Montana Natural Heritage Program - User Survey

1. What is your primary organizational affiliation?

	Response Percent	Response Count
US Bureau of Land Management	8.9%	30
US Forest Service	**22.6%**	76
US Fish & Wildlife Service	4.5%	15
Natural Resources Conservation Service	3.6%	12
MT Fish Wildlife & Parks	17.3%	58
MT Dept. of Natural Resources & Conservation	4.8%	16
MT Dept. of Environmental Quality	2.4%	8
MT Dept. of Transportation	1.8%	6
Other State Agency	3.3%	11
MT University / Higher Education	2.1%	7
Local Government	1.2%	4
Tribal Government	0.9%	3
Non-profit organization	6.0%	20
Private business	6.3%	21
Private individual	8.9%	30
Other (please specify)	5.7%	19
	answered question	**336**
	skipped question	**1**

2. For what purposes do you use MTNHP data or services? (Check all that apply)

	Response Percent	Response Count
Environmental reviews & assessments	50.5%	161
Land management	32.0%	102
Species & habitat management	**53.6%**	171
Noxious Weed Management	11.6%	37
Local Government Planning	5.3%	17
Conservation planning	32.0%	102
Research	30.1%	96
Education	20.4%	65
Remediation/Restoration	11.0%	35
Monitoring	24.1%	77
Recreation	14.1%	45
Permitting	12.5%	40
Other (please specify)	8.8%	28
	answered question	**319**
	skipped question	**18**

3. How often do you use MTNHP data or services?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Daily	1.9%	6
Weekly	14.4%	46
Monthly	**31.3%**	100
Quarterly	25.6%	82
Rarely	22.2%	71
Have never used them	4.7%	15
If your answer is Rarely or Never, please tell us why? (e.g., no need, no interest, no time, too difficult to use, can't find what you need, etc.).		84
	answered question	**320**
	skipped question	**17**

4. Over the past two years, has your use of MTNHP services...

	Response Percent	Response Count
Increased substantially	11.7%	37
Increased some	27.0%	85
Stayed the same	**52.4%**	165
Decreased some	4.8%	15
Decreased substantially	4.1%	13
If decreased, can you tell us why?		32
	answered question	**315**
	skipped question	**22**

5. How would you rate MTNHP's:				
	Outstanding	**Good**	**Needs Improvement**	**Response Count**
Overall services	**51.7% (121)**	47.0% (110)	1.3% (3)	234
Web-based services	47.0% (110)	**48.7% (114)**	4.3% (10)	234
Quality of information	48.7% (114)	**49.6% (116)**	1.7% (4)	234
Completeness of information	35.2% (82)	**55.8% (130)**	9.0% (21)	233
Expertise of staff	**66.5% (147)**	33.5% (74)	0.0% (0)	221
Responsiveness of staff	**68.8% (148)**	30.7% (66)	0.5% (1)	215
			answered question	**242**
			skipped question	**95**

6. How easy are the following web services to use?					
	Easy to use	**OK with effort**	**Too difficult**	**Don't Use**	**Response Count**
Montana Field Guide	**73.9% (173)**	14.1% (33)	0.4% (1)	11.5% (27)	234
Natural Heritage Tracker	**43.3% (101)**	37.3% (87)	3.0% (7)	16.3% (38)	233
Tracker: Submit an Observation	19.2% (43)	24.1% (54)	4.0% (9)	**52.7% (118)**	224
Ecology Information	**41.7% (93)**	23.3% (52)	0.9% (2)	34.1% (76)	223
Aquatic Ecosystem Guide	24.0% (53)	11.3% (25)	0.5% (1)	**64.3% (142)**	221
Publications	**47.9% (105)**	12.8% (28)	0.9% (2)	38.4% (84)	219
Help Files	16.9% (36)	11.3% (24)	0.5% (1)	**71.4% (152)**	213
				answered question	**243**
				skipped question	**94**

7. How important are the following MTNHP services or products to you?

	Essential	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Do not use	Response Count
Species of Concern requests/reviews	**48.0% (107)**	29.1% (65)	4.9% (11)	17.9% (40)	223
Electronic datasets	**36.3% (78)**	31.2% (67)	9.8% (21)	22.8% (49)	215
On-line Field Guide	26.0% (58)	**45.3% (101)**	13.5% (30)	15.2% (34)	223
Tracker Website	26.7% (56)	**37.1% (78)**	13.3% (28)	22.9% (48)	210
Species of Concern Ranks/Lists	**45.0% (100)**	37.8% (84)	6.3% (14)	10.8% (24)	222
Species of Concern Search on our website	37.3% (82)	**37.7% (83)**	10.0% (22)	15.0% (33)	220
Public & Conservation Lands (Stewardship) Map/Database	22.4% (48)	**36.0% (77)**	12.6% (27)	29.0% (62)	214
Aquatic ecosystem information	8.9% (19)	30.5% (65)	12.2% (26)	**48.4% (103)**	213
Plant community information	15.0% (32)	36.0% (77)	12.6% (27)	**36.4% (78)**	214
Wetland information	14.4% (31)	33.8% (73)	10.6% (23)	**41.2% (89)**	216
MTNHP studies and reports	19.6% (42)	**46.3% (99)**	11.7% (25)	22.4% (48)	214
Staff experties & consultation	**34.4% (75)**	33.5% (73)	5.5% (12)	26.6% (58)	218
				answered question	**232**
				skipped question	**105**

8. Which of the following new/expanded data or services would you find useful?				
	Very valuable	**Somewhat valuable**	**Least valuable**	**Response Count**
Statewide land cover maps of 80+ Ecological Systems	**53.6% (105)**	43.4% (85)	3.1% (6)	196
Descriptions of Ecological System Types	**48.2% (93)**	45.1% (87)	6.7% (13)	193
Crosswalk of Ecosystem Types to other classifications	37.4% (70)	**46.5% (87)**	16.0% (30)	187
Status Ranks for all Ecosystem Types	32.6% (61)	**55.1% (103)**	12.3% (23)	187
Quality assessment criteria for Ecosystems	32.4% (60)	**57.3% (106)**	10.3% (19)	185
Wetland & Riparian maps based on 1-meter imagery	**57.5% (115)**	31.5% (63)	11.0% (22)	200
More mangement information on species and ecosystems	**52.5% (104)**	39.9% (79)	7.6% (15)	198
Descriptions & field data for areas surveyed	43.7% (83)	**47.4% (90)**	8.9% (17)	190
Detailed land cover maps (1:12,000) for selected areas and cover types	**52.1% (100)**	41.7% (80)	6.3% (12)	192
More information on aquatic ecosystems & species	26.7% (52)	**57.4% (112)**	15.9% (31)	195
More information on invertebrates (aquatic & terrestrial)	23.3% (45)	**58.0% (112)**	18.7% (36)	193
More information on invasive species / weeds	**43.8% (85)**	41.8% (81)	14.4% (28)	194
Monitoring of priority species/habitats	**52.1% (101)**	41.2% (80)	6.7% (13)	194
Predictive distribution maps for species	**54.4% (105)**	34.2% (66)	11.4% (22)	193
Field trainings in i.d, survey & assessment techniques for species, vegetation & aquatic	36.2% (68)	**37.2% (70)**	26.6% (50)	188
Training in website use	27.6% (53)	**39.6% (76)**	32.8% (63)	192
Web access to Species of Concern	**47.9% (92)**	35.4% (68)	16.7% (32)	192

Lists by Public Land Section				
			answered question	**216**
			skipped question	**121**

9. Please tell us how MTNHP data & services have helped your work or organization?				
	Great Benefit	**Some Benefit**	**No Benefit**	**Response Count**
Greater efficiency	**53.5% (129)**	37.8% (91)	8.7% (21)	241
Cost savings	34.4% (78)	**41.9% (95)**	23.8% (54)	227
Improved accuracy	**55.6% (133)**	37.7% (90)	6.7% (16)	239
Better decision-making	**55.7% (132)**	35.9% (85)	8.4% (20)	237
Improved resource management/conservation	**50.6% (122)**	41.1% (99)	8.3% (20)	241
Improved products/services to your customers/public	**53.0% (124)**	36.3% (85)	10.7% (25)	234
			Other (please describe)	27
			answered question	**262**
			skipped question	**75**

10. How do you prefer to learn about new or changed MTNHP products & services?					
	First Choice	**Second Choice**	**Third Choice**	**Last Choice**	**Response Count**
Printed annual newsletter	5.0% (11)	11.4% (25)	**53.9% (118)**	29.7% (65)	219
Electronic newsletter once or twice a year	40.7% (101)	**50.8% (126)**	7.3% (18)	1.2% (3)	248
Email notices whenever new services/products become available	**51.8% (129)**	28.9% (72)	15.3% (38)	4.0% (10)	249
No communications - I'll just scan the website for myself	15.8% (35)	6.8% (15)	15.4% (34)	**62.0% (137)**	221
				answered question	**276**
				skipped question	**61**