

## Montana Wetland Council Survey – “Other” Response Changes

These tables shows the category that “Other” responses were placed in for each question.

| <b>Q2 Which category best describes your occupation that connects you to wetland issues?</b> |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Original Response</b>   | <b>Categorized as</b>                 |
| watershed group  | Conservation Non-profit               |
| educator and hobby farmer  | Educator                              |
| environmental educator   | Educator                              |
| landowner with a small wetland threatened by a federal highway                               | Landowner                             |
| County Floodplain Administrator  | Local Government                      |
| County Government  | Local Government                      |
| Weed Coordinator   | Local Government                      |
| Lincoln Conservation District  | Local Government                      |
| conservation district  | Local Government                      |
| Tribal Wetland Development Consultant  | Natural Resources Consultant/Engineer |
| Engineering  | Natural Resources Consultant/Engineer |
| Construction   | Other Industry                        |
| Utility  | Other Industry                        |
| heavy equipment contractor specializing in wetland enhancement and stream restoration        | Other Industry                        |
| Environmental Health Spec./Sanitarian  | Natural Resources Consultant/Engineer |
| Noxious weeds  | Natural Resources Consultant/Engineer |
| scientist with state government  | Scientist                             |

| <b>Q4 Over the last 10 years Montana’s wetlands have been conserved:</b>  |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| <b>Original Response</b>  | <b>Categorized as</b>     |
| Somewhere between adequate and poor. Observing impacts and loss too sub-divisions   | Between adequate and poor |
| Fair, but needs improvement   | Between adequate and poor |
| Somewhere between Adequate and Poor; attention is being paid, but there is never enough resources for adequate conservation | Between adequate and poor |
| Better than 'poorly' but less than 'adequately  | Between adequate and poor |
| fair to good in our area but without education to the public  | Between adequate and poor |
| Somewhere between poor and adequate, major threats exist, some irrerversable impacts offset numerous small gains            | Between adequate and poor |
| not sure  | Don't know                |
| Don't know  | Don't know                |
| unknown   | Don't know                |

| <b>Q4 Over the last 10 years Montana's wetlands have been conserved:</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Original Response</b>   | <b>Categorized as</b>   |
| not informed on large geographic area, seems inadequate locally  | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| unable to assess - 2/12 year resident  | Don't know  |
| Don't know   | Don't know  |
| I don;t know   | Don't know  |
| I don't know   | Don't know  |
| Don't know   | Don't know  |
| not sure how well they have been conserved   | Don't know  |
| I just moved here in January, don't know   | Don't know  |
| I don't have a statewide picture   | Don't know  |
| don't have a frame of reference  | Need standard for measuring   |
| not sure-I just moved here   | Don't know  |
| Don't Know   | Don't know  |
| Don't know   | Don't know  |
| I don't know   | Don't know  |
| i do not know the complete answer to this question!!! i know wetlands are more in the spotlight in the last 10 years, however. | Don't know  |
| Don't have enough info   | Don't know  |
| Not sure   | Don't know  |
| don't know   | Don't know  |
| Don't have a good overall sense  | Don't know  |
| Conservation improved over last 10 years, but overall trend is still down  | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| Inconsistently   | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| both well and poorly- site specific  | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| Varies per area  | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| may need more attention?   | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| Good work has been done yet there is still much to do  | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| Depends on the type of wetland   | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| some well, others not  | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| Mixed-gains and losses   | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| Mixed, but natural wetlands continue to be impacted  | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |

| <b>Q4 Over the last 10 years Montana's wetlands have been conserved:</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Original Response</b>   | <b>Categorized as</b>   |
| It depends on the region, some are conserved well and others are not. A better statewide effort needs to be made that not only focuses on the southwest corner of the state.                             | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| More pressure in high growth areas   | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| We are not the worst, but we are not the best. The last 10 years have raised the awareness level. Now, the next 10 years need to solidify the conservation and enhancement of wetlands in our state.     | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| There has been progress, but more to do.   | Mixed - depends on type, area, some improvement but still more needed |
| no accounting program in place   | Need standard for measuring   |
| there has been good work done but no measure as to overall trends  | Need standard for measuring   |
| need more unbiased info for decisionmaking   | Need standard for measuring   |
| is conservation the only issue ? -- answer: adequately   | No impacts, enough protection in place                                |
| Wetlands are not given the attention they be given, especially in Sub-division approvals. Tougher enforcement is needed.   | Poorly  |
| with not much forward thinking   | Poorly  |
| not enough   | Poorly  |
| conservation over the past 20 years has been poor, however the last 5 years have shown a turnaround in wetland awareness and to a lesser extent conservation   | Poorly  |
| very, very poorly  | Poorly  |
| To the extent that waterfowl production contributes to wetland conservation, the state has put forth some effort, but I think conservation efforts can be expanded to include more attributes and values | Poorly  |
| I am relatively new to MT, however I know that it is extremely difficult to mimic a true wetland. With so much new construction in wetland areas I feel that more harm occurs than can be remediated.    | Poorly  |

| <b>Q5 Please rate what you believe to be the top 3 critical impacts or threats to Montana's wetlands in the next 10 to 15 years</b> |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| <b>Original Response</b>  | <b>Categorized as</b>  |
| degradation due to 'cumulative effects' of improper grazing, invasive species, development, etc.                                    | Development/Conversion |
| Conversion of timber lands to residential, commercial, and industrial use.  | Development/Conversion |
| Conversion of wetlands and assoc. grasslands to row crops in NE MT  | Development/Conversion |
| Watershed impacts associated with agricultural practices and urban development  | Development/Conversion |
| ignorant land developers  | Development/Conversion |

| <b>Q5 Please rate what you believe to be the top 3 critical impacts or threats to Montana's wetlands in the next 10 to 15 years</b> |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Original Response</b>  | <b>Categorized as</b>   |
| current identification  | Current Identification  |
| Farm Bill Revision and reduction in CRP and WRP   | Farm Bill Revision and reduction in CRP and WRP                                 |
| grazing and cropping, including irrigation  | Grazing   |
| grazing of riparian wetlands  | Grazing   |
| Farming/draining  | Increasing demands on ground and surface water from agriculture                 |
| Lack of understanding and community commitment to care for wetlands   | Lack of understanding and community commitment to care for wetlands             |
| Conflicting goals and policies between government agencies  | Limited or inconsistent enforcement of laws and regulations protecting wetlands |
| Don't need to spend taxpayers   | No impacts, enough protection in place  |
| too much government oversight   | No impacts, enough protection in place  |
| no impacts - plenty of protections already  | No impacts, enough protection in place  |

| <b>Q7 What do you see as the three most important (top priority) strategies or actions Montana could take in the next 10 years to better conserve its wetland resources?</b>                       |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Original Response</b>   | <b>Categorized as</b>  |
| sensitize the public of the consequences of not taking care of wetlands  | Adult and youth education about the importance and need to conserve and restore wetlands |
| all of the above, tho outreach and 'buy-in' is likely the most important   | All of the above   |
| All of the above in tandem   | All of the above   |
| all items not checked above are to be 1, but would not check   | All of the above   |
| Develop green energy   | Develop green energy/limit oil & gas consumption   |
| Limit oil & Gas  | Develop green energy/limit oil & gas consumption   |
| Give the County Planning Departments and the County Commissioners back the power to disapprove or modify Sub-division applications. As it stands now every application is rubber stamped approved, | Encourage and assist local government planning and development decision-making           |
| Don't need to spend taxpayers money.   | Enough protection in place   |
| Less Bureaucrats   | Enough protection in place   |
| plenty of protections in place already   | Enough protection in place   |
| Incentives to developers to leave wetlands in place during development or incentives to find other locations for construction to leave the wetlands alone  | Incentives for developers to avoid wetlands  |
| Increase dedicated funding in MT for wetland protection (tax based revenues, lottery proceeds, state tax incentives for CEs, etc.)   | Increase dedicated funding in MT   |
| further the development of the science specific to our wetlands, gw/sw system in the arid montane west   | Increase Montana-specific wetland science  |
| Prioritize wetlands and acres for protection, restoration & management across MT and then use people and resources to focus those efforts.   | Prioritize areas for wetland protection and focus efforts                                |

**Q7 What do you see as the three most important (top priority) strategies or actions Montana could take in the next 10 years to better conserve its wetland resources?**

| Original Response   | Categorized as  |
|---|---|
| Work w/ conservation agencies and NGO's to provide more resources to restore and conserve wetlands (easements, incentive-based programs, cooperative conservation, etc.). | Provide more resources to conservation agencies & organizations |
| weed control  | Weed control  |
| Identify wetland locations (mapping)  | Wetland mapping   |