

Stewardship Progression Project

Cowichan Community Land Trust Society



**FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION
OF 11 YEARS OF LANDHOLDER CONTACT
IN THE COWICHAN REGION**

By Ann Archibald, François Cormier, and John Scull

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
INTRODUCTION	9
Background: Landholder contact in the Cowichan region	9
Evaluating landholder contact programs	12
METHOD	13
Telephone Survey	13
Participants	13
Site visits	13
Land	13
RESULTS	15
Recall of Landowner Contact	15
Stewardship activities	17
Wildlife habitat	17
Number taking action	18
Water quality and conservation	19
Energy conservation	20
Solid waste management	20
Memberships in conservation organizations	21
Effects of the landholder contact program	21
<i>Conservation campaigns</i>	23
<i>Plans for the future</i>	23
Other activities	24
<i>CVRD gorse identification hotline</i>	24
<i>One-tonne challenge</i>	24
<i>Charitable giving</i>	24
Evaluation of CCLT and the landholder contact program	25
<i>Activities in support of land stewardship</i>	25
Global evaluation of the landholder contact programs	26
DISCUSSION	28
Changing land ethics	28
Landholder contact programs	28
Limitations to the survey	28
Site Visits	29
RECOMMENDATIONS	30
<i>For CCLT and other organizations doing landholder contact programs</i>	30
<i>For funding and policy bodies concerned with environmental stewardship</i>	30
REFERENCES	31

APPENDICES	33
Appendix 1. Stewardship Pledge	35
Appendix 2. Letters to land stewards.....	37
Appendix 3. Telephone Interview Protocol	39
Appendix 4. Verbatim responses to open questions.....	43

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Cowichan Community Land Trust Society gratefully acknowledges the contributions of its primary funders who include the following:

**Habitat Conservation Trust Fund
Cowichan Valley Regional District
Kaatza Foundation**

In addition to these funders, we would like to acknowledge the many stewards who provided information and insight throughout this project as well as project staff: Francois Cormier and Ann Archibald.

And finally, a special thank you to John Scull who volunteered countless hours to this project, from its inception to its successful conclusion.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Landholder contact programs have been favoured by many organizations as a tool for encouraging land stewardship. The Cowichan region has experienced various landholder contact programs over a period of 11 years. This long history provided a unique opportunity for an assessment of the long-term consequences of landholder contact programs.

In the spring of 2005 a telephone survey was conducted with 89 participants from previous landholder contact programs. Following the interviews, site visits were made to 8 properties.

In general, the results of the survey were extremely positive with respect to changing the attitudes, knowledge, and activities of landholders, both with respect to the specific focus of the landholder contact and with respect to wider environmental issues. Landholders were motivated to care for the natural environment and eager for information about how to do it. They appreciated the knowledge gained through the landholder contact program. They responded with a wide range of changes in land use practices and other environmentally-relevant behaviours.

Specifically;

- changes in attitudes about land stewardship, including a greater understanding of the importance of passive conservation (leaving things alone).
- increased knowledge and understanding of land stewardship issues.
- a wide range of changes in environmental management practices, especially those related to wildlife habitat.
- changes in a number of different areas of environmental stewardship, with the average landholder reporting 8 different changes.
- Land stewards were much more likely than the general population to join environmental and conservation organizations or contribute to land acquisition campaigns.

The major weakness identified for all the programs resulted from the short-term nature of project funding from grants. Staff changes and a lack of consistent follow-up were seen as major weaknesses in the landholder contact programs. A more consistent dialogue with the sponsoring organization and with other land stewards might enhance the effectiveness of landholder contact.

Landholder contact was shown to be very effective compared to some other approaches to environmental protection. To maximize effectiveness, landholder contact programs should be planned and funded on an ongoing basis or, at least, for several years at a time.

INTRODUCTION

An important piece of the environmental puzzle is the stewardship of private land for wildlife habitat protection and the amelioration of negative downstream environmental consequences. The traditional method for encouraging stewardship has been the use of government regulation and penalties. Municipal land use bylaws, provincial water and fisheries laws, and federal wildlife and fisheries laws have been used to prevent or punish inappropriate land use practices. To be effective, these strategies require a substantial commitment to enforcement and they seldom encourage positive stewardship actions such as restoration. They often tend to be reactive rather than preventative.

A second approach to land stewardship has been for government or land trusts to purchase land and take responsibility for stewardship. This option is expensive at the outset and involves a perpetual commitment to good stewardship.

More recently, there has been increasing use of conservation covenants (or easements) to enforce land stewardship (Hillyer & Atkins, 2005). Both governments and private land trusts have used this legal tool to protect environmental values in perpetuity. As with regulation, covenants and easements require the holder to make a substantial commitment to monitoring and enforcement. An advantage of covenants over regulation is they can be designed for the unique features of each piece of land rather than having the "one size fits all" quality of regulation. Covenants are usually less costly than land acquisition and, within the limits imposed by the covenant, the land may continue to have an economic, personal, or social use.

A fourth approach to land stewardship has been through environmental education. Governments and private organizations have produced educational materials, courses, workshops, and media campaigns to teach land stewardship to the general population or to targeted landholders. The use of voluntary and educational measures rather than regulation has been characterized in a recent book as "new tools for environmental protection" (Dietz & Stern, 2002).

Behavior change is a complex, multi-stage or multi-dimensional process involving education, emotional/spiritual change, public commitment, technical knowledge, regulation, and incentives (Gardner & Stern, 2002). The multi-faceted approach called community-based social marketing, first developed in the fields of agricultural extension and public health education, is increasingly being applied to encouraging environmental behaviour change (Andreasen, 1995; McKenzie-Mohr & Smith, 1999). Landholder contact is an application of these methods to encourage the good environmental stewardship of private lands. Direct contact provides a means to individualize assistance, education, incentive, social support, and encouragement for land stewardship.

Landholder contact programs in Canada were pioneered in Ontario about fifteen years ago (Hilts, Moull, Razadki, & Van Patter, 1991) and early programs in British Columbia were modeled on the Ontario initiative. In 1997 an influential handbook (Duynstee, 1997) was created for British Columbia based on the Ontario model and on experience in a number of stewardship projects, including the early projects reported here.

Background: Landholder contact in the Cowichan region

Beginning with a project sponsored by the Pacific Estuary Conservation Program in 1993 and continuing with projects operated by the Cowichan Community Land Trust (CCLT), landholder contact

stewardship programs have taken place almost continuously in the Cowichan region. In meeting the needs of funding agencies, this ongoing activity has taken the form of seven separate projects, each focused on a different subset of rural landholders. Table 1 lists the projects and the geographical or ecological focus of each project. Table 2 lists the principal funding agencies for one or more of the projects.

Methodology in each project was based on earlier work done by others (Duynstee, 1997; Hilts, et.al., 1991) and adapted in the light of an improving understanding of community-based environmental marketing (Gardner & Stern, 2002; McKenzie-Mohr & Smith, 1999). Because of time gaps between some of the projects, continuity of methodology and staff was sometimes limited. The focus of all the projects was approximately the same, with the following two exceptions:

- The Intertidal Stewardship Project included preparation of a handbook, *Caring for our Shores*, (Cowan, Wilson, & Austin, 1998). In addition to stewardship visits, some landholders participated in focus groups and as editorial consultants throughout this process. Copies of the book were distributed to all coastal landholders in the region.
- The primary focus of the Tzouhalem Protection Project was on developing a conservation strategy. Land stewardship education was only a minor part of the project. The main activity arising from this project was a partnership with the Nature Conservancy of Canada to raise funds to acquire the Cowichan Garry Oak Preserve.

Table 3 summarizes the accomplishments of each project. It can be seen that (except for the Tzouhalem Protection Project) 20% to 36% of landholders who were contacted agreed to host a site visit. Following site visits, between 22% and 98% of landholders agreed to sign the stewardship pledge (Appendix 1). The differences in pledge rates between the different projects apparently reflects differences in methodology between projects and increasing public resistance to signing anything.

While there were methodological differences among the projects, the process always followed a similar outline:

1. Publicly-available databases were used to target landholders appropriate to the scope of the project.
2. Most Landholders were recruited through letters and follow-up telephone calls. Some landholders were also recruited at public workshops or meetings and by referral from neighbours.
3. Two CCLT staff visited the landholder, walked around the property with him/her, and discussed both the landholder's intentions for the land and the ecological values on the property.
4. CCLT staff followed up on the visit in a variety of ways, depending on the needs of the land and the wishes of the individual landholder
 - Brochures, booklets, research, and resources related to specific questions
 - A second visit, perhaps with a consultant, to evaluate specific features of the land
 - A stewardship management plan prepared with the support of a consultant
5. If landholders agreed to sign the stewardship pledge (Appendix 1) they were given the choice of a stewardship certificate or driveway gate plaque (Figure 1).
6. Land stewards were invited to a land steward recognition event and to community workshops provided by CCLT.
7. Land stewards were encouraged to join local community stewardship organizations.
8. Land stewards were given a free subscription to the quarterly CCLT newsletter, *The Steward*.

Table 1. Landholder contact and stewardship projects

Year	Project title	Target landholders
1993-1994	Cowichan Chemainus Stewardship Project (CCSP)	Cowichan Chemainus lowlands
1995-1997	Cowichan Stewardship Project (CSP)	Cowichan Chemainus lowlands
1997-1998	Freshwater Stewardship Project (FSP)	Riparian habitat in North Cowichan
1997-1998	Intertidal Stewardship Project (SSP)	Saltwater waterfront property
1998-1999	Tzouhalem Protection Project	Mount Tzouhalem region
1999-2000	Sensitive Ecosystem Stewardship Project (SEP)	Sites identified by the SEI
2001-2004	South Cowichan Stewardship Project (SCSP)	Riparian habitat in South Cowichan

Table 2. Project Funders

Pacific Estuary Conservation Program Environment Canada Action 21 and Eco-Action Wildlife Habitat Canada Real Estate Foundation of BC Urban Salmon Habitat Program HRDC BC E-team BC Ministry of Education, Skills, & Training TD Canada Trust Friends of the Environment Fund Information, Science, & Technology Agency Habitat Conservation Trust Fund Vancouver Foundation Wilburforce Foundation Cowichan Valley Regional District Many local donors and volunteers

Table 3. Participation in each stewardship project

Project	Contacts	Site visits	Land stewards
CCSP	74	27 (36%)	12 (44%)
CSP	256	64 (25%)	56 (88%)
FSP	237	84 (35%)	82 (98%)
ISP	78	26 (33%)	21 (81%)
TPP	505	29 (6%)	12 (41%)
SEP	192	38 (20%)	25 (66%)
SCSP	235	55 (23%)	12 (22%)
Total	1477	323	220

Evaluating landholder contact programs

Several of these projects were evaluated with telephone interviews at the time they were completed and landholder reactions were generally positive, but the questions were oriented towards specific features of the project rather than to global outcome. These evaluations were described in the final reports of each project.

In a previous study, intensive interviews were conducted with small samples from three landholder contact programs in different communities, including CCLT stewards (Lawrance, Littley, and Scull, 2000). They interviewed participants in the Freshwater Stewardship Project and the Intertidal Stewardship project one or two years following initial contact.

When they asked stewards about attitude change, they found that 30% of responses indicated an existing predisposition to stewardship, 25% indicated positive attitude change, and 7% indicated negative attitude change. When they asked about land stewardship behaviour, 14% reported engaging in active enhancement activities, 28% reported passive conservation activities, and 17% reported increased participation in community stewardship. From this study it appears that landholder contact programs are effective in encouraging improved land stewardship attitudes and practices in many participants.

The present study took advantage of the long history of landholder contact stewardship education in the Cowichan region to interview some land stewards many years after their initial contact. Table 4 shows the number of years that elapsed between the first landholder contact and the telephone interviews in the current study. Thus, responses on the survey may give some indication of the long-term effects of landholder contact stewardship education programs.

Years	Number
1	5
2	17
3	1
4	0
5	14
6	4
7	9
8	20
9	6
10	4
11	4
12	1
Not known ¹	4

¹ Staff recorded dates in documentation without indicating the year and landholders were unable to recall the year.

METHOD

Telephone Survey

Databases and site visit records from all the stewardship projects were combined into a single database. Letters (Appendix 2) were sent to 163 landholders for whom records were readily available. Approximately one week later landholders contacted by letter were telephoned and asked if they were willing to participate in a telephone interview. Some letters were returned because the landholder had moved. Online directories were used to find the new address of the landholder for our records and the new owner's name for future reference. Once contacted by telephone, landholders who agreed to an interview were then either interviewed at that time or an appointment was made for a telephone interview at a later date. The interview protocol, which resulted from discussions with people familiar with the land stewardship projects, is given in Appendix 3.

Participants

122 of the 163 land stewards could be contacted. 90 agreed to interviews but one interview was not completed due to time constraints. Of the remaining 32 land stewards, 9 were not interested in being interviewed and the others either did not recall the visit, were deceased, were not available, or were new owners or occupants. Of the people contacted who were eligible for interviews, 91% agreed to participate and 9% refused.

Site visits

Following completion of the telephone interviews, 7 stewards were identified as having expressed a desire for another visit or follow up. Of these only three were available for a site visit within the time frame of the project. In addition, a random sample of 22 interviewed stewards representing roughly one quarter of the remaining respondents were selected for follow up visits.

The sample contained an equal number of stewards who had reportedly made significant changes to their land, and of stewards who had not made significant changes. These 22 stewards were contacted by phone and offered a follow up visit. Of these, one no longer lived on the site, six were not reachable, and two were unavailable within the time frame allowed for the visits. Seven stewards said that they felt there was no need for another visit, and five agreed to a follow up. In the end a total of 8 stewards were visited, of which 7 had made significant changes. An additional visit was made to a steward who had said in the survey that she did not recall being visited before.

Land

Tables 5 to 8 summarize the uses and features of the land. Most of the land was being maintained in a natural state with a farm, hobby farm, or garden and a single residence. Streams, bluffs, and wetlands were the dominant ecological features. These characteristics of the land mostly reflect the criteria used by CCLT staff in recruiting land stewards. Large parcels of land were given priority over smaller parcels and most of the projects were focused on waterfront or riparian habitat. The special features most often identified by landholders were trees.

*Table 5. Primary land use
(question 10a)*

Use	Number
Untouched natural area	32
Hobby farm or garden	19
Residential	19
Farm	14
Recreation	2
Managed forest	2
Institutional	1

Table 6. Secondary land uses (question 10b)

Use	Number
Residential	64
Untouched natural area	41
Garden or hobby farm	13
Managed forest	4
Business	4
Farm	1
Monument	1

*Table 7. Ecological features identified
by landowners (question 11a)*

Feature	Number
Stream/creek	54
Wetlands	30
Bluffs	20
Ocean shoreline	12
Pond	9
Seasonal stream/creek	8
Lake shoreline	6
River shoreline	5
Bog	3
Seasonal pond	3
Estuary shoreline	2
Seasonal wetland	2
Banks	2
Ditch	1
Lagoon	1

<i>Table 8. Special features identified by landowners (question 11b)</i>	
Feature	Number
Old growth forest/large trees	13
Garry Oak trees	12
Other notable trees	3
Waterfalls	3
Wildflowers	3
Spring	1
Eagle nest	1
Ant hill	1

RESULTS

Recall of Landowner Contact

The opening questions of the survey were aimed at helping the respondents remember their contact with the stewardship program and to assess the extent of their memory of the landholder contact episode. Table 9 summarizes the results for the first 9 questions. Table 10 lists the responses to Question 2, “What was the visit about?”

Almost all the participants remembered the site visit and some of the details. They had a poor memory for follow-up and receiving printed matter, but the number who remembered signing the stewardship pledge was similar to the CCLT figure. The discrepancy in the figures for management plans is probably the result of different definitions. For the CCLT, management plans always involved a consultant, while landholders may have had a broader definition.

Table 9. Responses to questions recalling the landowner contact process (questions 1-9)

Question	Yes	Comments
1. Do you remember the site visit?	85 (96%)	Of the 4 who responded “no”, 1 had only had telephone contact, the other 3 had apparently forgotten the visit.
2. What was the visit about?		See Table 10
3. Was there follow-up?	49 (55%)	CCLT records show that there was always follow-up by telephone, mail, or a subsequent site visit.
4. Did you receive printed material?	63 (71%)	Everyone was given a CCLT brochure and publications related to their stewardship issues
4a. Did you receive the book <i>Caring for our Shores</i> ? If so, do you still use it?	8 (9%) remembered the book	4/8 (50%) of book recipients still use the book.
5. Did you have a management plan?	12 (13%)	CCLT records showed that only 2 participants had received formal management plans
6. Did you attend any workshops, courses, meetings?	26 (29%)	
7. Did you attend a stewardship recognition event?	17 (19%)	This is close to the 25% attendance recorded in CCLT records
8. Did you take the stewardship pledge?	13 (15%)	This number is much lower than recorded by CCLT
9. Did you receive a gate plaque or certificate?	43 (48%)	Only those who completed the stewardship pledge were given gate plaques or certificates

Table 10. Remembered topics of site visits (question 2)

Number	Comment topic
23	stream stewardship
22	general environmental topics
11	wildlife, biodiversity, habitat
10	native plants
9	erosion and flooding
7	trees, especially Garry Oaks
6	promotion of CCLT
5	specific species - birds, frogs, bats
4	invasive plants, esp. blackberries & Japanese knotweed
4	can't remember, don't know
2	pond
1	conservation covenant
1	septic system
1	pesticides

Stewardship activities

Landholders were asked specific questions about their stewardship activities in five domains: improving wildlife habitat, conserving clean water, energy conservation, solid waste management, and community land stewardship. Then more open-ended questions were asked about land stewardship activities.

Wildlife habitat

Questions 12a to 12k referred to actions that might be beneficial to wild fish, birds, and animals. Specific questions were asked about different categories of habitat protection and restoration. Table 11 summarizes these responses.

Landholder contact seems to have been quite effective in changing the relationship of landholders to vegetation: 67% removed invasive plants, 38% planted native species, 33% changed forestry practices, 21% changed farming practices, and 10% changed cosmetic gardening practices. 13% reported reduced pesticide use; 2% reported increased pesticide use. Most participants reported reducing pesticide use prior to the site visit.

Most of the planting involved trees, native shrubs and grasses, riparian planting, and hedgerows. Invasive species removal mostly focused on scotch broom and blackberries. There was no assessment of the extent of these activities.

Table 11. Actions on behalf of wildlife habitat (questions 12a – 12k)

Question and topic	Number taking action	Number taking specific actions
12a. planting	34 (38%) reported planting native vegetation.	19 planted trees 15 planted native shrubs/grasses 6 did riparian planting 4 planted hedgerows 4 refrained from removing native vegetation
12b & 12c. harmful invasive plants	60 (67%) reported removing or controlling harmful invasive plants	49 removed scotch broom 17 blackberries 8 thistle 4 english ivy 3 daphne 2 japanese knotweed 2 morning glory 2 gorse 1 reed canary grass, dock, nettle, rosebush, salmonberry, pea, wild carrot, bracken fern, laburnum
12d & 12e. Gorse information	17 (19%) were aware of the CVRD hotline on gorse identification 43 (48%) would like more information about gorse identification	
12f, 12g. & 12h. Forestry and farming practices	2/6 (33%) with managed forest changed forestry practices 7/33 (21%) with farms or hobby farms changed ecological practices (14 others reported changes unrelated to stewardship)	8 planting native plants 4 more organic (less chemical fertilizers and pesticides) 3 fencing near creeks 1 reported using more pesticides
12i & 12j. Cosmetic gardening	22 (25%) reported changing practices 9/22 (41%) were related to stewardship, the rest were cosmetic changes	4 planting for erosion control 3 planting native plants 2 restoring damaged areas
12k. Pesticides	12 (13%) reported reduced pesticide use 2(2%) reported increased pesticide use	Most of the remaining 85% reported reducing pesticide use prior to the project.

Water quality and conservation

Responses related to water conservation and water quality are summarized in Table 12. 44% reported taking measures to conserve water, 20% had taken steps to reduce runoff, 25% had begun collecting rainwater.

Erosion control, especially along streams and shorelines, was important to many landholders. 25% had taken steps to control erosion. 22% of waterfront landholders had taken specific steps to protect shorelines.

Concerns about water pollution, beyond the effects of erosion, were demonstrated by 27% of landholders who reported changing to less harmful household chemicals. Smaller numbers had reduced chemical fertilizer use (11%) and pesticides (6%). One individual reported an increase in pesticide use.

Table 12. Actions on behalf of water (questions 13a – 13i)

Question and topic	Number taking action	Specific actions
13a & 13b. water conservation	39 (44%) reported water conservation measures	18 described general efforts to conserve water 7 installed drip irrigation systems 6 installed low-water toilets or low-flow showers 5 created ponds 4 installed rainwater collection systems/barrels 2 installed water recycling systems 2 increased mulching 1 described political advocacy
13c & 13d. Runoff reduction and rainwater collection	18 (20%) had taken steps to reduce runoff 22 (25%) had taken steps to collect rainwater	
13e. Erosion control	22 (25%) had taken steps to control erosion	
13f, 13g, & 13h. Water pollution	5 (6%) reduced pesticide use 1 (1%) increased use	
13g. Water pollution -- herbicides	7 (8%) reduced herbicide use	
13h. Water pollution – chemical fertilizers	10 (11%) reduced chemical fertilizer use	
13i. Water pollution – household chemicals	24 (27%) changed to less harmful household chemicals	
13j. Shoreline and riparian protection	14/65 (22%) waterfront owners reported specific actions to protect shorelines	

Energy conservation

Table 13 shows responses to questions about energy conservation. Of the landholders who had replaced their vehicle since the stewardship visit, 62% had switched to a more fuel-efficient vehicle while 16% had shifted to a less efficient vehicle. Since the visit, 17% had upgraded their home heating system, 39% had improved home insulation, and 65% had upgraded one or more household appliances to a more energy-efficient model.

Table 13. Energy conservation (questions 14a – 14g)

Question and topic	Number taking action	Specific actions
14a & 14b. Vehicle replacement	56 (63%) had replaced a vehicle since the stewardship visit.	35 (62%) purchased a vehicle that was more fuel-efficient 12 (21%) purchased a vehicle that was equally fuel-efficient 9 (16%) purchased a vehicle that was less fuel-efficient
14c. Heating and cooling	15 (17%) had upgraded their heating or cooling systems	
14d. Insulation	35 (39%) had improved home insulation	
14e. Machinery	22 (25%) had upgraded other machinery	
14f. One Tonne Challenge	2 (2%) had taken the One Tonne Challenge	
14g. Appliances	58 (65%) had upgraded one or more household appliances	

Solid waste management

Table 14 shows that landholders demonstrated very high rates of environmentally-friendly management of solid waste, partly in response to the stewardship visit and partly in response to municipal and regional initiatives. 44% reported composting, 75% reported conscious waste reduction at the point of purchase, 89% reported an increase in reuse, and 98% reported participating in recycling.

Table 14. Solid waste management (questions 15a – 15d)

Question and topic	Number taking action
15a. Composting	39 (44%)
15b. Waste reduction	67 (75%)
15c. Reuse	79 (89%)
15d. Recycling	87 (98%)

Memberships in conservation organizations

It can be seen from Table 15 that 26% of land stewards had become members of one or more conservation or environmental organizations, with TLC The Land Conservancy of British Columbia and CCLT at the top of the list. With only 8% of land stewards joining CCLT, it was clear that member recruitment was a weak point in the program. This partly resulted from assurances given at the first contact that there was no cost for land stewardship education.

Table 15. Conservation organizations (question 16a)

Organization	Number of memberships
TLC The Land Conservancy of British Columbia	10
Cowichan Community Land Trust	7
Sierra Club	8
Nature Canada (Canadian Nature Federation)	4
TD Canada Trust Friends of the Environment Fund	2
Cowichan Valley Naturalists' Society	2
Greenpeace	2
Nature Conservancy of Canada	2
Somenos Marsh Wildlife Society	2
Georgia Strait Alliance	2
Cowichan Valley Regional District APC or roundtable	2
Other environmental/conservation organizations	18 (1 membership each)
Total with one or more memberships	26 (29%)
Total memberships	61

Effects of the landholder contact program

Table 16 shows the response to the question, "what is the single most important change you have made in your environmentally-significant activities since the stewardship visit?" The most common response (17%) was that they had experienced a change in attitude, values, or understanding. This result is similar to the 25% who reported attitude change is an earlier study (Lawrence, et. al., 2000). 13% reported positive actions to enhance habitat and 13% reported passive changes to conserve habitat. 13% of stewards could not describe a change they had made.

The survey described 24 specific stewardship behaviours. The number of behaviours reported by each land steward were counted and the frequency distribution is shown in Table 17. Only one person failed to report any changes towards better land stewardship. The average land steward reported 8 specific behaviour changes and one super steward reported 22.

Table 16. Most environmentally-significant changes (question 21)

Topic	Number
Changed attitude, understanding, values	15
Enhance wildlife habitat, native plants	12
Do less, leave it alone, refrain from development	12
Increased recycling	7
Water conservation	6
Actions unrelated to CCLT visit	5
Control invasive species	5
Reduced pesticide use	5
Change farming practices	4
Energy conservation	3
More community involvement	2
Stopped burning	1

Table 17. Net number of positive changes in environmentally-significant activities

Number of changes	Number of stewards
0	1
1	2
2	3
3	4
4	3
5	6
6	7
7	15
8	10
9	9
10	11
11	4
12	5
13	3
14	2
15	3

22	1

Conservation campaigns

Table 18 shows the number of stewards contributing to land acquisition campaigns. The CCLT partnership to purchase the Cowichan Garry Oak Preserve was supported by 27% of the land stewards and they reported contributing to a number of other recent campaigns by different land trusts.

Campaign	Number of donors
Cowichan Garry Oak Preserve (CCLT, NCC)	24
Holland Creek Trail (CCLT)	8
Sooke Potholes (TLC)	8
Gowland Range (NCC)	2
Somenos Marsh (SMWS)	2
Wildwood (TLC)	1
Saltspring Island (SIC, TLC)	1
Not specified (NCC, TLC)	2

Plans for the future

Plans for this year and the next few years are shown in Table 19. Many people reported changes unrelated to land stewardship, 14 (16%) reported an intention to engage in further stewardship activities.

Plan	This year	Next few years
Transfer of ownership or occupancy	3	4
Improved farming practices	3	2
Riparian planting	3	4
Invasive removal (blackberry, bamboo)	2	1
Clear ditch, erosion control	2	2
Changes in land use	3	4
Buildings	2	1
Pond	1	0
Cleanup of windfalls	1	0
Conservation covenant	1	0
Water conservation	0	1
Fencing	1	1

Participants were specifically asked about possible future conservation donations. Their responses are shown in Table 20. About 1/3 of land stewards expressed interest in donating land or a conservation covenant.

Question	Number saying 'yes'
17h. Have you considered a conservation covenant or land donation as a way to protect your land into the future?	33
17i. Would you like more information on this?	33
17j. Have you considered a conservation covenant, land donation, or charitable donation to CCLT as a way to reduce your taxes or the taxes on your estate?	14
17k. Would you like more information on this?	38

Other activities

The survey provided an opportunity to ask about topics other than land stewardship and provided some additional information about landowners response to landholder contact programs as well as landowners' response to other environmental initiatives.

CVRD gorse identification hotline

Shortly before the survey was conducted in January 2005, the Cowichan Valley Regional District, in an attempt to map occurrences of gorse in the Cowichan Region, instituted and promoted a gorse identification hotline through contact with the CCLT and members of the Cowichan Valley Naturalist Society. Table 11 shows that 67% of the land stewards reported removing harmful invasive species, 48% said they would like more information about gorse, but only 19% were aware of the CVRD gorse identification hotline.

One-tonne challenge

In the months immediately prior to the survey, the Government of Canada aggressively promoted this effort to implement the Kyoto Protocol through a variety of media, including television ads featuring comedian Rick Mercer. Only 2% of land stewards reported taking the one-tonne challenge.

Charitable giving

Table 21 shows responses to the question about non-conservation charitable giving. In common with other Canadians, land stewards make most donations to health-related charities and social service organizations (Imagine Canada, 2000). In contrast to other Canadians, 61% reported making donations to environmental organizations (the national figure is 2%).

Type of organization	Number of donors
Health, hospital, and illness	65
Conservation and environment	61
Social service, United Way, Salvation Army	41
International development and relief	34
Animal welfare	6
Church and religious organizations	4
Service clubs	3

Evaluation of CCLT and the landholder contact program

Activities in support of land stewardship

One open-ended question asked how CCLT could be more helpful in land stewardship and the results are shown in Table 22. The most commonly mentioned items were printed materials, workshops, and follow-up site visits.

Activity	Number
Printed educational material and newsletters	12
Workshops, talks, and courses	10
Follow-up site visits	9
Volunteers for restoration	3
Talks and presentations to community groups	2
Conservation covenants	2
Environmental farm plan promotion	2
More conservation land acquisitions	2
Talk to neighbours, government, etc.	5

All the landholder contact programs were accompanied and have been followed by a program of workshops and other community events related to land stewardship. The value of these events were measured both with an open-ended question and by presenting a list of topics that have been covered in workshops in the past.

Responses to the open-ended question are shown in Table 23. Gardening for wildlife and organic gardening and pest control were the most frequently mentioned. Other topics included wood-lot management, agri-forestry, clean energy production, conservation covenants, water conservation, septic systems, and invasive plants.

*Table 23. Topics for workshops, talks, and courses
(questions 17d – 17f, open)*

Topic	Number
Gardening for wildlife habitat	10
Organic gardening, farming, pest control	5
Woodlot management, agroforestry	4
Hydroelectric and solar power	4
Conservation covenants	3
Water conservation	3
Septic systems and composting toilets	2
Invasive plants	2
Land claims, general ecology, air quality, erosion	1 each

Responses to the list of topics are shown in Table 24. Native plants, invasive plants and animals, septic systems, wildlife gardening, and water and energy conservation topped the list. This is very similar to the responses to the open-ended questions except for the high level of interest in septic systems. A number of land stewards also expressed interest in conservation covenants, taxes, waste reduction, forestry, alternative chemicals, and land donations.

Table 24. Topics for workshops, talks, and courses (question 17g, prompted)

Topic	Number
Native plants	30
Invasive plants and animals	24
Septic systems	21
Wildlife gardening	19
Water conservation	17
Energy conservation	14
Conservation covenants	8
Inheritance taxes	8
Waste reduction	8
Forestry	6
Alternative chemicals	6
Land donations	5
Alternative power	2
Stream stewardship	1
Taxes	1
Charitable giving	0

Global evaluation of the landholder contact programs

When asked about their over-all view of the program, 60% were very positive, 27% were moderately positive or neutral, and 13% expressed disappointment. These figures are shown in Table 25 and the verbatim responses to this question can be read in Appendix 4.

Comment	Number
Positive responses	53 (60%)
Neutral/moderate comments	24 (27%)
Negative comments	12 (13%)

Responses to a question about the best things in the program are summarized in Table 26 and the verbatim responses are in Appendix 4. The principal benefit of the programs, reported by 30% of the participants, was increased knowledge and understanding of land stewardship issues. 17% of the people felt empowered by feelings of solidarity with other land stewards and by the encouragement provided by CCLT staff. Other positive features were the friendliness of the staff, other CCLT activities, gate plaques, printed material, and the newsletter.

Strength	Number
Increased knowledge and understanding of stewardship issues on land	27
Feelings of solidarity with other land stewards, encouragement of stewardship ethic, empowerment	15
Friendliness and personal qualities of staff	9
CCLT's conservation activities in general	8
Gate plaques	5
Management plan and printed materials	2
Follow-up and newsletter	2

Table 27 lists identified weaknesses with the landholder contact programs. Verbatim responses can be found in Appendix 4. The leading concern (10%) was with poor follow-up. The need for funding and more continuity of staff were also identified. 6% of respondents said they had a poor understanding of CCLT as an organization.

Problem	Number
Poor follow-up	9
CCLT needs more funding	7
Poor understanding of CCLT and board	5
Frequent staff changes	3
Lack of depth or clarity about stewardship	3
Stewardship pledge is threatening	1
Conservation covenants are too complicated	1

DISCUSSION

Changing land ethics

The positive results of the various landholder contact programs were impressive:

- ❑ Many landholders reported changes in attitudes about land stewardship, including a greater understanding of the importance of passive conservation. This is consistent with the results of the earlier study (Lawrance, et. al, 2000).
- ❑ Many landholders reported increased knowledge and understanding of land stewardship issues.
- ❑ Landholders reported a wide range of changes in environmental management practices, especially those related to wildlife habitat.
- ❑ Most landholders reported changes in a number of different areas of environmental stewardship, with the average landholder reporting 8 different changes.
- ❑ Land stewards were much more likely than the general population to join environmental and conservation organizations.
- ❑ Significant numbers of land stewards contributed to land acquisition campaigns.

Landholder contact programs

Public response to the landholder contact programs was mostly very positive. Participants were motivated to care for the natural environment and eager for information about how to do it. They appreciated the work of CCLT and the knowledge gained through the landholder contact program. They responded with a wide range of changes in land use practices.

Concerns were expressed about limited follow-up, both in terms of keeping in touch with the stewards on a regular basis and in terms of viewing the changes they are making. Some respondents mentioned that the very fact of calling them for an interview prompted them to assess their participation in the program and to renew their commitment. In view of the many choices a landholder faces, especially when they live from the land, a more consistent dialogue with CCLT or with other stewards might influence the direction they will take.

While the landholder contact programs were effective in changing a broad range of environmental attitudes and behaviours, they were not very successful in promoting the sponsoring organization, CCLT.

Limitations to the survey

By initially agreeing to participate in a landholder contact program, the rural landholders in this study all showed some predisposition towards environmental responsibility. They subsequently increased their level of commitment by participating in the program and becoming land stewards. Most survey questions asked about changes since the stewardship visit, but it was clear that in many cases responses were biased in either direction as a result of the predisposition towards stewardship or from other factors:

- The participants were generally motivated towards environmentalism, so positive responses may not have been directly due to the landholder contact program.

- Because the questions were about changes since the site visit some negative responses indicating no change may have reflected earlier adoption of ecologically sound practices that were then reinforced by the program. This was especially true in terms of pesticide reduction and composting. A good number of respondents mentioned that they had already reduced their pesticide use or started composting prior to contact with CCLT.
- In the area of household energy conservation, many of the changes (insulation, replacing appliances) depended on the age of the building and the need for renovations or replacement. This was not accounted for in the phrasing of the questions.
- The questionnaire did not seek to quantify responses, so planting native plants can mean 2 or 3 plants or 2 or 3 hectares.

Site Visits

Nine landowners were visited during this project. Of the nine site visits, six were farmers, which added another dimension to their land stewardship as they were attempting to balance the economic realities of small lot agriculture with the desire to protect their natural areas. For example, three allowed grazing in natural areas but also had areas which were fenced off to livestock such as riparian zones, coniferous forest and some deciduous forested areas including Garry oak meadows. These issues did not come up as explicitly during the interview as they did during the site visits.

For example, one landowner who is committed to being a steward on her land had recently created an irrigation pond that she was hoping would attract more wildlife. While this landowner has a genuine interest in wildlife and in protecting the surrounding forest the pond has not enhanced the natural areas and is solely a practical agricultural use of the property. In this case and in many of the other farm site visits agricultural necessities seemed to be a priority and much could have been done to satisfy both the ecological and the agricultural values if planned more carefully.

From these site visits it has become clear that more needs to be done to assist land stewards who operate small agricultural holdings with their land use decisions. Programs that support smaller agricultural producers who are committed to stewardship need to be supported and made available. The Conservation Partners Program developed by the Land Conservancy of BC is one program that helps agricultural land stewards. By marketing their produce as a member of the 'Conservation Partners' agricultural stewards have a greater opportunity to seek support and assistance to develop more ecologically sound agricultural practices and have their products recognized in the marketplace as such.

Another aspect of stewardship that was brought forward during site visits were restoration or enhancement projects. All visited landowners were asked what areas they had concerns with and what areas of their property had changed during their time as stewards. Many of the site visited landowner's had not made many changes but were very interested in how to enhance natural areas with native plantings. Many landowners had plans to remove broom and other invasive plants as well or to protect an area of forest or Garry oak meadow from grazing. The Naturescape program was often referred to by project staff in response to these queries. The interest in this program was high amongst the landowners visited and much could be accomplished to enhance existing habitat with a targeted program to educate landowners about naturoscaping.

All of the site visited landowners saw their contribution to land stewardship as essential but also saw their natural areas being negatively impacted from activities beyond their control such as encroaching development and tree removal. For some, these negative impacts have increased their costs and increased their interest and active involvement within their community to try to reduce or prevent further threats to their natural areas. One landowner expressed extreme frustration with the lack of financial support available to stewards who would like to protect their riparian habitat. More assistance to landowners undertaking restoration work would be another area that would produce positive habitat gains.

Finally, long-term support for stewards was a request echoed by all landowners visited and it was suggested on some of the site visits that providing an opportunity for continued discussion among stewards might help create a bank of experience and shared knowledge.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For CCLT and other organizations doing landholder contact programs

- ❑ Provide more effective and consistent follow-up to the original site visit.
- ❑ Continue to provide printed material, the newsletter, and educational events
- ❑ Be more assertive in seeking memberships and donations to the sponsoring organization

For funding and policy bodies concerned with environmental stewardship

- ❑ Fund landholder contact programs on an ongoing basis or, at least, for several years at a time so that the implementing organization can have the continuity to provide effective follow-up and ongoing support for good land stewardship.
- ❑ Consider landholder contact programs as more effective vehicles for changing environmental behaviour and providing public education than either household mailing or mass media campaigns.

REFERENCES

- Andreasen, A.R. (1995). *Marketing Social Change: Changing behavior to promote health, social development, and the environment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cowan, S., Wilson, C., & Austin, B. (1998). *Caring for Our Shores: A handbook for coastal landowners in the Strait of Georgia*. Duncan: Cowichan Community Land Trust and the Marine Ecology Station.
- Dietz, T., & Stern, P.C. (2002). *New Tools for Environmental Protection: Education, Information, and Voluntary Measures*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Duynstee, T. (1997). *Landowner Contact Guide for British Columbia*. Victoria, BC : Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks.
- Gardner, G.T., & Stern, P.T. (2002). *Environmental Problems and Human Behavior, 2nd Edition*. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Hillyer, A., & Atkins, J. (2005) *Greening your Title: A guide to best practices for conservation covenants, second edition*. Vancouver: West Coast Environmental Law Research Foundation. (available at www.wcel.org)
- Hilts, S., Moull, J., Razadki, J., and Van Patter, M. (1991). *Natural Heritage Landowner Contact Training Manual*. Guelph, ON: The Natural Heritage League, University of Guelph.
- Imagine Canada, (2000) *National Survey on Giving, Volunteering and Participating, 2000*. Retrieved from www.givingandvolunteering.ca, April 15, 2005.
- Lawrance, R., Littley, S., & Scull, J. (2000). Three landholder contact programs in British Columbia. Paper presented at *Caring for our Land: Stewardship and Conservation in Canada*. University of Guelph, June 4, 2000, and *8th International Symposium on Society and Natural Resource Management*, Western Washington University, June 19, 2000. (available at www.landtrustalliance.bc.ca)
- McKenzie-Mohr, D., & Smith, W. (1999). *Fostering Sustainable Behavior*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Stewardship Pledge

THE COWICHAN COMMUNITY LAND TRUST SOCIETY

The Stewardship Pledge

This pledge is a voluntary commitment of landholders to:

1. Conserve the natural elements in the area and be sensitive to the wildlife (both plants and animals) that live there.
2. Encourage a diversity of native plants and animals, especially those that are rare and threatened, where possible.
3. If transferring your property, notify the new landholder(s) or manager(s) to encourage continued Stewardship.

Signed: _____
(Land Steward)

Date: _____

The strength of this pledge rests on the landowner's personal commitment to conservation*

*This is not a legally binding agreement. By signing this pledge you are recognized as a Land Steward by the CCLT.

Appendix 2. Letters to land stewards

Dear

The Cowichan Community Land Trust (CCLT) has been promoting conservation in the Cowichan Valley for more than 10 years. As we celebrate our 10th anniversary we are contacting landowners that have participated in one of our many land stewardship programs to help us evaluate our past work and improve our work in the future. You may recall that you were visited by members of our staff to learn to care for your land in ways that are friendlier to nature, wildlife, and the future of our beautiful valley.

In the next few days our new stewardship representative, François Cormier, will be calling to arrange a telephone interview, at your convenience, regarding your participation in our earlier land stewardship education programs and other topics related to conservation. Your responses and all personal information will remain confidential.

Please make yourself available for an interview. The time and energy you have dedicated to land stewardship is greatly appreciated and we want to learn how we can best support you and other landowners in the future.

Thank you for your efforts to help protect the natural beauty and ecological integrity of the Cowichan Valley. If you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to contact François, Ann Archibald or myself at 746-0227.

Sincerely,

John Scull,
Secretary

Appendix 3. Telephone Interview Protocol

Before we start I would like to mention that everything you say will be held in confidence. The results of this survey will be grouped together for their analysis. Your name will not be attached to your answers unless you have requested more information. The goal of the questionnaire is to assess the effectiveness of all aspects of the CCLT stewardship and education programs.

First we want to briefly review your contact with CCLT in [date]? [This is an open question to refresh their memory and assess their degree of participation in the project]

1. Do you remember the site visit? [Y/N]
2. In your view, what was the visit about? [Open end]
3. Was there a follow up after the site visit? [Y/N]
4. Did you receive any printed material? [Y/N]
- 4a. Did you receive a copy of Caring for Our Shores? [Y?N]
5. Did you have a management plan? [Y/N]
6. After the site visit ,did you attend any workshops, courses, or meetings? [Y/N]
7. Did you attend a Stewardship recognition ceremony? [Y/N]
8. Did you take a Stewardship pledge? [Y/N]
9. Did you receive a gate plaque or certificate? [plaque/certificate/none]

10a. I'm going to read you a list of possible ways of using the land. I would like you to tell me which one you consider the main use....,

10b. ... and then any additional uses in order of importance. [List]

1. residential
2. hobby farm/garden
3. forest management
4. farm
5. industrial/business
6. natural/untouched
7. recreational

11a. Now I'm going to read you a list of possible Ecological features. Please tell me which ones are represented on your land

1. wetland
2. stream
3. bluffs
4. lake shoreline
5. estuary shoreline
6. ocean shoreline
7. river shoreline

11b. [If yes to ocean shoreline, ask: Did you receive a copy of *Caring for our Shore*?

11c. Do you still use this book?

11d. special features [open question-specify]

Keeping in mind the stewardship and education programs, we would like to ask about changes in your land use practices since your first contact with CCLT

12. The first area we are going to look at is: wildlife

In the following list of activities, which one did you engage in or attempt to change on your land?

- a. planting native plants, hedgerows, riparian planting, trees, etc.? [read list] record specific actions
- b. removing harmful invasive species? [Y/N]
- c. if so, which ones?
- d. are you aware of the CVRD hotline for Gorse identification? [Y/N]
- e. Would you like to receive information on Gorse identification? [Y/N]
- f. logging practices? [Y/N/ n/a]
- g. farming/gardening practices? [Y/N/ n/a]
- h. if so, in what ways? [open end]
- i. tidying, lawns, cosmetic landscaping? [Y/N/ n/a]
- j. if so, in what ways? [open end]
- k. pesticides and herbicides - increased, reduced, switched to less harmful, eliminated or not changed [list]

13. The next area we are going to look at is: water

In the following list of activities, which one did you engage in or attempt to change on your land?

- a. water conservation [Y/N]
- b. what steps did you take? [open end]
- c. reducing runoff and impermeable surfaces [Y/N]
- d. rainwater collection [Y/N]
- e. managing erosion [Y/N]
- f. reduce pesticide use [Y/N]
- g. reduce herbicide use [Y/N]
- h. reduce fertilizer use [Y/N]
- i. reduce the use of harmful cleaning products and other chemicals [Y/N]
- j. shoreline or riparian protection [Y/N n/a]

14. The next area we are going to look at is: energy

- a. Since [date] have you replaced your vehicle? [Y/N]
- b. Is your new vehicle more or less fuel-efficient? [more/less/same]
- c. did you change your home heating/cooling system? [Y/N]
- d. have you improved home insulation or draft proofing? [Y/N]
- e. did you change other machinery (tractors, mowers, outboards, etc.)? [Y/N]
- f. did you take the one-tonne challenge recently advertised by the federal government? [Y/N]
- g. did you purchase energy efficient appliances (energuide)? [Y/N]

15. The next area we are going to look at is: waste management

- a. Have you started or increased Composting since [date]? [Y/N]
- b. Do you practice waste reduction at the time of purchase at the store, i.e. buying items with less packaging? [Y/N]
- c. How about reusing items? [Y/N]
- d. Do you recycle?[Y/N]

16. Now we want to ask you about your involvement in community stewardship

- a. What environmental organizations have you joined since [date]?
(CCLT, CVNS, TLC, NCC, DU, TNT, Sierra, WCWC, CPAWS, GSA, Fish and Game, Streamkeepers, other) [open end]
- b. Did you contribute to the campaign to purchase South Winchelsea Island? [Y/N]
- c. Did you contribute to the campaign to purchase the Garry Oak Preserve on Maple Bay Road? [Y/N]
- d. Did you contribute to the campaign to purchase the Holland Creek Trail? [Y/N]
- e. Have you contributed to other land acquisition or conservation efforts? [Y/N]
- f. What other charities do you regularly support? [open end]

17. Now we would like to ask about your vision of land stewardship in the future

- a. Do you plan specific changes to your land this year? [open end?]
- b. How about in the next few years? [open end?]
- c. How can CCLT help you be a more effective land steward? [open end]
- d. Are there subjects in which you would like us to provide workshops? [open end]
- e. Courses? [open end]
- f. or consultation? [open end]
- g. What about wildlife gardening, forestry, native plants, invasive plants and animals, waste reduction, land donations, conservation covenants, charitable giving, inheritance taxes, energy conservation, water conservation, alternative chemicals, septic systems [open end]
- h. Have you considered a conservation covenant or land donation as a way to protect your land into the future? [Y/N]
- i. Would you like more information about this? [Y/N]
- j. Have you considered a conservation covenant, land donation, or charitable donation to CCLT as a way to reduce your taxes or the taxes on your estate? [Y/N]
- k. Would you like more information on this? [Y/N]

18. Finally, what was your over-all view of the Landholder contact program?

19. What was the best thing about it?

20. What problems/weaknesses did you see?

21. What is the single most important change you have made in your environmentally-significant activities since [date]?

Appendix 4. Verbatim responses to open questions

<i>Question 18. What was your over-all view of the Landholder contact program? (responses sorted by expressed attitude)</i>
53 Positive responses (60%)
a very positive experience for us, very helpful, about where we find ourselves, enjoyed the people that we met, they were friendly
any program that enables people to look after the land and animals is a wonderful benefit to anybody, we have to be committed, to any kind of care
appreciate receiving the newsletter. I thought the visit was great, but I would have liked to get a written report or evaluation, I would enjoy having some other contact, like what you are doing now, making me think about some things. I love the plaque
been very good, I can appreciate that the society is dependent on the resources available
doing an excellent job
excellent, provided info I need at the time, opened the avenue to do that in future
fine, I know their funding is not that great, but very good, ongoing programs are great, hearing about things that are going on,
good, they looked at the land, talked about it, provided more education
great, totally non intrusive, we can engage to whatever degree we are comfortable with, I wish I had more time to be involved.
I appreciated the info and the fact that they are caring about what nature is, not to try to make everything to fit the pretty, not all manicured. They understand the value of creatures
I enjoyed it, but I would have liked to get a report to see what they thought even though I understood what she was saying
I find it's informative, it keeps your eyes open
I had a positive opinion about it (did not elaborate)
I realize that people are volunteers, I congratulate them on their time and effort, they do as good a job as they can. They are enthusiastic and dedicated.
I suppose, it's reassuring that there is interest in the welfare of the land, it gives one peace of mind, to know that it is not left to the wiles of the powers that be
I think it's pretty good, I get the newsletter, it helps me decide what I want to take part in
I thought it was good for me and a lot of other people. They identified native plants, ferns, mosses for me
I thought it was rather nice
I thought the person was very knowledgeable, the results were favorable.
it is good idea, the more people that realize what needs to be done, the better
it was a good idea, to provide people with a forum, a way of getting information: on ways to develop the property in less harmful ways and to preserve the character of the area
it was done very well, can't specify
it was good in my case, it provided me with education regarding my stream, stopped me from doing something silly I should not have been doing.
it was good, I was surprised it even happened, the fisheries people came before and it didn't seem too successful
it was good, interesting. It was a long time ago
it was great, I liked the young woman that came, very knowledgeable, she could see things we didn't see, very informative

it was nice to meet people with some more ideas and lots of energy!
it was pretty nice, they gave a good rating on what we were doing, happy with how we were doing things
it WAS very good, with emphasis on WAS. There was a lot of energy on stewards at first, have gone more or cleaning rivers and estuary now. Would like more practical features in the newsletter, on invasive species. Like to know who the other stewards are.
it was very good. It's up to us to make more use of it. Very friendly and kind.
it was very pleasant, very nice people, we were born here, we have seen a big change in terms of development, and are relieved that we have this group here now.
it's a good idea, the whole premise of it, to preserve significant parts of the land, like the Garry oak preserve
it's outstanding, I wish I had more time to be involved in the workshops. I feel the neighborhood has benefited from that. Our group is very protective of the area
pretty good, she came by several times, we had good conversations
pretty good, the people that came were informative, were able to identify plants
quite positive, awareness mostly, made the stewards quite aware. About the stream habitat. A lot of farmers were having their cattle go down in the streams, that is a big no no, we did quite a bit in raising awareness there
real good idea, informative for the people that joined, especially in this day and age, we have to look after the land more than we have, to keep it for our children, and children's children
there were several people that came and see me at first. But I haven't seen anyone since the last contact in 98.
they are doing a good job
they are doing very good work
they did a good job, they came and looked and talked, and gave information
they do a very good job, necessary organization to have. They work well with students
they were awesome, we wanted to know if we were doing all right and they said yes
they were supportive. I hope to have other ideas of how we can progress the maintenance of the Cowichan river
those young people are doing a good thing, I'm glad they are trying , I'm disabled so I'm beyond that now, but they are capable to work on saving what's left of mother earth
very good thing, our neighbors could benefit from this information
very good, we referred other people to it. When stream keepers came, they were very thorough, they did a very good job
was alright, had nice things to say
was very good, we basically leave things as they were, so there was not much they could provide except to say if were doing things right
we were quite pleased with the info they gave, their response, they came quite quickly
we were very pleased, they were very knowledgeable , able to answer our questions very well
wonderful, they do a terrific job, I wish I had more time to do more than I do
it was excellent the first 3 or 4 years, maybe I lost interest, or got busy, lost that contact. They do a great job.
24 Neutral responses (27%)
we had no contact until last year
did not have much contact since the site visit. But I would be interested to have you come out again and see what I do.

good idea, but as far as I concerned we seem to have pushed all the buttons necessary.
good program, but for me personally it didn't do anything, I got a pretty good grasp on things. It's hard for organisations like organic orgs that want to tell you how to do things, to let you be
good program, I know it's hard to have a follow up. the people have an understanding of issues
haven't followed enough to be able to give an intelligent response
I don't have a view on it, not really aware of what is being done. Do receive the newsletter, but it does not have a lot of information, and only comes once a year
I found it faded out over the years, I got the odd newsletter, but nobody made personal contact in a long time
I receive the newsletter, but like all newsletters, it's pretty boring, never been anything in it to entice me to a meeting
I think it's done by people who have a genuine interest, but I don't like to be organized by anybody, and I'm not going to go out of my way. We do what we can.
I thought it was good, if we hadn't known as much as we know, would have been useful
I wonder if there might be more education on that with people, to get people aware, grouping with other organisations to disseminate information, to stay in the press and the public eye. Water is a big item right now like the Cowichan river and aquifers
in the beginning it was interesting, but because it wasn't kept up after Mark Turner it wasn't as interesting to us
initially it was a bit vague, just getting their feet wet, there had been really good work done in Victoria, for the Garry oaks. But I didn't know about a couple of projects here, like Holland creek
it was brief, interesting, but I would like more information after the fact
It was minimal contact with us, more could have been provided in the past. Keeping us informed of steps taken by other individuals trying to protect their property in relation to gov't regulations
it's a bit distant because we're in another community. And my husband is more tied to the land in the Cowichan valley than I am.
that sort of came suprisingly, they phoned me up one day about visiting owners of creekside property
they mean well, but I didn't get involved with it, I'm not a joiner
they seemed to be quite satisfied with the way we are doing
very little impact on my life, this is the first contact since the original contact we had
was all right, didn't give me much new information, the info that I needed was not available at the land trust, had no expert in that field: rotation of animals, pasture management
we didn't want to be too involved with it, no real benefit to us. Lots that could have been done to slow the amount of flooding that we had, but never was done. I was hoping there would be some attempt to clean the stream, there was no flow in it
would like to know about the feasibility of land covenants in the long term, there was no follow up after the initial visit
12 Negative responses (13%)
don't know, didn't attend any of those things or read anything
I didn't find it particularly useful, I don't think that the people that came understood what my plans were,
I didn't think much of it, we only touched fleetingly on it
I don't know
I don't know anything about it
n/a
n/a

n/a, he contacted CCLT, not aware of the programs
not fully aware of it. Objectives were very good. I thought I would actively support it. But on discussing it with my daughters who live on it, I came to the conclusion that their objectives were the same as the trust so they wanted nothing to do with it
really wasn't something I wanted to get into.
they keep sending me these letter, but I never asked them to.
We were interested in preservation of the creek, but got discouraged after the letters we wrote to the government about the creek failed

<i>Question 19. What was the best thing about it?</i>
the friendliness and knowledge; background knowledge on land use and plants
relieved to know I wasn't the only person that believes in nature. My heart is in conservation.
important thing, to understand the need to have a green belt. To have the sign as a reminder that I have a responsibility. I see it everyday.
starting the society , and following through with visits
the whole business of being a steward, what it means to be a steward
it educated me about the Garry oaks, going over native flowers, because of that I've left a wild meadow in the back of my property, for the flowers and wildlife
the information provided, to do with where our property's situation in regards to the marsh,
the knowledge I got. Learning about the shoreline wildlife, to look for it.
if we have anything regarding the problems that arise they are willing to talk about it and do things. I still read the management plan and give it to the kids to read too
brings knowledge and new ideas on how to deal with common problems, we only see our own property, but the people involved have an opportunity to see many places and bring new ideas. All four people running the CCLT have been very personable and helpful
the idea that there is a rising awareness in all communities on the island on stewardship and the limited resource that the land is. We have to be careful with it
good staff, informative without bullying or being invasive
the information, that I could phone somebody if I wasn't sure about something, to talk about it
raising public awareness, I notice the plaques, I hear people talk about them
gives the landowner a bit of connection to the wider community in a positive way, made us feel proud that we are part of it.
I was really appreciative that they helped me get rid of all the metal scrap and junk I pulled out of the creek. I suppose I will have more to pull after the water goes down again later on.
the awareness factor, bringing awareness to the attention of stewards
it helps protect people's home and their land
the awareness, raising people's awareness of the land, accentuating the natural habitat
nothing since there was no contact
that they were able to identify plants and problem areas, like runoff, trees needing pruning
the very fact that they were interested in any of us that were making an effort
they helped me, I was grateful they walked around with me and increased my awareness of plants and characteristics of the place
it is constant reminder, we all forget about things or let them slide. Even this phone call is like 'oh yeah'...
having a walkabout with a biologist, and the assessment and package we received

the sign on the gate, people coming to the farm commented on that, it is an opportunity for education
it brought up my awareness about the creeks, keeping a respectful distance from the creek when doing things
they're doing a pretty good job
they were interested in how the land was taken care of
don't know, it didn't hit on anything we hadn't thought of
brings people awareness, educating the general population to the situation of landholders
information they provided initially . Ability to recommend things, to tell us how to protect the land,
the plaque was neat
the people, your human resources, their willingness to come out. Their knowledge, they are prepared to research, friendly, polite
sure they're doing a good job. But I'm not interested, it's not my thing
the newsletter: layout, notice of events. And having access to somebody who could introduce me to things
gave me all of these things that I could talk about, when people tell me I should do this or that I can tell them no, I keep them because they are useful. It gives you power. Also you don't bug me. I know you are there if I need you.
the fact that it is there trying to be useful
I can't say they did anything for me or me for them
the visit was useful, information is helpful to the environment, pointed out aspects that I may not have seen myself
helped me show more concern, regarding the septic systems, sewers
the land that you are setting aside and protecting,
face to face contact, the site visit, to see the lay of the land, pointed out some thing we were doing
success!, the energy put into, for example the Garry oak preserve
her explaining some of the plants to me
the preservation of the creek
the fact that someone else was interested, helping identify the native plants other than the obvious ones
with the visit of your officers, it was helpful and encouraging
the people who contacted me were personable, not aggressive, they made the visit a pleasure
assuring us we were on the right path in terms of preserving things
they were very personable
information that they provide, they try to look at things from the broader perspective, like looking at the whole watershed instead of just our bits of creeks
knowing that the opinion of the area was good, except for the bamboo
made a lot of people aware of alternates and conservation
CCLT wants to stop the land from getting razed and clear-cut, and developed
that you try and do it at all is a good thing
awareness, young parents and some older people that hadn't thought of things, for example beneficial insects
do not know enough to say
having someone come out and be available to our questions, with some knowledge
gives the landowner an idea that there is a group that cares
the fact that there is young people, they are going to be in it for a long time and see what is needed.
to preserve the land the way it is, especially about the creeks

a way for us to act on our commitment for environmental health and wholeness
 the plaque, it's a visible acknowledgement about the fact that we try to maintain good practices
 identification of particular native plants and wildflowers, they knew them all
 very prompt, relaxing, fun, interesting because I had never walked through the woods with a person that had the knowledge. About all the plants
 the river clean up, the people around the valley love the river but there is also a lot of garbage. The clean up party was the best and most high profile thing they did in the community
 they did respond when I asked
 to me they came quite quickly, were knowledgeable and effective
 they filled me in on the invasive species, some I was not aware of
 we got asked opinions ,we actually had contact, finally contacted
 they were happy with how we were doing things
 not able to say

Question 20. What problems/weaknesses did you see?

I'm worried about people on the board, that they would get tired, need more people to be involved
 if you had more funding, to be able to do far more. Being more out there, a stronger voice for caring for our environment.
 like with most things, problems with funding. There is not the follow through that there used to be, not the same contact.
 It definitely has some strengths, like when they were able to acquire and protect the Garry oak preserve.
 starting projects but lacking the funds to go on with them, to follow up.
 I never have a good sense of where the deliberation of the board is trying to take the CCLT, never clear whether the board is larger or stronger than one or two people, I don't know what the process is to select the board members
 it is most beneficial for those living in the community. More difficult to feel part of it when living in another community.
 this is first time there is a follow up aside from newsletter, there was no other follow up. just touching base, we need more contact is some way other than the AGM, like a picnic, social event that forges connection between stewards
 the fact that a lot of them did not become members of the land trust, did not take more interest. That was important to me
 the education of people that are there, it's not necessarily the fault of the organization, but make sure people are well educated
 that there was no contact since the original contact. My wife actually pursued them.
 lack of continuity, have to spend time fundraising, 60% goes into maintaining the crew on board, people are very sincere but what they can do is limited
 I'm not connected closely enough to see any
 it skimmed the surface, there wasn't the personnel power to delve into things more deeply
 they could do more about making sure that streams are flowing
 if they had more funding they could do more
 can't say that the program was outlined to me other than trying to conserve the creek
 wouldn't know, don't know enough about it
 I'm not close enough to know
 there is a lot of personnel change over, things get lost after a while, ideas get lost

I had nothing to compare it to, had no expectations
it's small group of people running, the rest of people don't have a say in it except contributing money.
the only thing was we were still leery about signing the stewardship because we didn't know what it would do to the value of the land. We were leery about it
the hope we might have more resources to deal with problems, instead of making do with what is available
some follow up, I guess it depends on funding, problem with continuity, people come and go
too much red tape and bureaucracy about the covenant, too many permits needed, so I preferred the voluntary system and do things by myself
I would have been more enthusiastic if they hadn't left me hanging
the turn over in people, not enough communication in your group, between old and new staff. We haven't seen anyone a while
they should be getting more gov't funding. The government always gives funds to the loud voices instead of the small people.
not enough follow up afterwards, we only saw them once, and got the plaque. Unfortunately we were both working full time, but we didn't know if they came again after if they didn't leave a message
communication, which is a weakness that we all have given the volume, ongoing to our community from the program, so it can be augmented
the one thing would be that the kids that came out, it felt like we know as much or more than they did, doing a tour instead of getting info from them
it was more vague than I thought, I expected it to be more formal, to get a report or suggestions
it was hard to know how to get involved if I didn't want any help. I guess I didn't ask enough questions to get involved. We told them they could use our farm as a teaching ground.
they can only spread themselves so thick on the ground
never got back to me about the question I had about the unidentified shrub
we would like to save the land, but the expense would be too high, if we put a covenant, and we have to sell, does it raise the price or reduce the price?

Question 21. What is the single most important change you have made in your environmentally-significant activities since the visit?

water buffalo farming, utilizes the forage that grows here naturally, they are considered the basis of sustainable agriculture.
felt more supported in my belief, when confronted with my neighbor, that trees have value. More determined that my land be in keeping with the need of animals.
going to organic gardening, when deciding what to grow, it was the right thing to do.
removing invasive species, the site visit was like a curse because I wasn't aware of all the invasive grass!
my own awareness, trying to protect the natural environment that I have here, looking after the wildlife, even the deer. I have left a path for them to go through.
Consciousness of the wilder parts of our property, the species we had, that we were not aware of. We are more careful, more respectful, we don't pick the wildflowers anymore.
I've become a lazier gardener. I let nature follow it's course . I let the wild-berries grow to provide food for the birds, let the native plants take over in the garden.
a better understanding and recognition of the stewardship of a property. More in terms of trying to make it a better piece of property for the future, improving it's balance.
thinking more about what I do, more aware

more aware than I was before, building birdhouses for the birds, and for wild bees.
Don't know if CCLT changed anything, but as result of climate change, I am more water conscious
eliminating the broom. That means a lot to me. I hate it, The animals hate it. They can't feed on it.
getting rid of the garbage in the creek
joining the land trust, and the naturalists, to become more aware of what goes in the valley
pest control, finding an environmental way to do pest control, something has to be done about it
more awareness of what is natural vegetation and what is not,
water course improvement, there used to be a year round creek that was filled in by the previous owner.
We opened up the stream course and created a pond.
less water use, not clearing everything away, leaving some habitat for animals.
the biggest difference, taking the fences down and turning the fields into gardens and lawns after I gave up the animals
Trying to become more self-sufficient in terms of food production, going more into plant production instead of animal production, such as fruit and nuts
I don't think I made any, except I am more aware of what I do. I resisted the urge of getting a bulldozer and raze the whole bloody mess!
Trying to be aware of what is happening on the property, watching for run off and the stream, bringing the bees. Everyday management, and knowing who to contact.
For myself, it was our APC that recommended that recycling move in cobble hill. And in terms of our land, to leave it alone, to make it so we don't impact it.
Pasture rotation, it enables you to have parasite free sheep, reduces the need to buy so much hay.
Giving up commercial farming on a large scale, that probably took forty tons of fertilizers out of the valley
I like to keep things up, like the blue orchard bees, attend the seedy Saturdays
being more conservative with water, and using energy efficient light bulbs
increasing the salmon habitat, the number of salmon in the habitat
being environmentally conscious on how we deal with things on our land
I recycle a lot, more than I used to.
my interest in the orchard bee. I was concerned after the Gov. sprayed in the area. We're losing the ability to pollinate the trees, because we're losing wildflowers to development. We may end up like California where they hire men to pollinate the trees.
We have always been very aware of the environment since we live here. We do the best we can, aware of wildlife. But I want to be able to do what I like on my land.
preserving this 100 acres as parkland
getting a pretty sophisticated solar power system in the house.. My son installed a new inverter that is much more efficient.
I haven't cleared some trees that I might have otherwise.
trying to use the land without harming it.
can't say that I have done anything significant other than keeping this land untouched.
recycling, and keeping our creek as natural as we can without any interference.
not done anything different, all I try to do is to keep it tidy . I don't have any money to do anything
the recycling
just in a general sense, it is easier to get to recycle stuff and get rid of used oil, and things like that.
using less water and pesticides, recycling
watch what we put in the septic system , had it cleaned out to make it more efficient
Establishing wildlife habitat, to counteract what human activity does, I maintain native plants and

brush piles for wildlife
getting the mason bees, putting more birdhouses
in 95 I went up to the Mackenzie and managed the tree planting project there
home insulation, energy cuts at home.
we re-roofed the house, that will contribute to having less rain water inside and that will affect the heating as well.
had nothing to do with our contact with CCLT, but we changed our washer and dryer, use less water because we lost our well
we reduced our water consumption.
Reduced use of pesticides.
we've always been environmentally aware. I'm getting a little old to make many changes. But we are more aware of the need for conservation, with Kyoto and all that.
not major changes, I was into this before hand, but I try to use more native plants and flowers
I kept the land as it was when I bought it which is a change in itself since most land today is getting transformed.
more aware of what sustains wildlife including fish habitat, and land uses.
letting things go back to their natural state
I used to burn my way through everything but I haven't burnt anything for years now, I let it rot instead and try to educate my neighbor to do the same
Drastically cut down the amount of water we use, don't use pesticides if not environmentally friendly and biodegradable
Established a fence line along the riparian area to reduce invasive species such as teenagers, who affected the stream greatly
Don't know that we have changed anything, more an awareness of the impact of what we are doing
the destruction of invasive plants, we have done a lot more since our contact
the worry level went right down, so we haven't taken any drastic action, we thought that there would have been lots to do but found out we were doing well, that it was better to leave the land alone
keeping in mind the long range impact of our presence on this parcel of land.
just attending to the Japanese knotweed, tried very hard to eradicate it
to be honest we haven't really done a change, but we have always been conscious of the land. We planted trees.
making sure we recycle everything