

# THE WOODLOT OWNERS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND: A SURVEY OF THEIR FOREST USE, MANAGEMENT, AND VALUES

**Solange Nadeau, Canadian Forest Service**  
**Tom Beckley, University of New Brunswick**  
**Robert Short, University of New Brunswick**



Agriculture  
and Forestry



Natural Resources  
Canada

Ressources naturelles  
Canada

Canadian Forest  
Service

Service canadien  
des forêts

**April 2003**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Forests and woodland are integral parts of the natural scenery of Prince Edward Island (PEI), even though these forests have been and still are intensely remodelled. Ninety percent of PEI's forests belong to some 16 600 private woodlot owners, and these individuals have a major impact on the state of this resource. We know little about PEI woodlot owners, even though studies were conducted in the mid 1980s. To overcome this, the PEI Department of Agriculture and Forestry, the University of New Brunswick, and Natural Resources Canada (Canadian Forest Service) collaborated on a survey of woodlot owners. The goal was to elicit beliefs, motivations, and attitudes of PEI woodlot owners and understand their role in forest management decisions. The survey was sent to a sample of woodlot owners that had been stratified to assess three sizes of private woodlots: small (1–10 acres), medium (11–50 acres), and large (51 acres or more). We completed two survey mail outs and a postcard follow-up, and received a 52% response rate. The main results of the survey are presented below.

In this analysis, we found it appropriate to occasionally report on owners of "smaller" or "larger" woodlot. For example, when we say that owners of smaller woodlots are more likely to do an activity, this means that this activity is more popular among owners of small woodlots than among owners of medium woodlots, and more popular among owners of medium woodlots than among owners of large woodlots.

### **Demographic profile of PEI woodlot owners**

Most respondents were males (77%) aged 45 to 64 (51%). Many woodlot owners work full time (43%) and earn a family income of \$20 000 to \$60 000 (43%). One out of four respondents did not complete high school, but most have higher education, some college, or a technical school or university degree.

### **Characteristics of woodlot ownership**

Many respondents (44%) live on their woodlots and 18% live outside PEI. Non-residents are more likely to own small woodlots. A third of the respondents own a farm beside their woodlot, but the percentage increases with the size of the woodlot owned, with 49% of owners of large woodlots owning a farm.

The woodlots of most owners (61%) comprise a single parcel of land, but this proportion is much higher among owners of small woodlots (78%) than among owners of large woodlots (30%). For owners of large woodlots, 54% own two to five parcels. Woodlots are owned by individuals (46%), jointly (46%), or in various partnerships (5%).

Many woodlot owners have owned their land for less than 15 years (40%), while 31% have owned it for 15 to 30 years. Most owners (65%) purchased part of their woodlot, and about a third inherited some of

their lands. Owners obtained their woodlots from family (54%) and other individuals (45%). Very few woodlot owners (15%) sell or given away woodland, and when they do so, it goes to family (30%), other individuals (43%), and logging contractors (25%).

Most owners (59%) do not have a management plan for their woodlot and are not interested in getting one. However, one out of four owners are interested in developing such a plan. Owners of larger woodlots are more likely to have a management plan for their woodlot.

### **Reasons for owning a woodlot**

Owners were asked to provide the main reason they own a woodlot. The most popular are: it is part of their home or farm (29%), they have inherited it (13%), it provides firewood or lumber (14%), and for personal use or enjoyment (9%). Owners of medium and large woodlots are more likely to cite timber production as their main motive, but owners of small woodlots are more likely to cite vacation property and recreation as their main motivation.

Motives related to legacy (given as heritage for future generations) are rated as important by most owners. Motives related to environmental considerations (wildlife enjoyment, ecosystem protection, water quality, green space) are also important for most owners. However, timber harvesting is rated as not important for most owners in all sizes of ownership, even though owners of large woodlots give it more importance. Most owners also rate economic motives (retirement funds, investment, making a living, a complement to income) as not important even if owners of large woodlots give more importance to these reasons.

### **Frequency of timber harvesting**

The frequency of timber harvesting varies greatly according to the size of woodlot owned. Many small woodlot owners (49%) have never harvested trees on their woodlot; this percentage drops to 23% for owners of medium woodlots and 10% for owners of large woodlots. Owners who harvest yearly follow the opposite trend, with 13% among owners of small woodlots, 29% for medium woodlots, and 37% for large woodlots.

Many woodlot owners have not been involved in forest harvesting over the last 10 years, and most of them own small or medium woodlots. This mitigates the impact this behaviour could have on the timber available for harvesting. In fact, area estimates provided by respondents show that owners of small woodlots control 2% of the total land base belonging to our sample (66 800 acres), owners of medium woodlots control 16%, and owners of large woodlot control the remaining 82%. Although 39% of owners have not harvested timber in the last 10 years, some harvesting has taken place on 84% of the land base

owned by our respondents, and only 6% of the land base belongs to owners who have not harvested and who have no intention of doing so in the future.

### **Reasons to harvest**

Most owners who had harvested timber over the last 10 years rate stand characteristics (trees were mature, removed damaged trees, improve remaining trees) as important in their decision to harvest. Owners of larger woodlots also value the need for wood for personal uses while owners of small woodlots value improvement of scenic quality or recreation opportunities.

### **Timber products harvested**

The wood harvested by owners in the last 10 years was put to various uses. We asked these owners if the timber products were for personal use or if they were sold. Firewood (68%), softwood sawlogs (32%), poles and pilings (14%), and hardwood sawlogs (13%) are the products that many owners keep for their own use. Softwood sawlogs (34%), pulpwood (30%), firewood (14%), and hardwood sawlogs (11%) are the most popular products sold. Overall, owners of medium woodlots are more likely to use timber that they harvested, but owners of large woodlots are more likely to put it on the market.

### **People involved in timber harvesting and satisfaction regarding contractors**

Most of the woodlot owners who have harvested timber from their land over the last 10 years have done so with their own labour or with the help of family; only one out of four has hired an independent contractor. Owners of smaller woodlots are more likely to do the harvesting themselves and with the help of family members, while owners of larger woodlots are more likely to hire a contractor. In fact, owners of large woodlots are four times more likely to have experience with logging contractors than owners of small woodlots (61% vs. 16%). Owners of larger woodlots also express higher satisfaction with the job done by contractors than owners of small woodlots.

### **Reasons not to harvest**

Most owners who have not harvested in the last 10 years have no intention of harvesting in the future. The percentage of owners expressing this view decreased as the size of ownership increased, ranging from 61% among owners of small woodlots to 29% among owners of large woodlots. Among owners who have not harvested in the last 10 years but might do so in the future, the most important reasons that prevented them from engaging in this activity are concerns about damaging the remaining trees (42%), lack of time (40%), and absence of financial needs (37%).

### **Clearcutting as a harvesting method**

Forty-five percent of owners of small woodlots judge clearcutting as an unacceptable means of harvesting timber on private land, but only 34% of owners of large woodlots do so. Owners of large woodlots are

also more likely to agree that clearcutting should be allowed where suitable, while owners of small woodlots are more likely to agree that clearcutting should not be used anywhere. This reflects the trend observed in use of clearcut by woodlot owners who have harvested timber in the last 10 years: owners of larger woodlots clearcut more often than owners of smaller woodlots.

### **Harvesting of non-timber forest products**

Non-timber forest products are marginally used (10% and less) by woodlot owners, except for berries (23%) and boughs and brush (18%) collected for personal use.

### **Forest management**

Removing low quality trees (38%), selective cutting (25%), and planting (21%) are the forest management activities that have been the most popular among woodlot owners in the past five years. A similar percentage of woodlot owners are also interested in forest management in the next five years. Overall, owners of large woodlots are engaged and plan to be engaged in more forest management activities.

### **Advice on forest management**

There is an important variation in the number of owners who received advice according to the size of their woodlots. Most owners of large woodlots (57%) receive advice on management of their woodlots but most owners of medium (62%) and small woodlots (74%) do not. Among those who receive advice on managing their woodlot, most, especially owners of larger woodlots, get advice from PEI Forest Service technicians. Logging contractors provide more advice to owners of medium and large woodlots and neighbours and other landowners provide more advice to owners of small woodlots.

### **Learning tools**

Consulting with foresters or other natural resources professionals by means of pamphlets or newsletters is rated as the most useful tool for learning about forest management. Home courses, talking with contractors, and membership in landowner organizations are rated as the least useful.

### **Awareness of woodlot management programs and woodlot owners' organizations**

There is a low rate of participation in woodlot owners' associations, although 39% of respondents would consider joining such an organization. There is also a low rate of awareness about woodlot management programs (24%). Despite that, 50% of respondents are satisfied with government efforts to support and encourage better woodlot management.

### **Forest sustainability**

The survey uncovered a concern about the sustainability of PEI forests. Regardless of the size of ownership, most respondents are concerned that too much wood is being cut on PEI. Most also disagree

that there is enough timber in PEI for all users. Finally, 48% of respondents agree that PEI will have little wood left in 10 to 20 years.

### **Conservation**

Woodlot owners share common views on conservation issues. Most (60%) agree that greater efforts are needed to protect old growth forests. Most (63%) also agree that government should provide incentives to private woodlot owners for protected areas, while 51% are concerned about the lack of financial incentives for preservation.

### **Wildlife issues**

A few woodlot owners (17%) think that wildlife has no impact on their management decisions. There is high acceptability (71% to 75%) for practices such as leaving clumps of trees for wildlife or using selective cutting to preserve wildlife habitat.

### **Owners' rights versus regulation**

Overall, woodlot owners have mixed opinions about restrictions to private rights; opposition to this is stronger among owners of large woodlots. Many owners (44%) agree that ownership does not give people rights to do whatever they want, while almost a third think that society could control what owners do with their private woodland. However, only 24% to 28% of respondents support issues such as accepting cutting restrictions on their land, legislative requirements for best management practices, or involvement of governments to regulate cutting on private land; this raises the opposition to between 30% and 41%.

### **Use of herbicides and pesticides**

The position of woodlot owners about the use of pesticides and herbicides is also mixed, with around a third disagreeing and disapproving and about a quarter agreeing and approving. Owners of large woodlots are slightly more likely to support the use of pesticides and herbicides.

### **Financial concerns**

Owners of larger woodlots are more concerned about financial issues related to taxation of woodlot income, low levels of funding for forest management, and the high costs of silviculture.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
Executive Summary.....	i
List of Table .....	vii
1.0 Introduction: .....	1
1.1 Survey methods.....	1
1.2 Data Analysis.....	3
2.0 Woodlot owners and the land they own .....	4
2.1 Demographic profile of PEI woodlot owners.....	4
2.1.1 Gender, Age, Occupation, Education, Income .....	4
2.1.2 Woodlot owners, residence, and farm woodlots. ....	6
2.1.3 Characteristics of woodlot and motivation for ownership.....	7
2.1.4 Reasons for owning woodlot.....	10
3.0 Woodlot owner behaviour .....	14
3.1 Management planning .....	14
3.2 Factors affecting woodlot management .....	15
3.2.1 Wildlife concerns .....	15
3.2.2 Finding a reliable crew .....	15
3.3 Harvesting intentions and implications for wood supply. ....	16
3.4 Timber harvesting on woodlots.....	17
3.4.1 Reasons for harvesting timber and products harvested .....	18
3.4.2 Harvesting methods, who does the harvest and experience with contractors .....	20
3.5 Nonharvesting woodlot owners.....	23
3.6 Non-timber forest products .....	23
3.7 Other forest management activities .....	26
3.8 Sources of information for woodlot owners.....	27
3.9 Woodlot owner associations .....	30
3.10 Woodlot management programs.....	31
4.0 Woodlot owner attitudes.....	32
5.0 Future of woodland .....	39
6.0 Additional comments .....	40
7.0 Conclusions .....	41
8.0 References .....	43
Appendix 1: Survey questionnaire .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Appendix 2: Other responses .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Appendix 3:Expanded tables .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Appendix 4: Answer and coding of question10: What is the one main reason you own woodland?	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page</b>
Table 1: Information about the mail survey and sampling error .....	2
Table 2: Information about weighted sample.....	3
Table 3: Gender of respondents .....	4
Table 4: Age of respondents .....	4
Table 5: Characteristics of respondents' employment .....	5
Table 6: Highest education attained by respondents.....	5
Table 7: Annual income of respondents' households before taxes.....	6
Table 8: Distance that respondents reside in relation to closest woodlot.....	6
Table 9: Ownership of a farm within one kilometre of respondents' woodlot.....	7
Table 10: Number of individual tracts or parcels of woodland owned .....	7
Table 11: Length of ownership.....	8
Table 12: Proportion of owners who acquired forest through various means .....	8
Table 13: The sources from which respondents had obtained their woodlot .....	9
Table 14: The number of times that respondents had sold or given away woodland .....	9
Table 15: The individual or group that received respondents' sold or given woodland .....	10
Table 16: Type of ownership that majority of respondents' property is held .....	10
Table 17: Main reasons given by respondents for owning woodland .....	11
Table 18: Importance of various reasons respondents own woodland.....	12
Table 19: The current situation of owners with regard to a woodlot management plan .....	15
Table 20: Impact of the possible affect on wildlife and their habitat on forest management decisions .....	15
Table 21: Importance of finding a trustworthy harvesting crew in deciding about harvesting or removing trees from woodlot.....	16
Table 22: How often respondent, or someone they asked, harvested trees from woodland.....	16
Table 23: Timber harvest intentions and affected woodland area. ....	17
Table 24: Importance of various reasons in the decision to harvest in the last 10 years.....	19
Table 25: Products and use of trees harvested or removed by those who have harvested in the last 10 years .....	20
Table 26: Harvesting methods used to remove trees by those who have harvested in the last 10 years.....	21
Table 27: Who conducted most of the harvesting on respondents' woodlot.....	22
Table 28: Whether respondents had experience with logging contractors on their land .....	22
Table 29: Satisfaction of respondents who had experience with logging contractors.....	22
Table 30: Harvest intentions of those respondents who had not harvested in the last 10 years....	23
Table 31: Reasons for not harvesting by those who would consider doing so, but who had not harvested in the last 10 years.....	24
Table 32: Forest products collected by respondents and their families in the past 5 years .....	25
Table 33: Past and proposed activities on woodland.....	27
Table 34: Had the respondents ever received advice or information about the woodlot that they own in PEI.....	28



**LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)**

		<b>Page</b>
Table 35:	Source of advice for the respondents who had received advice on their woodlots.....	28
Table 36:	Usefulness of different learning tools to assist owners in managing their woodlands.....	29
Table 37:	Attended meetings or received information from a woodland owners' organizations .....	30
Table 38:	Use of technical services from or attended seminars offered by a woodland owners' organization.....	31
Table 39:	Interest in being a member of a woodland owners' association.....	31
Table 40:	Awareness about woodlot management programs to assist woodlot owners.....	31
Table 41:	Interest in long-term agreement with an agency that would assist them in managing their forest .....	31
Table 42:	Satisfaction about the government's efforts to support and encourage better woodlot management .....	32
Table 43:	Assessment of sustainability of forest management according to ownership .....	32
Table 44:	Agreement of respondents with given statements about forest management in PEI .....	34
Table 45:	Respondents' attitudes toward clearcutting.....	35
Table 46:	Concerns about problems facing woodland owners today.....	36
Table 47:	Agreement with given perspectives on forest issues .....	37
Table 48:	Acceptability of given forest management practices for PEI.....	38
Table 49:	Respondents' plans for their woodland in PEI in the next 10 years.....	39
Table 50:	Additional comments written by respondents .....	40
Table 51:	Complete data on owners who acquired forest through various means	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 52:	Complete data on the sources from which respondents had obtained their woodland.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 53:	Complete data on the individual or group that received respondents' sold or given woodland.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 54:	Complete data on products and use of trees harvested or removed by those who have harvested in the last 10 years.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 55:	Complete data on forest products collected by respondents and their families in the past 5 years.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 56:	Complete data on past and proposed activities on woodland	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 57:	Complete data on source from which owners have received advice	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 58:	Complete data on respondents' plans for their woodland in PEI in the next 10 years	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION:**

Forests and woodland are integral parts of the natural scenery of Prince Edward Island (PEI). These forests, which belong to the Atlantic Maritime Ecozone, are composed of a mix of softwoods and hardwoods, and have been intensely remodelled by uses such as shipbuilding and agriculture. Another key feature of PEI's forests is that 90% of it belongs to private woodlot owners. Therefore, primary responsibility for the stewardship of the province's forests resides with this group. Despite this, we know little about PEI woodlot owners.

The last survey of this group was completed in 1988 (IEA Consulting Group 1988). Given average turnover rates for parcels of rural real estate, it is likely that many current woodlot owners are different from those surveyed nearly 20 years ago. Also, even if the ownership has not changed, the objectives and the values the owners attach to this land are likely to have changed. It is important to track trends and changes in forest owners' attitudes, values, and motivations for several reasons: (1) to determine future wood supply, (2) to assess the degree to which enlightened forest management is taking place, and (3) to monitor changes in how owners view their land and use it.

To update the available information on PEI woodlot owners, the PEI Department of Agriculture and Forestry, the University of New Brunswick, and Natural Resources Canada (Canadian Forest Service) joined their efforts to conduct a woodlot owner survey. The study was designed to elicit motivations, beliefs, and attitudes of PEI woodlot owners and to understand their role in forest management decisions. This report presents results from the survey organized into three sections. The first section describes PEI woodlot owners and the nature of their holdings and includes background demographic information on owners (such as age, income, gender, and education) and information about their land holdings (number of parcels, whether they are resident on their land or are absentee owners). The second describes woodlot owners' activities and management of their land and includes information on management planning, harvesting, and intent to harvest. The third focuses on the attitudes and values of PEI woodlot owners about land stewardship, forest management, and regulations.

### **1.1 Survey methods**

During the fall of 2001, researchers at the Canadian Forest Service and the University of New Brunswick created a survey for woodlot owners. The survey incorporated items from previous survey research from the Nova Forest Alliance (Sanderson et al. 2000) and from other sources (Roy 1983, Wellstead and Brown 1993, USDA Forest Service 2001) to increase comparability to other social science research on

woodlot owners. The survey instrument was pre-tested and edited in collaboration with Agriculture and Forestry staff (see Appendix 1).

In December 2001, the Department of Agriculture and Forestry developed a database of woodlot owners for the province. They estimated that private forests belong to some 16 600 owners. Since we wanted to obtain a statistically significant representation for different sizes of woodlot ownership, a stratified sample was selected from the woodlot owners' database. The owners' population was divided into three categories: those who own from 1 to 10 acres (small woodlots), those who own from 11 to 50 acres (medium woodlots), and those who own 51 or more acres (large woodlots); a random sample was selected from each of these groups.

Since we knew that not every person contacted would answer the questionnaire and we wanted to get enough respondents to have reliable results, the sample size was selected based on the expectation of a 50% response rate. A total of 2199 questionnaires were mailed out. We asked that the individual who makes most of the forest management decisions fill out the survey. We used a modified Dillman method of mailing surveys (Salant and Dillman 1994) and follow-up reminder postcards. We completed two rounds of survey mailing and postcard follow-up and got a 52% response rate. There was no readily available information that could be used to check for the presence of non-response bias. Table 1 summarizes the sample's characteristics, the response rate, and the sampling error. Information on sampling error provides guidelines on the reliability of the results for each category of ownership class and for the overall population of woodlot owners.

Table 1: Information about the mail survey and sampling error

	<b>Woodlot Ownership Size</b>				<b>Total</b>
	Small	Medium	Large	Unknown	
Estimated population	5 956	6 904	3 781	-	16 641
Mailed out surveys	733	733	733	-	2 199
Undeliverable surveys	138	39	1	-	178
Delivered surveys	595	694	772	-	2 061
Unusable surveys	10	10	3	6	29
Completed surveys	244	390	441	-	1 075
Response rate	41%	56%	57%	-	52%
Sampling error (for a 95% confidence level)	± 0.06	± 0.05	± 0.04	-	± 0.03

Several questionnaires (178) were returned to us as undeliverable or with mention that people did not own woodland. Thus, we estimate that 2061 questionnaires were delivered to households of forest owners. Among all the questionnaires that came back, 29 could not be used for the study as they were

returned with the survey identification number removed, or were otherwise ruined. Completed surveys were those that were returned indicating that they owned woodland and were at least partially filled out by the respondent. Answers to the completed surveys were coded and entered into SPSS 11 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for statistical analysis.

## 1.2 Data analysis

Since the study sample has been stratified by size of ownership, owners belonging to each class of ownership had various chances of being chosen to participate in this study. For example, the proportion of owners of large woodlots in the sample is much higher (41%) than the proportion of this group in the estimated population of woodlot owners (23%) (Table 2). To account for the unequal chances of selection of each group, weight factors were used in frequency analysis so that results reported in tables will reflect the relative weight of each group within the overall population. Unless otherwise mentioned, all tables presenting frequency are weighted distributions, and refer to the total number of respondents (n=1075).

Table 2: Information about weighted sample

Size of woodlot	Estimated population		Useable questionnaire		Weight factor
	Number of owners	Proportion of total	Number	Proportion	
Small woodlots	5 956	36%	244	23%	1.57
Medium woodlots	6 904	41%	390	36%	1.16
Large woodlots	3 781	23%	441	41%	0.55
All woodlot	16 641		1 075		

In the result section, frequency tables present results for each category of ownership and for the total population. Please note that occasionally the frequencies might not add to 100% because numbers were rounded. We used Chi-square tests to assess if the differences observed between answers provided by owners of different size of woodlots could be attributed to hazard or if they existed in the population. In a couple of cases, the number of respondents who picked a specific answer was low and we used the method described by Lawal and Upton (1980) to verify if chi-square result was still a good approximation. An asterisk (\*) flags significant relationships in tables or their title. It should also be noted that some of the scale used in survey's questions were collapsed by regrouping similar choices of answer such as totally agree and agree, or unacceptable and totally unacceptable. Finally, we found it appropriate to occasionally report on owners of "smaller" or "larger" woodlot. For example, when we say that owners of smaller woodlots are more likely to do an activity, this means that this activity is more popular among owners of small woodlots than among owners of medium woodlots, and more popular among owners of medium woodlots than among owners of large woodlots.

## 2.0 WOODLOT OWNERS AND THE LAND THEY OWN

### 2.1 Demographic profile of PEI woodlot owners

We asked some background demographic questions to obtain a snapshot of who owns PEI woodland in the year 2002. We inquired about our respondents' age, gender, occupation, education, annual household income, location of their primary residence (with respect to their woodlots), and the number of parcels they own.

#### 2.1.1 Gender, age, occupation, education, income

Most respondents were male, which is not surprising given that we asked the person most likely to make forest management decisions to fill out the survey (Table 3). Another noticeable pattern is that women are more likely to be managing smaller woodlot than men. The average age of respondents is middle-aged or older. The two age classes that comprise owners between the ages of 45 and 64 account for 51% of all owners (Table 4). Over 70% of owners are between 35 and 64 years old. There are few owners younger than 34 (6%); in fact, there are more over the age of 74 (7%) than in the 34 and younger categories. As landowners live longer, their heirs are now inheriting land at a much older age. As well, with land values increasing, people cannot afford to buy woodland until they have accumulated some capital.

Table 3: Gender of respondents\*

Gender	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
Male	68	79	86	77
Female	30	21	12	22
No response	2	0	2	1

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 4: Age of respondents

Age	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
Under 35 years	9	5	3	6
35 – 44 years	19	19	17	19
45 – 54 years	28	27	30	28
55 – 64 years	24	23	21	23
65 – 74 years	11	17	17	15
75 years and more	6	8	9	7
No response	2	2	3	2

Nearly half of the survey respondents work full time, year round (Table 4). As mentioned earlier, provincial and national data suggest Canadians are living longer, and the same is true of woodlot owners. Given the national population trends, it is not surprising that 25% of our respondents are retired. Common entries in the "Other" category (Table 5) included "self-employed" and "homemaker" (for details see Appendix 2).

Table 5: Characteristics of respondents' employment

Employment	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
Full-time year-round worker	45	40	46	43
Full-time seasonal worker	11	14	11	12
Part-time year-round worker	4	5	4	4
Part-time seasonal worker	2	3	3	3
Retired	23	28	26	26
Other	10	6	7	8
No response	4	3	3	4

The education attained by respondents was evenly distributed across categories (Table 6), but most have pursued postsecondary education at some point in their lives. Forty or fifty years ago, it was not uncommon for people to quit before the end of high school to work on the farm. Given the rural character and older profile of PEI woodlot owners, it is not surprising that over a quarter of woodlot owners have less than a grade 12 education.

Table 6: Highest education attained by respondents

Education	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
Less than 12th grade	20	29	29	26
High school	19	20	18	19
Some college	18	14	14	15
Associate or technical degree	11	11	12	11
Bachelor's degree	16	11	13	13
Graduate degree	12	11	10	11
No response	4	3	4	4

Most respondents fall in the middle range for annual household income (Table 7). Quite a few respondents (19%) refused to answer this question. Despite this, many respondents (43%) report earnings of between \$20 000 and \$60 000 and 28% more than \$60 000 yearly.

Table 7: Annual household income of respondents before taxes

Household income	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Less than \$20,000	9	11	9	10
\$20,000 – 39,999	18	24	24	22
\$40,000 – 59,999	21	22	20	21
\$60,000 – 99,999	18	15	19	17
\$100,000 or more	13	11	10	11
No response	21	17	18	19

### 2.1.2 Woodlot owners, residence, and farm woodlots

Respondents were asked how far they lived from their closest wooded property and if they owned a farm within one kilometre of any part of their woodlot. Most live on or within 10 kilometres of a wooded property, and do not own farms (Tables 8 and 9). Compared to the 1988 estimates, there are fewer woodlot owners who have their home on the same parcel of land as one of their woodlots. IEA Consulting Group (1988) estimated that 52% of woodlot owners had their home beside a woodlot, compared to 44% in 2002. Many factors might have contributed to this decline, one of which is the number of individuals who own forested land but are not residents of the Island. Overall, 18% of our respondents are not Island residents, and these are more likely to own small (23%) or medium woodlots (16%) than large ones (13%). Of these, some are Islanders who have moved away and some are people from away who have bought land on the Island.

Another trend in land ownership is the link between forest and farm holding. A third of our respondents hold woodlots as a part of their farm holding, and those owning larger woodlots are more likely to be in this situation. Previous surveys of PEI woodlot owners did not provide specific information on woodlots that were part of a farm holding. Since the number of farms in PEI has continued to decline, from 2217 in 1996 to 1845 in 2001 (Statistic Canada 2003), it is likely that fewer woodlots are now held by people who farm.

Table 8: Distance that respondents reside in relation to closest woodlot\*

Distance	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
On wooded property	48	40	43	44
Within 10 km	14	26	27	22
Within 11 – 50 km	10	15	13	13
Within 51 – 100 km	3	2	4	3
Outside PEI	23	16	13	18
No response	1	0	1	1

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 9: Ownership of a farm within one kilometre of respondents' woodlot\*

Farm ownership	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	18	36	49	33
No	78	62	49	65
No response	4	2	2	3

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

### 2.1.3 Characteristics of woodlot and motivation for ownership

This section describes factors related to woodlot owners and their land ownership. We asked owners how many parcels they own, how long they have owned some land, how they obtained their land, and whether they have sold, bequeathed, or given away any land that they once owned. We also asked owners why they owned a woodlot.

Although most respondents own only one parcel of woodland, we can see significant variation between the size of the property and the number of parcels owned (Table 10). Owners of large woodlots are more likely to own many parcels compared to owners of small or medium woodlots.

Table 10: Number of individual tracts or parcels of woodland owned\*

Number of parcels	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
1 parcel	78	63	30	61
2 parcels	11	21	27	19
3 – 5 parcels	6	11	27	13
6 – 10 parcels	2	1	8	3
More than 10 parcels	0	3	5	3
No response	3	2	3	3

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

The period of ownership varies considerably, with 40% owning a woodlot for less than 15 years and 50% owning a woodlot for more than 15 years (Table 11). In general, owners of large woodlots have owned them for longer periods.



Table 11: Period of ownership\*

Period of time owned	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
0 – 5 years	18	11	8	13
6 – 10 years	16	12	9	13
11 – 15 years	16	14	12	14
15 – 30 years	29	31	35	31
31 years and more	11	21	28	19
No response	10	11	8	10

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Woodlot owners acquire land through various means, but the most common is through purchases or bequests. For all sizes of woodlots, most owners acquire their land by buying it, and many (32%) inherit woodlots (Table 12). Overall, owners of large woodlots are more likely to have bought and to have inherited land. Considering that owners of large woodlots own more parcels of land, it is not surprising that they have used more diversified methods to obtain this land. As owners might have obtained woodland by more than one method, the total for each category of ownership or for the whole sample is likely to be greater than 100%.

Table 12: Percent of owners who acquired forest through various means

Method obtained	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Bought*	66	61	72	65
Inherited*	24	35	39	32
Gift	9	8	7	8
Other	1	1	1	1

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 51 in Appendix 3.

Respondents have obtained their woodlot through various methods and from a many sources. A little more than half of the owners acquired their properties from family members (either through inheritance, gift, or sale), and this is especially true for owners of medium and large woodlots (Table 13). Acquisitions from “other individuals” are a close second (45%). Many responded to the “other” category with entries such as “real estate” or “tax sale” (see Appendix 2 for details).

Table 13: The sources from which respondents had obtained their woodlot

Former owner of woodlot	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Family*	45	58	62	54
Other individual	44	41	54	45
Land developer	1	2	1	1
Investment group	1	0	1	0.3
Logging contractor	0	0	0	0
Other	8	7	7	7

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 52 in Appendix 3.

Very few respondents have sold or parted with any woodland owned, though owners of large woodlots are more likely to have done so (Table 14). Owners who have sold or given away land sell or give to unrelated "other individuals" first (43%) and family members second (30%) (Table 15). This is similar to the distribution of former owners listed in Table 13. However, many respondents have sold their land to independent logging contractors (27%), a source from which few owners had originally acquired their property.

Table 14: The number of times that respondents had sold or given away woodland\*

Times land sold or given away	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Never	90	87	78	86
1 time	8	9	13	10
2 – 5 times	1	4	7	4
6 + times	1	0	1	1
No response	1	0	1	1

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 15: The individual or group that received woodland sold or given by respondents (n=147)

Receiver of land sold or given	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Family	37	24	33	30
Other individual	42	44	43	43
Land developer	0	0	2	1
Investment group	0	0	2	1
Logging contractor	24	28	27	25
Other	0	5	10	5

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 53 in Appendix 3.

The vast majority of woodland is held in one of two forms of ownership—individual or joint (Table 16). Joint ownership includes a husband and wife whose names are both on the deed. Over 90% of woodlot owners listed individual or joint ownership in response to this question.

Table 16: Type of ownership that majority of respondents' property is held\*

Type of ownership	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Individual	42	49	45	46
Joint	48	45	43	46
Formal partnership	3	1	5	3
Informal partnership	1	2	3	2
Non-forestry corporation	1	1	2	1
Non-profit group	1	0	0	0.5
Other	2	1	1	1
No response	1	1	0	1

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

#### 2.1.4 Reasons for owning woodland

Owners of PEI's woodland own land for various reasons. We asked respondents to list the main reason they own woodland. The responses were grouped under common themes for analysis (Appendix 4). Most owners acquired their woodlot incidentally when they bought property for their home or farm (Table 17). Many also passively obtained their land through inheritance. In either case, woodlot owners are not necessarily seeking out opportunities to own forestland. This explains, in part, the results about low levels of active management of woodland (discussed later in the report). Lumber and firewood production are considered important by owners of larger woodlots, while the forest as part of vacation property is more popular among owners of small woodlots.

Table 17: Main reasons given by respondents for owning woodland\*

Main reason	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Part of home or farm	31	29	28	29
Inherited or given	14	13	13	13
Personal use or enjoyment	11	8	8	9
Firewood only	5	13	7	9
Firewood and lumber	1	6	7	5
Part of vacation property	12	3	1	6
Important to family	4	5	6	5
Investment or asset	2	4	6	4
Conservation or wildlife	2	3	4	3
Recreation	4	1	1	2
Income or development	1	2	5	2
Lumber only	0	1	1	1
Other	1	0	2	1
No response	12	12	13	12

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

People own woodland for more than one reason, and they use it for many reasons. We asked respondents to supply the main reason for owning woodland, and then we provided them with a list of common reasons for ownership and asked them to rate the importance they attach to each.

The themes of stewardship and legacy are important in woodlot owners' motivations for owning land (Table 18). A majority (57%) also listed "to preserve forest ecosystems" as important or very important, and this holds for every size of ownership. Even more listed "for the sake of future generations" as important or very important (67%), with owners of medium and large woodlots slightly more likely to rate this as important. Most (54%) also listed "to pass on as a heritage" as important or very important.

The incidental nature of woodland ownership for some is reflected in the response that woodland is very important as part of their farm or home (21% and 23%, respectively). However, there are important differences in the patterns of answers to these questions. Owners of small woodlots give more importance to their woodland being part of their cottage or home property, while owners of larger woodlots give more importance to their woodlot being part of their farm. Many owners also enjoy their property as a wildlife area or simply as "green space."

Table 18: Importance of various reasons respondents own woodland

Reason	Importance	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
To pass on as a heritage	Not important/slightly imp.	39	33	32	35
	Important/very imp.	48	56	57	54
	No response	12	11	10	11
For maple syrup*	Not important/slightly imp.	82	80	78	80
	Important/very imp.	1	3	5	3
	No response	17	17	17	17
Because I've inherited it*	Not important/slightly imp.	55	42	45	47
	Important/very imp.	26	42	39	36
	No response	19	16	16	17
To preserve forest ecosystem	Not important/slightly imp.	31	29	25	29
	Important/very imp.	53	57	63	57
	No response	16	14	12	14
For sake of future generations*	Not important/slightly imp.	25	18	18	21
	Important/very imp.	61	70	71	67
	No response	14	12	11	12
For Christmas trees	Not important/slightly imp.	81	81	81	81
	Important/very imp.	2	4	2	3
	No response	17	16	17	17
As a retirement fund	Not important/slightly imp.	66	70	66	68
	Important/very imp.	18	16	19	17
	No response	16	13	15	15
As an investment	Not important/slightly imp.	57	60	56	58
	Important/very imp.	29	27	32	29
	No response	14	13	12	13
As a location for my cottage*	Not important/slightly imp.	59	68	72	65
	Important/very imp.	27	18	13	20
	No response	14	15	15	14
As a location for my permanent residence*	Not important/slightly imp.	47	57	57	53
	Important/very imp.	41	29	28	33
	No response	12	14	15	14
For wildlife enjoyment	Not important/slightly imp.	32	35	35	34
	Important/very imp.	55	53	55	54
	No response	13	13	10	12
Enjoyment of owning "green space"	Not important/slightly imp.	22	26	31	26
	Important/very imp.	67	63	59	63
	No response	11	12	11	11
To make a living*	Not important/slightly imp.	79	79	73	78
	Important/very imp.	4	6	12	7
	No response	17	15	15	16

Table 18 (continued): Importance of various reasons respondents own woodland

Reason	Importance	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
To complement yearly income*	Not important/slightly imp.	81	81	74	80
	Important/very imp.	2	5	12	5
	No response	17	14	14	15
To harvest firewood*	Not important/slightly imp.	72	47	40	54
	Important/very imp.	15	45	52	36
	No response	13	8	8	10
Forest land is part of a farm*	Not important/slightly imp.	61	50	40	52
	Important/very imp.	25	39	49	36
	No response	14	11	11	12
For hunting and fishing	Not important/slightly imp.	76	78	74	76
	Important/very imp.	7	8	12	9
	No response	17	14	15	15
For recreation*	Not important/slightly imp.	48	61	56	55
	Important/very imp.	39	26	31	32
	No response	14	13	13	13
For timber harvesting*	Not important/slightly imp.	77	64	53	66
	Important/very imp.	7	23	37	20
	No response	16	13	11	13
To protect water quality*	Not important/slightly imp.	39	40	29	37
	Important/very imp.	46	46	59	49
	No response	15	13	12	14
To harvest non-timber forest products*	Not important/slightly imp.	75	78	70	75
	Important/very imp.	7	8	16	9
	No response	17	14	14	15
For other reasons	Not important/slightly imp.	27	24	23	25
	Important/very imp.	9	7	7	8
	No response	63	69	70	67

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Few owners rate their woodlot as important for monetary purposes or financial gain. More than two thirds (68%) state that their woodland is not important or slightly important as a source of retirement funds. Few respondents rely on forestland income to supplement annual income, and nearly 80% feel that their land was not important for making a living. However, the importance of the woodlots in making a living or supplementing annual income is greater for owners of larger woodlots.

Production of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) (e.g., maple syrup, Christmas trees, and berries) is also minor factors in reasons for ownership. Production of some of the NTFPs is, however, significantly more important for owners of larger woodlots. There is also a clear trend for owners of larger woodlots to give

more importance to production of firewood and timber as a motive of ownership than owners of smaller woodlots. For example, while most small woodlot owners attach little importance to harvesting firewood, most large woodlot owners rate this as an important reason for ownership.

All this suggests that many PEI woodlot owners are passive owners; they obtained woodland more through circumstance than intention. The implications of this are reflected in the next section, which describes woodlot owner behaviour and activities. It appears, however, that overall PEI's woodlot owners are more concerned with wildlife, green space, and ecosystem integrity than they are with earning income from their land.

### **3.0 WOODLOT OWNER BEHAVIOUR**

We are particularly interested in woodlot owner behaviour. Sustainable resource management requires that we periodically assess what practices and activities are occurring on the land. On a fragmented, privately owned land base such as in PEI, one way to do that is to survey owners with regards to what they do and why. This section covers woodlot owner behaviour with regard to timber harvesting and harvesting intentions, reasons for timber harvesting, harvest of other forest products, and where woodlot owners obtain information about forest management.

#### **3.1 Management planning**

The professional forestry community places a high value on rational planning in forest management. Clearly defined objectives are easier to meet and evaluate. However, as discussed earlier, many woodlot owners take a casual approach to woodlot management. We were curious to know how many woodlot owners have a written plan, how many have a written plan that they use, and how many who do not currently have a plan might be interested in having one. The vast majority of owners (85%) do not have a written management plan and are not interested in having one (Table 19). This is especially true for owners of small (92%) and medium woodlots (85%). Only 11% of owners have written plans, and 9% actively use these plans. Owners of large woodlots are more likely to use a management plan than owners of smaller woodlots. However, one out of four owners in each size of ownership shows interest in developing such a plan.

Table 19: The current situation of owners with regard to a woodlot management plan\*

Management plan situation	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
I am using a formal (written) management plan	4	9	17	9
I have a formal (written) management plan that I do not use	0	3	4	2
I am currently developing a formal (written) management plan	1	1	5	2
I don't have a plan but I'm interested in having one	27	24	26	26
I don't have a plan and I'm not interested in having one	65	61	43	59
No response	3	2	5	3

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

## 3.2 Factors affecting woodlot management

### 3.2.1 Wildlife concerns

Forests provide habitat for a wide range of species. To varying degrees woodlot owners consider the impact of their management actions on wildlife. Almost any human action taken in the forest can have some impact on wildlife and wildlife habitat. We asked woodlot owners whether they considered wildlife in managing their woodlots. A vast majority (80%) feel that impacts on wildlife have some bearing on what they do with their forests; owners of smaller woodlots pay more attention to this issue (Table 20).

Table 20: Impact of the possible affect on wildlife and their habitat on forest management decisions\*

Impact of wildlife on management decisions	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
They have a great impact	41	37	31	37
They have some impact	37	45	49	43
They don't have any impact	18	16	19	17
No response	3	2	1	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

### 3.2.2 Finding a reliable crew

Another reason that many consider when deciding whether or not to harvest timber products from the woodlots, is finding a reliable and trustworthy crew to do the work. Table 21 shows that having a trustworthy crew is rated as important or very important by most respondents (64%). There are significant variations according to the size of woodlot owned in the importance given to finding a trustworthy crew. Only 50% of the owners of small woodlots consider this an important reason; this increases to 67% for owners of medium woodlots and to 81% for owners of large woodlots. The influence of the size of ownership is also related to the number of owners who attach no importance to



finding trustworthy crew, with owners of small woodlots being more likely to disregard this factor than owners of medium or large woodlots.

The assessment of importance of finding a reliable crew is likely associate with the fact that many woodlot owners have never harvested timber and have no intention of doing so (Table 22). In such a case, the harvesting crew factor has no influence on a decision that had already been made (as many respondents indicated next to this question on the survey with a handwritten note).

Table 21: Importance of finding a trustworthy harvesting crew in deciding to harvest or remove trees from a woodlot\*

Importance of a trustworthy harvesting crew	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Very important	25	35	42	33
Important	25	32	39	31
Slightly important	7	5	5	5
Not important at all	34	23	10	24
No response	9	6	5	7

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

### 3.3 Harvesting intentions and implications for wood supply

As shown in Table 22, 57% of respondents' woodland had been harvested in the last 10 years, and there is a strong relationship between ownership size and the rate of harvesting. Involvement in forest harvesting over the last 10 years increases with the size of the woodlot. Owners of small woodlots are two times less likely than owners of medium woodlots and three times less likely than owners of large woodlots to have harvested. Almost one out of two owners of small woodlots, one out of four owners of medium woodlots, and one out of ten owners of large woodlots have never harvested trees from their woodlots.

Table 22: How often the respondent or someone they asked harvested trees from a woodlot\*

How often land was harvested	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Never	49	23	10	29
At least once a year	13	29	37	25
Not in the last year but once over the last 5 years	17	24	31	23
Not in the last 5 years but at least once over the last 10	7	10	9	9
Not in the last 10 years but at least once before then	10	10	10	10
No response	4	4	3	4

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

The observed relationship between ownership size and timber activity is not surprising; larger parcels have greater potential financial return, have better economies of scale, and represent a larger fixed asset for most woodlot owners. Table 23 demonstrates the implications of harvest intentions for PEI's timber supply. In this stratified sample, owners of large woodlots account for 41% of the respondents and control 82% of the woodland area, according to respondents' estimates of their forest acreage. On the other hand, owners of small woodlots account for 23% of our sample but hold only 2% of the total forested land owned by our sample. Overall, the percentage of land where harvesting has taken place in the last 10 years accounts for 84% of the land owned by our sample, and only 6% of the land belongs to owners who have no intention of harvesting.

Owners of small woodlots show little interest in harvesting and owners of large woodlots show the greatest interest, but owners of medium woodlots fall into the middle with respect to harvesting behaviour and intentions. About 13% of owners with between 11 and 50 acres have not harvested timber and did not intend to. Of the remaining, 15% who have not harvested in the last 10 years mentioned that they might do so in the future; 61% have harvested timber in the last 10 years.

Table 23: Timber harvest intentions and affected woodlot area.

Intention		Number of			Total
		Small	Medium	Large	
Intend to never harvest	Owners	85	50	24	159
	Acres	434	1 454	2 285	4 173
Might consider harvesting	Owners	44	60	47	151
	Acres	238	1 926	4 564	6 728
Have harvested in the last ten years	Owners	89	239	333	661
	Acres	482	7 599	4 7817	55 898
No response	Owners	26	41	37	104

### 3.4 Timber harvesting on woodlots

A series of questions were asked only to the 676 owners who had harvested or removed trees from their land in the last 10 years. Results to these questions are presented in Tables 24 to 29. The reasons some of the other landowners did not harvest are provided in Tables 30 and 31. Information from questions pertaining to all respondents resumes at Table 32.

### ***3.4.1 Reasons for harvesting timber and products harvested***

Table 24 shows that few owners harvest to improve hunting or recreation opportunities or to avoid time constraints in the future. The only significant difference between size of ownership and these reasons to harvest is that owners of small woodlots (23%) are twice as likely than owners of medium (10%) or large woodlots (11%) to cite scenic and recreation improvement as an important motive. Also, few respondents harvest trees because of financial reasons, which correspond to the low percentages of people who owned woodland for monetary gain (Tables 17 and 18). Here again, owners of larger woodlots were more likely to rate financial reasons as important.

The most common reasons for harvesting are: the trees are mature or naturally damaged and the respondent needs the wood for personal use. Tree maturity is a more important motive for owners of larger woodlots and removal of damaged trees is equally important to all owners; owners of medium woodlots give more importance to harvesting for their own uses.

This later trend coincides with what is observed for products harvested for personal use (as opposed to being sold) (Table 25). Overall, owners of medium woodlots are more likely to harvest timber products for their own use and owners of large woodlots are more likely to harvest timber products for sale. Firewood (68%) is the most popular product used by all owners, followed by softwood sawlogs (32%), posts, piles, and pilings (13%), and hardwood sawlogs (13%). Softwood sawlogs (34%), pulpwood (30%), firewood (14%), and hardwood sawlogs (11%) are the most popular products for sale.

Table 24: Importance of various reasons in the decision to harvest in the last 10 years (n=676)

Reason	Importance	Percent of respondents			Total
		Small	Medium	Large	
To achieve objective in management plan*	Not important/slightly imp.	65	58	55	59
	Important/very imp.	9	21	25	20
	No response	25	21	20	22
Trees were mature*	Not important/slightly imp.	35	22	14	23
	Important/very imp.	45	65	76	64
	No response	20	13	10	14
To clear land for conversion*	Not important/slightly imp.	58	66	55	61
	Important/very imp.	19	13	30	20
	No response	23	21	14	20
Had the time to do it	Not important/slightly imp.	58	62	63	62
	Important/very imp.	17	16	19	17
	No response	25	22	18	21
Needed money*	Not important/slightly imp.	68	69	65	68
	Important/very imp.	9	10	20	13
	No response	23	21	15	20
Needed the wood for own use*	Not important/slightly imp.	49	33	42	39
	Important/very imp.	30	56	48	47
	No response	21	11	10	13
Price was right*	Not important/slightly imp.	71	65	58	64
	Important/very imp.	6	13	24	14
	No response	23	22	18	21
To avoid harvest restrictions in the future	Not important/slightly imp.	73	72	74	73
	Important/very imp.	2	7	9	6
	No response	25	21	17	21
To improve hunting opportunities	Not important/slightly imp.	74	76	82	77
	Important/very imp.	1	2	2	2
	No response	25	21	16	21
To improve for scenic & recreation*	Not important/slightly imp.	57	68	73	67
	Important/very imp.	23	11	10	14
	No response	20	21	17	19
Remove trees damaged by nature	Not important/slightly imp.	28	31	40	33
	Important/very imp.	57	54	51	54
	No response	16	15	10	13
To improve quality of remaining trees	Not important/slightly imp.	23	27	34	28
	Important/very imp.	60	55	53	56
	No response	17	17	13	16
Contractor contacted me to do the harvest*	Not important/slightly imp.	71	65	64	66
	Important/very imp.	4	12	20	13
	No response	25	23	16	21
Other	Not important/slightly imp.	20	20	19	19
	Important/very imp.	4	5	3	4
	No response	76	76	78	77

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 25: Products and use of trees harvested or removed by those who have harvested in the last 10 years (n=676)

Product Harvested		Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Firewood	for own use*	57	74	67	68
	for sale*	6	11	25	14
Posts, pilings	for own use*	9	14	17	14
	for sale*	1	4	8	4
Hardwood sawlogs	for own use*	6	19	9	13
	for sale*	4	7	22	11
Softwood sawlogs	for own use*	19	37	33	32
	for sale*	18	28	54	34
Pulpwood	for own use*	0	4	4	3
	for sale*	14	24	51	30
Hardwood veneer	for own use*	2	1	2	1
	for sale*	1	4	11	6
Softwood veneer	for own use*	0	2	1	1
	for sale*	1	4	16	7
Christmas trees	for own use*	6	6	5	6
	for sale*	0	1	2	1
Other products	for own use*	6	2	3	3
	for sale*	0	2	2	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 54 in Appendix 3.

### 3.4.2 Harvesting methods, who does the harvest, and experience with contractors

Of the given categories for harvesting methods, clearcutting is the least used harvesting method, although it is much more popular among owners of large woodlots (Table 26). Salvaging fallen and dying trees is the most common method of harvest, followed by selection cutting. Owners of medium woodlots are more likely to salvage fallen and dying trees. Also, many owners chose not to answer this question.

Table 26: Harvesting methods used to remove trees by those who have harvested in the last 10 years (n=676)

Method	Frequency	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Cutting all the trees*	Never	45	32	18	31
	Sometimes	13	23	34	24
	Often	4	7	15	9
	Always	6	12	18	12
	Don't know	2	2	2	2
	No response	29	24	12	22
Cutting only preselected trees	Never	13	10	13	12
	Sometimes	22	20	31	24
	Often	10	17	13	14
	Always	26	22	16	21
	Don't know	2	3	3	3
	No response	27	27	24	26
Cutting a couple of trees here and there*	Never	13	15	17	15
	Sometimes	32	23	32	28
	Often	10	15	11	13
	Always	12	12	4	10
	Don't know		4	3	3
	No response	32	31	32	32
Salvaging fallen and dying trees*	Never	11	5	10	8
	Sometimes	15	18	21	19
	Often	21	19	21	20
	Always	29	36	22	30
	Don't know	1	3	2	2
	No response	22	18	24	21
Other	Never	6	5	4	5
	Sometimes	0	2	1	1
	Often	0	0	1	0
	Always	0	1	1	1
	Don't know	2	3	5	4
	No response	91	88	89	89

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Most of the woodlot owners who harvest timber from their woodlots do so with their own labour or with the help of family (Table 27). About a third use contractors or hire their own crew for the job. Overall, owners of smaller woodlots are more likely to harvest by themselves or with the help of family and friends, while owners of larger woodlots are more likely to hire independent contractors. The question referring specifically to experience with logging contractors confirms this trend. Table 28 shows that most owners of small and medium woodlots have not had experience with logging contractors but that most owners of large woodlots have.

We asked the 36% of woodlot owners who had dealt with contractors if they were satisfied with their experiences with them and if they would use contractors for future harvests. Overall, satisfaction with contractors is evenly distributed, although owners of small woodlots express greater dissatisfaction with contractors.

Table 27: Who conducted most of the harvesting on respondents' woodlots (n=676)\*

Who did majority of harvesting	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Just myself	29	22	15	22
Myself and/or members of my family	38	40	32	37
My friends and neighbours	4	5	4	4
A crew that I hired	9	3	6	6
An independent contractor	12	24	40	26
Other	4	3	2	3
No response	4	2	1	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 28: Whether respondents had experience with logging contractors on their land (n=676)\*

Experience with logging contractors	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	16	31	61	36
No	80	68	38	62
No response	4	1	1	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 29: Satisfaction of respondents who had experience with logging contractors (n=296) \*

Satisfaction with contractors	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes I was entirely satisfied	23	42	44	41
Not entirely satisfied, but it is possible that I will hire them again	27	31	33	32
No I was not satisfied and I would not hire their services again	50	26	22	26
No response	0	1	1	1

\*Because the numbers of respondents to these questions were few and the categories of answers were many, the Chi-square test did not provide a reliable estimate of the statistical significance of the answers for the sizes of ownerships.

### 3.5 Nonharvesting woodlot owners

Table 30 shows that many of those who had not removed trees from their land in the last 10 years never intended to harvest, and there is a significant variation in the intention of woodlot owners according to the size of their woodlot. Owners of smaller woodlots are more likely to never want to harvest (61%) than owners of medium (40%) or large woodlots (29%). For those who would consider harvesting, information as to why they had not harvested in the past ten years is provided in table 31.

Table 30: Harvest intentions of those respondents who had not harvested in the last 10 years\* (n=399)

Harvest intentions	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
Intend to never harvest	61	40	29	50
Might harvest	31	47	54	40
No response	8	13	17	10

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Once again, table 31 suggests that financial considerations hold a low priority for woodlot owners and do not factor heavily in to whether they harvest (see the categories of low prices, market, income tax, and pension). Common reasons for not harvesting have more to do with being too busy with other matters, concern over damaging residual trees, or having no financial needs; for most of the reasons, the importance does not vary significantly with the size of ownership. Many owners of large woodlots (30% to 35%) did not answer these questions.

### 3.6 Non-timber forest products

We asked all respondents about their harvest of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). Table 32 shows that few landowners, in all categories of ownership, are engaged in the harvest of any NTFPs. The NTFPs that owners most often harvested are berries for personal use, with boughs or brush being the second most frequent; other responses include gravel or aggregates. Christmas tree harvesting was included because respondents probably harvested a few for their own use and did not consider them to be in the same category as other trees harvested or removed from their land. The only significant difference in use of NTFPs according to the size of woodlot ownership is in the sale of berries. This activity, although it remains marginal for all sizes of ownership, occurs more often on large woodlots.



Table 31: Reasons for not harvesting by those who would consider doing so, but who had not harvested in the last 10 years (n=172)

Reasons for not harvesting	Importance	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
I was too busy with other activities*	Not important/slightly imp.	54	48	19	46
	Important/very imp.	34	42	50	40
	No response	13	10	31	14
I didn't have any financial need to do so	Not important/slightly imp.	54	44	27	46
	Important/very imp.	28	41	46	37
	No response	18	14	27	18
I did not know what or how to sell	Not important/slightly imp.	62	61	50	60
	Important/very imp.	20	24	19	22
	No response	18	14	31	19
The prices were too low	Not important/slightly imp.	79	73	62	74
	Important/very imp.	3	10	4	6
	No response	18	17	35	20
I could not find a market	Not important/slightly imp.	76	73	58	72
	Important/very imp.	4	8	8	7
	No response	20	18	35	22
The trees were not large enough to sell	Not important/slightly imp.	62	54	44	56
	Important/very imp.	23	31	26	27
	No response	15	14	30	17
Cutting could damage remaining trees	Not important/slightly imp.	38	48	37	42
	Important/very imp.	49	38	33	42
	No response	13	14	30	16
There were access or road problems*	Not important/slightly imp.	64	61	46	60
	Important/very imp.	18	30	15	22
	No response	18	10	38	18
Extra income could increase income tax	Not important/slightly imp.	69	75	54	69
	Important/very imp.	13	8	15	11
	No response	18	17	31	20
Extra income could decrease my pension*	Not important/slightly imp.	75	80	67	76
	Important/very imp.	7	0	0	3
	No response	18	20	33	21
I was unable due to age	Not important/slightly imp.	79	77	58	75
	Important/very imp.	3	4	8	4
	No response	18	18	35	21
I was unable due to absence from the area	Not important/slightly imp.	62	63	54	61
	Important/very imp.	20	24	19	22
	No response	18	13	27	17
I have just bought or inherited the land	Not important/slightly imp.	59	62	44	58
	Important/very imp.	23	17	26	21
	No response	18	21	30	21
Other	Not important/slightly imp.	18	14	7	15
	Important/very imp.	3	13	15	9
	No response	79	73	78	76

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 32: Forest products collected by respondents and their families in the past five years

Item	Use	Percent of respondents			Total
		Small	Medium	Large	
Game birds	Not collected	91	89	87	89
	Personal use	4	7	8	6
	Gift	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
	Sale	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Fur animals	Not collected	91	93	93	92
	Personal use	2	2	2	2
	Gift	0	0.2	0	0.1
	Sale	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.4
Mushrooms	Not collected	89	91	88	89
	Personal use	5	5	7	6
	Gift	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.4
	Sale	0	0.2	0.4	0.2
Maple sap	Not collected	93	92	90	92
	Personal use	2	3	5	3
	Gift	0	0.2	1	0.3
	Sale	0	0.7	0.8	0.5
Berries	Not collected	71	74	67	71
	Personal use	23	21	26	23
	Gift	0	0.2	1	0.4
	Sale*	0	0.4	3	0.8
Fiddleheads	Not collected	88	91	89	90
	Personal use	6	4	6	5
	Gift	0	0	0	0
	Sale	0	0	0	0
Boughs/brush	Not collected	75	77	77	76
	Personal use	20	17	17	18
	Gift	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.6
	Sale	0	0.4	0.8	0.4
Fish	Not collected	90	89	86	89
	Personal use	4	6	8	6
	Gift	0	0	0.4	0.1
	Gift	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Handicraft material	Not collected	85	85	84	85
	Personal use	9	10	11	10
	Gift	0	0.4	1	0.4
	Sale	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.3
Peat moss, soil	Not collected	89	91	87	89
	Personal use	6	5	7	6
	Gift	0	0	0	0
	Sale	0	0	0.4	0.1
Other	Not collected	92	94	92	93
	Personal use	2	2	2	2
	Gift	0	0	1	0.2
	Sale	0	0.2	0.8	0.3

N.A.: not applicable

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 55 in Appendix 3.

### **3.7 Other forest management activities**

Many woodlot management activities, including harvests of various products, occur rarely. Therefore, we asked woodlot owners if they had participated in an activity in the last five years (the past) or if they intended to engage in the activity in the next five years (the future).

Of the given categories, the most frequent activities are removing low quality trees, selection cutting, planting trees, and spacing of young stands (with an almost even distribution for each between the last and next five years) (Table 33). The least popular are developing Christmas trees, subdividing the woodlot, applying pesticides or herbicides, and wildlife projects.

The greatest difference between the frequency of an activity in the past and future occurs with management plans; there was an 11% increase between those who had prepared or updated a management plan and those who plan to. This coincides with the interest displayed by owners who said that they did not have a management plan but would consider getting one. This also indicates a need for these owners to learn how to develop their plan or get help preparing it.

Owners of larger woodlots engage in more management activities than owners of smaller woodlots. We also noticed an important difference in the non-response rate for these questions: owners of smaller woodlots are more likely not to answer.

Table 33: Past and proposed activities on woodlots

Activity	Done or planned	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Management plan*	Done in last 5 years	3	8	16	8
	Planned for next 5 years	20	15	27	19
Plant trees*	Done in last 5 years	20	18	27	21
	Planned for next 5 years	24	18	28	22
Apply biocides*	Done in last 5 years	3	4	12	5
	Planned for next 5 years	2	5	7	4
Thinning/spacing*	Done in last 5 years	17	14	19	17
	Planned for next 5 years	23	18	24	21
Selection cutting*	Done in last 5 years	18	27	33	25
	Planned for next 5 years	21	22	32	24
Removing low quality trees*	Done in last 5 years	34	42	37	38
	Planned for next 5 years	35	28	33	32
Development of Christmas trees*	Done in last 5 years	1	2	2	2
	Planned for next 5 years	3	3	4	3
Boundary lines*	Done in last 5 years	14	16	21	16
	Planned for next 5 years	15	14	22	16
Roads and trails*	Done in last 5 years	10	19	24	17
	Planned for next 5 years	15	14	23	16
Wildlife projects*	Done in last 5 years	3	5	7	5
	Planned for next 5 years	8	6	13	8
Recreation projects*	Done in last 5 years	10	6	7	8
	Planned for next 5 years	14	8	13	11
Subdivide parcel*	Done in last 5 years	1	5	5	4
	Planned for next 5 years	6	5	7	6
Other*	Done in last 5 years	2	2	1	1
	Planned for next 5 years	4	4	5	4

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 56 in Appendix 3.

### 3.8 Sources of information for woodlot owners

Landowners were asked questions about sources of information and their familiarity with woodlot owner organizations to get an idea about what (if any) information landowners had received, where they might obtain information, and their interest in management programs and owner associations. Table 34 shows that most respondents owning small or medium woodlots had not received advice about managing their woodlot while most respondents owning large woodlots had received advice.

Table 34: Had the respondents ever received advice or information about the woodland they own in PEI? \*

Advice received	Percent of Respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	23	35	57	36
No	74	62	41	62
No response	3	2	2	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

For those landowners who had received advice, most received it from a provincial government technician; this is more likely to be the case for owners of larger woodlots (Table 34). Many received advice from contractors (26%) or other landowners (24%). Respondents who checked the "Other" category usually replied that they received advice from family (for details see Appendix 2).

Table 35: Source of advice for the respondents who had received advice on their woodlots (n=444)

Received advice from	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
PEI Forest Service technician*	47	71	79	68
Watershed management groups	3	9	10	8
Private consultant	15	9	9	10
Company forester or technician	9	6	14	10
Logging contractor	16	29	29	26
Employee of non-profit group	9	4	9	7
Woodlot owner association*	0	9	4	5
Other landowner, neighbour	34	22	21	24
I don't remember	6	2	1	3
Other	6	8	4	6

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 57 in Appendix 3.

Owners were asked to assess the usefulness of various tools used in learning more about woodlot management. Consulting with a forester or other natural resources professional and pamphlets or newsletters are the most useful to landowners (Table 36). Home study courses, talking with contractors, and membership in a landowner organization are rated as the least useful means. This likely indicates unwillingness for landowners to commit much time to learning about management and a general distrust of logging contractors. Owners of large woodlots are more likely to find that conferences and workshops, visits to other woodlots, and discussions with foresters or contractors are useful tools.

Table 36: Usefulness of different learning tools to assist owners in managing their woodlots

Ways of learning	Usefulness	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Books	Not useful	30	27	23	27
	Neither	9	7	10	8
	Useful	31	33	37	33
	Don't know	12	13	12	13
	No response	18	19	18	18
Pamphlets or newsletters	Not useful	27	22	20	23
	Neither	10	8	10	9
	Useful	36	39	45	39
	Don't know	10	12	10	11
	No response	17	19	15	17
Magazines or newspapers	Not useful	30	26	22	26
	Neither	12	9	13	11
	Useful	27	33	35	31
	Don't know	11	13	10	12
	No response	20	20	20	20
Conferences or workshops*	Not useful	38	35	26	34
	Neither	11	10	13	11
	Useful	14	18	28	19
	Don't know	16	14	13	14
	No response	21	23	20	21
Home study course	Not useful	39	37	34	37
	Neither	10	11	13	11
	Useful	15	14	17	15
	Don't know	14	15	14	15
	No response	22	23	22	22
Videotapes for home viewing	Not useful	33	26	23	28
	Neither	10	10	12	10
	Useful	24	31	35	29
	Don't know	13	13	12	13
	No response	20	21	19	20
Television or radio programs	Not useful	32	26	26	28
	Neither	13	13	12	13
	Useful	23	28	30	27
	Don't know	13	12	12	12
	No response	19	21	19	20
Visiting other woodlots*	Not useful	36	29	21	30
	Neither	9	11	12	10
	Useful	21	25	39	27
	Don't know	13	14	10	13
	No response	21	21	18	20
Talking with a forester*	Not useful	29	21	17	23
	Neither	8	8	9	8
	Useful	35	40	51	41
	Don't know	11	12	9	11
	No response	16	19	14	17

Table 36 (continued): Usefulness of different learning tools to assist owners in managing their woodlots

Ways of learning	Usefulness	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Talking with contractor*	Not useful	49	40	35	42
	Neither	10	12	12	11
	Useful	7	14	23	13
	Don't know	13	14	12	13
	No response	21	22	19	21
Membership in landowner organization	Not useful	43	36	33	38
	Neither	8	10	12	10
	Useful	13	13	19	14
	Don't know	16	18	14	16
Websites	Not useful	29	31	32	31
	Neither	11	10	12	11
	Useful	28	21	20	23
	Don't know	13	16	14	15
	No response	19	22	22	21
Other	Not useful	16	9	9	12
	Neither	2	0	1	1
	Useful	1	1	1	1
	Don't know	11	12	12	12
	No response	70	77	77	74

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

### 3.9 Woodlot owner associations

Tables 37 to 39 show that landowners are not very involved with woodlot associations. A slight proportion of landowners has had contact with woodlot associations or has received service from them, and this is more frequent for owners of larger woodlots. Overall, more than a third of our respondents and 48% of owners of large woodlots would consider becoming a member of a woodlot association. However, most owners of small and medium woodlots are not interested in joining such an organization.

Table 37: Attended meetings or received information from a woodlot owners' organization\*

Attended meetings or received information	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	6	16	28	15
No	93	83	71	84
No response	1	1	1	1

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 38: Use of technical services from or attended seminars offered by a woodlot owners' organization

Used services or attended seminars	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	3	7	9	6
No	95	92	90	93
No response	1	2	1	1

Table 39: Interest in being a member of a woodlot owners' association\*

Interested in being a member of an association	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes, I am already a member	1	2	7	3
Yes, I could consider it	34	39	48	39
No	63	56	44	56
No response	2	3	2	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

### 3.10 Woodlot management programs

Owners were also asked a few questions about management programs on PEI. Most respondents are unaware of the existence of such programs, although the degree of awareness increased with the size of ownership (Table 40). We also asked if owners would consider a long-term management agreement. Over half are not interested, but over a third say they might be (Table 41). Entering a long-term agreement is more appealing to owners of larger woodlots.

Table 40: Awareness about woodlot management programs to assist woodlot owners\*

Aware of management programs available	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	17	25	34	24
No	81	73	65	74
No response	2	2	1	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 41: Interest in long-term agreement (10–20 years) with an agency that would assist them in managing their forest\*

Interested in long-term management agreement	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Yes	9	5	12	8
Maybe	29	39	44	36
No	61	54	42	54
No response	1	2	2	2

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)



#### 4.0 WOODLOT OWNER ATTITUDES

We were interested in the opinions of woodlot owners about forest-related topics such as stewardship, legislation, harvest methods, and policy. This section reviews responses to these questions.

The first, which follows from the previous section, deals with woodlot owners' satisfaction with government programs directed toward woodlot owners. Many are satisfied with government efforts to encourage and support woodland stewardship (Table 42). There were a few non-responses to this question, which suggests they may not have enough information to form an opinion.

Table 42: Satisfaction about the government's efforts to support and encourage better woodlot management

Satisfaction	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
Totally satisfied	4	5	3	4
Satisfied	45	46	51	46
Unsatisfied	24	27	26	26
Totally unsatisfied	9	10	12	10
No response	18	13	9	14

We asked woodlot owners their opinions about sustainable management on woodland owned by individuals versus woodland owned by timber harvesting contractors. Most owners did not know or gave no response. Over a quarter believe sustainable management is practiced on individual woodlots, but nearly one fifth believe the opposite (Table 43). Many also have concerns with sustainable management on land owned by contractors, especially among owners of large woodlots. This is consistent with previous responses that reveal that owners often have a negative view of contractors.

Table 43: Assessment of sustainability of forest management according to the ownership

Sustainable management on woodland owned by		Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Contractors*	Yes	8	7	7	7
	No	27	34	40	33
	Don't know	60	50	46	52
	No response	5	9	7	7
Individuals*	Yes	22	28	31	26
	No	17	19	23	19
	Don't know	55	48	41	49
	No response	6	5	5	5

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 44 shows respondents' degree of agreement with given statements about forest management in PEI. Many owners disagree with statements that would affect their freedom to choose their management methods. Clearly, they, and especially owners of large woodlots, want maximum flexibility in choosing how to manage their land. Nevertheless, most owners agree that greater efforts should be made to protect old growth forests. Respondents were most uncertain about statements concerning management skills of other landowners; 48% expressed concerns about harvest sustainability.

Table 44: Respondents' level of agreement with given statements about forest management in PEI

Statement	Agreement	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Properly applied pesticides are an acceptable tool*	Totally disagree/Disagree	27	34	26	30
	Neutral	28	24	21	25
	Agree/Totally agree	22	20	29	23
	Don't know	16	17	15	16
	No response	7	5	8	6
Environmentalists go too far in trying to restrict logging*	Totally disagree/Disagree	35	28	24	30
	Neutral	23	27	23	25
	Agree/Totally agree	21	28	35	27
	Don't know	15	11	10	12
	No response	7	5	8	6
Greater efforts should be made to protect old growth	Totally disagree/Disagree	7	8	10	8
	Neutral	15	19	20	18
	Agree/Totally agree	64	59	57	60
	Don't know	7	9	5	8
	No response	7	5	8	6
Woodland that is not actively managed is wasted	Totally disagree/Disagree	32	34	28	32
	Neutral	21	22	23	22
	Agree/Totally agree	30	30	36	31
	Don't know	11	8	6	9
	No response	7	5	7	6
I would accept cutting restrictions on my land	Totally disagree/Disagree	39	46	43	43
	Neutral	19	15	19	17
	Agree/Totally agree	24	24	23	24
	Don't know	11	11	7	10
	No response	6	5	8	6
Legislation should require owners to adhere to best management practices*	Totally disagree/Disagree	27	38	45	36
	Neutral	22	19	19	20
	Agree/Totally agree	34	27	21	28
	Don't know	11	12	8	10
	No response	7	5	8	6
Most owners in PEI don't know how to look after forests*	Totally disagree/Disagree	16	24	23	21
	Neutral	22	22	26	23
	Agree/Totally agree	28	27	31	28
	Don't know	26	22	14	22
	No response	7	4	6	6
PEI will have little wood to harvest in 10 – 20 years*	Totally disagree/Disagree	9	16	15	14
	Neutral	12	10	12	11
	Agree/Totally agree	47	47	50	48
	Don't know	26	25	18	24
	No response	5	3	5	4

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Woodlot owners' opinions on clearcutting as a harvesting practice are mixed (Table 45). Most feel that clearcutting should be allowed were the practice is judged suitable for regeneration. However, nearly a quarter of respondents feel that clearcutting should not be allowed; this belief is more common among owners of small and medium woodlots.

Table 45: Respondents' attitudes toward clearcutting\*

Attitude toward clearcutting	Percent of respondents			
	Small	Medium	Large	Total
I am unfamiliar with it and do not have an opinion	11	13	10	11
There should be restrictions placed upon clearcutting	4	3	7	5
Clearcutting should be allowed only where suitable	52	59	65	58
Clearcutting should not be allowed anywhere	30	22	15	23
No response	4	3	3	3

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Once again, table 46 shows that most owners, regardless of the size of woodlots they own, are concerned with the amount of wood being cut on PEI. The lack of financial incentives for preservation is also a concern for most woodlot owners. This is in line with other opinions expressed on management and woodlot owners' behaviour. Not surprisingly, woodlot owners prefer incentives for sustainable management rather than regulatory approaches to achieve sustainability targets. In keeping with their responses listed in Tables 37 to 39, owners are least concerned about a lack of landowner organizations. Financial issues such as taxation of woodlot income, low funding for forest management, and the high cost of silviculture are greater concerns among owners of larger woodlots.

Landowners were asked to indicate their level of agreement with given perspectives on forest issues and these coincide with results obtained to previous questions. Again, concerns over contractor's activities, unsustainability of timber resources and support for financial aid for protection are emphasized by a majority of respondents (Table 47). Respondents still express mix opinions regarding the quality of stewardship exert by landowners. Once more, we note that owners of larger woodlots are somewhat more likely to express their opposition to regulations of their activities, as they are more likely to see herbicides as an appropriate tool for forest management.

Table 48 shows responses to a set of questions addressing the acceptability of various forest management practices. Respondents are concerned over clearcutting on private land, but owners of larger woodlots find this practice more acceptable. Concern over the use of herbicides was the next highest priority item, and owners of large woodlots deem this practice more acceptable, which coincides with the position they have expressed previously on the use of pesticides and herbicides (Tables 44

and 47). Other management practices were judged acceptable by most landowners, except that many respondents were uncertain about converting sites from mixed-wood to softwood to increase timber production.

Table 46: Concerns about problems facing woodlot owners today

Issue	Concern	Percent of respondents			Total
		Small	Medium	Large	
The lack of knowledge of cutting methods	Not concerned	14	17	19	17
	Neutral	31	34	33	33
	Concerned	44	40	38	41
	No response	11	9	10	10
Public perceptions of timber harvesting	Not concerned	16	16	16	16
	Neutral	35	36	32	35
	Concerned	37	36	41	37
	No response	12	12	12	12
Taxation of woodlot income*	Not concerned	23	21	18	21
	Neutral	40	35	30	36
	Concerned	25	34	40	32
	No response	12	10	12	11
The lack of strong landowner organizations	Not concerned	20	24	23	22
	Neutral	46	43	39	43
	Concerned	21	21	26	22
	No response	13	12	13	12
The low level of funding for forest management*	Not concerned	18	19	14	18
	Neutral	37	28	26	31
	Concerned	32	41	48	39
	No response	13	11	12	12
The lack of financial incentives for preservation	Not concerned	12	14	13	13
	Neutral	28	24	20	25
	Concerned	48	51	55	51
	No response	12	11	11	12
The high cost of silviculture*	Not concerned	16	19	16	17
	Neutral	45	40	33	40
	Concerned	26	27	38	29
	No response	13	13	14	13
Too much wood being cut	Not concerned	9	10	12	10
	Neutral	18	22	19	20
	Concerned	62	63	61	62
	No response	10	5	8	8

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 47: Agreement with given perspectives on forest issues

Issue	Agreement	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Government should not regulate private cutting*	Totally disagree/Disagree	32	26	19	27
	Neutral	17	22	20	20
	Agree/Totally agree	34	42	48	41
	Don't know	11	4	5	7
	No response	6	5	7	6
Properly applied herbicides are an appropriate tool*	Totally disagree/Disagree	32	36	27	33
	Neutral	25	23	22	23
	Agree/Totally agree	22	23	33	25
	Don't know	16	13	11	13
	No response	6	5	7	6
There is sufficient wood in PEI for all users	Totally disagree/Disagree	59	58	53	57
	Neutral	10	12	14	12
	Agree/Totally agree	4	7	11	7
	Don't know	21	19	17	19
	No response	5	5	5	5
Timber harvesting contractors should be strictly regulated	Totally disagree/Disagree	8	7	9	8
	Neutral	9	13	15	12
	Agree/Totally agree	68	71	67	69
	Don't know	9	5	4	6
	No response	5	4	5	5
Society should not control what owners do with private forests	Totally disagree/Disagree	32	33	27	31
	Neutral	23	19	23	22
	Agree/Totally agree	33	39	40	37
	Don't know	5	4	3	4
	No response	6	5	6	5
Woodlot owners in PEI are good forest stewards*	Totally disagree/Disagree	22	22	23	22
	Neutral	26	28	29	28
	Agree/Totally agree	16	24	27	22
	Don't know	29	20	14	22
	No response	7	6	7	6
Ownership doesn't give people the right to do whatever they want	Totally disagree/Disagree	25	25	27	25
	Neutral	16	21	21	19
	Agree/Totally agree	46	45	42	44
	Don't know	7	5	3	5
	No response	7	5	7	6
Government should provide incentives for private owners to establish protected areas	Totally disagree/Disagree	7	9	8	8
	Neutral	15	13	19	15
	Agree/Totally agree	62	65	62	63
	Don't know	10	7	4	7
	No response	7	5	7	6

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

Table 48: Acceptability of given forest management practices for PEI

Management practice	Acceptance	Percent of respondents			
		Small	Medium	Large	Total
Using clearcuts to harvest timber on private land*	Totally unacceptable/unacceptable	54	44	34	45
	Neither	16	19	18	18
	Acceptable/Totally acceptable	12	17	31	18
	Don't know	14	13	10	13
	No response	4	6	8	6
Herbicides to control unwanted vegetation*	Totally unacceptable/unacceptable	39	37	29	36
	Neither	20	21	18	20
	Acceptable/Totally acceptable	23	21	33	24
	Don't know	13	14	12	13
	No response	5	6	7	6
Leaving clumps of trees for wildlife habitats	Totally unacceptable/unacceptable	4	7	5	5
	Neither	11	11	10	11
	Acceptable/Totally acceptable	72	69	74	71
	Don't know	8	9	4	8
	No response	4	4	7	5
Closing forest access roads to control illegal dumping*	Totally unacceptable/unacceptable	7	8	10	8
	Neither	10	4	9	8
	Acceptable/Totally acceptable	70	73	70	72
	Don't know	7	9	4	7
	No response	5	5	7	5
Converting sites from mixed-wood to softwood*	Totally unacceptable/unacceptable	35	33	26	32
	Neither	20	23	27	23
	Acceptable/Totally acceptable	19	23	28	23
	Don't know	20	15	12	16
	No response	6	6	8	7
Using selection and other partial harvest techniques	Totally unacceptable/unacceptable	4	6	3	5
	Neither	15	14	15	15
	Acceptable/Totally acceptable	56	57	62	58
	Don't know	19	16	11	16
	No response	6	7	8	7
Cutting selectively to maintain wildlife habitat	Totally unacceptable/unacceptable	3	3	3	3
	Neither	9	7	14	9
	Acceptable/Totally acceptable	77	76	71	75
	Don't know	7	9	5	7
	No response	5	5	7	5

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

## 5.0 FUTURE OF WOODLAND

Owners were asked to indicate any plans they might have for their woodlot for the next 10 years, instead of five, as in Table 33. Most respondents, especially owners of smaller woodlots, have few to no plans for their woodlots (Table 49). One out of four respondents intend to pass the land on to their heirs, which is another important trend. Few owners seem interested in subdividing their woodlot, which is similar to the responses in Table 33.

In general, owners of larger woodlots are more interested in conducting more than one activity on their woodlots. Since owners of large woodlots are more likely to own a farm, converting woodland to other uses might be considered as expanding their farming activities. However, converting other land uses to woodland was a rare response, even though many respondents (22%) desire to plant trees (Table 33). The owners may have been referring to planting a few trees around their home, a hedgerow, or trees on harvested woodland.

Table 49: Respondents' plans for their woodlot in PEI in the next 10 years

Activity	Percent of respondents			Total
	Small	Medium	Large	
No plans/Don't know*	39	41	30	38
Leave as it is — no activity*	34	26	15	26
Minimum activity to maintain woodland	42	40	42	41
Collect non-timber products*	9	14	17	13
Harvest timber products*	4	18	37	17
Sell some or all my woodland*	2	6	10	6
Give woodland to children, heirs*	20	30	29	26
Divide woodland and sell subdivisions	2	1	2	2
Buy more land*	9	4	10	7
Convert woodland to another use*	5	6	20	9
Convert another land use to woodland	4	3	7	4
Other	5	8	7	7

\*Significantly different at  $P < 0.05$  (Chi-square test)

To simplify the presentation of results, this table presents only positive answers. The complete results used in calculating Chi-square tests are shown in table 58 in Appendix 3.



## 6.0 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

At the end of the survey, we provided a section for respondents to add handwritten comments. The comments that we collected were sorted into general categories to facilitate their presentation. Most respondents did not include any handwritten comments (Table 50). The most frequent comment gives details about respondents’ woodland and their past, present, and future activities. Most owners who included this information likely did so to clarify or substantiate responses given to earlier questions in the survey. The next most frequent response is concern over harmful forest management practices, which coincides with the negative feelings toward the activities of logging contractors and harvest sustainability expressed by many landowners. The least frequent comments are from those concerned with financial issues (incentives for management and woodlot taxation).

Table 50: Additional comments written by respondents

<b>Comments categories</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Need balance of incentive, restrictions, rights	1
Strengthen existing forestry regulations	0
Concerned about harmful practices, management, etc.	4
Need replanting regulations (for clearcutting)	1
Details on woodlot/activities	6
Complaints about the survey (length, wording, etc.)	1
Need more incentives, education, spending on forest mgmt.	0
Protect landowner rights	1
Information requests (not for survey results)	1
Request for survey results only	1
Concerned about taxation issues	0
Other	0
No response	84

## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

Results from the survey show that woodlot owners own their land for many different reasons and that they also have different beliefs and attitudes toward forest management. Often, motivations, attitudes, and beliefs are related to the size of woodlots owned. In this section we will discuss the key findings and highlight potential paths for future analysis and research.

There is a noticeable difference in response rate according to the size of woodlots owned: owners of larger woodlots have a higher rate of participation than owners of small woodlots. Those owning larger acreages are more likely to be involved in forest management activities and concerned with forestry issues. Participating in this study might have been appealing to them. Owners of small woodlots often felt that most (or all) of the survey did not apply to them, as they were not managing their woodlot and had no plans to (often because it was a small acreage). The sampling for this survey involved smaller properties than has previously been studied; this reflects, in part, the small average size of holdings on PEI. Even though the lowest rate of response was from owners of small woodlots, it is important to keep track of their behaviour and attitude even though they currently do not own much forestland. Other studies have pointed out that woodlots in the United-States are getting smaller (Mehmood and Zhang, 2001; DeCoster 1998). It would be interesting to determine if this trend applies to PEI; if it does, then owners of small woodlots will be deciding what will happen on a larger part of the forest in the future.

Financial reasons are not a key factor in explaining why people own their woodlots, nor are they a major reason why owners decide to engage or not in timber harvesting activities. Most owners acquired their woodlots passively, either as an inheritance or in an incidental purchase when they bought other land (as part of a lot for a house, cottage, or farm). Many forestland owners do not consider using the land's resources (timber and non-timber) other than for firewood, but simply intend to pass it on their children as apart of their heritage or as an area to preserve forest health. However, owners of larger woodlots are more engaged in resource harvesting and are more aware of the financial potential and burdens associated with woodlot ownership.

Woodlot owners did not respond negatively to any forest management practices or issues other than clearcutting and contractors, although owners of small woodlots had more negative opinions on these issues. Often the respondents perceive one as being synonymous with the other (as was made clear by comments written in the margin or included at the end of the survey). Respondents think that logging contractors should be restricted and regulated while private landowners should be left alone to do as they

see fit. However, they are unsure if private land on PEI is being managed sustainably or if private landowners are good stewards of the forest. General questions about the sustainability of PEI forests revealed that many woodlot owners are concerned about sustainability of timber supply. This does not appear to be either a new or a growing concern among woodlot owners. Two surveys conducted in the 1980s obtained similar results when they asked if people agreed that PEI would soon run out of wood. In the 1984 survey, 46% of owners agreed with this statement (IEA Consulting Group 1984); this dropped to 41% in 1988 (IEA Consulting Group 1988) and rose to 48% for a similar question in the present survey.

Respondents were not too negative in their responses to the use of herbicides and pesticides (compared to public perception about this issue). It is not surprising to see that support for herbicide and pesticide use is higher among owners of larger woodlots, who are more likely to own farms and who might view these practices differently since they are likely to use similar products in their farming activities. Regardless, the support for pesticide and herbicide use among woodlot owners has decreased compared to what it was in 1988 (55%) (IEA Consulting Group 1988).

For this report, the analysis of survey data looked only at the relation between answers provided from owners of various size of ownership. This reveals interesting trends and allows us to see that PEI owners are not a homogeneous group. It would be interesting to look at other factors that might characterize groups of owners. For example, response patterns could be analyzed based on respondents' sociodemographic profiles or ownership motivations. We could also examine the motivations, attitudes, and behaviour of absentee owners compared to those living on their woodlots. The proportion of owners who are not living on their woodlots has increased over the last 14 years and it is likely that this trend will continue; it would be interesting to verify the impacts on activities in private woodlots.

The results of this survey provide a snapshot of PEI's woodlot owners in 2002. This work complements a timber supply analysis conducted by PEI Agriculture and Forestry. As acknowledged in the *State of the Forest Report* (PEI Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, 1993), woodlot owner characteristics, behaviour, and management intentions are critical to the issue of future timber supply. Given PEI's mainly private land base, any timber supply analysis should consider the social aspects of timber availability. It is also critical to update this information to monitor trends in ownership as well as in forest management activities and uses. The survey is also important for understanding PEI's woodlot owners' commitment to progressive management and sustainability. As many owners have an overall passive approach to management, concern for environmental values, and an inclination to harvest lightly, forests in PEI do not appear to be under threat from overutilization.

## 8.0 REFERENCES

- DeCoster, L. A. 1998. *The boom in forest owners: A bust for forestry?* Journal of Forestry, Vol. 96, no.5. p. 25–28.
- IEA Consulting Group Ltd. 1984. *Report on a public survey of forestry related attitudes and awareness in Prince Edward Island* Canadian Forestry Service and Department of Energy and Forestry, Prince Edward Island. 42 p. plus Appendices.
- IEA Consulting Group Ltd. 1988. *Public awareness survey of forestry-related attitudes and awareness on Prince Edward Island: Final report.* Canadian Forestry Service and Department of Energy and Forestry, Prince Edward Island. 39 p. plus Appendices.
- Lawal, H. B. and Upton, G. J. G. 1980. *An approximation to the distribution of the  $X^2$  goodness-of-fit statistic use with small expectations.* Biometrics 67(2):447–453.
- Mehmood S. R., and Zhang D. 2001. *Forest parcelization in the United-States: A study of contributing factors.* Journal of Forestry, Vol. 99 no.4. p.31-34.
- PEI Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. 1993. *Prince Edward Island State of the forest report 1980-1990.* Forestry Division, PEI Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. 42 p.
- Roy, Pauline. 1983. *New Brunswick non-industrial woodlot owner survey: A background paper for the N.B. Private Woodlot Resources Study.* New Brunswick Private Woodlot Resources Study. 150 p. plus Appendices.
- USDA Forest Service. 2001. *The national woodland owner survey questionnaire (Maine).* On-line <http://www.fs.fed.us/woodlandowners/quest.htm>. Consulted March 13th 2003.
- Salant, P. and Dillman D.A. 1994. *How to conduct you own survey.* John Wiley & Sons Inc. New York, NY, USA. 232 p.
- Sanderson, L., Colborne, R., and Beesley, K. 2000. *Woodland owner's perceptions and attitudes towards sustainable forest management: Central Nova Scotia, 2000.* Rural Research Centre, Nova Scotia Agricultural College, Nova Forest Alliance. 95 p.
- Statistic Canada. 2003. *Census of Agriculture: Land tenure by province.* Statistic Canada. <http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/econ113c.htm>.
- Wellstead, A. and Brown P. 1993. *The 1993 Nova Scotia woodlot owner survey.* Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources, Halifax.