Wastewater ▪ Any topics geared towards small communities ▪ Climate protection ▪ ALL ▪ Finding resources ▪ Climate change ▪ Community profiles similar to ours ▪ How- to ▪ Planning ▪ Life support systems, food, water, atmosphere ▪ Plan creation ▪ Climate change adaptation ▪ Energy management ▪ Transportation policies ▪ District energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Corporations and our dependency on oil ▪ Densification of towns and cities ▪ Practical GHG reductions ▪ Transit ▪ Wind generation ▪ Energy self-sufficiency ▪ Climate change adaptation and mitigation ▪ Energy management ▪ Developing people friendly subdivisions ▪ Storm water management ▪ Fleet ▪ Innovations that work ▪ Brownfield – brown to green ▪ Alternative Energy – community, residential ▪ Wastewater reuse ▪ Grant application requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bio-mass ▪ Transport efficiency, including electric vehicles ▪ Power generation 		
--	--	---	--	--

34. How likely would you be to use the following COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS and/or SERVICES provided by a nonprofit organization?

COMMUNICATIONS PRODUCTS AND/OR SERVICES	VERY LIKELY 2007	VERY LIKELY 2010	SOMEWHAT LIKELY 2007	SOMEWHAT LIKELY 2010	NEUTRAL 2007	NEUTRAL 2010	SOMEWHAT UNLIKELY 2007	SOMEWHAT UNLIKELY 2010	VERY UNLIKELY 2007	VERY UNLIKELY 2010	NOT APPLICABLE 2007	NOT APPLICABLE 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Sustainability planning	36% (51)	38% (77)	46% (65)	46% (94)	14% (21)	11% (22)	1% (2)	2%(4)	1% (2)	2%(5)	0% (0)	0%(0)	141	203
Regional workshops	36% (51)	38% (77)	51% (72)	50% (102)	7% (10)	6% (13)	4% (7)	4% (8)	1% (2)	2% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	142	204
Website devoted to sustainability issues from a local government perspective	55% (77)	37% (75)	32% (45)	48% (98)	7% (10)	9% (18)	4% (6)	3% (6)	1% (2)	3% (*6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	140	203
Topic-specific research	25% (36)	33% (67)	54% (76)	50% (103)	15% (22)	11% (22)	2% (4)	3% (7)	1% (2)	2%(5)	0% (0)	0%(0)	140	204
Public education	24% (35)	26% (53)	51% (73)	46% (94)	17% (24)	16% (33)	4% (6)	6% (12)	2% (4)	4%(9)	0% (0)	1%(1)	143	202
Public consultation	22% (31)	26% (52)	42% (60)	44% (88)	27% (39)	20% (41)	5% (8)	6% (13)	1% (2)	3%(7)	0% (0)	0%(0)	140	201
Briefing notes / Fact sheets	29% (41)	25% (51)	47% (67)	48% (97)	16% (23)	17% (34)	4% (7)	6% (13)	2% (3)	4%(8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	141	203
Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of workshops	18% (26)	23% (46)	40% (57)	42% (84)	29% (41)	24% (48)	6% (9)	8% (15)	4% (7)	3%(6)	0% (0)	1%(1)	141	200
Communications planning	25% (36)	23% (46)	37% (53)	42% (84)	26% (38)	24% (48)	7% (10)	8% (15)	2% (3)	3% (6)	0.5% (1)	0.5% (1)	141	200
Regular electronic newsletters	30% (42)	22% (43)	45% (63)	42% (86)	20% (28)	24% (49)	4% (6)	7% (15)	0% (1)	4% (8)	0% (0)	0.5% (1)	140	203
Regular webinars (web-based presentations)	18% (26)	18% (36)	34% (49)	46% (92)	27% (39)	17% (35)	12% (18)	12% (24)	6% (9)	6% (12)	0% (0)	2% (3)	141	202
Mentorship program	18% (26)	17% (34)	26% (37)	30% (60)	35% (49)	32% (63)	11% (16)	12% (24)	6% (9)	8% (15)	1% (2)	2% (4)	139	200
Regular printed newsletters / magazines	14% (20)	16% (32)	37% (53)	39% (79)	28% (40)	24% (49)	12% (18)	14% (29)	5% (8)	6% (12)	0% (0)	0.5% (1)	140	202
Annual conference	29% (41)	16% (32)	41% (59)	39% (79)	19% (28)	30% (60)	6% (9)	10% (20)	2% (4)	6% (12)	0% (0)	0% (0)	141	203
Coordination, facilitation, and documentation of focus groups	17% (25)	16% (32)	36% (51)	40% (81)	31% (45)	28% (56)	8% (12)	11% (22)	4% (6)	4% (9)	2% (3)	1%(1)	142	201

35. Please list ANY OTHER sustainability-related communications services you would like to see offered by a nonprofit 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

RESPONSE #1	RESPONSE #2	RESPONSE #3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation strategies ▪ Key is – too much overload – what is important to read ▪ Funding summaries and program briefings twice a year with deadlines ▪ One stop website for sustainability ▪ How their legislation will stop encouraging sprawl ▪ Access to academic journal database on sustainability and local government issues ▪ Educational materials ▪ Need case studies – how have others done it ▪ Wireless internet ▪ Funding for conference attendance ▪ Model bylaws ▪ Sessions at PIBC and CIP conferences ▪ Air quality program ▪ A database of specialists in local government ▪ Internet listing of federal information sites ▪ Notification of legislative changes ▪ Tax shifting research ▪ International ▪ Emerging products ▪ New established programs ▪ Coordination of the orders of government ▪ Town council and first nations working together ▪ Universities (assumption: rational, evidence based, reasonably free from bias) ▪ Water sustainability ▪ Roadside electronic billboards ▪ Land costs for young farmers help ▪ I would like to see and hear more information of a practical nature as opposed to just a government or special interest group's perspectives ▪ It just has to be easy to use and not time consuming ▪ Coordinating of a sustainable municipalities to a non-sustainable municipality ▪ Local demonstration projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concrete programs ▪ How the federal government will develop and fund a national housing strategy ▪ Sustainability 101 presentation ▪ Expanded cellular phone service ▪ Funding for education ▪ Areas to focus on ▪ Comprehensive electronic listing of grants, pilot projects ▪ A database of specialists in the industry ▪ More federal, provincial funding for projects ▪ New GREEN project ▪ Fraser institute ▪ Roadside project signs ▪ Future sustainability moving exhibit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How the federal government will implement a climate action strategy ▪ White paper with inventory and comparison of different sustainability frameworks used by local governments ▪ Natural gas to rural communities ▪ Funding for sustainability positions ▪ List of provincial and federal specialists ▪ More available green fuel alternatives ▪ Bio-culture ▪ Canadian Institute of Resource Law (U of Calgary) ▪ Quarterly success-related brochures

36. How FREQUENTLY would you READ or PARTICIPATE in the following?

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION	MONTHLY 2007	MONTHLY 2010	EVERY TWO MONTHS 2007	EVERY TWO MONTHS 2010	EVERY THREE MONTHS 2007	EVERY THREE MONTHS 2010	EVERY SIX MONTHS 2007	EVERY SIX MONTHS 2010	EVERY YEAR 2007	EVERY YEAR 2010	NEVER 2007	NEVER 2010	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2007	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 2010
Electronic newsletter about sustainability	48% (69)	46% (95)	22% (32)	22% (46)	21% (30)	21% (45)	4% (6)	5% (11)	2% (3)	2% (5)	2% (3)	2% (5)	143	207
Printed newsletter / magazine	22% (30)	33% (68)	19% (26)	23% (47)	31% (42)	23% (46)	12% (17)	9% (18)	3% (4)	4% (8)	12% (16)	8% (16)	135	203
Social Media (e.g., YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, blogs)	N/A	30% (60)	N/A	8% (16)	N/A	5% (10)	N/A	6% (13)	N/A	2% (5)	N/A	49% (97)	N/A	201
Other	N/A	13% (8)	N/A	5% (3)	N/A	7% (4)	N/A	13% (8)	N/A	2% (1)	N/A	60% (37)	N/A	61
Webinar (web-based presentation)	13% (18)	12% (25)	15% (22)	25% (51)	23% (33)	26% (53)	23% (32)	15% (30)	7% (11)	8% (176)	17% (24)	14% (29)	140	205
Provincial Workshops	N/A	3% (6)	N/A	4% (8)	N/A	11% (23)	N/A	23% (47)	N/A	47% (97)	N/A	12% (25)	N/A	206
Regional workshops	2% (3)	2% (6)	4% (6)	9% (18)	14% (20)	20% (41)	33% (48)	36% (74)	42% (60)	29% (60)	6% (9)	4% (8)	146	207
National Conference	2% (3)	1% (3)	0% (1)	0.5% (1)	4% (7)	1% (2)	6% (9)	3% (7)	76% (109)	54% (109)	10% (15)	41% (82)	144	204

37. 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.