


Do you prefer using % of nontidal wetlands (value to be discussed) instead of acreage in the updated outcome language?



Follow Up: Do you prefer using % of nontidal wetlands (value to be discussed) instead of acreage in the updated outcome language?

I prefer %, with follow up acres

No, I prefer using acreage as a more useful currency for understanding-percentage requires more context.

A percentage increase can be part of the rationale for an acreage goal. Both can be used in the outcome language.

% can just be nice when you want it in context of the whole (v. and acreage doesn't tell you what it's 'out of'), to see/know progress

Acreage is a common measure used across Outcomes and is preferable to %, which will have less meaning to implementers and the public.

This is okay but for calculations to determine if we have met goals, jurisdictions are going to use acres (wetland restoration requires permitting in acres) - which can feed into a percentage

Any value is needed

Prefer acreage within the outcome itself!

Follow Up: Do you prefer using % of nontidal wetlands (value to be discussed) instead of acreage in the updated outcome language?

BUT if you break down acreage out of a target, that actually gives MORE info than % (unless you show fractions...?)

As an IRT member, acreage seems easy for landowners, sponsors, engineers, and long-term stewards across the board. While I see the value in % as adaptive, the public is already confused about science

I think acreage is clearer to the public. I understand a % gives the ability to be more adaptable, but worry about confusion that might come from a shifting goal

How are other groups using percentages? I think acreages is more useful for wetlands