Table 1a.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AB (N=177) | MB (N=102) | SK (178) |
|  | *Mean (SD)* | *Mean (SD)* | *Mean (SD)* |
| Number of wetlands on farmland |  |  |  |
| Permanent | 12 (37) | 21 (79) | 15 (45) |
| Seasonal | 17 (58) | 15 (43) | 23 (59) |
| Wetland drainage decisions when n no drainage penalty |  |  |  |
| Percent wetlands converting | 42 (37) | 41 (40) | 42 (39) |
| Number of wetlands converting | 7 (18) | 6 (13) | 10 (22) |
| Acres of wetlands converting | 39 (99) | 44 (130) | 68 (210) |
| Drainage cost of wetlands | 611 (1,161) | 581 (806) | 543 (1,087) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* |
| Conserve wetlands if mandatory in sustainable ag. Certification (yes=1) | 72 (41%) | 42 (41%) | 75 (42%) |
| Have environmental farm plan? (yes=1) | 29 (16%) | 23 (23%) | 32 (18%) |
| Participated in gov’t BMP (yes=1) | 117 (66%) | 60 (59%) | 103 (58%) |
| Ownership of Drainage Equipment |  |  |  |
| Own equipment (yes =1) | 69 (39%) | 60 (59%) | 62 (35%) |
| Rent equipment (yes =1) | 20 (11%) | 14 (14%) | 13 (7.3%) |
| Do not rent or own (yes =1) | 88 (50%) | 28 (27%) | 103 (58%) |
| Own scrapper (yes =1) | 54 (31%) | 53 (52%) | 55 (31%) |
| Own track hoe (yes =1) | 23 (13%) | 18 (18%) | 19 (11%) |
| Own ditch machine (yes =1) | 21 (12%) | 16 (16%) | 14 (7.9%) |
| Own tile plow (yes =1) | 5 (2.8%) | 3 (2.9%) | 2 (1.1%) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 1b. continued

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AB (N=177) | MB (N=102) | SK (178) |
| Delayed seeding |  |  |  |
| Two out of ten | 28 (16%) | 15 (15%) | 38 (21%) |
| Four out of ten | 32 (18%) | 13 (13%) | 36 (20%) |
| Six out of ten | 36 (20%) | 18 (18%) | 39 (22%) |
| Eight out of ten | 47 (27%) | 19 (19%) | 31 (17%) |
| Ten out of ten | 5 (2.8%) | 6 (5.9%) | 5 (2.8%) |
| Do not farm seasonal wetlands | 29 (16%) | 31 (30%) | 29 (16%) |
| Wetland land quality compared to surrounding dryland |  |  |  |
| 25% above average | 27 (15%) | 10 (9.8%) | 31 (17%) |
| 10% above average | 43 (24%) | 11 (11%) | 49 (28%) |
| About average | 31 (18%) | 18 (18%) | 28 (16%) |
| 10% below average | 22 (12%) | 10 (9.8%) | 22 (12%) |
| 25% below average | 25 (14%) | 22 (22%) | 19 (11%) |

Table 1c. continued

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AB (N=177) | MB (N=102) | SK (178) |
|  | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* |
| Rate factor that could influence you to drain wetland in absence of penalty |  |  |  |
| *Increased efficiency of operations* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 4 (2.3%) | 8 (7.8%) | 5 (2.8%) |
| Slightly important | 13 (7.3%) | 5 (4.9%) | 9 (5.1%) |
| Moderately important | 36 (20%) | 19 (19%) | 40 (22%) |
| Very important | 80 (45%) | 35 (34%) | 90 (51%) |
| Extremely important | 44 (25%) | 35 (34%) | 34 (19%) |
| *Land quality* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 3 (1.7%) | 3 (2.9%) | 5 (2.8%) |
| Slightly important | 12 (6.8%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (3.9%) |
| Moderately important | 39 (22%) | 21 (21%) | 53 (30%) |
| Very important | 86 (49%) | 46 (45%) | 76 (43%) |
| Extremely important | 37 (21%) | 32 (31%) | 37 (21%) |
| *Drainage cost* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 7 (4.0%) | 8 (7.8%) | 11 (6.2%) |
| Slightly important | 13 (7.3%) | 19 (19%) | 14 (7.9%) |
| Moderately important | 54 (31%) | 32 (31%) | 67 (38%) |
| Very important | 63 (36%) | 27 (26%) | 52 (29%) |
| Extremely important | 40 (23%) | 16 (16%) | 34 (19%) |
| *Effect on water quality* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 24 (14%) | 9 (8.8%) | 24 (13%) |
| Slightly important | 24 (14%) | 16 (16%) | 28 (16%) |
| Moderately important | 56 (32%) | 34 (33%) | 58 (33%) |
| Very important | 47 (27%) | 24 (24%) | 52 (29%) |
| Extremely important | 26 (15%) | 19 (19%) | 16 (9.0%) |

Table d. continued

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AB (N=177) | MB (N=102) | SK (178) |
|  | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* |
| *Effect on nearby flooding* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 22 (12%) | 8 (7.8%) | 18 (10%) |
| Slightly important | 22 (12%) | 11 (11%) | 13 (7.3%) |
| Moderately important | 40 (23%) | 28 (27%) | 49 (28%) |
| Very important | 65 (37%) | 36 (35%) | 69 (39%) |
| Extremely important | 28 (16%) | 19 (19%) | 29 (16%) |
| *Effect on nearby land access* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 18 (10%) | 9 (8.8%) | 11 (6.2%) |
| Slightly important | 15 (8.5%) | 8 (7.8%) | 14 (7.9%) |
| Moderately important | 44 (25%) | 32 (31%) | 61 (34%) |
| Very important | 71 (40%) | 31 (30%) | 72 (40%) |
| Extremely important | 29 (16%) | 22 (22%) | 20 (11%) |
| *Delayed or prevented planting* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 9 (5.1%) | 6 (5.9%) | 6 (3.4%) |
| Slightly important | 22 (12%) | 8 (7.8%) | 23 (13%) |
| Moderately important | 49 (28%) | 36 (35%) | 68 (38%) |
| Very important | 67 (38%) | 32 (31%) | 59 (33%) |
| Extremely important | 30 (17%) | 20 (20%) | 22 (12%) |
| *Weed control* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 10 (5.6%) | 11 (11%) | 11 (6.2%) |
| Slightly important | 22 (12%) | 12 (12%) | 23 (13%) |
| Moderately important | 43 (24%) | 33 (32%) | 61 (34%) |
| Very important | 71 (40%) | 30 (29%) | 54 (30%) |
| Extremely important | 31 (18%) | 16 (16%) | 29 (16%) |
| *Wildlife habitat* |  |  |  |
| Not important at all | 18 (10%) | 16 (16%) | 23 (13%) |
| Slightly important | 45 (25%) | 17 (17%) | 37 (21%) |
| Moderately important | 49 (28%) | 35 (34%) | 63 (35%) |
| Very important | 44 (25%) | 20 (20%) | 38 (21%) |
| Extremely important | 21 (12%) | 14 (14%) | 17 (9.6%) |

Table 1e. continued

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AB (N=177) | MB (N=102) | SK (178) |
|  | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* |
| Importance of Wetland Ecosystem Services (ESS) |  |  |  |
| *Water quality* |  |  |  |
| Very important | 15 (8.5%) | 13 (13%) | 19 (11%) |
| Slightly important | 26 (15%) | 9 (8.8%) | 25 (14%) |
| Not important | 54 (31%) | 30 (29%) | 52 (29%) |
| No opinion | 56 (32%) | 34 (33%) | 61 (34%) |
| *Flood control* |  |  |  |
| Very important | 27 (15%) | 12 (12%) | 25 (14%) |
| Slightly important | 28 (16%) | 7 (6.9%) | 19 (11%) |
| Not important | 45 (25%) | 30 (29%) | 55 (31%) |
| No opinion | 51 (29%) | 30 (29%) | 60 (34%) |
| *Erosion control* |  |  |  |
| Very important | 15 (8.5%) | 11 (11%) | 14 (7.9%) |
| Slightly important | 22 (12%) | 8 (7.8%) | 18 (10%) |
| Not important | 41 (23%) | 25 (25%) | 50 (28%) |
| No opinion | 62 (35%) | 36 (35%) | 72 (40%) |
| *Wildlife habitat* |  |  |  |
| Very important | 17 (9.6%) | 11 (11%) | 18 (10%) |
| Slightly important | 36 (20%) | 13 (13%) | 37 (21%) |
| Not important | 58 (33%) | 38 (37%) | 72 (40%) |
| No opinion | 45 (25%) | 25 (25%) | 32 (18%) |

Table 1f. continued

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | AB (N=177) | MB (N=102) | SK (178) |
|  |  | *Total Number (Percentage)* | *Total Number (Percentage)* |
| Wetland trends in local area |  |  |  |
| *Number of wetlands* |  |  |  |
| Decreased a lot | 22 (12%) | 20 (20%) | 38 (21%) |
| Slightly decreased | 57 (32%) | 36 (35%) | 72 (40%) |
| No change | 76 (43%) | 43 (42%) | 60 (34%) |
| Slightly increase | 16 (9.0%) | 3 (2.9%) | 7 (3.9%) |
| Increased lot | 6 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.6%) |
| *Water quality* |  |  |  |
| Decreased a lot | 16 (9.0%) | 13 (13%) | 26 (15%) |
| Slightly decreased | 33 (19%) | 23 (23%) | 55 (31%) |
| No change | 108 (61%) | 62 (61%) | 86 (48%) |
| Slightly increase | 18 (10%) | 4 (3.9%) | 10 (5.6%) |
| Increased lot | 2 (1.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.6%) |