Methodology

• Survey was conducted by a bipartisan research team of New Bridge Strategies (Republican) and FM3 Research (Democrat).
• N=500 interviews conducted with registered Montana voters.
• Statistically valid sample with an overall margin of sampling error of ±4.38% at the 95% confidence interval for the total sample.
• Interviews conducted March 19-24, 2020, on landline and cell phones.
• Trend data from similarly conducted surveys of N=500 registered voters conducted June 2014, May 2016, and April 2018.
Montanans love their outdoor lifestyle of visiting national and state public lands, and engaging in a variety of outdoor recreation activities.

Public lands and outdoor recreation businesses/jobs are considered critical to Montana’s economy.

Most voters indicate Wilderness Study Areas should be kept as is or have their protections increased.

There is vast support across political parties, outdoor recreation enthusiasts, and regionally for proposals aimed at increasing protections for existing public lands.

Two-thirds of voters want publicly processed proposals acted on by Congress within one year.
Outdoor Recreation Habits
Nearly all Montanans have visited national public lands this past year; more than one-quarter have visited 20 or more times.

Over the past year, how many times do you think you have visited national public lands such as national parks, national forests, national monuments, national wildlife refuges, or other national public lands?

- Never: 12%
- Once or Twice: 18%
- 3-5 Times: 16%
- 6-10 Times: 12%
- 10-20 Times: 15%
- 10 or Less: 46%
- More than 20 Times: 27%
- 10 or More: 42%
- 10 or Less: 46%
- More than 20 Times: 27%

2018:
- 89% Visited Park
- 46% Visited 10+ Times
- 44% Visited <10 Times

Due to rounding, totals may not equal the sum of individual answer choices or add up to 100%.
Montanans also enjoy visiting state lands, indicating they go to a state-run area slightly more often than a national park.

And what about state lands, such as Montana wildlife management areas, state parks, fishing access sites and trust lands? How many times do you think you have visited those areas over the past year?

Due to rounding, totals may not equal the sum of individual answer choices or add up to 100%.
Montanans regularly participate in a variety of outdoor activities.

Which of the following types of outdoor activities do you participate in regularly?
Multiple answers accepted.
Nearly two-thirds of Montana residents consider themselves a sportsmen.

- 12% Hunter Only
- 39% Both Hunter & Angler
- 13% Angler Only
- 64% Sportsmen

Do you consider yourself a hunter, an angler or both?
Four out of five voters consider themselves to be a conservationist.

79%

Yes, I’m a conservationist

Do you consider yourself to be a conservationist?
Public Lands and the Economy
Public lands are helpful to Montana’s economy.

When you think about the presence of national public lands in Montana – do you think that having such lands helps our economy, hurts our economy, or has little impact on our economy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps our economy</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurts our economy</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has little impact on</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outdoor recreation businesses and jobs are universally considered an important part of the state’s economy.

The outdoor recreation economy is made up of businesses that serve Montanans and visitors who want to hunt, fish, camp, boat, ski, and see wildlife, as well as businesses that manufacture and sell equipment for those activities. When you think of Montana’s economy do you think these types of business and jobs are extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not that important, or not at all important?

Due to rounding, totals may not equal the sum of individual answer choices or add up to 100%.
Montana voters are highly supportive of the work being done by the Office of Outdoor Recreation.

Three years ago, Montana created an Office of Outdoor Recreation to work with these mostly small businesses to help grow the outdoor recreation economy and to support the public lands, wildlife habitat and waters on which these jobs depend. Do you support or oppose the Office of Outdoor Recreation continuing to work with these Montana businesses and efforts in the state?

86% Strongly Support
56% Total Support
9% Strongly Oppose
9% Total Oppose
Support for the Office of Outdoor Recreation extends across party lines.

Three years ago, Montana created an Office of Outdoor Recreation to work with these mostly small businesses to help grow the outdoor recreation economy and to support the public lands, wildlife habitat and waters on which these jobs depend. Do you support or oppose the Office of Outdoor Recreation continuing to work with these Montana businesses and efforts in the state?
Overall, voters are supportive of increases taxes or fees to protect water, habitats, and recreation.

Would you support or oppose a small increase in local taxes or fees in order to protect water, conserve wildlife habitat and ensure opportunities for outdoor recreation in your part of Montana?

- Strongly Support: 60%
- Strongly Oppose: 36%
- Total Support: 32%
- Total Oppose: 26%
However, an increase in taxes or fees invokes a political divide.

*Increase in Taxes or Fees to Protect Water, Habitats, and Recreation by Party*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
<th>Total Support</th>
<th>Total Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you support or oppose a small increase in local taxes or fees in order to protect water, conserve wildlife habitat and ensure opportunities for outdoor recreation in your part of Montana?
Benefits of Public Lands
Enhancing and protecting publicly owned lands are viewed as having a positive effect for many aspects of life in Montana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% Negative Impact</th>
<th>% Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting clean water</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for children to explore and learn about nature</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of life in Montana</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining what is best about Montana</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting our culture and heritage</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking a step back and thinking about all publicly owned lands -- Generally speaking, do you believe enhancing and protecting public lands, such as local, state and national parks, national forests, and wilderness has a positive impact, a negative impact, or no real impact on each of the following: (Statements were split sampled; Asked of N= 248/252 Respondents)
Nine-in-ten Montanans say public lands have a positive impact on clean water, children’s education on nature, and quality of life.

Taking a step back and thinking about all publicly owned lands -- Generally speaking, do you believe enhancing and protecting public lands, such as local, state and national parks, national forests, and wilderness has a positive impact, a negative impact, or no real impact on each of the following:  (Statements were split sampled; Asked of N= 248/252 Respondents)
The next tier of positive benefits include tourism, wildlife, and maintaining the best of Montana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Negative Impact</th>
<th>% Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintaining what is best about Montana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking a step back and thinking about all publicly owned lands -- Generally speaking, do you believe enhancing and protecting public lands, such as local, state and national parks, national forests, and wilderness has a positive impact, a negative impact, or no real impact on each of the following: (Statements were split sampled; Asked of N= 248/252 Respondents)
Voters also believe public lands help protect Montana’s culture and provide opportunities for outdoor activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Protecting our culture and heritage</th>
<th>% Negative Impact</th>
<th>% Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Opportunities for hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation</th>
<th>% Negative Impact</th>
<th>% Positive Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking a step back and thinking about all publicly owned lands -- Generally speaking, do you believe enhancing and protecting public lands, such as local, state and national parks, national forests, and wilderness has a positive impact, a negative impact, or no real impact on each of the following: (Statements were split sampled; Asked of N= 248/252 Respondents)
Views of Wilderness Study Areas
Voters would like the Wilderness Study Areas to stay as is or more protections added; a mere 8% would eliminate their status.

Here in Montana, there are seven areas of public lands protected as Wilderness Study Areas managed by the U.S. Forest Service. These seven Wilderness Study Areas include such places as the Big Snowy Mountains, the West Pioneers and the Gallatin Range. These public lands are accessible to hunters, anglers, hikers, and others on foot and horse, and allow grazing, mountain bikes, and motorized vehicle use in limited areas, but do not allow mining, drilling, or logging.

Only Congress can change the status of these areas, so would you prefer that Congress --

- Increase protections in all seven areas: 23%
- Keep the seven areas as they are now: 52%
- Add protections in some areas and eliminate protections in others: 14%
- Eliminate existing protections in all seven areas: 8%
Across party lines, a majority of voters want to increase or keep protections the same for the Wilderness Study Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Independents</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase protections in all seven areas</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the seven areas as they are now</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCREASE/KEEP</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add protections in some areas and eliminate protections in others</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate existing protections in all seven areas</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here in Montana, there are seven areas of public lands protected as Wilderness Study Areas managed by the U.S. Forest Service. These seven Wilderness Study Areas include such places as the Big Snowy Mountains, the West Pioneers and the Gallatin Range. These public lands are accessible to hunters, anglers, hikers, and others on foot and horse, and allow grazing, mountain bikes, and motorized vehicle use in limited areas, but do not allow mining, drilling, or logging. Only Congress can change the status of these areas, so would you prefer that Congress --
Residents in all community types also prefer more or the same amount of protections for these public lands.

Here in Montana, there are seven areas of public lands protected as Wilderness Study Areas managed by the U.S. Forest Service. These seven Wilderness Study Areas include such places as the Big Snowy Mountains, the West Pioneers and the Gallatin Range. These public lands are accessible to hunters, anglers, hikers, and others on foot and horse, and allow grazing, mountain bikes, and motorized vehicle use in limited areas, but do not allow mining, drilling, or logging. Only Congress can change the status of these areas, so would you prefer that Congress --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>City/Suburbs</th>
<th>Small Town</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase protections in all seven areas</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the seven areas as they are now</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCREASE/KEEP</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add protections in some areas and eliminate protections in others</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate existing protections in all seven areas</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No matter a voter’s preference for outdoor activities, they would like these study areas to be kept the same or have increased protections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase protections in all seven areas</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Hikers/Trail Runners</th>
<th>Campers</th>
<th>Kayakers/Canoers/Boaters</th>
<th>Bird Watchers/Viewers of Wildlife</th>
<th>Snowshoers/Skiers/Snowboarders</th>
<th>Riders of Off-Road/Snowmobile</th>
<th>Mountain Bikers</th>
<th>Hunters</th>
<th>Anglers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the seven areas as they are now</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCREASE/KEEP</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add protections in some areas and eliminate protections in others</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate existing protections in all seven areas</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here in Montana, there are seven areas of public lands protected as Wilderness Study Areas managed by the U.S. Forest Service. These seven Wilderness Study Areas include such places as the Big Snowy Mountains, the West Pioneers and the Gallatin Range. These public lands are accessible to hunters, anglers, hikers, and others on foot and horse, and allow grazing, mountain bikes, and motorized vehicle use in limited areas, but do not allow mining, drilling, or logging. Only Congress can change the status of these areas, so would you prefer that Congress --
Voters want Wilderness Study Areas to be used for recreation and wildlife habitats, until acted upon by Congress.

Continue to be treated as they are now, mostly to conserve them for recreation and wildlife habitat

Allow changes in the uses such as oil and gas exploration and establishment of new or expanded motorized recreation

And congressional action to address Wilderness Study Areas can often take years, so in the meantime, should these lands –
Majorities of all partisan sub-groups believe Wilderness Study Areas should be left alone until Congressional action is taken.

% Selected “Continue to be treated as they are now, mostly to conserve them for recreation and wildlife habitat”

64% 83% 98%

And congressional action to address Wilderness Study Areas can often take years, so in the meantime, should these lands –
More than half of voters *strongly* support the proposal to increase protections in the Gallatin Range WSA.

*Increasing protections for the Wilderness Study Area in the Gallatin Range, which borders Yellowstone National Park, by maintaining the existing recreation uses, conserving some areas for wildlife migration, protecting the headwaters of the Gallatin and Yellowstone rivers and designating some new wilderness. Mining, new road building, oil and gas development would not be allowed on these lands. The proposal was put forward by a partnership of local residents including sportsmen, business owners, recreationists, conservationists and others.*

There are two other proposals concerning existing public lands here in Montana that have been developed by local land users such as hunters, anglers, ranchers, business owners and others over several years – For each one, please tell me if that seems like something you would support or oppose.
Overall, a majority of voters in each political party support increasing protections for this WSA.

*Increasing Protections for the Wilderness Study Area in the Gallatin Range by Party*

- **Republicans**
  - Strongly Support: 60%
  - Total Support: 93%
  - Strongly Oppose: 32%
  - Total Oppose: 68%

- **Independents**
  - Strongly Support: 78%
  - Total Support: 87%
  - Strongly Oppose: 17%
  - Total Oppose: 26%

- **Democrats**
  - Strongly Support: 96%
  - Total Support: 100%
  - Strongly Oppose: 3%
  - Total Oppose: 3%

*Please tell me if that seems like something you would support or oppose.*
Views of Policies Affecting Public Lands
Three-quarters of voters support the Blackfoot Clearwater Stewardship Project, just as they had in 2016 and 2018.

The Blackfoot Clearwater Stewardship Project in western Montana would ensure access to hunting and fishing sites, increasing protections for approximately eighty thousand acres of existing public lands by adding them to the Bob Marshall, Scapegoat and Mission Mountains wilderness areas; open a high-quality area for snowmobiling, and maintain timber harvesting.

Thinking specifically about the following proposals regarding public lands here in Montana – For each one, please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.

- Strongly Support
- Strongly Oppose
- Total Support
- Total Oppose

2016
- Strongly Support: 35%
- Strongly Oppose: 11%
- Total Support: 74%

2018
- Strongly Support: 36%
- Strongly Oppose: 8%
- Total Support: 73%

2020
- Strongly Support: 36%
- Strongly Oppose: 8%
- Total Support: 75%
And, there is solid support for the Blackfoot Clearwater Project across party lines.

Blackfoot Clearwater Stewardship Project by Party

- Republicans:
  - Strongly Support: 32%
  - Total Support: 75%
  - Strongly Oppose: 15%
  - Total Oppose: 7%

- Independents:
  - Strongly Support: 33%
  - Total Support: 71%
  - Strongly Oppose: 19%
  - Total Oppose: 10%

- Democrats:
  - Strongly Support: 46%
  - Total Support: 82%
  - Strongly Oppose: 15%
  - Total Oppose: 6%

Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
Outdoor recreation enthusiasts also support the project.

% Support for Blackfoot Clearwater Stewardship Project by Outdoor Recreation

79% Hikers and trail runners
80% Campers
82% Kayakers, canoeors or boaters
78% Bird watchers and viewers of wildlife
83% Snowshoers, skiers or snowboarders
80% Riders of off-road vehicle or snowmobile
87% Mountain bikers

Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
While hunters and anglers are supportive of Blackfoot Clearwater Project, their counterparts are less enthusiastic.

% Support for Blackfoot Clearwater Stewardship Project by Sportsmen

80% Sportsmen

66% Non-Sportsmen

Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
There is solid majority support across the state for the project.

Blackfoot Clearwater Stewardship Project by Media Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
Nearly six-in-ten Montanans strongly support designating Badger-Two Medicine area as a Cultural Heritage Area.

The Badger-Two Medicine area of the Lewis and Clark National Forest, which connects Glacier National Park with the Bob Marshall Wilderness is considered sacred by the Blackfeet Tribe. Along with outdoor recreation groups and others from the surrounding area, the Blackfeet Tribe proposes designating the land a Cultural Heritage Area in order to protect its cultural and wildlife values. Under this, the Badger-Two Medicine would continue to be accessible to hunters, anglers, hikers, and others on foot and horseback and remain off-limits to mining, oil and gas development, and the use of motorized or off-road vehicles.

Thinking specifically about the following proposals regarding public lands here in Montana – For each one, please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
Voters of all political parties are supportive of the proposal for Badger-Two Medicine Region, especially Democrats.

Badger-Two Medicine Region Proposal by Party

Republicans
- Strongly Support: 66%
- Strongly Oppose: 9%
- Total Support: 38%
- Total Oppose: 27%

Independents
- Strongly Support: 78%
- Strongly Oppose: 11%
- Total Support: 55%
- Total Oppose: 17%

Democrats
- Strongly Support: 96%
- Total Support: 86%
- Total Oppose: 3%

Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
Even voters who enjoy off-roading, support this proposal for the Badger-Two Medicine area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor Recreation Activity</th>
<th>Support Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hikers and trail runners</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campers</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayakers, canoers or boaters</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird watchers and viewers of wildlife</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoers, skiers or snowboarders</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riders of off-road vehicle or snowmobile</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain bikers</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
Voters across the state support the proposed plan for Badger-Two Medicine Region.

**Badger-Two Medicine Region Proposal by Media Market**

- **Missoula**
  - Support: 82%
  - Oppose: 14%

- **Butte**
  - Support: 80%
  - Oppose: 19%

- **Great Falls**
  - Support: 71%
  - Oppose: 25%

- **Billings**
  - Support: 78%
  - Oppose: 13%

Please tell me whether it sounds like something you would support or oppose.
Voters believe it is highly important that Badger-Two Medicine area conserve wildlife habitats and continue recreational use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>% Extremely/Very Important</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Total Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conserve wildlife habitat, for species such as elk, native trout and mountain goats</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to allow all existing recreational opportunities for those who come to hike, camp, fish, hunt, and recreate here either on foot or horseback</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for community input in how the land is managed and conserved</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect archaeological and cultural sites considered sacred by the Blackfeet Tribe</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td><strong>67%</strong></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create jobs in nearby communities</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a role for the Blackfeet tribe in managing these lands, which does not exist today</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I’m going to read you a number of potential aspects of a plan to protect the Badger-Two Medicine area’s natural and cultural values. For each one, please tell me how important you think it is that the plan for this area include that particular element - is it extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important? (Statements were split sampled; Asked of N=288/291 Respondents)
Nearly three-quarters of Montanans also support the local proposal for increased protections on national forest land in western Montana.

Increasing protections on national forest lands in western Montana, near the town of Lincoln, by promoting forest restoration, protecting existing snowmobile access, and providing a better trail system for motorized recreation and mountain bikes to help avoid conflicts with local property owners. The proposal would add fifty-five thousand acres of Wilderness in the headwaters of the Big Blackfoot River, including additions to the Scapegoat Wilderness and exclude new mining and oil and gas development for around one hundred and twenty thousand acres mostly along the continental divide and in the Blackfoot River’s headwaters.

There are two other proposals concerning existing public lands here in Montana that have been developed by local land users such as hunters, anglers, ranchers, business owners and others over several years – For each one, please tell me if that seems like something you would support or oppose.
The improved access for snowmobiles, off-road vehicles, and mountain bikes are supported by all outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

% Support for increasing protections on national forest lands in western Montana by Outdoor Recreation

74% Hikers and trail runners
76% Campers
77% Kayakers, canoers or boaters
74% Bird watchers and viewers of wildlife
78% Snowshoers, skiers or snowboarders
74% Riders of off-road vehicle or snowmobile
74% Mountain bikers

Please tell me if that seems like something you would support or oppose.
The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is our nation’s strongest rivers protection law. It safeguards rivers by ensuring that they remain free-flowing, clean, and not harmed by new projects or development, such as new dams. It does not affect private property rights, water rights, or public access. Currently Montana has five wild and scenic rivers. The Montana Headwaters Legacy Act asks Congress to designate segments of seventeen rivers flowing through public lands as Wild and Scenic rivers, including segments of the Gallatin, Madison, Yellowstone and Smith rivers.

Would you support or oppose this proposal?
A majority of voters from each political party want Congress to designate rivers flowing through public lands as Wild and Scenic rivers, especially Democrats.

Montana Headwaters Legacy Act by Party

Would you support or oppose this proposal?
Two-thirds (66%) would like all proposals that have gone through a public process to be handled by Congress within one year.

As you may know, all of these proposals we have described must be approved by Congress in order to be put in place. Assuming that each proposal is developed through a public process including community input in Montana, would you say that Congress should act on each of these proposals within six months of the plan being submitted to congress, within one year, within two years, within five years, or five years or longer?
Across the political spectrum, voters want Congress to deal with proposals within a year of being submitted.

Proposal Timeline by Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Independents</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 6 months</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within one year</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1 YEAR OR LESS</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you may know, all of these proposals we have described must be approved by Congress in order to be put in place. Assuming that each proposal is developed through a public process including community input in Montana, would you say that Congress should act on each of these proposals within six months of the plan being submitted to Congress, within one year, within two years, within five years, or five years or longer?
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