

SURVEY OF HISTORIC PLACES IN SASKATCHEWAN MUNICIPALITIES



SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Prepared by:
Ministry of Parks, Culture and Sport
2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION	4
METHODOLOGY	4
SURVEY RESULTS	5
Identification, protection and regulation	6
Heritage policy and planning	10
Municipal Incentives	12
Promotion	13
Municipal priorities and resources	14
Archaeology	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to understand the activities municipalities are engaged in to protect and promote historic places within their jurisdictions. The study was also designed to support the development of heritage tools and services for municipalities.

A total of 770 municipal contacts were directly emailed an invitation to participate in the historic places online survey. Email addresses were obtained from the Ministry of Government Relations's Municipal Directory. A total of 385 completed survey questionnaires were returned.

Identification, protection and regulation

Three quarters (74.5%) of respondents were aware of the *Heritage Property Act*. The large majority of respondents (81.8%) were aware that properties could be designated as Municipal Heritage Property (MHP). Only 38.2% reported that their municipality had a designated MHP. A small proportion of respondents (14.4%) reported that their municipality monitors the condition of historic places. Over half of those respondents (50.9%), reported that MHPs are monitored only when necessary.

A small proportion of respondents indicated that their municipality has a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (2.6%) or some other committee that advises council on heritage (9%).

A small proportion of respondents (8%) use the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. The most commonly reported uses were: 1) providing heritage conservation advice to property owners and others (56.7%); and 2) as a guide when making alterations to municipally owned historic places (46.7%). Forty-three percent of users indicated that the Standards and Guidelines had been officially adopted by policy or bylaw. A small proportion of respondents (3.1%) use the Statement of Significance.

Heritage policy and planning

Approximately two thirds of respondents (64.6%) indicated that their municipality has an Official Community Plan. Of these, 42% indicated that the plans contain policy for the protection and use of historic places.

Respondents were also asked if their municipality had any of five types of stand-alone plans to protect and manage historic places. The most commonly reported types of plans were: informal heritage policy (9.3%) and municipal heritage policy enacted by bylaw (8.4%).

Municipal investment and incentives

A little over three percent (3.4%) of respondents indicated that their municipality has provided financial incentives to support the preservation, restoration or rehabilitation of historic places during the past five years. The incentives included grants, loans, property tax reductions and fee waivers. In-kind assistance was reported by nine percent of respondents, most commonly labour, materials and use of equipment.

Promotion

The most frequently cited tools used by municipalities to promote historic places were: municipality's website (40%); museum exhibits (29.4%); and on-site plaque, sign or cairn (26.7%)

Over a quarter of respondents (26.4%) were aware that MHPs can be listed on the online Canadian Register of Historic Places. Over two thirds (35.5%) were aware that MHPs can be listed on the online Saskatchewan Register of Heritage Property.

Municipal priorities and resources

A small proportion of respondents (6.6%) indicated that the protection of historic places is a high or very high priority in their municipality. Three in 10 (35.2%) respondents reported that the protection of historic places is a medium priority.

Respondents indicated that the most common outcomes that were quite likely or extremely likely to result if a municipality is actively involved in protecting or promoting historic places were: 1) Greater community pride (33.7%) 2) Increased tourism (29.5%) 3) The municipality will be a more appealing place to live (22.3%).

The groups or organizations that were reported to be the most active in protecting or promoting historic places were: Local museum (27.6%); Individual volunteers (17.3%).

Respondents were asked to rate how different factors have limited their municipality's ability to protect historic places. The factors most frequently reported limitations were: 1) Lack of municipal financial resources (70.7%); 2) Limited volunteer capacity (69.5%); and 3) Municipal staff lacks heritage expertise (64.9%).

INTRODUCTION

The conservation and promotion of historic places has real economic, environment and social benefits. Rehabilitating historic buildings generates jobs, revitalizes older neighbourhoods, and increases property values and property tax revenues. Rehabilitated historic buildings have often proven to be good sources of housing stock. Compared to demolition and new development, historic building rehabilitation and reuse also reduces landfill waste, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Finally, historic places that are conserved and promoted increase residents' pride in their communities and often support tourism.

Municipal governments are key players in protecting and promoting Saskatchewan's historic places. They possess knowledge of local heritage resources, and are connected with local individuals and organizations that can help conserve and promote historic places. Under *The Heritage Property Act* and *The Planning and Development Act, 2007* municipal governments are also empowered to regulate, protect and promote local heritage resources.

The purpose of this study is to learn about municipalities' heritage activities, and to support the development of tools and services to help local governments protect, use and enjoy their communities' historic places. This report presents the overall survey results, including results broken down by municipality type. The report makes no attempt to draw insights or conclusions from the results.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire was developed by the Strategic and Corporate Services Branch and Heritage Conservation Branch of the Ministry of Parks, Culture and Sport, and based primarily on the Historic Places in Saskatchewan Municipalities Surveys that were conducted by the Ministry in 2008 and 2013.

The sample for the survey was drawn from the email list of municipal contacts obtained from the Ministry of Government Relations' Municipal Directory. A total of 770 municipal contacts were directly emailed an invitation to participate in the survey. Municipal contacts were also sent two email reminders. Data was collected during June and August, 2018. This process resulted in a total of 385 completed surveys. Readers should exercise caution when interpreting the results for cities, given the small number of respondents.

All identifiers were removed immediately to protect the privacy of the survey respondents.

Table 1 – Response Rate by Municipality Type

	Completed Surveys	Response Rate
City	6	37.5%
Town*	86	57.7%
Village [†]	142	46.0%
Rural Municipality	151	51.0%
TOTAL	385	50.0%

* Includes Towns and Northern Towns

[†] Includes Villages, Resort Villages, Northern Villages and Northern Hamlets

SURVEY RESULTS

The following sections present the overall results and the results by municipality type, based on the following four groups (n = number of responses):

- 1) Village – includes villages, resort villages, northern villages and northern hamlets (n=142);
- 2) Town – includes towns and northern towns (n=86); and
- 3) Rural Municipality (RM) – includes rural municipalities (n=151)
- 4) City – includes cities (n=6).

Demographics

Current Employment Status

Over three-quarters of respondents (77%) indicated that they were a full-time municipal staff member.

Table 1 - Current Employment Status

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
I am not an employee of the municipality	2.3%	3.5%	0%	0%	1.8%
Full-time municipal staff	89.5%	50.7%	95.4%	83.3%	77.4%
Part-time municipal staff	4.7%	44.4%	2.6%	16.7%	18.7%
Municipal elected official	3.5%	2.1%	2.6%	0%	2.6%

Approximately 43% of the respondents who were not municipal employees indicated that they were an individual volunteer. A smaller proportion of respondents (28.6%) indicated that they were affiliated with a heritage group or organization.

Table 2 – Organizational Affiliations

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Member of a heritage organization (e.g., local museum, historic site)	50%	20%	0%	0%	28.6%
Individual volunteer	100%	20%	0%	0%	42.9%
Consultant or contractor	0%	60%	0%	0%	42.9%
Local business person	0%	20%	0%	0%	14.3%

Section 1 – Identification, Protection and Regulation

Historic Places Inventory

The following table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that their municipality has an inventory of historic places.

Table 3 – Inventory of Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	36%	12.7%	23.2%	83.3%	23.1%
No	57%	63.4%	58.9%	16.7%	59.5%
I do not know	7%	23.9%	17.9%	0%	17.4%

Designated Municipal Heritage Property

The following table shows the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were aware of *The Heritage Property Act*.

Table 4 – Aware of The Heritage Property Act

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	76.5%	65.5%	80.8%	100%	74.5%

Overall, the large majority of respondents (81.8%) were aware that properties can be designated as Municipal Heritage Property (MHP).

Table 5 - Aware Properties can be Designated as Municipal Heritage Property

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	87.2%	74.6%	84.7%	100%	81.8%

Approximately 38% of respondents (n=147) indicated that their municipality has historic places that have been designated as MHP.

Table 6 – Municipality has Designated Properties

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	50%	23.9%	43%	83.3%	38.2%
No	38.4%	54.2%	31.8%	16.7%	41.3%
I don't know	11.6%	21.8%	25.2%	0%	20.5%

Eligibility Criteria

A small proportion of respondents (5.2%) reported that their municipality has eligibility criteria for designating historic places as municipal heritage property

Table 7 – Municipality has Eligibility Criteria for Designating Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	3.5%	4.2%	4.7%	66.7%	5.2%
No	60%	54.2%	53.3%	16.7%	54.6%
I don't know	36.5%	41.5%	42%	16.7%	40.2%

Regulating Alterations to MHPs

A small proportion of respondents (8.9%) reported that their municipality has a review process for proposed alterations to MHP

Table 8 – Review Process for Proposed Alterations to Municipal Heritage Properties

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	11.8%	2.1%	11.3%	66.7%	8.9%
No	74.1%	73.9%	70%	16.7%	71.5%
I don't know	14.1%	23.9%	18.7%	16.7%	19.6%

Monitoring of MHPs

A small proportion of respondents (14.4%) reported that their municipality monitors the condition of MHP.

Table 9 – Monitor the Condition of Historic Places Designated as MHP

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	24.7%	12%	8%	83.3%	14.4%
No	63.5%	69%	77.3%	16.7%	70.2%
I don't know	11.8%	19%	14.7%	0%	15.4%

Historic Places in Saskatchewan Municipalities
Ministry of Parks, Culture and Sport

Of the 14.4% of respondents who reported that their municipality monitors MHPs, over half (50.9%) reported that MHPs are monitored only when necessary. Slightly over 41% indicated that MHPs are monitored annually.

Table 10 – MHP Monitoring Frequency

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Annually	47.6%	58.8%	8.3%	40%	41.8%
Once every 2 years	9.5%	0%	8.3%	0%	5.5%
Once every 3 years	0%	0%	8.3%	0%	1.8%
Only as necessary (e.g. incident at the property, requirement for grant funding, etc.)	42.9%	41.2%	75%	60%	50.9%

Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC)

A very small proportion of respondents (2.6%) reported that their municipality has an MHAC.

Table 11 – Municipality Has a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	3.5%	0.7%	1.3%	66.7%	2.6%
No	89.4%	90.7%	92.6%	33.3%	90.3%
I don't know	7.1%	8.6%	6%	0%	7.1%

Of the respondents who reported not having an MHAC or did not know if their municipality had an MHAC (n=370), a small proportion (9%) reported that their municipality has other committees to advise council on heritage.

Table 12 – Municipality Has Another Committee to Advise Council on Heritage

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	15.8%	7.9%	5.1%	100%	9%
No	78.9%	81.9%	89.1%	0%	83.7%
I don't know	5.3%	10.2%	5.8%	0%	7.3%

Changes to The Heritage Property Act

A small proportion of respondents (1.8%) indicated that changes could be made to the Heritage Property Act that would improve their municipality's ability to protect and manage historic places. Over 70% did not provide an opinion.

Table 13 – Making Changes to the Heritage Property Act

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	4.7%	0.7%	1.3%	16.7%	1.8%
No	20%	28.9%	28.9%	83.3%	26.7%
I don't know	75.3%	70.4%	69.8%	0%	71.5%

Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places

A small proportion of respondent (8%) use the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*.

Table 14 – Use of the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	14.1%	3.5%	6%	66.7%	7.9%
No	47.1%	62%	65.1%	16.7%	59.2%
I do not know	38.8%	34.5%	28.9%	16.7%	33%

Of the respondents who use the Standards and Guidelines, (n=30), the most commonly reported uses were: 1) Providing heritage conservation advice to property owners and others (56.7%). 2) As a guide when making alterations to municipally owned historic places (46.7%).

Of the respondents who used the Standards and Guidelines, 43% (n=13) indicated that the Standards and Guidelines have been officially adopted by policy or bylaw.

Table 15 - Uses of the Standards and Guidelines

Used the Standards and Guidelines (selected any of below)	7.9%
As a tool for regulating alterations to designated heritage properties	33.3%
As a guide when making alterations municipally owned historic places	46.7%
Setting eligibility and compliance standards for municipal heritage incentives	23.3%
Providing heritage conservation advice to property owners and others	56.7%
Developing municipal heritage policies or procedures	30%
Other	16.7%

Statement of Significance

A small proportion of respondents (3.1%) indicated that their municipality uses the Statement of Significance. Half of respondents from cities (50%) use the Statement of Significance.

Table 16 - Use of the Statement of Significance

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	3.5%	0.7%	3.3%	50%	3.1%
No	71.8%	73.2%	78%	33.3%	74.2%
I do not know	24.7%	26.1%	18.7%	16.7%	22.7%

SECTION 2 – Heritage Policy and Planning

Official Community Plan

Table 17 – Municipalities with an Official Community Plan that includes Policy for the Protection and Use of Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	34.5%	13.6%	33.8%	83.3%	27.2%
No	19%	23.6%	18.2%	0%	20.1%
Our municipality doesn't have an official community plan	23.8%	45.7%	33.8%	0%	35.4%
I do not know	22.6%	17.1%	14.2%	16.7%	17.2%

For municipalities that have an Official Community Plan (n=244), 42% of respondents reported that their plan includes policy for the protection and use of historic places (n=103). Approximately 17% were unsure if their plan includes policy for historic places.

Other Heritage Plans

Respondents were asked if their municipality has any of five types of stand-alone plans to protect and manage historic places. The most commonly reported types of plans were:

1) Informal heritage policy (9.3%); and 2) Municipal heritage policy enacted by bylaw (8.4%)

Table 18 – Stand-Alone Plans to Protect and Manage Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Municipal heritage policy enacted by bylaw	9.5%	5.8%	10%	16.7%	8.4%
Informal heritage policy	11.9%	9.4%	6%	50%	9.3%
Municipality-wide heritage resource management plan	0%	0%	0.7%	0%	0.3%
Neighborhood heritage resource management plan(s)	2.4%	0.7%	0%	0%	0.8%
Property-specific heritage plan(s)	4.8%	3.6%	1.4%	0%	2.9%
Other	5.4%	2.1%	2.9%	0%	3.1%

The Planning and Development Act, 2007

Only 2% respondents indicated that their municipality has used provisions of The *Planning and Development Act, 2007* to protect historic places or facilitate the reuse of historic buildings. Half of these respondents indicated that their municipality has used dedicated lands (municipal and environmental reserve) (50%).

Table 19 – Use of Provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 2007

Dedicated lands (municipal and environmental reserve)	50%
Discretionary use provisions	25%
Contract zoning	25%
Architectural control district	12.5%
Demolition control district	12.5%
Other	25%

Municipal Cultural Plan

A very small proportion of respondents reported that their municipality has a Municipal Cultural Plan (2.9%) or has a plan in progress (0.5%).

Table 20 – Municipality Has a Municipal Cultural Plan

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	7.1%	0.7%	0.7%	66.7%	2.9%
Plan in Progress	1.2%	0%	0%	0%	0.5%
No	84.5%	90.8%	94%	33.3%	89.8%
I don't know	7.1%	8.5%	5.3%	0%	6.8%

Of those respondents who have a Municipal Cultural Plan or have a plan in progress, the majority (76.9%) reported that the plan includes aspects of heritage.

Table 21 – Municipal Cultural Plan includes Provisions related to Protection of MHP

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	57.1%	100%	100%	100%	76.9%
No	14.3%	0%	0%	0%	7.7 %
I don't know	28.6%	0%	0%	0%	15.4 %

Section 3 – Municipal Incentives

A small proportion of respondents (3.4%) reported that their municipalities have provided financial incentives to property owners during the past five years to support the preservation, restoration or rehabilitation of historic places.

Table 22 – Provided Financial Incentives during the Past Five Years

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	3.6%	1.4%	4%	33.3%	3.4%
No	90.4%	85.9%	86.7%	66.7%	86.9%

The following table shows the number of respondents who indicated that their municipality has provided different types of financial incentives

Table 23 –Number of Respondents Reporting Financial Incentives by Type of Incentive

	Number of Respondents
Grants	7
Property Tax Reductions	5
Reduced, Waived Municipal Fees	2
Loans	1

In-Kind Contributions

Slightly more than nine percent (9.2%) of respondents indicated that their municipalities have provided in-kind assistance to support the preservation, restoration or rehabilitation of historic places during the past five years. The most commonly reported in-kind contributions were labour equipment and supplies.

Table 24 – Number of Respondents Reporting In-Kind Assistance by Type of Assistance

	Number of Respondents
Labour	21
Site clean-up	18
Office space or supplies	5
Advertising and promotion	7
Professional services (e.g., legal, IT, accounting)	6
Use of equipment	12
Building materials or supplies	11
Other	8

Section 4 - Promotion

The most frequently cited tools used by municipalities to promote historic places were:

1) Municipality's website (40%); 2) Museum exhibits (29.4%); and 3) On-site plaque, sign or cairn (26.7%).

Table 25 –Tools Used to Promote Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Printed brochures or guides	34.5%	14.5%	9.1%	100%	21.7%
Municipality's website	62.1%	30.6%	21.8%	100%	40%
Social media	37.9%	16.1%	3.6%	100%	21.7%
Roadside signage	29.3%	9.7%	14.5%	20%	17.8%
On-site plaque, sign or cairn	29.3%	16.1%	29.1%	100%	26.7%
Newspaper or magazine advertising or articles	20.7%	6.5%	1.8%	80%	11.7%
Museum exhibits	56.9%	22.6%	5.5%	60%	29.4%
Heritage-themed events	24.1%	9.7%	5.5%	40%	13.9%
Workshops	3.4%	0%	0%	20%	1.7%
Heritage tours	20.7%	9.7%	1.8%	60%	12.2%
Heritage awards program	3.4%	0%	0%	40%	2.2
Other	8.6%	40.3%	41.8%	20%	30%

Canadian Register of Historic Places

Over a quarter of respondents (26.4%) were aware that MHP could be listed on the online Canadian Register of Historic Places.

Table 26 – Aware that MHP could be Listed on the Online Canadian Register of Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	29.4%	19.7%	28.7%	83.3%	26.4%
No	70.6%	80.3%	71.3%	16.7%	73.6%

Saskatchewan Register of Heritage Property

35% of respondents were aware that MHPs are listed on the online Saskatchewan Register of Heritage Property.

Table 27 – Aware that MHP are Listed on the Saskatchewan Register of Heritage Property

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	35.3%	26.8%	42%	83.3%	35.5%
No	64.7%	73.2%	58%	16.7%	64.5%

Section 5 – Municipal Priorities and Resources

A small proportion of respondents (6.6%) indicated that the protection of historic places is a high or very high priority in their municipality.

Table 28 - Priority of Protecting Historic Places in Municipality

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Very Low Priority	20%	26.8%	20%	0%	22.2%
Low Priority	32.9%	29.6%	43.3%	50%	36%
Medium Priority	35.3%	38.7%	31.3%	50%	35.2%
High Priority	7.1%	4.2%	4.7%	0%	5%
Very High Priority	4.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0%	1.6%

Outcomes of Protection and Promotion Activities

The following table shows the proportion of respondents who indicated that each of the following outcomes were quite likely or extremely likely to result if a municipality is actively involved in protecting and promoting historic places. The three outcomes with the highest ratings were: 1) Greater community pride (33.7%) 2) Increased tourism (29.5%) 3) The municipality will be a more appealing place to live (22.3%).

Table 29 – Outcomes of Protection and Promotion Activities

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Revitalized neighborhoods	23.2%	10.3%	9.7%	33.4%	13.3%
Higher property values	20.8%	13.4%	8.3%	0%	12.8%
Increased property tax revenues	14.6%	8.8%	8.4%	16.7%	10.1%
Job growth	7.3%	8.1%	4.2%	0%	6.3%
Reduced environmental impacts	7.3%	7.3%	6.3%	50%	7.6%
Improved quality of community life	19.6%	10.3%	9.7%	33.4%	12.5%

Historic Places in Saskatchewan Municipalities
Ministry of Parks, Culture and Sport

The municipality will be a more appealing place to live	35.4%	20%	15.3%	66.7%	22.3%
Easier to attract new business and investment	19.5%	11%	6.3%	50%	11.7%
Greater community pride	45.7%	30.9%	27.3%	83.4%	33.7%
Increased tourism	45.1%	24.3%	24.5%	50%	29.5%

Downtown Revitalization

Approximately one-fifth of respondents (21.1%) indicated that they were interested in learning about programs and tools to support heritage-based downtown revitalization strategies.

Table 30 - Interest in Learning about Downtown Revitalization

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	56.6%	17%	4%	50%	21.1%
No	43.4%	83%	96%	50%	78.9%

Limitations to Protection of Historic Places

The following table shows the proportion of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that each of the following factors limited their municipality's ability to protect historic places. The factors most frequently reported were: 1) Lack of municipal financial resources (70.7%); 2) Limited volunteer capacity (69.5%); and 3) Municipal staff lacks heritage expertise (64.9%).

Table 31 - Limits to Protection and Promotion of Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Lack of municipal staff resources	71.8%	65.7%	57.1%	50%	63.4%
Lack of municipal financial resources	82.4%	75.1%	59.2%	83.3%	70.7%
Municipal staff lacks heritage expertise	72.9%	66.1%	59.2%	66.7%	64.9%
Not a priority for Council	57.6%	50%	57.8%	50%	54.8%
Lack of external financial resources (e.g., federal, provincial, private)	71.4%	59.9%	53.1%	66.7%	59.9%
Limited volunteer capacity	71.8%	69.4%	69.1%	50%	69.5%
Lack of heritage expertise in the community	63.5%	59.1%	59.2%	50%	60%
Difficult to find qualified contractors	49.4%	38.2%	38.1%	50%	40.9%
Difficult to find information about protecting historic places	30.6%	22.6%	23.8%	0%	24.6%
Lack of public interest	45.2%	45.2%	46.6%	16.7%	45.3%

Community Organizations Involved in Protecting or Managing Historic Places

The following table shows the proportion of respondents who reported that the following groups or organizations are moderately active to very active in protecting or managing historic places in their municipality. Overall, the groups or organizations that were reported as the most active were: Local museum (27.6%); Individual volunteers (17.3%).

Table 32 – Organizations Active in Protecting and Managing Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Local Museum	49.4%	11.7%	29.2%	50%	27.6%
"Friends" of an historic site	7.3%	2.9%	7.7%	66.6%	6.8%
Historical society	6.1%	2.2%	7.7%	50%	6%
Genealogical society	1.2%	0%	3.5%	16.7%	1.9%
Archaeological society	2.4%	0%	0.7%	0%	0.8%
Local archives	10.8%	5%	2.8%	50%	5.7%
Tourism committee	16.8%	1%	3.5%	33.3%	6%
Individual volunteer(s)	30.1%	38.2%	12%	33.3%	17.3%
Other (specify)	5%	3.1%	3.3%	0%	3.6%

Perception of Government Assistance

The following table shows the proportion of respondents who indicated they agreed or strongly agreed with each of the following statements.

Table 33 – Government Approval Rate in Protecting Historic Places

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Our municipal government does a good job of helping protect our municipality's historic places	27.4%	11.7%	8.7%	50%	14.6%
The Saskatchewan Government does a good job of helping protect our municipality's historic places	26.2%	25%	24.9%	33.4%	25.3%
The Federal government does a good job of helping protect our municipality's historic places	20.2%	19.3%	17%	33.4%	18.8%

Section 6 - Archaeology

Respondent were asked if they ever required a developer to submit a development proposal for provincial review in order to determine if a heritage resource impact assessment were required.

Table 34 – Submission of a Development Proposed by a Developer

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	6%	0.7%	14.2%	16.7%	7.4%
No	66.3%	70.7%	67.6%	50%	68.2%
I do not know	27.7%	28.6%	18.2%	33.3%	24.4%

Respondents were asked if their municipality had ever submitted a development being conducted by the municipality for provincial review in order to determine if it required a heritage resource impact assessment. Approximately 1 in 11 respondents (9.3%) reported that their municipality had submitted a development for provincial review.

Table 35 – Submission of a Development Proposed by the Municipality

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	8.3%	2.1%	16.2%	16.7%	9.3%
No	60.7%	75.7%	62.8%	50%	63.2%
I do not know	21%	32.1%	20.9%	33.3%	27.5%

Respondents were asked if they were aware of the Ministry's online developer's screening tool, which is used to determine whether new developments are in archaeologically sensitive areas. A small proportion of respondents (14.4%) were aware of the Ministry's online developer's screening tool.

Table 36 – Aware of Online Screening Tool

	Town	Village	RM	City	Overall
Yes	11.9%	8.6%	21.1%	16.7%	14.4%
No	88.1%	91.4%	78.9%	83.3%	85.6%