Corvus Centre for Conservation Policy

Applying Research for Conservation Solutions

Developing a Conservation Policy Research Agenda

Results of a Practitioner Survey

Appendix 2: Individual Question Counts / Percentages

Prepared by **Guy Greenaway**

September 2021

Developing a Conservation Policy Research Agenda:
Results of a Practitioner Survey

Appendix 2 - Individual Question Counts/Percentages

Greenaway, Guy T.
September 2021

Corvus Centre for Conservation Policy
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
www.corvus.ca

Table of Contents

Survey Overview **1**

Land Use and Biodiversity **2**

Participation in Theme Questions 2

Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme? 2

Research Questions (LUB) 3

Communal Legal Defence for Land Trusts – An Exploration of Cases and Options 3

Conservation Easements and Sub-surface Rights – An Analysis of Issues and Opportunities 4

Cows and Panels – The Potential for 'Solar Grazing' in Alberta 5

A Comparison of Conservation Data Availability in Alberta, British Columbia, and Montana 6

Measuring Biodiversity for Program Applications – A Review of Cases and Practices 7

Measuring Producer Tolerance for Wildlife – A Review of Methodologies 8

Municipal Approaches to Identifying Environmentally Significant Areas – A Comparison 9

Placing Mineral Rights into a Trust for Conservation – Barriers and Opportunities 10

Research Applications (LUB) 11

Conservation and Area Structure Plans / Land Use Bylaws / Municipal Development Plans – Cases, Opportunities, and Recommendations 11

Considering Local Environmentally Significant Areas at the Regional Scale - Why and How 12

Monitoring Biodiversity at the Program Level – Balancing Ecology and Politics 13

Nature-based Solutions (NBS) Data for Private Land Conservation – Making the Connection Between Information and Ecological Outcomes 14

Using Land Cover Data to Inform Local and Regional Conservation Planning – Cases, Methods and Strategies 15

Guides and Training (LUB) 16

'Fostering Well-being of the Environment' – A Guide for Converting the New Purpose of Municipalities into Local Government Policy 16

Amending Conservation Easements – A Guide for Private Land Conservation Practitioners 17

Best Practices for Evaluating a Program's Conservation Impact 18

Conservation Easements and Municipalities - Training for Planners and Ag Fieldmen 19

Creating a Municipal Planning Overlay for Wildlife Movement – A Science-based Guide for Planners 20

Municipal School for Conservation Leaders – What You Need to Know About Municipalities in Order to Work Effectively with Municipalities 21
Municipalities and Conservation – A One-day Symposium Showcasing Tools and Approaches 22
When is a Change in Land Use Ecologically Damaging? – A Guide for Policy Makers 23

Facilitation and Engagement (LUB) 24

A Private Land Conservation Policy Repository – A Clearing House of Relevant Policy 24
Conservation and Stewardship Strategy for ALSA – An NGO-driven Vision 25
Framework for Developing a Municipal Conservation Plan – A Proposed Approach 26
Setting Provincial Targets for Private Land Conservation – A Proposed Approach 27

Evaluation and Recommendations (LUB) 28

Abuse of Conservation Easements – Current Status, Best Practices, and Recommendations 28
Conservation Easements as Biodiversity Banks – Pluses and Pitfalls 29
Conservation of Public Lands – Threats and Opportunities 30
Layering Conservation Easements – Additionality or Double Dipping? 31
Red Tape Removal for Conservation in Alberta – Recommendations for Improving the Efficiency of Conservation Programs 32
Towards a Conservation Data Strategy for Alberta – Challenges, Opportunities, and Recommendations 33
Tracking Biodiversity Offsets in Alberta – Issues and Recommendations 34

Natural Infrastructure 35

Participation in Theme Questions 35

Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme? 35

Research Questions (NI) 36

Best Management Practices for Protecting Source Water's Natural Infrastructure – A Review of Cases and Strategies 36
Engaging Private Landowners in Protecting Natural Infrastructure – Cases and Strategies 37
Incorporating Natural Infrastructure at the Municipal Level - A Review of Accounting and Asset Management Approaches 38
Land Securement in Support of Natural Infrastructure – Cases and Strategies 39
Modelling Natural Infrastructure – A Review of Current Approaches 40
Motivating Action for Natural Infrastructure Maintenance and Protection – A Review of Best Practices 41
Natural Infrastructure Accounting and Asset Management Approaches – A Review of Local Government Approaches 42
Regenerative Agriculture – A Review of Applications in Alberta 43

Wetlands and Floodplains as Blue Natural Infrastructure – Methods for Identification and Calculation 44

Research Applications (NI) 45

Funding the Maintenance and Protection of Natural Infrastructure – Cases and Strategies 45
Integrating Natural Infrastructure into Watershed Management – An Overview of Issues and Opportunities 46
Land Trusts and Source Water Protection – Private Land Conservation Options for Maintaining Natural Infrastructure 47
Local Government Strategies for Maintaining Healthy Riparian Areas – A Review of Approaches 48
Regional Natural Infrastructure - Strategies for Identification and Maintenance 49
Who is Alberta's USCAE? – Options for Certifying Wetland Replacement and Restoration in Alberta 50
Using Environmental Reserve to Conserve Natural Infrastructure – Creative Applications of an Existing Municipal Government Act Tool 51
Wetlands Conservation Policy – A Clearing House of What's Available and What's New 52
Riparian Conservation Policy – A Clearing House of What's Available and What's New 53

Guides and Training (NI) 54

A Guide to Explaining Natural Infrastructure to Citizens, Ratepayers, or Constituents / 54
A Guide to Explaining the Natural Infrastructure Approach to Municipal Councillors 55
A Guide to Identifying Natural Infrastructure in the Calgary/Edmonton Metro Region 56
How to 'Value' Natural Infrastructure – A Primer on Economics, Ecosystems, Values, and Valuation 57
Integrating Groundwater into Source Water Protection – A Policy-makers Guide to Identifying and Demarcating Recharge Areas 58
Inventorying Municipal Natural Infrastructure in Alberta – A Guide for Municipal Decision Makers 59
Natural Infrastructure and Cost Savings – Workshop for Decision Makers 60
Natural Infrastructure in Municipalities – Workshop for Planners / Workshop for Political Leaders 61
Threats to Natural Infrastructure – A Guide to Assessing Risk 62
Undertaking Wetland Restoration and Replacement – A Guide for Municipal Decision Makers 63
Upstream Forest and Riparian Management practices that Support Flood Mitigation – Guidance for Identification and Uptake 64

Using Conservation Easements to Protect Natural Infrastructure – A Guide For Municipalities 65
Using Local Government Zoning and Bylaws to Maintain Natural Infrastructure – A Guide for Municipal planners 66
Riparian Conservation – Tools, Policies and Best Practices for Planners, Conservation Groups, and Landowners 67
A Guide to Municipal Wetland Policy – Cases, Templates, and Best Practices 68
Strange Bedfellows – How Maintaining Wetlands can Help Agricultural Producers 69

Facilitation and Engagement (NI) 70

Tracking Change in Riparian Condition at a Landscape Scale – Balancing Efficiency With Efficacy 70
Tracking Wetland Replacement Projects in Alberta – A Proposed System 71
Using Drained Wetland Inventories to Support Municipal Wetland Restoration Programs 72
Wetland Restoration Program Design and Management 73
Who's Who in Natural infrastructure in Alberta – A Source Book of Potential Partners 74
Whos Who in Riparian Conservation and Enhancement – A Directory of Conservation Groups, Agencies, and Consultants 75
Outreach for Wetland and Riparian Conservation and Management – A Catalogue of Materials, Programs and Resources 76

Evaluation and Recommendations (NI) 77

Governance Structures for Maintaining Natural Infrastructure in the Bow Basin / NSask Basin / Red Deer Basin / Battle basin – Cases, Principles, and Recommendations 77
Perverse Incentive Threats to Natural Infrastructure – A Review of Existing and Potential Policy-based Threats 78
Policy barriers to Implementing 'Room for the River' Approaches in Alberta – An Assessment 79
Wetland Replacement Activity in Alberta – An Assessment of Effectiveness, Recommendations for Improvement 80
Policy Barriers to Implementing 'Room for the River' Approaches in Alberta – An Assessment 81
A Comparative Analysis of Available Wetland Inventory Approaches – What Works Best in Municipal Policy 82
Improving Riparian Conservation Policy – What's Working, What's Not 83

Nature and Climate Change 84

Participation in Theme Questions 84

Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme? 84

Research Questions (NCC) 85

Comparative Costs of Grassland Restoration vs Grassland Conservation as a Carbon Sequestration Strategy....85
Incorporating Climate Migration Considerations Into Protected Area Designation and Assessment....86
Research Applications (NCC)....87
Establishing Climate Refugia and Evolutionary Pathways in Alberta – Planning and Policy Strategies....87
Nature-based Solutions for Biodiversity and for Climate Change – Maximizing Synergy, Minimizing Discord....88
The Potential Role of Alberta's Natural Lands in a Provincial Climate Strategy – Quantifying the Sequestration Opportunity....89
Guides and Training (NCC)....90
Conservation Easements and Renewable Energy – A Guide for Private Land Conservation Practitioners....90
Facilitation and Engagement (NCC)....91
Program-specific Policy Design for Implementation of Nature-based Solutions for Climate Change....91
Evaluation and Recommendations (NCC)....92
Carbon Sequestration in Places Where Trees are Weeds – The Existing and Potential Role of Alberta's Grasslands In Carbon Sequestration....92
Conservation Easements and Carbon Credits – The Pluses and Pitfalls....93
Drought Resilience Policies – Assessing Effectiveness....94
Planting for Carbon Sequestration in Alberta – What Works Best....95
Adaptation Gap Report – An Assessment of Alberta's Progress Towards Nature-based Climate Change Adaptation....96
Finance and Biodiversity....97
Participation in Theme Questions....97
Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme?....97
Research Questions (FB)....98
Avoided Cost Methodologies for Economic Assessments of Natural Infrastructure – A Review....98
Costs of Wetland Restoration – A Comparative Catalogue of Jurisdictions and Programs....99
Insurance for Natural Infrastructure Assets – Options, Cases and Recommendations....100
Policy Barriers to Applying Conservation Offsets in Alberta – A Review....101
Quantifying the Restoration Economy in Alberta – A Financial Picture....102
Total Economic Valuation for Natural Assets – A Review of Methodologies....103

Research Applications (FB) 104

Application of Conservation Banking in Alberta – Legal, Ecological, and Practical Considerations 104
Expanding the Land Trust Business Model – Using Conservation Expertise to Enhance the Sustainability of Landscapes and Land Trusts 105
Wheat from the Chaff - Identifying Viable PES Program Opportunities in Alberta 106

Guides and Training (FB) 107

A Beginner's Guide to the Task Force on Biodiversity-related Financial Disclosures 107
Financial Models for Transfer of Development Credits – 5 Scenarios for Making TDC Programs Viable for Developers 108
Hidden Values - 10 Creative Ways to Use A Conservation Easement Tax Receipt 109
Valuing Ecosystem Services – A Guide for Policy Makers 110

Facilitation and Engagement (FB) 111

Measuring Biodiversity for Portfolio Managers – Helping the Science Community Define Appropriate Measures 111
Place-based Ecological-Economic Assessments of Natural Infrastructure / Ecosystem Services 112
Policy Design for Implementation of Market-based Instruments (MBIs) for Conservation 113
Strategic Business Planning for Private Land Conservation Organizations – Conservation Impact Beyond Land Securement 114

Evaluation and Recommendations (FB) 115

Biodiversity Proofing the Provincial Budget – A Collaborative Assessment and Recommendations for Ensuring Appropriate Spending 115
Emerging Opportunities from the Task Force On Biodiversity-related Financial Disclosures – Is the Conservation Community Ready? 116
Building the Restoration Economy – Recommendations for Growth 117
Establishing Local Conservation Funds in Alberta – Barriers, Opportunities, and Recommendations 118
Measuring Biodiversity for Financial Disclosures – Challenges and Paths Forward 119
Private Land Conservation and Carbon Markets – Promises, Pitfalls and Recommendations 120
Using Nature-Related Financial Disclosures to Attract Investment to Alberta – Options and Opportunities 121

Individual Question Counts/Percentages

Survey Overview



Viewed	Started	Completed	Completion Rate	Drop Outs (After Starting)	Average Time to Complete Survey
407	**101**	**49**	**48.51%**	**52**	**15 minutes**

Land Use and Biodiversity

Participation in Theme Questions

Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme?



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	Yes	57	87.69%
2.	No	8	12.31%
	Total	65	100%

Mean : **1.123**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[1.043 - 1.204]**	Standard Deviation : **0.331**	Standard Error : **0.041**

Research Questions (LUB)

Communal Legal Defence for Land Trusts – An Exploration of Cases and Options



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	8	20.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.00%
4.	Others might need this	19	47.50%
5.	Others would definitely need this	6	15.00%
6.	I might need this	0	0.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	12.50%
	Total	40	100%

Mean : **3.875**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.322 - 4.428]**	Standard Deviation : **1.786**	Standard Error : **0.282**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	4.55%
2.	There is no need for this	1	2.27%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	11	25.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	14	31.82%
6.	I might need this	11	25.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	11.36%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.977**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.567 - 5.388]**	Standard Deviation : **1.389**	Standard Error : **0.209**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	7	15.91%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	4	9.09%
4.	Others might need this	18	40.91%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	15.91%
6.	I might need this	6	13.64%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	4.55%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.000**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.515 - 4.485]**	Standard Deviation : **1.642**	Standard Error : **0.248**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.36%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	8	18.18%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	22.73%
6.	I might need this	10	22.73%
7.	I would definitely need this	10	22.73%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **5.000**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.463 - 5.537]**	Standard Deviation : **1.817**	Standard Error : **0.274**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	9	20.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	20.00%
6.	I might need this	15	33.33%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	15.56%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **5.000**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.494 - 5.506]**	Standard Deviation : **1.732**	Standard Error : **0.258**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.36%
2.	There is no need for this	1	2.27%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	18	40.91%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	22.73%
6.	I might need this	6	13.64%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	6.82%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.295**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.829 - 4.762]**	Standard Deviation : **1.579**	Standard Error : **0.238**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.22%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	10	22.22%
5.	Others would definitely need this	15	33.33%
6.	I might need this	5	11.11%
7.	I would definitely need this	14	31.11%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **5.422**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[5.031 - 5.814]**	Standard Deviation : **1.340**	Standard Error : **0.200**

Placing Mineral Rights into a Trust for Conservation – Barriers and Opportunities



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.11%
2.	There is no need for this	1	2.22%
3.	The need for this is low	2	4.44%
4.	Others might need this	19	42.22%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	17.78%
6.	I might need this	9	20.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	2.22%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **4.222**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.778 - 4.667]**	Standard Deviation : **1.521**	Standard Error : **0.227**

Research Applications (LUB)

Conservation and Area Structure Plans / Land Use Bylaws / Municipal Development Plans – Cases, Opportunities, and Recommendations



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	0	0.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	13	28.89%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	24.44%
6.	I might need this	8	17.78%
7.	I would definitely need this	13	28.89%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **5.467**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[5.116 - 5.817]**	Standard Deviation : **1.198**	Standard Error : **0.179**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	0	0.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	6	13.64%
5.	Others would definitely need this	16	36.36%
6.	I might need this	9	20.45%
7.	I would definitely need this	12	27.27%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **5.568**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[5.241 - 5.896]**	Standard Deviation : **1.108**	Standard Error : **0.167**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	6.82%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	6	13.64%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	25.00%
6.	I might need this	13	29.55%
7.	I would definitely need this	10	22.73%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **5.295**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.829 - 5.762]**	Standard Deviation : **1.579**	Standard Error : **0.238**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	4.44%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.22%
4.	Others might need this	8	17.78%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	26.67%
6.	I might need this	12	26.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	10	22.22%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **5.311**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.889 - 5.733]**	Standard Deviation : **1.443**	Standard Error : **0.215**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	4.55%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	6	13.64%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	29.55%
6.	I might need this	10	22.73%
7.	I would definitely need this	12	27.27%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **5.409**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.975 - 5.843]**	Standard Deviation : **1.468**	Standard Error : **0.221**

Guides and Training (LUB)

'Fostering Well-being of the Environment' – A Guide for Converting the New Purpose of Municipalities into Local Government Policy



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.27%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	4.55%
4.	Others might need this	12	27.27%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	29.55%
6.	I might need this	10	22.73%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	13.64%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **5.045**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.669 - 5.422]**	Standard Deviation : **1.275**	Standard Error : **0.192**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	9.09%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	15	34.09%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	27.27%
6.	I might need this	6	13.64%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	15.91%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.750**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.277 - 5.223]**	Standard Deviation : **1.601**	Standard Error : **0.241**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	4.55%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	7	15.91%
5.	Others would definitely need this	14	31.82%
6.	I might need this	12	27.27%
7.	I would definitely need this	9	20.45%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **5.341**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.933 - 5.749]**	Standard Deviation : **1.380**	Standard Error : **0.208**

Conservation Easements and Municipalities - Training for Planners and Ag Fieldmen



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	4.44%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.22%
4.	Others might need this	12	26.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	18	40.00%
6.	I might need this	5	11.11%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	15.56%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **4.933**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.537 - 5.329]**	Standard Deviation : **1.355**	Standard Error : **0.202**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.27%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	19	43.18%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	25.00%
6.	I might need this	4	9.09%
7.	I would definitely need this	8	18.18%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.886**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.498 - 5.275]**	Standard Deviation : **1.316**	Standard Error : **0.198**

Municipal School for Conservation Leaders – What You Need to Know About Municipalities in Order to Work Effectively with Municipalities



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	4.44%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	4.44%
4.	Others might need this	10	22.22%
5.	Others would definitely need this	17	37.78%
6.	I might need this	7	15.56%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	15.56%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **4.978**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.572 - 5.384]**	Standard Deviation : **1.390**	Standard Error : **0.207**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.22%
4.	Others might need this	9	20.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	28.89%
6.	I might need this	8	17.78%
7.	I would definitely need this	9	20.00%
	Total	45	100%

Mean : **4.889**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.374 - 5.403]**	Standard Deviation : **1.761**	Standard Error : **0.263**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.33%
4.	Others might need this	7	16.28%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	30.23%
6.	I might need this	12	27.91%
7.	I would definitely need this	9	20.93%
	Total	43	100%

Mean : **5.395**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[5.014 - 5.776]**	Standard Deviation : **1.275**	Standard Error : **0.194**

Facilitation and Engagement (LUB)

A Private Land Conservation Policy Repository – A Clearing House of Relevant Policy



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	9.09%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	19	43.18%
5.	Others would definitely need this	6	13.64%
6.	I might need this	9	20.45%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	11.36%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.591**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.121 - 5.061]**	Standard Deviation : **1.589**	Standard Error : **0.240**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.36%
2.	There is no need for this	1	2.27%
3.	The need for this is low	3	6.82%
4.	Others might need this	15	34.09%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	20.45%
6.	I might need this	8	18.18%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	6.82%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.318**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.834 - 4.803]**	Standard Deviation : **1.639**	Standard Error : **0.247**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	6.82%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	16	36.36%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	29.55%
6.	I might need this	7	15.91%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	11.36%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.750**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.327 - 5.173]**	Standard Deviation : **1.433**	Standard Error : **0.216**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	6.82%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	4	9.09%
4.	Others might need this	14	31.82%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	25.00%
6.	I might need this	8	18.18%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	9.09%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.591**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.153 - 5.029]**	Standard Deviation : **1.484**	Standard Error : **0.224**

Evaluation and Recommendations (LUB)

Abuse of Conservation Easements – Current Status, Best Practices, and Recommendations



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	8	18.18%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	4.55%
4.	Others might need this	15	34.09%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	15.91%
6.	I might need this	6	13.64%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	13.64%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.250**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.687 - 4.813]**	Standard Deviation : **1.906**	Standard Error : **0.287**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	6	13.64%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	10	22.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	20.45%
6.	I might need this	12	27.27%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	13.64%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.727**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.189 - 5.266]**	Standard Deviation : **1.822**	Standard Error : **0.275**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	4.55%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	11	25.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	27.27%
6.	I might need this	11	25.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	8	18.18%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **5.182**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.767 - 5.596]**	Standard Deviation : **1.402**	Standard Error : **0.211**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.90%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	5	11.90%
4.	Others might need this	14	33.33%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	21.43%
6.	I might need this	6	14.29%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	7.14%
	Total	42	100%

Mean : **4.238**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.748 - 4.728]**	Standard Deviation : **1.620**	Standard Error : **0.250**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.27%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	4.55%
4.	Others might need this	16	36.36%
5.	Others would definitely need this	14	31.82%
6.	I might need this	6	13.64%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	11.36%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.818**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.456 - 5.180]**	Standard Deviation : **1.225**	Standard Error : **0.185**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	11.36%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	3	6.82%
4.	Others might need this	10	22.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	27.27%
6.	I might need this	9	20.45%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	11.36%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.614**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.111 - 5.116]**	Standard Deviation : **1.701**	Standard Error : **0.256**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	9.09%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.27%
4.	Others might need this	14	31.82%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	25.00%
6.	I might need this	7	15.91%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	15.91%
	Total	44	100%

Mean : **4.750**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.268 - 5.232]**	Standard Deviation : **1.630**	Standard Error : **0.246**

Natural Infrastructure

Participation in Theme Questions

Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme?



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	Yes	43	81.13%
2.	No	10	18.87%
	Total	53	100%

Mean : **1.189**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[1.082 - 1.295]**	Standard Deviation : **0.395**	Standard Error : **0.054**

Research Questions (NI)

Best Management Practices for Protecting Source Water's Natural Infrastructure – A Review of Cases and Strategies



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.56%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.78%
4.	Others might need this	6	16.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	30.56%
6.	I might need this	11	30.56%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.89%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **5.139**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.669 - 5.608]**	Standard Deviation : **1.437**	Standard Error : **0.240**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.56%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	9	25.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	36.11%
6.	I might need this	4	11.11%
7.	I would definitely need this	8	22.22%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **5.083**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.600 - 5.567]**	Standard Deviation : **1.481**	Standard Error : **0.247**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.78%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.78%
4.	Others might need this	11	30.56%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	30.56%
6.	I might need this	5	13.89%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	19.44%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **5.056**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.614 - 5.497]**	Standard Deviation : **1.351**	Standard Error : **0.225**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.56%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.56%
4.	Others might need this	14	38.89%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	19.44%
6.	I might need this	4	11.11%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	19.44%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.778**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.271 - 5.285]**	Standard Deviation : **1.551**	Standard Error : **0.259**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	13.89%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.78%
4.	Others might need this	9	25.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	4	11.11%
6.	I might need this	9	25.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	8	22.22%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.833**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.197 - 5.470]**	Standard Deviation : **1.949**	Standard Error : **0.325**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.71%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.71%
4.	Others might need this	14	40.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	14.29%
6.	I might need this	6	17.14%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	17.14%
	Total	35	100%

Mean : **4.771**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.256 - 5.286]**	Standard Deviation : **1.555**	Standard Error : **0.263**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.86%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	3	8.57%
4.	Others might need this	11	31.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	6	17.14%
6.	I might need this	9	25.71%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	14.29%
	Total	35	100%

Mean : **4.943**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.475 - 5.411]**	Standard Deviation : **1.413**	Standard Error : **0.239**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.33%
2.	There is no need for this	1	2.78%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.78%
4.	Others might need this	15	41.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	22.22%
6.	I might need this	5	13.89%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.33%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.417**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.920 - 4.913]**	Standard Deviation : **1.519**	Standard Error : **0.253**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.56%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	7	19.44%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	27.78%
6.	I might need this	11	30.56%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.67%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **5.222**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.753 - 5.691]**	Standard Deviation : **1.436**	Standard Error : **0.239**

Research Applications (NI)

Funding the Maintenance and Protection of Natural Infrastructure – Cases and Strategies



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	13.16%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	7	18.42%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	34.21%
6.	I might need this	8	21.05%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.16%
	Total	38	100%

Mean : **4.763**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.208 - 5.318]**	Standard Deviation : **1.747**	Standard Error : **0.283**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	21.62%
6.	I might need this	10	27.03%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	18.92%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **5.162**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.685 - 5.640]**	Standard Deviation : **1.482**	Standard Error : **0.244**

Land Trusts and Source Water Protection – Private Land Conservation Options for Maintaining Natural Infrastructure



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	18	48.65%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	21.62%
6.	I might need this	3	8.11%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.22%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.703**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.242 - 5.164]**	Standard Deviation : **1.431**	Standard Error : **0.235**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.70%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	27.03%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.22%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **5.081**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.656 - 5.507]**	Standard Deviation : **1.320**	Standard Error : **0.217**

Regional Natural Infrastructure - Strategies for Identification and Maintenance



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	21.62%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.22%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.919**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.430 - 5.407]**	Standard Deviation : **1.516**	Standard Error : **0.249**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	6	16.22%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	12	32.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	21.62%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.11%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.405**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.830 - 4.981]**	Standard Deviation : **1.787**	Standard Error : **0.294**

Using Environmental Reserve to Conserve Natural Infrastructure – Creative Applications of an Existing Municipal Government Act Tool



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	12	32.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	18.92%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	18.92%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.946**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.420 - 5.472]**	Standard Deviation : **1.632**	Standard Error : **0.268**

Wetlands Conservation Policy – A Clearing House of What's Available and What's New



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.70%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	16	43.24%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	18.92%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.51%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.865**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.441 - 5.289]**	Standard Deviation : **1.316**	Standard Error : **0.216**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.70%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	17	45.95%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	13.51%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.51%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.865**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.434 - 5.296]**	Standard Deviation : **1.337**	Standard Error : **0.220**

Guides and Training (NI)

A Guide to Explaining Natural Infrastructure to Citizens, Ratepayers, or Constituents /



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	29.73%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.22%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.973**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.502 - 5.444]**	Standard Deviation : **1.462**	Standard Error : **0.240**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	7	18.92%
5.	Others would definitely need this	14	37.84%
6.	I might need this	4	10.81%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	18.92%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.865**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.343 - 5.386]**	Standard Deviation : **1.619**	Standard Error : **0.266**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.56%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.56%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.78%
5.	Others would definitely need this	15	41.67%
6.	I might need this	4	11.11%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.33%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.667**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.232 - 5.101]**	Standard Deviation : **1.331**	Standard Error : **0.222**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	8	21.62%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	18.92%
6.	I might need this	10	27.03%
7.	I would definitely need this	9	24.32%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **5.270**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.769 - 5.772]**	Standard Deviation : **1.557**	Standard Error : **0.256**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	8	21.62%
5.	Others would definitely need this	14	37.84%
6.	I might need this	5	13.51%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.22%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.919**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.448 - 5.389]**	Standard Deviation : **1.460**	Standard Error : **0.240**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	32.43%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.811**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.356 - 5.265]**	Standard Deviation : **1.411**	Standard Error : **0.232**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.56%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.78%
5.	Others would definitely need this	14	38.89%
6.	I might need this	6	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	11.11%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.889**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.449 - 5.329]**	Standard Deviation : **1.348**	Standard Error : **0.225**

Natural Infrastructure in Municipalities – Workshop for Planners / Workshop for Political Leaders



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	12	32.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	32.43%
6.	I might need this	4	10.81%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.51%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.730**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.270 - 5.190]**	Standard Deviation : **1.427**	Standard Error : **0.235**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.56%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.56%
4.	Others might need this	11	30.56%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	22.22%
6.	I might need this	10	27.78%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.33%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.806**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.338 - 5.273]**	Standard Deviation : **1.431**	Standard Error : **0.238**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	32.43%
6.	I might need this	4	10.81%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.22%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.730**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.217 - 5.243]**	Standard Deviation : **1.592**	Standard Error : **0.262**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	5	13.51%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	32.43%
6.	I might need this	5	13.51%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.11%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.541**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.087 - 4.994]**	Standard Deviation : **1.406**	Standard Error : **0.231**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	35.14%
6.	I might need this	6	16.22%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.811**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.369 - 5.253]**	Standard Deviation : **1.371**	Standard Error : **0.225**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.70%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	14	37.84%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	29.73%
6.	I might need this	5	13.51%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.51%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.865**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.455 - 5.275]**	Standard Deviation : **1.273**	Standard Error : **0.209**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.70%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	27.03%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	8	21.62%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **5.189**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.747 - 5.631]**	Standard Deviation : **1.371**	Standard Error : **0.225**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	27.03%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.51%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.784**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.279 - 5.288]**	Standard Deviation : **1.566**	Standard Error : **0.257**

Strange Bedfellows – How Maintaining Wetlands can Help Agricultural Producers



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	10.81%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	14	37.84%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	18.92%
6.	I might need this	5	13.51%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	16.22%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.595**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.045 - 5.145]**	Standard Deviation : **1.707**	Standard Error : **0.281**

Facilitation and Engagement (NI)

Tracking Change in Riparian Condition at a Landscape Scale – Balancing Efficiency With Efficacy



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	13.89%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.78%
4.	Others might need this	16	44.44%
5.	Others would definitely need this	4	11.11%
6.	I might need this	8	22.22%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	5.56%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.278**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.733 - 4.822]**	Standard Deviation : **1.667**	Standard Error : **0.278**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	16	43.24%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	24.32%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	5.41%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.541**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.087 - 4.994]**	Standard Deviation : **1.406**	Standard Error : **0.231**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	11.43%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.86%
4.	Others might need this	10	28.57%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	25.71%
6.	I might need this	7	20.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	11.43%
	Total	35	100%

Mean : **4.629**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.071 - 5.186]**	Standard Deviation : **1.682**	Standard Error : **0.284**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	10.81%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	24.32%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.568**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.033 - 5.102]**	Standard Deviation : **1.659**	Standard Error : **0.273**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	13.51%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	5	13.51%
4.	Others might need this	13	35.14%
5.	Others would definitely need this	4	10.81%
6.	I might need this	6	16.22%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.216**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.647 - 4.785]**	Standard Deviation : **1.766**	Standard Error : **0.290**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	13.51%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	5	13.51%
4.	Others might need this	12	32.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	13.51%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.11%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.216**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.657 - 4.775]**	Standard Deviation : **1.734**	Standard Error : **0.285**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	11.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	4	11.11%
4.	Others might need this	14	38.89%
5.	Others would definitely need this	4	11.11%
6.	I might need this	7	19.44%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.33%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.306**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.766 - 4.846]**	Standard Deviation : **1.653**	Standard Error : **0.276**

Evaluation and Recommendations (NI)

Governance Structures for Maintaining Natural Infrastructure in the Bow Basin / NSask Basin / Red Deer Basin / Battle basin – Cases, Principles, and Recommendations



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	14	37.84%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	27.03%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	2.70%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.432**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.986 - 4.879]**	Standard Deviation : **1.385**	Standard Error : **0.228**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	10.81%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	21.62%
6.	I might need this	9	24.32%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.11%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.568**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.038 - 5.097]**	Standard Deviation : **1.642**	Standard Error : **0.270**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	35.14%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	5.41%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.676**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.213 - 5.138]**	Standard Deviation : **1.435**	Standard Error : **0.236**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	13.51%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	12	32.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	21.62%
6.	I might need this	10	27.03%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	5.41%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.514**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.973 - 5.054]**	Standard Deviation : **1.677**	Standard Error : **0.276**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.57%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	13	37.14%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	31.43%
6.	I might need this	6	17.14%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	5.71%
	Total	35	100%

Mean : **4.571**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.101 - 5.042]**	Standard Deviation : **1.420**	Standard Error : **0.240**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	10.81%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	15	40.54%
5.	Others would definitely need this	6	16.22%
6.	I might need this	6	16.22%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.432**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.903 - 4.962]**	Standard Deviation : **1.642**	Standard Error : **0.270**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	17	45.95%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	13.51%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.703**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.242 - 5.164]**	Standard Deviation : **1.431**	Standard Error : **0.235**

Nature and Climate Change

Participation in Theme Questions

Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme?



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	Yes	38	80.85%
2.	No	9	19.15%
	Total	47	100%

Mean : **1.191**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[1.078 - 1.305]**	Standard Deviation : **0.398**	Standard Error : **0.058**

Research Questions (NCC)

Comparative Costs of Grassland Restoration vs Grassland Conservation as a Carbon Sequestration Strategy



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.78%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.78%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	25.00%
6.	I might need this	6	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	7	19.44%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.889**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.349 - 5.429]**	Standard Deviation : **1.652**	Standard Error : **0.275**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	5.41%
4.	Others might need this	8	21.62%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	29.73%
6.	I might need this	10	27.03%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.946**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.484 - 5.408]**	Standard Deviation : **1.433**	Standard Error : **0.236**

Research Applications (NCC)

Establishing Climate Refugia and Evolutionary Pathways in Alberta – Planning and Policy Strategies



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	5	13.51%
4.	Others might need this	12	32.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	18.92%
6.	I might need this	9	24.32%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	5.41%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.541**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.081 - 5.000]**	Standard Deviation : **1.426**	Standard Error : **0.234**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.78%
4.	Others might need this	9	25.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	22.22%
6.	I might need this	11	30.56%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	11.11%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.889**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.372 - 5.406]**	Standard Deviation : **1.582**	Standard Error : **0.264**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	10.81%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	8	21.62%
5.	Others would definitely need this	14	37.84%
6.	I might need this	8	21.62%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.11%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.730**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.222 - 5.237]**	Standard Deviation : **1.575**	Standard Error : **0.259**

Guides and Training (NCC)

Conservation Easements and Renewable Energy – A Guide for Private Land Conservation Practitioners



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	15	40.54%
5.	Others would definitely need this	6	16.22%
6.	I might need this	7	18.92%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.51%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.676**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.166 - 5.185]**	Standard Deviation : **1.582**	Standard Error : **0.260**

Facilitation and Engagement (NCC)

Program-specific Policy Design for Implementation of Nature-based Solutions for Climate Change



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	12	32.43%
5.	Others would definitely need this	6	16.22%
6.	I might need this	11	29.73%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.811**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.302 - 5.319]**	Standard Deviation : **1.578**	Standard Error : **0.259**

Evaluation and Recommendations (NCC)

Carbon Sequestration in Places Where Trees are Weeds – The Existing and Potential Role of Alberta's Grasslands In Carbon Sequestration



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	32.43%
6.	I might need this	6	16.22%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	10.81%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.703**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.217 - 5.188]**	Standard Deviation : **1.507**	Standard Error : **0.248**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	1	2.70%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	32.43%
6.	I might need this	5	13.51%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	13.51%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.703**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.194 - 5.211]**	Standard Deviation : **1.579**	Standard Error : **0.260**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	2.78%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	13	36.11%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	33.33%
6.	I might need this	7	19.44%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.33%
	Total	36	100%

Mean : **4.889**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.508 - 5.270]**	Standard Deviation : **1.166**	Standard Error : **0.194**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	8.11%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	10	27.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	12	32.43%
6.	I might need this	11	29.73%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	2.70%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.757**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.305 - 5.209]**	Standard Deviation : **1.402**	Standard Error : **0.231**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	5.41%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	2.70%
4.	Others might need this	11	29.73%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	29.73%
6.	I might need this	9	24.32%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	8.11%
	Total	37	100%

Mean : **4.838**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.398 - 5.278]**	Standard Deviation : **1.365**	Standard Error : **0.224**

Finance and Biodiversity

Participation in Theme Questions

Would you like to rate several possible research projects under this theme?



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	Yes	33	68.75%
2.	No	15	31.25%
	Total	48	100%

Mean : **1.312**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[1.180 - 1.445]**	Standard Deviation : **0.468**	Standard Error : **0.068**

Research Questions (FB)

Avoided Cost Methodologies for Economic Assessments of Natural Infrastructure – A Review



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	10.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	11	36.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	16.67%
6.	I might need this	8	26.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	10.00%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.700**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.120 - 5.280]**	Standard Deviation : **1.622**	Standard Error : **0.296**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	9	30.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	23.33%
6.	I might need this	9	30.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	13.33%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **5.133**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.666 - 5.601]**	Standard Deviation : **1.306**	Standard Error : **0.238**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.45%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	13	44.83%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	17.24%
6.	I might need this	10	34.48%
7.	I would definitely need this	0	0.00%
	Total	29	100%

Mean : **4.759**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.338 - 5.179]**	Standard Deviation : **1.154**	Standard Error : **0.214**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	9	30.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	30.00%
6.	I might need this	8	26.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	10.00%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **5.033**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.588 - 5.479]**	Standard Deviation : **1.245**	Standard Error : **0.227**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.23%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.23%
4.	Others might need this	11	35.48%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	29.03%
6.	I might need this	5	16.13%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	12.90%
	Total	31	100%

Mean : **4.871**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.410 - 5.332]**	Standard Deviation : **1.310**	Standard Error : **0.235**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	0	0.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.33%
4.	Others might need this	8	26.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	30.00%
6.	I might need this	7	23.33%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	16.67%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **5.233**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.827 - 5.640]**	Standard Deviation : **1.135**	Standard Error : **0.207**

Research Applications (FB)

Application of Conservation Banking in Alberta – Legal, Ecological, and Practical Considerations



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	9	30.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	10	33.33%
6.	I might need this	9	30.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	3.33%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.933**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.524 - 5.342]**	Standard Deviation : **1.143**	Standard Error : **0.209**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.33%
4.	Others might need this	13	43.33%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	30.00%
6.	I might need this	4	13.33%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	6.67%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.633**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.208 - 5.059]**	Standard Deviation : **1.189**	Standard Error : **0.217**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	12.90%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.23%
4.	Others might need this	12	38.71%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	25.81%
6.	I might need this	4	12.90%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	6.45%
	Total	31	100%

Mean : **4.290**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.729 - 4.852]**	Standard Deviation : **1.596**	Standard Error : **0.287**

Guides and Training (FB)

A Beginner's Guide to the Task Force on Biodiversity-related Financial Disclosures



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	6	20.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.33%
4.	Others might need this	12	40.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	16.67%
6.	I might need this	5	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	3.33%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **3.967**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.340 - 4.593]**	Standard Deviation : **1.752**	Standard Error : **0.320**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	5	16.67%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	13	43.33%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	23.33%
6.	I might need this	5	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	0	0.00%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.067**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.503 - 4.630]**	Standard Deviation : **1.574**	Standard Error : **0.287**

Hidden Values - 10 Creative Ways to Use A Conservation Easement Tax Receipt



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	10.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	11	36.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	30.00%
6.	I might need this	3	10.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	13.33%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.600**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.031 - 5.169]**	Standard Deviation : **1.589**	Standard Error : **0.290**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.33%
4.	Others might need this	5	16.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	26.67%
6.	I might need this	10	33.33%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	16.67%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **5.300**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.819 - 5.781]**	Standard Deviation : **1.343**	Standard Error : **0.245**

Facilitation and Engagement (FB)

Measuring Biodiversity for Portfolio Managers – Helping the Science Community Define Appropriate Measures



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	11	36.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	11	36.67%
6.	I might need this	5	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	6.67%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.800**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.386 - 5.214]**	Standard Deviation : **1.157**	Standard Error : **0.211**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	6.67%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	8	26.67%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	30.00%
6.	I might need this	5	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	6	20.00%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **5.033**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.481 - 5.585]**	Standard Deviation : **1.542**	Standard Error : **0.282**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.33%
4.	Others might need this	15	50.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	5	16.67%
6.	I might need this	5	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	10.00%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.667**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.203 - 5.130]**	Standard Deviation : **1.295**	Standard Error : **0.237**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.23%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.23%
4.	Others might need this	15	48.39%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	22.58%
6.	I might need this	3	9.68%
7.	I would definitely need this	4	12.90%
	Total	31	100%

Mean : **4.677**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.219 - 5.135]**	Standard Deviation : **1.301**	Standard Error : **0.234**

Evaluation and Recommendations (FB)

Biodiversity Proofing the Provincial Budget – A Collaborative Assessment and Recommendations for Ensuring Appropriate Spending



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.33%
4.	Others might need this	10	33.33%
5.	Others would definitely need this	15	50.00%
6.	I might need this	3	10.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	0	0.00%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.567**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.219 - 4.914]**	Standard Deviation : **0.971**	Standard Error : **0.177**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	10.00%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	1	3.33%
4.	Others might need this	13	43.33%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	30.00%
6.	I might need this	3	10.00%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	3.33%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.267**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.770 - 4.763]**	Standard Deviation : **1.388**	Standard Error : **0.253**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	1	3.23%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	2	6.45%
4.	Others might need this	15	48.39%
5.	Others would definitely need this	7	22.58%
6.	I might need this	4	12.90%
7.	I would definitely need this	2	6.45%
	Total	31	100%

Mean : **4.516**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.091 - 4.941]**	Standard Deviation : **1.208**	Standard Error : **0.217**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	6.90%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	8	27.59%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	27.59%
6.	I might need this	6	20.69%
7.	I would definitely need this	5	17.24%
	Total	29	100%

Mean : **5.000**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.441 - 5.559]**	Standard Deviation : **1.535**	Standard Error : **0.285**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	4	13.33%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	12	40.00%
5.	Others would definitely need this	8	26.67%
6.	I might need this	5	16.67%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	3.33%
	Total	30	100%

Mean : **4.300**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.743 - 4.857]**	Standard Deviation : **1.557**	Standard Error : **0.284**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	2	6.90%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	9	31.03%
5.	Others would definitely need this	9	31.03%
6.	I might need this	6	20.69%
7.	I would definitely need this	3	10.34%
	Total	29	100%

Mean : **4.828**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[4.303 - 5.352]**	Standard Deviation : **1.441**	Standard Error : **0.268**



	Answer	Count	Percent
1.	No opinion	3	10.34%
2.	There is no need for this	0	0.00%
3.	The need for this is low	0	0.00%
4.	Others might need this	10	34.48%
5.	Others would definitely need this	13	44.83%
6.	I might need this	2	6.90%
7.	I would definitely need this	1	3.45%
	Total	29	100%

Mean : **4.379**	Confidence Interval @ 95% : **[3.879 - 4.879]**	Standard Deviation : **1.374**	Standard Error : **0.255**