

**Funding Solutions Survey: A Look at the
Financial Stability of Stewardship and
Environmental Organizations in British Columbia**

**Final Report
June 2004**

Funding Solutions Committee
An ad hoc group of environmental organizations in B.C.

Acknowledgements

The Funding Solutions Committee consists of an ad hoc group of organizations and government representatives from across B.C. The committee is open and more groups join as they become interested and involved. The purpose of the committee is to address the funding situation of non-government environmental organizations in B.C. This is being accomplished through ongoing discussion by email, conference calls, meetings and actions such as research, networking, awareness raising, advocacy with both provincial and national levels of government, as well as innovative fund-raising solutions that will benefit all groups and communities in B.C.

Funders of this report and forum are:

Real Estate Foundation, Habitat Conservation Trust Fund, Environment Canada, and the Endswell Foundation.

Organizers of the Funding Solutions Report and Workshop are: Gretchen Harlow, Canadian Wildlife Service; Nikki Wright, SeaChange Marine Conservation Society.

Author of the Funding Solutions Survey and Report: Angela Smailes, Environmental and Community Consultant, Cumberland, B.C.

Environmental groups that have taken part thus far:

Aquatic Management Board, BC Environmental Network, BCEN Education Foundation, BC Wildlife Federation, Coastal Communities Conservation Society, Community Fisheries Development, Como Watershed Group, Cowichan Tribes, East Kootenay Environment Society, Federation of BC Naturalists, Habitat Acquisition Trust, Land Trust Alliance, Langley Environmental Partners Society, Living by Water Project, Mainland Inlet Stewardship Group, Maple Creek Streamkeepers, Millard/Piercy Watershed Stewards, Pacific Streamkeepers Federation, Quesnel River Watershed Alliance, Rivershed Society BC, Surrey Environmental Partners, Saanich Inlet Protection Society, SeaChange Marine Conservation Society, The Land Conservancy.

Agencies Represented in Funding Solutions discussions:

Environment Canada, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, BC Stewardship Centre, Carmanah Strategies, Dovetail Consultants, Institute for Media, Policy and Civil Society (IMPACS), the Real Estate Foundation, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks, Peter Abrams Consulting Services.

Activities in Funding Solutions initiative thus far include:

- Report on the Funding Solutions Survey and overhead presentation (see Appendix C)
- January 25/04 Funding Solutions Forum (see Appendix E for the agenda)
- Report on the economics of stewardship, *Safeguarding Canada's Wealth: Bringing Stewardship and Conservation into Ecological, Economic Valuation*
- Formation of four committees and proposed actions:
 - o A Coordinated, Province-wide across-sector Appeal to Governments (local, provincial and federal)
 - o Planned Giving (Green Legacies)
 - o Strategies Related to Banks
 - o Pollinator Project (device to collect donations in retail outlets)

For further information or materials, please contact:

Nikki Wright
SeaChange Marine Conservation Society
250-652-1662 seachange@shaw.ca

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Introduction | 2 |
| Methods | 3 |
| Results | 4 |
| <i>Profile of Organizations</i> | 4 |
| <i>Location</i> | 4 |
| <i>Geographic Scope</i> | 4 |
| <i>Staffing</i> | 4 |
| <i>Members</i> | 5 |
| <i>Volunteers</i> | 5 |
| <i>Average Yearly Income</i> | 6 |
| <i>Sources of Funds</i> | 6 |
| <i>Issues and Activities</i> | 6 |
| <i>Status of Organizations and Funding</i> | 8 |
| <i>Impacts</i> | 8 |
| <i>Changes in Funding Situation</i> | 8 |
| <i>Impacts of Funding Changes</i> | 9 |
| <i>Responses to Funding Changes</i> | 9 |
| <i>Key Issues Not Addressed</i> | 9 |
| Discussion | 11 |
| <i>Is There a Crisis?</i> | 11 |
| <i>Which Organizations are Affected?</i> | 11 |
| <i>Administration</i> | 11 |
| <i>Region</i> | 12 |
| <i>Budget</i> | 13 |
| <i>Issues and Activities</i> | 13 |
| <i>How are Organizations Responding?</i> | 13 |
| <i>What can be done? Recommendations</i> | 14 |
| Conclusion | 16 |
| | |
| Appendices | 17 |
| | |
| A. Funding Solutions Survey Questionnaire | 18 |
| B. Collated Survey Results | 22 |
| C. PowerPoint Presentation of Mid-way Results at Funding Solutions Forum: January 25/04 | 29 |
| D. Power Point Presentation on Results of Report <i>Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship Conservation Sector in Canada</i> by Julia Gardner of Dovetail Consulting | 33 |
| E. Agenda for Funding Solutions Forum – January 25/04 in Richmond | 37 |

Graphs and Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Geographic Distribution of Survey Responses | 4 |
| 2. Geographic Scope of Organizations..... | 4 |
| 3. Number of Members in Organizations..... | 5 |
| 4. Number of Volunteers in Organizations | 5 |
| 6. Average Yearly Budget for Last Five Years | 6 |
| 7. Issues Dealt With by Organizations..... | 7 |
| 8. Activities Undertaken by Organizations | 7 |
| 9. Current Status of Organizations..... | 8 |
| 10. Status of Organizations Versus Administration | 12 |
| 11. Status of Organizations Versus Location | 12 |
| 12. Status Versus Average Yearly Expenditures | 13 |

Executive Summary

The purpose of the Funding Solutions Survey is to gain a “snap-shot” of how changes to funding in the last five years are affecting environmental non-government organizations (ENGOS) in B.C. The survey provides an overview of the experiences of B.C. environmental organizations and can be considered a supplement to the very thorough and comprehensive report, *Appreciating the Values, Needs, and Potential of the Stewardship and Conservation Sector in Canada*, produced by Dovetail Consulting in 2003. It is anticipated that the Funding Solutions report will provide the impetus for further discussions in the ENGO community regarding this sector’s role and continuing health. In addition, survey organizers and members of the Funding Solutions Committee intend to use the results for an awareness-raising media campaign as well as use the findings for letters and visits with provincial and federal government representatives to address the funding situation.

One hundred ENGOS were surveyed by phone and email from January to March, 2004. The 17 questions broadly categorized groups based on size, mandate and activities. The survey also identified the status of organizations in terms of their future viability based on a 5-point scale. In addition, the survey itemized particular reasons for funding changes and impacts that were mentioned by each group.

The results show that the Stewardship Sector in B.C. is on the brink of a crisis. The 5-point scale provided the most cogent results. Thirty-seven of the 100 groups placed themselves in the “Uncertain” category meaning “the viability of the organization depends on the response to applications in the next month or two and they have wavering confidence in future funding”. Twelve groups placed themselves in categories below this where they stated that they were permanently cutting programs and staff and in three cases were folding. The remaining 47 groups stated that they considered themselves viable for the time being, although 35 of those groups had funding in place for only one year. It is important to note that both large and small groups were affected; many groups with large budgets, large volunteer contingents and members also placed themselves in the “Uncertain” or worse categories. The groups that are faring somewhat better in the current situation are those that rely entirely on volunteers to direct and operate their organization’s activities – 27% of the volunteer-based groups as opposed to 43% of the staffed groups were in the “Uncertain” category.

Recommendations arising from these results include three main approaches:

1. There must be an immediate response from all levels of government to address the looming crisis. Confidence in this sector and recognition of the tremendous value it provides the citizens of B.C. needs to be demonstrated by all levels of government through various funding programs such as core funding, coordinated funding arrangements with partners, longer-term funding programs and financing arrangements.
2. The Stewardship Sector in B.C. is beginning to see itself as an identifiable entity and recognize its value to communities and the province. Discussions of the role of this sector in relation to government and the private sector are necessary to determine long-term solutions.
3. It is clear that this sector will slowly develop significant alternative sources of funding to avoid the funding cycles of government programs. Already committees are working on creative, long-term funding and resource solutions that will enable the groups across B.C. to carry out their mandates more effectively.

The results of the Funding Solutions Survey reveal the enormous energy, vision, creativity and dedication of a relatively small group of individuals in our province who are truly guardians of our natural heritage. Their value to us as citizens of this province and country and to the environment cannot be under-estimated. The surveyors were struck over and over again by how much groups had accomplished invariably with more cooperation, savvy and determination than with large budgets. At the same time, it is apparent that organizations have developed enormous capacity. However, they are not able to reach their full potential due to lack of access to appropriate funding and support.

Finally, this report should serve as a wake-up call to the citizens of B.C. From the stories told from across the province over the space of 3 months, it is clear is that the environment in most regions is in a state of siege – the pressures from various industrial and commercial projects are overwhelming and unprecedented. With fewer resources to raise awareness or safeguard the natural heritage of the province, immediate, and innovative measures are needed.

Funding Solutions for BC ENGOs

Survey Report – June 2004

Introduction

Environmental non-governmental organizations, particularly stewardship groups in B.C. are on the verge of a serious crisis. Several reasons for this situation include the ending and non-renewal of a number of funding programs by federal and provincial governments, changes in focus and requirements by government and foundation sources, and scaling down of the public sector by the provincial government. The Funding Solutions Survey, carried out January to April 2004, shows that an alarming number of community and regional stewardship groups are uncertain as to whether or not they will exist as viable organizations into the next year. A majority of the one hundred organizations consulted across the province stated that they were cutting programs and staff, and narrowing their mandate. The impact on the environment and communities is particularly grave since many of these groups have been attempting to take over crucial activities previously conducted by government.

The findings of this survey are consistent with two larger and more comprehensive research projects carried out last year. Katherine Scott, author of the seminal report *Funding Matters (2003)* conveyed a disturbing picture of the impact of funding and resource cut backs for the entire non-profit and volunteer organizations in Canada. Her conclusions are that changes in funding structures, criteria and requirements were being implemented in such a way as to threaten the existence of non-governmental groups. A report by Julia Gardner of Dovetail Consulting entitled *Appreciating the Values, Needs, and Potential of the Stewardship and Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support (2003)*, provides a detailed Canada-wide look at the value of conservation and stewardship groups, the funding situation, and what is needed to sustain the stewardship sector across the country. Some key recommendations from this report are: government funding sources will continue to be important; regional and local governments can be more responsive to the needs of the conservation movement and volunteers than higher levels of government, and; the private sector should play an increasing role in funding conservation groups either through specific funds or through other ways. (For the power point summary of this report see Appendix D).

The Funding Solutions Survey is based on a short questionnaire to 100 environmental non-profit organizations across B.C. An effort was made to obtain a representative sample of groups from each region. The majority of questionnaires were completed via phone interview, and a few were submitted by email. Two-thirds of the responses were from groups who used staff and usually volunteers to carry out their missions and activities. One-third of the groups who responded did not use administrative staff but did access funding for specific project items. The results of this survey are a cursory view of the situation, given the small sample size and the fact that the questions were not set up by a professional social scientist. Despite these limitations, the results do confirm that the problems with funding and resources span all regions, sizes, and wealth of organizations. Even those groups that have size and longevity advantages are feeling uncertain of their future.

The report is organized as a standard scientific report with methods, results and discussion. The categories in each section mirror the order of the questions in the survey (see Appendix A).

Methods

An 18-question questionnaire was emailed out to a sub-set of approximately 150 groups in the stewardship sector, of which 7 responded. (See Appendix A for the questionnaire). The majority of the one hundred responses to the questionnaire were obtained by phone interview. Approximately 250 groups were phoned and 93 responded. The interview took 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

While some larger environmental advocacy groups were contacted, the survey focused on stewardship groups that work at a regional or local level on issues such as stream and wetland protection. A typical 'environmental group' is commonly perceived as an organization that carries out focused lobby campaigns designed to apply political pressure to bring about change. However, most stewardship groups use non-controversial means to protect regions they live in through monitoring, education, and on-the-ground projects and are therefore beginning to see themselves as distinct from 'traditional' environmental organizations.

Not all categories of stewardship groups were included in the survey. Organizations were included if they maintained paid staff to assist with carrying out their mandate or if they accessed funding to pay for aspects of their projects even if they did not have paid staff.

Organizations such as naturalist groups throughout the province were not routinely contacted because they generally operate on a completely volunteer basis. Hatcheries were also not contacted because their funding, although continually being threatened, is generally from one source and relatively stable. First Nations offices and organizations were not contacted because they are considered a level of government.

Responses to 50 groups were collected before Jan. 25/04 so the initial results of the survey could be presented to the Funding Solutions Forum held in Richmond. Please see the overhead presentation in Appendix C. An additional 50 responses were added to the database between Jan. 25 and March 25.

When reading the questionnaire it is important to keep in mind the interpretation of the questions, as these are not spelled out in the questionnaire:

- Groups were asked if they were volunteer-based or staffed. Groups were categorized as 'volunteer' if they used only volunteers to administer their group (some volunteer groups did hire contractors to do special jobs). All groups that paid part-time or full-time staff during the last five years to administer their organization were designated as 'staffed'.
- The description of the organization – issues and activities lists - applied to the last 3-5 years.
- The size of organization applied to the current situation except for expenditures where the interviewer asked for the average of the last 5 years.
- "Current status" is a scale that most respondents found relatively easy to situate themselves on. Interviewers meant "Will your organization still be in existence in the next year or so?" Some respondents may have interpreted the question to mean that they would not be able to carry out their mandates but would still continue to exist in some form.
- Sources of funding were only marked if the amount received was greater than 10% of the organization's yearly budget.
- "Key issues" for the organization referred to what representatives thought were 'falling off the table' in terms of their own organization due to lack of funding. For the community or region, we wanted to know what larger issues were not being addressed due to inadequate funding or resources.

Results

Profile of Organizations:

Location:

An effort was made to obtain a good sample of responses from every region of the province. The result is that the outlying regions are better represented proportionately than the more populated areas of the Lower Mainland and Vancouver Island. Please see table below for a distribution of responses.

| | Lower Mainland | Vancouver Island/Sth Coast | Kootenays | Cariboo/Chilcotin | Okanagan | Thompson/Shushwap | Northwest Coast/Haida Gwaii | North |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| Respondents to Funding Sol's Survey | 26 | 21 | 13 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 3 |
| Approximate # of groups in region | 225 | 138 | 43 | 20 | 31 | 18 | 22 | 17 |
| Percent of groups that responded | 11% | 15% | 28% | 60% | 29% | 15% | 32% | 18% |

1. Geographic Distribution of Survey Responses

Geographic Scope:

Thirty-five groups worked at the local level and fifty groups worked at a regional level. Only 10 groups worked at the provincial level, 2 at a national scale, and another 2 at an international scale. Many groups working at a larger scale were, at the same time, implementing projects that took place at smaller scales. Please see table below for distribution of geographic scope.

| Local | Regional | Provincial | National | International |
|-------|----------|------------|----------|---------------|
| 35 | 50 | 10 | 2 | 2 |

2. Geographic scope of Organizations

Staffing:


The majority of groups (63) had some staffing during the last five years ranging from a part-time administrator to an office of full and part time employees. Twenty-one groups had one part time person (often doing full-time work), 8 groups had one full-time person, and 18 groups had combinations of 1 to 3 full and/or part time staff. There were five groups that had 4-6 full-time staff, and nine groups with combinations of 7-12 full or part-time staff.

Thirty-seven organizations were volunteer groups, which meant that volunteers carried out the administration of the organization, although many groups hired contractors to carry out specialized work on specific projects.

Were there more staffed groups from populated than outlying areas in the province? Based on these results more groups from the lower Mainland and Vancouver Island (75%) were staffed than those from other areas of B.C. However, 100% of groups from the Peace Region (North) were staffed and 67% of groups from the Kootenays were staffed. Only the Okanagan and the Thompson Shushwap had more volunteer than staffed groups. These results are not based on a random sampling of groups and therefore may not reflect the actual ratio.

Members:


The majority of groups (67) have 1 to 200 members. Twenty groups do not have memberships. Eleven groups have over 200 members. Of these, five groups have 600-1000 members and 2 groups have over 1000 members (see graph below).



3. Number of Members In Organizations

Volunteers:


Respondents were asked to provide the maximum number of volunteers they could muster at any one time for an event or project they were organizing. Most groups stated they could count on 4 to 25 volunteers to come out to help with large or important events or projects. Respondents often stated that the number of people upon whom they could rely consistently was much smaller. Groups that can draw on 26 volunteers and more at a time likely have a paid or volunteer coordinator. Nineteen groups did not rely on volunteers. (See graph below).



4. Number of Volunteers in Organizations

Average Yearly Income:

Respondents were quick to point out that their budgets had varied, sometimes greatly, from year to year over the past five years. These average yearly budgets, therefore, are quite approximate. Of the 31 groups with budgets of less than \$10,000, 25 are volunteer-based and 7 have staff. All 22 groups with budgets of over \$200,000 are staffed. The majority of groups with budgets greater than \$35,000 are staffed and only four volunteer groups have budgets of this size. (See graph below).




6. Average Yearly Budget for the Last Five Years

Source of Funds:

Respondents were asked only for the broad category of funder or funding source and not for the names of specific funders. Most groups accessed funds from more than one source. Only six groups reported receiving funds from federal government sources. More groups (21) received funds from the provincial government. Only ten groups received funds from local and regional levels of government. The most groups (27) received funds from foundations and from donations. Thirteen groups obtained membership fees. Eight groups obtained funding from businesses. Five groups sold merchandise to obtain funds. Eight groups conducted fund raising events to raise money. One group reported that they received funds from lottery or bingo participation (many groups received funds from the Gaming Commission's "Direct Access" program which is a different program).


Issues and Activities:

Respondents could pick as many issues as corresponded to their situation. Since the survey focused on stewardship groups, the issues that were most common were forestry, wildlife, salmon, habitat (of all types), and water quality. Slightly less common were areas of specialization such as marine issues, agriculture, urban land use, and parks and wilderness. Many groups have tackled a wide range of issues and activities over the past 5 years – with some groups identifying up to eight categories in each section.



7. Issues Dealt with by Organizations

Virtually every group cited education/outreach as one of their key activities and gave various examples of their specific activities such as newsletters, pamphlets, community and school programs, information sessions, and innovative programs to carry out their respective mandates. Many stewardship groups, had undertaken restoration and salmon enhancement projects in the last five years as well as landowner contact programs in their respective areas. A large number of groups (55) had also taken part in land use planning processes during the “CORE” era (Commission on Resources and the Environment) and some were in the process of completing these with their communities. Although few groups identified themselves as focusing on advocacy full-time, a majority of groups (66) did include ‘advocacy’ as part of their activities, citing letter writing and presentations to local and provincial government, education of elected officials and campaigns to save specific areas. (See graph below).




8. Activities Undertaken by Organizations

Status of Organizations:

Respondents were asked to rate their organizations on a scale of organizational viability, the top category being 'Good' or fully viable for the foreseeable future and descending from there. Of the 100 groups surveyed,

- 12 groups are 'Good' or 'Robust' (funding in place for two-three years, very confident about future funding and/or viability),
- 35 are 'OK' or 'Viable' (funding in place for one year – fairly confident about future funding),
- 37 are 'Uncertain' or 'Waiting and Hoping' (their viability as an organization – that is, carrying out their current mandate - depends on the response to applications in the next month and they have wavering confidence in future funding)
- 5 are 'Not Good' or 'Ailing' (have already or will have to cut programs and/or lay off staff and are not confident about future funding),
- 4 are 'Very Bad', or 'Floundering' (have cut most of staff and are hanging on with part-time help and volunteers with not much hope for future funding)
- 3 are 'Terrible' or 'Folded' (the organization has or will have to shut down in the near future and they have no hope for future funding).
- 1 accomplished its mission and folded.



9. Current Status of Organization

Impacts:

Changes in Funding Situation:

The main change identified was that several federal and provincial programs ended. These included provincial programs such as Fisheries Renewal B.C., Urban Salmon Habitat Program, Environment Youth Team Program, Science Council of BC and federal programs such as Habitat Restoration and Salmon Enhancement Program (HRSEP), Habitat Conservation Stewardship Program, and the Community Animation Program. At the same time, foundations experienced a drop in revenues due to several world crises that they passed on to their recipients. US foundations also refocused their

energies at home to deal with mounting crises. Only some groups that relied on donations experienced a decline in giving – other groups who mounted a donor campaign experienced an increase in donations. In some cases, lack of energy on the part of a small, but previously active group of people caused the group to cut back on activities. The groups that relied on fee for service or other sources of funding or accessed smaller amounts from funding programs that have not ended, did not notice changes in the funding situation.

Impacts of Funding Changes:

Many groups mentioned one or several of the impacts to funding changes listed below. Thirty-nine groups reported that they had cut programs or staff in one form or another over the past several years. Many of these said they were not starting new programs until they were more confident about the funding situation. Groups were using various strategies to cope with these changes:

- Twenty-two groups said they were relying more on volunteers.
- Ten were diversifying funding sources and most were putting more time into fund raising.
- Ten groups didn't notice the funding changes.
- Six stated that staff members were doing "more with less", including putting more time into fund raising.
- Six said that volunteers were burning out as groups tried to keep afloat and find funding.

Responses to Funding Changes:

Responses varied to the changing funding situation. Most groups are responding by submitting more applications for funds (21) and diversifying their efforts (24). The other top seven strategies include (for a complete list, see Appendix B):

- moving to 'fee for service', including contracting to local government and cost recovery (12)
- changing focus to go after different funding (10)
- relying more on volunteers (9)
- implementing a donation drive (9)
- 'extreme networking' (8)
- hiring a professional fund raiser (7)
- putting on fund-raising events (7)
- expanding (4) – that is, signing up more members and obtaining donations – which often meant taking on a bigger mandate and obtaining more support in the community.

For many of these strategies, it was too early to tell if they would be successful and in many cases, groups were just at the point of discussing them as possible directions. Groups that had implemented some of their strategies were having success with diversifying funding, Canadian foundations, networking and partnering with other groups, fee for service and in-kind donations. The only strategy that had been implemented with varying success was the volume approach – some groups said they had received very little back for the increased effort in number of proposals they had submitted.

Key Issues Not Addressed:

There seem to be an overwhelming number of issues that are not being addressed due to lack of funding. Some of these are directly related to groups and their mandates:

- complying with project funding criteria means that groups cannot do quality assessment and monitoring for adequate periods of time to provide proper baseline information,
- groups cannot adequately respond to requests for information and support from their immediate community,
- groups are unable to implement excellent and innovative programs that have been developed (and some of which have won awards) that are now sitting on the shelf, and

- groups are unable to participate in government processes, hearings and information sessions even though in many cases they have information that would be important for the public to know about.

Non-government groups often provide a crucial 'watch-dog' role for society since they have an interest in and knowledge of specific areas and issues. There are key issues that the public is not being informed about such as protection of crucial habitat and awareness-raising regarding potentially dangerous substances and practices. A sub-set of these issues is included below. (For the complete list see Appendix B).

- Ecosystems at risk that are not getting enough attention:
 - o Garry Oak meadows
 - o Stream protection guidelines
 - o Purcell Wilderness threatened (oldest trees in Canada – connectivity issues)
 - o Broughton Archipelago and the impact of fish farms
 - o Pine beetle forests and government and industry response
 - o Arsenic in drinking water on the Sunshine Coast
 - o Pulp and paper issues severely neglected – roll-back of regulations to protect water quality
- Species at Risk are not getting enough attention or funding:
 - o Heronry in Vernon
 - o Interior coho - streams (illegally dammed by ranchers)
 - o Mountain Caribou – many are worried about the fate of this species
 - o Wolverine
 - o Granby grizzlies
 - o Rock fish
 - o Tailed frog, spotted owl, bull trout and Chinook salmon in Upper Birkenhead
- Developments that threaten important habitat that do not have enough resources to save them:
 - o Ski resorts in the Kootenays
 - o Oil and gas development, particularly lifting of oil exploration moratorium off of the west coast
 - o Selling off crown land in Horsefly in the Interior
 - o Rapid and unsustainable pace of industrial logging
 - o Threat of aquaculture in Barkley Sound
 - o Working Forest Legislation
 - o Proposed large wind farm in Hecate Strait
 - o Consideration of coal-based methane on Vancouver Island and elsewhere
 - o Ground water quality problems in Arrowsmith Watershed on Vancouver Island

Discussion

Is There a Crisis?

Based on the results of the survey, one can conclude that while B.C.'s ENGOs may not be directly in the middle of a crisis, they are verging on one. The fact that 49% of the 100 groups interviewed were uncertain of funding even for the up-coming year, 12% of which were not at all optimistic about receiving funding and were beginning to consider shutting down, indicates that this sector is in a precarious state. The implication of designating one's organization as "uncertain" or worse meant that representatives were not sure if their respective organizations would have enough funding in the next few months to keep their current programs going and staff employed. As a result, in many cases, representatives stated that they might be forced to decide on whether the respective organizations can continue to exist.


For many groups a sense of uncertainty regarding funding and whether their programs will be implemented is 'business as usual'. For the last 10 to 15 years, the nature of the funding landscape is such that 95% of funders provide short term, project-based, partner-dependent funding. When there were several programs operating at various levels of government and foundations targeting funds to groups in B.C., organizations could anticipate obtaining some, if not all, of their yearly budgets. In the last few years not only has less funding been available, but also important sources of funding have disappeared. Exacerbating this situation are the cut-backs of provincial and federal staff who provided crucial support to non-profit organizations. Many representatives reported feeling caught in the middle where they felt obligated to try and make up the lack of monitoring and protection by government, but in essence see government downloading as an unacceptable abdication of responsibility to the public. Several respondents were so discouraged by this state of affairs, that they had, or were in the process of, leaving the sector altogether.

Which organizations are affected?

Administration

When staffing and organizational status were compared, staffed groups were the most adversely affected. Staffed (54%) and volunteer (43%) categories ranged from 'Uncertain' to 'Terrible'. Whereas 27 (43%) of the 67 staffed organizations said they would categorize themselves as 'Uncertain', 10 (27%) of the 37 volunteer-based groups put themselves in this category. Twenty-one (57%) of the 37 volunteer-based groups were in the 'OK' and 'Good' category whereas 29 (46%) of organizations with staff put themselves in these categories. Comparatively few organizations of either category fell into the 'Not Good', 'Very Bad', or 'Terrible' category – 7 staffed and 5 volunteer-based groups respectively. (See graph below).

There were many opinions expressed by respondents about the use of and reliance on funding. Some volunteer groups were justifiably proud of the work they do in communities and regions using volunteers and donated materials. Many of these groups foster a strong sense of community with their activities and did not want to be caught up in the time and effort required to raise funds. Other groups however, expressed frustration at being in the "in-between" stage – capable of carrying out substantial projects and education, but unable to access funds either from lack of experience with fund raising or lack of funds. These groups had built up skills, knowledge and a reputation by working on issues and projects, and often at a volunteer level or with minimal funds. They needed to move to the next level for various reasons: their volunteers were burning out and they needed a coordinator to take on the administration; their community was demanding more services; threats to their area were increasing and they were in a position to respond. Another sub-set of groups that successfully fund raised often decried the time and effort it took to secure funds but recognized its importance in allowing them to carry out their respective mandates.



10. Status of Organizations Versus Administration

Region

No one region seemed to be affected more than others, although Vancouver Island was slightly worse off than the rest of the province with the highest number of groups (76%) of all the regions in the ‘Uncertain’ or worse categories. None of Vancouver Island’s 21 groups put themselves in the ‘Good’ category and only 5 were in the ‘OK’ category. The Lower Mainland had the second most in the ‘Uncertain’ and worse categories but this constituted 42% of the 26 groups who responded. In the other regions, the Kootenays had the highest percentage of groups (54%) in the ‘Uncertain’ or worse categories. The Northwest had the highest percentage (57%) of its groups in the ‘Uncertain’ category. All other regions, Cariboo, North, Okanagan and Thompson had their fair share of groups in the ‘Uncertain’ category ranging from 25% to 38% of the groups who responded in each region. While interviewers heard from respondents that quite a few streamkeepers groups in different areas had folded – none were interviewed. (See table below).

| Status of Organization vs Location | Cariboo/Chilcotin | Kootenays | Lower Mainland | North | North west Coast/Haida Gwaii | Okanagan | Thompson/Shushwap | Vancouver Island/Sth Coast |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|------------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Good (robust) | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| b. O4K (viable) | 5 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| c. Uncertain (Waiting and Hoping) | 3 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 11 |
| d. Not Good (ailing) | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 |
| e. Very bad (floundering) | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| f. Terrible (moribund) | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Mission basically accomplished. | | | | | | 1 | | |

10. Status of Organizations Versus Location

Budget

A large budget and membership does not make a group immune from the funding troubles. Twelve groups with budgets over \$200,000 classified themselves as uncertain of their future. When comparing Status and Budget, the groups with the smallest and largest budgets seemed the least stable with 14 groups with budgets of \$10,000 or less in the ‘Uncertain’ or worse category. The groups with budgets ranging from \$10,000 to \$200,000 had an average of 4-6 groups (40-60% of the total groups in these budget categories) in the categories of ‘Uncertain’ or worse. (See table below).

| Average Yearly Expenditures Vs Status | <> | a. Good | b. OK | c. Uncertain | d. Not Good | e. Very bad | f. Terrible | Mission basically accomplished |
|---------------------------------------|----|---------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| no data | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| Under 10,000 | | 5 | 13 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| 10,000 - 35,000 | | 2 | 4 | 5 | | | | |
| 35,000 - 50,000 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | | | | |
| 50,000 - 100,000 | | | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | |
| 100,000 - 150,000 | | 1 | 5 | 5 | | | | |
| 150,000 - 200,000 | | 1 | 2 | 4 | | | | |
| Over 200,000 | | 2 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 1 | | |

12. Status Versus Average Yearly Expenditures

Issues and Activities

Lack of funding has an impact on groups that engage in certain issues and activities. Groups that were involved with habitat and habitat restoration particularly for salmonids were hardest hit with 31 groups (22 staffed and 9 volunteer-based) falling into the ‘Uncertain’ category. Groups that focused on other issues were less affected – Urban Land Use 8, Parks and Wilderness 11, Marine issues 9 in the categories of ‘Uncertain’ and worse. Some groups were active in several of these areas and would therefore be counted more than once.

How are Organizations Responding?

When speaking to representatives of this sector, their persistence, dedication, and optimism came through loud and clear. The most successful groups were the ones that had seen the crisis coming and had taken aggressive steps to address the situation, either by streamlining, cultivating new and sometimes unusual partners and pursuing alternative sources of funding. The size of the group did not seem to make any difference as to their response, although larger groups did seem to have more human resources to draw on to ‘weather the storm’.

While many groups reported cutting back and either reducing staff salaries or time, they were also looking for alternative sources of funds and support. The impression that emerges is that a lot of groups are refocusing their mandates, and pursuing other avenues of funding and support. In some cases, groups were hiring professional fundraisers, putting on more fund raising events or producing and marketing merchandise. Other groups reported turning to ‘non-traditional’ sources of funding such as corporations, local government, donor campaigns or fee-for-service contracts. They reported striking alliances with unusual partners and practicing what one respondent termed “extreme networking”. In several cases groups reported looking at amalgamation with other organizations. Some of the smaller, more narrowly-focused groups, however, had pared down already and were now finding that accessing the very small

amounts of funding available was getting too difficult. Fund raising was taking too much time and energy away from their mandates, missions and activities. In the future, it looked as though these groups would either carry out their mandates on a solely volunteer and in-kind donation basis, or they would fold.

The level of dedication in this sector is remarkable. However, there is a small sub-set of people who were interviewed that stood out. They are people who were not paid or paid very little for their work and in fact often subsidized their environmental work with their savings and their frugal lifestyle. Most are not ‘big’ names in the environmental sector, but their accomplishments are extremely significant and far-reaching, benefiting all British Columbians. These people have managed to save large areas of important habitat around the province. They have also made drinking water in many areas safer by insisting on pollution controls and protection from logging of watersheds. They have, and continue, to reveal polluting practices of industries, businesses and individual citizens. They also set up wildlife animal rehab centers with their own savings. One can think of them as “pure advocates” – they are driven by a love of nature and the areas they live in, and devote themselves completely to protecting it. Even in this group, funding is important. They all admitted that although their accomplishments are more based on good strategizing, sheer hard work and working successfully with people in their respective communities, a little funding was important to carry them through.

In general it is clear that environmental non-government organizations have built tremendous capacity over the last number of years. In less than a year’s time, that potential may be completely lost because groups will have to close. What will be the impact on communities and the province of losing even a small number of these groups if they have to close their doors? Some of the outfall from these closures would be loss of: ‘watch-dog’ services for natural areas and reporting of infractions to the authorities; education of a wide variety people including school children, businesses and the general public about natural systems in their areas, and; assessment and monitoring services that supplement or replace government services.

Many groups are turning to local businesses, local government and individual citizens for support. However, support at this level is varied. There is still a strong belief that this sector should operate mainly on volunteer labour. While many ‘on-the-ground’ projects are done by volunteers, much of the administration of a stewardship group can be tedious paper work and include interactions with government officials that does not appeal to most volunteers. As one respondent stated, the work in this sector “is not typical community work”. Much of the work requires specialized knowledge that is acquired in bachelor and masters programs at a university or through years of experience. In addition, most stewardship groups, particularly in urbanizing areas, deal with a large volume of work unrealistic to ask volunteers to undertake. Stewardship groups are often puzzled by the disinclination of communities to pay for protection and restoration. As one coordinator articulated, “We’ve paid a lot of money in our society to compromise the environment – we have to expect to pay something to repair and protect it.”

What can be done? Recommendations

These are initial recommendations by the writer and organizers. Further recommendations will be elicited from groups and individuals reading this report and will be circulated to all on the Funding Solutions list-serve.

1. We are at the beginning of a real crisis. Although organizations in this sector are tenacious and resilient, lack of action by the federal and provincial governments during the next two funding periods will bring large cut backs and potential folding of organizations around the province. While

many groups may be able to technically stay open, their ability to carry out their respective mandates will be severely compromised.

2. Different types of funding are needed for the different types of organizations and their capacities. Short-term funding programs sponsored by various levels of government are required to address immediate funding needs that are not solely based on project expenses. Core funding expenditures, the lack of which can slow or cripple the conservation work of environmental groups, needs to be a high priority. Longer-term funding programs and financing arrangements that address the current weaknesses of the funding landscape are necessary to maintain a viable and sustainable non-profit sector.
3. While some organizations are determined to become independent of government funding programs, others are realizing that starting a business or running a large fund-raising program is not within their capacity or interest to carry out. A discussion regarding sources of funds and an exploration of innovative fund-raising is underway as a result of the Funding Solutions Forum, Jan. 25/04. This must be continued and deepened with as many groups and individuals as would like to participate.
4. In the process of figuring out who should pay for what in the long term issues such as the respective roles of ENGOs and the various levels of government deserve more discussion. Downloading and funding cuts to government departments has muddied the waters in terms of what needs to be carried out for the public good and who should do the work. The role of professional environmental consulting organizations should be included in the discussion. In addition, access to, and sharing of, information should also be part of this conversation.
5. The stewardship sector in B.C. is just beginning to see itself as an identifiable entity. The Funding Solutions initiative needs to strengthen and build communication networks by email, lists serves, web-forums, conference calls, meetings and conferences. As this sector gains a stronger sense of itself, it will put conservation groups in a better position to raise awareness across the province as to the work they carry out and its value.

Conclusion

The main conclusions emerging from the Funding Solutions Survey results regarding the state of ENGOs in B.C. are clear:

- a) the ENGO sector in B.C is on the verge of crisis and unless action is taken immediately, many groups will begin to cut back even further and fold. As a result this sector could lose tremendous capacity built up over the last 5 to 10 years and the B.C. public would lose stewards in their communities, advocates for their natural resources and leaders of sustainable economy and lifestyle.
- b) The pending crisis is affecting groups across the board: organizations in all areas of the province, with all levels of income, and all sizes (in terms of members or volunteers) are being affected.
- c) In the immediate term, most groups are responding by cutting programs and staff and relying more on volunteers.
- d) In the medium to longer term, most groups stated that they are diversifying funding sources, increasing their effort in applying for funds, and trying a wide array of alternatives to raise money. While some organizations are having some success, for most groups it is too early to determine if their efforts will pay off.

Some stark and disturbing conclusions can also be drawn from the comments of respondents:

- a) Taken together, the issues that representatives of this sector identify as needing attention are substantial. The indelible impression one is left with is that the natural environment in B.C. is under siege – and that this state of affairs needs immediate attention by government, business, and the general public.

Respondents often stated that provincial and federal government departments seemed unable to carry out their legislated mandates - protecting the public interest and public domain. They cited the combination of field and support staff cut backs, changes in policy, and the lack of funding programs for stewardship groups and environmental work, as their greatest concerns.

- b) Even with the general nature of the survey's questions, it is clear that the services provided by the ENGO sector in B.C. are varied and substantial. The dedication, creativity and sheer determination of individuals in these groups to ensure that environmental values are upheld, understood and respected means they accomplish a huge amount for a fraction of what would be considered 'normal' expenditures for similar work done by government or the private sector. In addition, ENGOs carry out work that neither of the other sectors will undertake. Attention to particular species and habitats in various areas of the province come under the purview of these citizen groups who care about them because they live near them and know and appreciate them.
- c) The amount of capacity built by groups over the last 5 to 10 years is demonstrated by the fact that many groups, when reporting their yearly budget, stated that they are currently working at about $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ capacity due to lack of funding or inefficient funding mechanisms. This includes groups at all budget ranges. All parts of this sector from the enhancement groups who run hatcheries, to the stream-keepers who run stewardship programs, to the advocacy groups that work for economic, policy and legal change have built knowledge and skills, acquired equipment and developed relationships and expertise with local, provincial and federal government representatives, and with each other and with the public.

Appendices

- A. Funding Solutions Survey Questionnaire**
- B. Collated Survey Results**
- C. Power Point Presentation of Mid-way Results at Funding Solutions Forum: January 25/04**
- D. PowerPoint Presentation on Results of Report *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship Conservation Sector in Canada* by Julia Gardner of Dovetail Consulting**
- E. Agenda for Funding Solutions Forum – January 25/04 in Richmond**

Appendix A

Funding Solutions Survey Questionnaire

Information on Organization and Respondent:

1. **Name of Organization:**
2. **Name of Respondent:**
3. **Position in Organization:**
4. **Phone Number (of Org'n):**
5. **Email:**
6. **Geographic Scope of Organization (highlight or put 'x' next to ONE):**

Local ____ Regional ____ Provincial ____ National ____ International ____

- 7. a. Located in Region (highlight or 'x' ONE below):**
- Lower Mainland
 - Vancouver Island/South Coast
 - Okanagan
 - Thompson/Shushwap
 - Kootenays
 - Cariboo/Chilcotin
 - Northwest Coast/Haida Gwaii
 - North
 - Peace
- b. Work in Region (add new one below if different):**
- Lower Mainland
 - Vancouver Island/South Coast
 - Okanagan
 - Thompson/Shushwap
 - Kootenays
 - Cariboo/Chilcotin
 - Northwest Coast/Haida Gwaii
 - North
 - Peace

- 8. Has your organization been administered by volunteers or by staff (even part time) during the last five years?** Volunteer-based ____ Staffed ____

- 9. How would you best describe your organization?**

a. Issues that you have dealt with in last 5 years (highlight or put an 'x' next to ALL that apply and add others as necessary):

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Marine | h. Urban Land Use |
| b. Forestry | i. Parks and Wilderness |
| c. Wildlife | j. Sustainability |
| d. Salmon | j. Other (please describe) |
| e. Habitat | |
| f. Agriculture | |
| g. Water Quality | |

b. Activities you have undertaken in the last 5 years (highlight or put an ‘x’ next to ALL that apply and add others as necessary):

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| a. Education/Outreach | h. Landowner/Business/Industrial Contact |
| b. Habitat Restoration/Rehabilitation | i. Land Use Planning Processes |
| c. Salmon Enhancement | j. Conservation |
| d. Wildlife Enhancement | k. Networking/Umbrella |
| e. Land Acquisition/Conservation | l. Advocacy |
| f. Policy Development/Processes | m. Other (please describe) |
| g. Watershed Management | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

c. CURRENT size of Organization (highlight or ‘x’ one under each category OR add a more accurate number at the bottom if desired):

| Number of Members | Part-time Staff | Full Time Staff | Number of Volunteers |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 1-30 | 1x | 1 | 1-5 |
| 31-50 | 2 | 2 | 5-15 |
| 51-75 | 3 | 3 | 15-25 |
| 76-100 | 4 - 6 | 4 - 6 | 25-50 |
| 101-200 | 7 - 10 | 7 - 10 | 50-100 |
| | 10 - 15 | 10 - 15 | Over 100 |
| | Over 15 | Over 15 | |
| | | | |

d. Average yearly budget over the LAST 5 YEARS (ie: what does your organization do when you access to funding/resources?) Highlight or ‘x’ ONE under each category:

| <i>AVERAGE TOTAL BUDGET (all projects and admin.) for last 5 years</i> | <i>AVERAGE CORE EXPENSES Amount of total budget used for Administration including personnel for fund-raising.</i> |
|--|---|
| Under \$10,000 | Under \$10,000 |
| 10,001 – 35,000 | 10,001 – 35,000 |
| 36,000 – 65,000 | 36,000 – 65,000 |
| 65,000 – 100,000 | 65,000 – 100,000 |
| 100,000 – 150,000 | Over 100,000 |
| 150,000 – 200,000 | |
| Over 200,000 | |

- 10. How would you describe the CURRENT financial status of your organization (highlight or put 'x' in space provided beside ONE of below):**
- a. Good (robust) – continuing with programs/starting new programs – funding for staff and operations in place for 2-3 years – confident about future funding
 - b. OK – (viable) funding for staff and programs in place for one year – no cuts so far – fairly confident about future funding
 - c. Uncertain – (typical) depends on response to last round of applications – waiting for 1 (or 2-3) months to hear back – wavering confidence because of increased competition, changing mandates of funders etc.
 - d. Not good – (ailing) have already or will have to cut programs and lay off staff (or volunteers cutting back on time) – not confident about future funding
 - e. Very bad – (floundering) have cut most staff and are limping along on ½ time help and volunteers (or volunteers leaving – and no energy to recruit new ones) – not much hope for future funding
 - f. Terrible – (moribund) the organization has or will have to shut down in the near future due to inadequate funding (or burnt-out volunteers) – no hope for future funding

- 11. If your organization is having difficulty due to inadequate or reduced funding – how is it affecting your organization?**

a. Staffing: (highlight one or add on)

- laying off contractors
- laying off core staff
- relying on volunteers
- joining forces/sharing staff with another group/s

b. Programs: (highlight one or add one)

- not starting new programs
- cutting planned programs/activities
- amalgamating programs/activities
- cutting current programs/activities
- sticking to core programs/activities

c. Other or Additional Comments:

- 12 a. From which sources did your organization receive the MAIN PORTION (more than 10%) of your funding during the last 3 years? (Highlight or put an 'x' beside all that apply).**

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| - Federal government | - Foundations | - Merchandising |
| - Provincial government | - Memberships | - Bingo/Casinos/Lottery |
| - Regional government | - Donations | - Private Sector |
| - Municipal government | - Fundraising Events | - Other |

- b. How have these sources changed during the last 5 years? (Highlight or put an 'x' beside all that apply. Add any points that best answer the question).**

- funding program ended
- your organization moved to different funders (grantors)
- your organization diversified funding sources (moved to other sources – identify from list above)

- 13. a. What steps is your organization taking to address funding difficulties? (Please describe).**

- b. What results have you had with these steps and strategies? (Please describe).**

14. What are some key issues in your community/region that will not be addressed due to inadequate funding of:
- a. your organization? (please describe)
 - b. other ENGOs in your area? (please describe)
15. Would you like to be kept in touch with results of the survey and meetings? Yes ___ No ___

THANK YOU for filling out this questionnaire!

Appendix B

Collated Survey Results

Profile of Organizations:

Please Note: <> means no data available.

Location of Organizations

| Located in Region | <> | Boundary | Cariboo/ Chilcotin | Kootenay s | Lower Mainland | North | Northwest Coast/Haida Gwaii | Okanagan | Thomp son/Shu shwap | Vancouver Island/Sth Coast |
|-------------------|----|----------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | 1 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 26 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 21 |

Geographic Scope

| Geographic Scope | <> | International | Local | National | Provincial | Provincial and beyond | Regional | Regional and International | Regional and Provincial |
|---------------------|----|---------------|-------|----------|------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| International | | 1 | 35 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 1 |

Administrative Status – Staff or Volunteer

| Administration - Volunteer or Staff? | <> | Staff | Volunteer |
|--------------------------------------|----|-------|-----------|
| | 1 | 63 | 37 |

Types of Organizations – Issues and Activities

Size – Number of Members

| Number of Groups | Number of Members |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 20 | No members |
| 17 | 1-30 |
| 14 | 31-50 |
| 10 | 51-75 |
| 8 | 101-200 |
| 7 | 76-100 |
| 2 | 4-10 |
| 2 | 26-50 |
| 2 | 800 |
| 2 | Over 100 |
| 2 | 4,000 |
| 1 | 100's |

| Number of Groups | Number of Members |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 1900 |
| 1 | 11-25 |
| 1 | 1-3 |
| 1 | 1000 |
| 1 | 150 |
| 1 | 200 + |
| 1 | 2000 |
| 1 | 3000 |
| 1 | up to 800 |
| 1 | 300-600 |
| 1 | 400 |
| 1 | 51-100 |
| 1 | 900 donors |
| 1 | 300 |

Size – Number of Active Volunteers

| # of Active Volunteers | <> | 1-3 | 4-10 | 11-25 | 26-50 | 51-100 | 101-200 | Over 100 | 1-30 | 600 |
|------------------------|----|-----|------|-------|-------|--------|---------|----------|------|-----|
| - no volunteers | 19 | 4 | 27 | 27 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

Part Time and Full Time Staff

| # of Full-time Staff | # of Part-time Staff | Number of Groups |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| No full-time staff | No part-time staff | 34 |
| | 1 | 19 |
| 1 | | 8 |
| 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 4-6 | | 3 |
| | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 7-10 | | 2 |
| 7-10 | 2 | 2 |
| none | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | | 1 |
| | 2 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | 4-6 | 1 |

| # of Full-time Staff | # of Part-time Staff | Number of Groups |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 7-10 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 4-6 | 1 |
| 4-6 | 0 | 1 |
| 4-6 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 4-6 | 1 |

Average Yearly Budget for last 5 Years

| Average Yearly Expenditures | No data | Under 10,000 | 10,000 - 35,000 | 35,000 - 50,000 | 50,000 - 100,000 | 100,000 - 150,000 | 150,000 - 200,000 | 200,000 | Over 200,000 |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------|
| | 9 | 31 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 21 |

Current Status of Organization

| Status of Organization | <> | a_ Good (robust) | b_ OK (viable) | c_ Uncertain (Waiting and Hoping) | d_ Not Good (ailing) | e_ Very bad (floundering) | f_ Terrible (moribund) | Mission basically accomplished_ |
|-------------------------|----|------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Number of Organizations | 1 | 12 | 36 | 38 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 |

Cross-tabulated Results:

Status vs. Location of Organization by Region

| Status of Organization 3 | Boundary | Cariboo/ Chilcotin | Kootenays | Lower Mainland | North | Northwest Coast/Haida Gwaii | Okanagan | Thompson /Shushwap | Vancouver Island/Sth Coast |
|---|----------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| a. Good (robust) | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| b. OK (viable) | 1 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| c. Uncertain (Waiting and Hoping) | | 3 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 11 |
| d. Not Good (ailing) | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 |
| e. Very bad (floundering) | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| f. Terrible (moribund) | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| Mission basically accomplished. | | | | | | | 1 | | |

Comments:

Response to Funding Changes:

There were a huge variety of responses to the changing funding situation:

- applying for more funds (21)
- diversifying their efforts (24)
- moving to 'fee for service', including contracting for local government and cost recovery (12)
- changing focus to go after different funding (10)
- relying more on volunteers (9)
- implementing a donation drive (9)
- 'extreme networking' (8)
- hiring a professional fund raiser (7)
- putting on fund-raising events (7)
- going after corporate donations and support (5)
- relying more on in-kind donations (5)
- asking for funds from local businesses (3)
- amalgamating or partnering with other groups (3)
- using own savings and earnings (2)
- subsidized by 'for-profit' business (usually related to organization in some way) (2)
- previously un-incorporated groups are incorporating so they fund raise (2)
- going after local government to pay more for local group (2)
- producing and marketing organizational merchandise (2)
- implementing a membership drive (1)
- coming up with innovative fund-raising program (1)

Key Issues Not Addressed:

There are many, many issues that are not being addressed from lack of funding. Some of these are directly related to groups and their mandates:

- groups cannot do quality assessment and monitoring for adequate periods of time to provide proper baseline information,
- groups cannot adequately respond to requests for information and support from their immediate community,
- groups cannot participate as informed citizens in government processes, hearings and information sessions.

Ecosystems at risk that are not getting enough attention:

- o Garry Oak meadows
- o Stream Protection guidelines
- o Purcell Wilderness threatened (oldest trees in Canada – connectivity issues)
- o Broughton Archipelago and the impact of fish farms
- o pine beetle forests and government and industry response
- o arsenic in drinking water on the Sunshine Coast
- o pulp and paper issues severely neglected – roll-back of regulations to protect water quality
- o eco-integrity within and between parks
- o logging on Vancouver Island
- o habitat protection in general on Vancouver Island
- o marine areas and marine foreshore
- o long term study of all B.C. forests
- o wildlife corridors and wetlands in urbanizing areas
- o need B.C. database on toxic chemicals

Species at Risk and not getting enough attention or funding:

- o heronry in Vernon
- o Interior Coho - streams (illegally damned by ranchers)
- o Mountain Caribou – many are worried about the fate of this species
- o Wolverine
- o Granby grizzlies
- o Rock Fish
- o Tailed Frog, Spotted Owl, Bull Trout and Chinook Salmon in Upper Birkenhead

Developments that threaten important habitat that do not have enough resources to save them:

- o ski resort development in the Kootenays
- o national/provincial energy issues – move towards CO2 producing fuels: coal, coal-based methane, oil off the coast and natural gas
- o oil and gas development, particularly lifting of oil exploration moratorium off of the west coast
- o selling off crown land in Horsefly in the Interior
- o rapid and unsustainable pace of industrial logging
- o gravel pits in Coquitlam
- o urban development in the Lower Mainland, South and Middle Vancouver Island
- o drinking water and drinking water policy
- o climate change
- o heliski operations in the interior
- o cumulative effects of fragmentation, oil, gas, and forests up north
- o proposed large wind farm in the middle of Hecate Strait which is the main Pacific Flyway for migrating birds
- o cruise ship impacts
- o clear cuts in caribou habitat

Developments that threaten important habitat that do not have enough resources to save them: (continued)

- consideration of coal-based methane on Vancouver Island and elsewhere – this industry uses very destructive extraction methods as recorded by groups in Wisoconsin
- changes and reduction in fishing, the primary industry for many communities
- threat of aquaculture in Barkley Sound
- Working Forest Legislation
- access to government mapping and inventories by community groups
- toxins in wild fish
- crown land sell off to developers near populated areas such as Courtenay and Qualicum and across the rest of the province
- loss of farmland in Delta to sub-divisions and green houses and bad policies
- deleterious effect of tourism on Selkirk Loop in Kootenays – no support/education or buffers to increased traffic
- ground water quality problems in Arrowsmith Watershed on Vancouver Island
- fish farms severely compromising wild salmon runs and marine habitat
- water use in the Interior – irrigation, dams etc.
- building of dams and changing of water regimes further threatening fish and wildlife by Alcan to generate income from sale of the electricity
- consideration of dams such as site C in B.C. without looking at effectiveness of previous conservation programs to avoid costly and habitat destroying energy production

Other issues:

- B.C. is 10 to 15 years behind the rest of world in terms of developing sustainable, alternative energy sources – there is broad support for renewable energy at the community level – need programs etc. at this level
- transition from volume-based to alternative forestry industry and economy is too slow
- need a different provincial government
- need to link general health and environmental issues
- more attention needed to deal with invasive species – we’re entering a huge epidemic – a tidal wave that will be hard to contain if we don’t get on it
- there seems to be a lack of understanding, particularly on the part of government and business, as to the intrinsic and ecological value of natural areas
- more attention needed for sustainability concepts and practices
- each group on every issue having to scale back at a time when we need to be ramping up
- volunteer burn-out
- to get more attention for habitat protection we need to connect habitat protection to species at risk or climate change or drinking water

Funding and Capacity-building needed for programs:

- more comprehensive education in the schools
- follow-up for restoration projects three to five years after
- continued stewardship group support in communities
- thorough data-gathering – need complete results to make good decisions
- outreach and education in Lower Mainland
- Quesnel and Qualicum public awareness about stewardship issues
- watershed implementation of programs and implementation of stewardship programs in Salmon River Watershed in Salmon Arm and in the Comox Valley
- Nature Centre support in the Interior and the North
- continuity of restoration and education on southern Vancouver Island
- using the excellent data gathered on successful marine monitoring and education programs to protect whales (not just letting it sit there in the data base)
- licensing whale watchers
- urban environmental issues in the Kootenays– recycling, waste, poverty

Funding and Capacity-building needed for programs: (continued)


- enhancement and restoration on hold in Englishman River
- “buy local” education and organic seeds for farmers
- information sharing in Broughton Archipelago – compromised by divide and conquer strategy of companies
- greening school yards
- steady monitoring of stocks
- habitat restoration projects (x3)
- water quality and quantity in B.C.
- ground water in B.C.
- permaculture demo and training site
- funds for continuing programs (not just starting them up)
- parks
- implementation of River Valley plan
- development of stream data gathered into accessible documents
- more education programs
- Christina lake management plan – assistance with monitoring and education programs
- marine life awareness in Richmond
- large regional program for Baynes Sound on hold
- more streamkeepers groups on the east coast of VI (no new ones since cut backs)
- creek monitoring in Cowichan
- reduction of natural resource consumption
- urban development in Campbell River – no restoration
- tourism signage, trail maintenance, fire impact and prevention programs, and tourism education in provincial wilderness parks
- networking and newsletters for B.C. Stewardship groups to better communicate with each other

Government Issues:

- forest practices review board
- loss of fish stewardship groups
- miss USHP instruction seminars and support
- miss Stewardship Coordinators funded by DFO – these were key networkers and supporters for the community and needed to be in place for at least another 5 years.


Appendix C

PowerPoint Presentation of Mid-way Survey Results: Funding Solutions Forum, January 25/04




The Funding Situation for
BC ENGOS

How Bad Is It?



Outline

- Purpose of Survey
- Overview of groups surveyed
- Funding: Who's Affected and How?
- Impacts on Stewardship Community
- Impacts on the Environment
- Some Initial Thoughts



BC ENGO Funding Survey

- To obtain a 'snap-shot' of the funding situation of non-profit environmental organizations in B.C.
- Gather initial information for Jan. 25 Meeting
- Provide basis for a position paper to Provincial and Federal Governments

Overview of Respondents

- 50 of about 300 ENGO's – all over province
- 30 with staff, 20 run by volunteer
- Types and Activities:
 - Stewardship, Land Trusts, Umbrella, Wildlife Rehab., Urban, Advocacy
 - Not Naturalists, Recycling, Hatcheries
- Size
 - Regional – 28; Local 18; Province 4
 - 12 – \$10,000/yr and under
 - 14 – \$200,000/yr and over
 - 20 – in between
 - 5 – 4-10 full-time staff; 25 – 1-2 full and part-time

Current Status of ENGOs

| Total - 50 | Status | Staff – 30 | Vol'r - 20 |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| • 1 – 2% | Good (robust) | 1 – 3% | 0 |
| • 19 – 38% | OK (viable) | 8 – 26% | 11 – 55% |
| • 22 – 44 % | Uncertain (waiting and hoping) | 16 – 53% | 6 – 30% |
| • 3 – 6% | Not Good (ailing) | 3 – 10 % | 0 |
| • 3 – 6% | Very Bad (floundering) | 2 – 2.5 | 1 – 5 % |
| • 1 – 2% | Terrible (moribund) | 0 | 1 – 5 % |
| • 1 – 2% | Mission Accomplished | 0 | 1 – 5 % |

Types of Organizations Affected

- Gov't-funded Stewardship/Restoration – 52% uncertain and worse
- Advocacy – OK
- Staffed – uncertain
- Volunteer-based – OK (although hearing that many streamkeepers groups folding)
- Larger, established - Varied

Impacts

- Cutting current and planned programs and activities
- Have laid or will lay off core staff (30%)
- Continuing reduced programs with part-time staff and volunteers
- Volunteer burn-out
- Great programs that have been developed are languishing or lost
- Inability to respond to pressing issues, public processes, or public inquiries
- Programs and activities suffering from lack of completeness and quality (assess't & monit'g)
- More time spent on fund-raising than on programs

Response


- Diversifying funding sources (eg: corporate, local government, foundations)
- Writing more proposals
- Working on donor base
- Contracting out or charging for services
- Creating more and non-traditional partnerships
- Belt-tightening and 'making do'
- Going after more 'in-kind' donations
- Refocusing on new (and more fundable) projects
- Expanding

Key Issues Not Addressed

- Education and outreach projects cut or developed and not implemented
- Less protection for important habitat
- Restoration projects at a stand-still
- Ongoing maintenance and monitoring not occurring
- Needed long-term studies not being undertaken
- Issues not addressed: pulp pollution, oil and gas, aquifer water quality and quantity, invasive species, parks, sensitive areas in forest lands and urban areas, aquaculture, rock fish fishery, 'working forest' legislation, coal-based methane on VI, protection for streams



Some Initial Thoughts

- Preliminary findings
 - Huge effort and capacity built by BC ENGO's in the last 5 years
 - Environment and environment NGO sector under siege
 - Beginning of Crisis – unless action is taken immediately, next two funding periods will bring large cut backs and folding of groups
 - Transition to non-government funding sources difficult and contentious (varied returns for time and energy)
 - Respective roles of ENGO's and government deserves deep and prolonged discussion
 - What do we really want and what is the best way to get it?
- 

Appendix D

Power Point Presentation on Results of Report by Julia Gardner of Dovetail Consulting

Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada:

Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support

Approach:

- Telephone interview survey of 150 conservation and stewardship group representatives across the country
- 22 in-depth telephone interviews of people with extensive experience in the sector
- Literature review

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*

Current funding realities:

Adequacy

- Funding is more difficult to secure now than in the last 10 years. *"Volatility"*
- Designated funding for core expenses is obtained by less than a third of the groups surveyed.
- Meeting salaries and administrative expenses is a challenge. *"Loss of infrastructure"*
- The scale of dollars required by the sector is growing as costs rise and the need for more work to protect the environment grows.

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*

Current funding realities:

Funding pressures

- Smaller groups with a narrower focus are at a disadvantage.
- There is a risk of compromising the mission of a group as it adapts to funding opportunities. *“Mission drift”*
- Funding priorities do not support the mission of some groups. *“Advocacy chill”*
- Most funding is short-term and hampers groups in accomplishing stewardship goals.

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*

Current funding realities:

More funding pressures

- Onerous application and reporting procedures. *“Reporting overload”*
- Fundraising can have a negative effect on the morale of a group. *“Human resource fatigue”*
- Funding notification does not always coincide with project start dates.
- As funding decreases, competition for funds is fierce.
- Costs of raising and administering funds are a major burden, especially for smaller groups.
- Charitable status is increasingly difficult to obtain and retain.

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*

Capacity Building and the Road Ahead: *Outline only*

- Contextual challenges:
Governance, Reluctance to change behaviour, Negative economic forces, Pressures on ecosystems, Lack of societal awareness
- Core issues affecting capacity:
Resources, Organizational development, Marketing and communication
- The promise of a sector working at full capacity:
More, Easier, Faster, Top Quality!

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*

Recommendations: *Actions for government*

- Prioritize funding the stewardship and conservation sector.
- Continue environmental programs that provide financial support.
- Assess the potential for tax- or fee-based sources of funding for the stewardship and conservation sector.
- Use endowments to the greatest extent possible.
- Continue to support standing funds.
- Strive for a harmonized approach to policy development.
- Coordinate stewardship and conservation programs and support a more integrated, broader scale approach.

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*

Recommendations: *Actions for grantors*

- Harmonize reporting and application procedures
- Supplement or accompany project funding with core funding that allows for effective implementation of projects and long-term capacity-building.
- Provide bridge funding to groups making transition to new forms of support
- Provide more multi-year grants and support applications for continuing as well as new projects.

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*

Recommendations: *Actions for conservation and stewardship groups*

- Stay healthy – invest in organizational development.
- Build strong linkages with the local community, including the private sector.
- Increase cooperation, coordination, networking.
- Improve messaging to be better received by business and the general public.

Jan. 2004 *Appreciating the Values, Needs and Potential of the Stewardship & Conservation Sector in Canada: Strategic Directions for Funding and Other Support*



Recommendations: *Popular, but problematic options*

- Leveraged funding “*House of cards*”
- Diversification of funding sources:
*individual donations, planned giving,
sales of services*
- Collaboration

Appendix E

Agenda for Funding Solutions Forum



Finding Solutions to the ENGO Funding Crisis in BC

10 am to 4 pm
Sunday, January 25, 2004
Four Points Sheraton Hotel (8368 Alexandra Rd, Richmond)

- 10:00** **Welcome / Opening:** Lorna Visser, Facilitator
 Expectations from Today's Forum
 Review agenda
- 10:30** **Introductions**
- 10:40** ***Key findings of Leading Edge research and Perspectives of an ENGO Board Member***
 Julia Gardner, Dovetail Consulting
- 10:50** **Follow-up work to date**
 Nikki Wright, Seachange Conservation Society
- 11:00** ***Economic Value of Stewardship & Conservation***
 Sheila Harrington & Linda Horsfall (Land Trust Alliance of BC)
- 11:20** ***How Bad Is It?: An Overview of the current status of ENGOs in BC***
 Angela Smailes (Millard/Piercy Watershed Stewards)
- 11: 40** **Discussion**

Agenda, Continued

- 12:00** *An Integrated Strategy: Watershed Connections across Canada*
Aileen Anderson, Langley Environmental Partners Society
- 12:20** **Catered Lunch, courtesy of our sponsors**
- 12:45** *Approaches to Green Funding: Some Models to Consider*
Dianne Ramage, Gretchen Harlow,
- 1:15** *Where Do We Go From Here and How Do We Get There?*
Break-out discussions
- 1:45** *Decide on Priorities*
- 3:00** *Develop Action Plan*
- 4:00** *What Happens Next?*

Adjournment

Thank you to our sponsors for making this forum possible!

*The Real Estate Foundation
Canadian Wildlife Service
Habitat Conservation Trust Fund
The Endswell Foundation
BC Environmental groups*