1. When you think about the amount of trees Ontario loses every year due to various reasons including urbanization, infestation, fire, logging and climate change, how serious do you think the problem is:

		REGION	
		Rest of	
	Total	Ontario	North
		Α	В
Base: All respondents	846	782	64
Weighted	846	782	64*
Very serious	341	314	26
	40%	40%	41%
Somewhat serious	394	368	26
	47%	47%	40%
Not very serious	95	86	9
	11%	11%	14%
Not at all serious	16	13	3
	2%	2%	5%
Summary			
Top2Box (Very/ Somewhat serious)	735	683	52
	87%	87%	81%
Low2Box (Not very/ Not at all serious)	111	99	12
	13%	13%	19%

2. When you think about the amount of trees Ontario has lost over the past decade due to various reasons including urbanization, infestation, fire, logging and climate change, how much of a collective impact do you think this has had on Ontario's ecosystem/biosphere? Has it created a severe crisis, somewhat of a crisis, or really not a crisis at all for Ontario's ecosystem/biosphere?

		REGION	
		Rest of	
	Total	Ontario	North
		Α	В
Base: All respondents	846	782	64
Weighted	846	782	64*
A severe crisis	210	193	17
	25%	25%	27%
Somewhat of a crisis	483	451	33
	57%	58%	51%
Really not a crisis at all	152	138	14
	18%	18%	22%

3. When the ecosystem/biosphere in Ontario loses trees - over 10,000 hectares of forested land has been lost in the past 10 years due to urbanization alone - efforts are made to renew the loss. But whereas a decade ago Ontario renewal was taking place by planting 20 million trees a year on rural, private lands in the province, in 2007 only 2 million trees were planted mainly due to lack of funding - particularly from non - government agencies. Given all of the many competing environmental issues confronting the province, how much of a priority should we put on increasing our collective efforts to plant more trees on rural and private lands in Ontario? Should it be a very high priority, a somewhat high priority, a somewhat low priority, not really a priority at all?

		REGION	
		Rest of	
	Total	Ontario	North
		Α	В
Base: All respondents	846	782	64
Weighted	846	782	64*
Very high	306	281	25
	36%	36%	39%
Somewhat high	433	401	32
	51%	51%	49%
Somewhat low	90	85	5
	11%	11%	8%
Not really at all	17	15	2
	2%	2%	3%
Summary			
Top2Box (Very/Somewhat high)	739	682	57
	87%	87%	89%
Low2Box (Somewhat low/Not at all)	107	100	7
, '	13%	13%	11%
			.,,

Detailed tables

4. Currently retail and service outlets across the province are charging consumers 5 cents for every plastic bag they take from the store. The money collected by the outlet can go to wherever the outlet decides: for example, Loblaws plans to give \$1 million a year over three years to the World Wildlife Fund - Canada. Metro Foods is donating \$2 million toward an environmental stewardship program in schools in Ontario and Quebec for the 2009/10 school year and Sobeys Ontario is funding grants of up to \$20,000 to support Earth Day Canada projects. Or they can just keep it. Given all the places an organization could donate its 5 cent bag fee if it wanted to (including social, health and environmental causes), how supportive would you be if an outlet decided to designate Trees Ontario - a not for profit organization that plants trees in Ontario on rural and private lands - as the recipient of its collected amount? Would you be very supportive, somewhat supportive, not really supportive or not at all supportive?

Total Rest of Ontario North			REGION		
Base: All respondents				Rest of	
Base: All respondents 846 782 64			Total	Ontario	North
Weighted 846 782 64* Very supportive 412 370 42 49% 47% 65% A A Somewhat supportive 356 337 19 42% 43% 30% Not really supportive 56 53 2 7% 7% 4% Not at all supportive 23 22 1 3% 3% 2% Summary 702 61 91% 90% 94% Low2Box (Not really/ Not at all supportive) 79 75 4				А	В
Very supportive	Base: All respondents		846	782	64
A9% A7% 65% A	Weighted		846	782	64*
A9% A7% 65% A					
Not really supportive 356 337 19 42% 43% 30%	Very supportive		412	370	42
Somewhat supportive 356 337 19 42% 43% 30% 30% 42% 43% 30% 42% 43% 30% 42% 43% 30% 42% 43% 43% 30% 42% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 43% 4			49%	47%	65%
A2% A3% 30%					Α
Not really supportive	Somewhat supportive		356	337	19
7% 7% 4%			42%	43%	30%
7% 7% 4%					
Not at all supportive 23 22 1 3% 3% 2%	Not really supportive		56	53	2
3% 3% 2%			7%	7%	4%
3% 3% 2%					
Summary Top2Box (Very/ Somewhat supportive) 767 707 61 91% 90% 94%	Not at all supportive		23	22	1
Top2Box (Very/ Somewhat supportive) 767 707 61 91% 90% 94% Low2Box (Not really/ Not at all supportive) 79 75 4			3%	3%	2%
Top2Box (Very/ Somewhat supportive) 767 707 61 91% 90% 94% Low2Box (Not really/ Not at all supportive) 79 75 4					
91% 90% 94%	Summary				
Low2Box (Not really/ Not at all supportive) 79 75 4	Top2Box (Very/ Somewhat supportive)		767	707	61
			91%	90%	94%
	Low2Box (Not really/ Not at all supportive)		79	75	4
			9%	10%	6%

5. If you heard that an organization was contributing to Trees Ontario - a not for profit organization that is dedicated to planting trees in Ontario on rural and private lands for the benefit of the eco system/biosphere - how would it affect your view of their reputation and contribution to the community? Would it make you more likely, less likely or neither more nor less likely to think better of them?

		REGION	
		Rest of	
	Total	Ontario	North
		Α	В
Base: All respondents	846	782	64
Weighted	846	782	64*
More likely	595	549	45
	70%	70%	71%
Less likely	36	33	4
	4%	4%	6%
Neither more nor less	215	199	15
	25%	26%	24%