

Priority-Setting Exercise

At a Steering Committee meeting in January 2005, attendees participated in a priority-setting exercise. The results of this exercise are included in this appendix as reference for future decision-making if there are constraints on financial or staff resources.

Overview

Participants were asked to rate each Implementation Strategy a High, Medium, or Low priority, utilizing the definitions provided below, based on the basis of its strategic merit. Participants were asked to consider the extent to which each Implementation Strategy supports the Goals.

Priority indicates whether a strategy is

High – This Implementation Strategy is **absolutely essential** to the MCPI’s ability **to achieve its Goals**. The successful execution of this Implementation Strategy is expected to make a substantial contribution to the advancement of the Goals. Its **absence would place our ability to achieve the Goals at risk**.

Medium – While this Implementation Strategy is **clearly supportive** of the MCPI’s Goals, it is **not absolutely essential** to their achievement. Successful implementation of this Strategy is expected to represent **more of an incremental contribution** than the high priority items.

Low – Although important and advisable, this Implementation Strategy should be **undertaken only to** the extent that its **implementation does not risk the successful execution of high or medium priority Strategies**.

For some strategies, funds have already been dedicated and is indicated as such.

There is no correlation between timeframe and priority. For example, a High priority Implementation Strategy might be deferred for several reasons (e.g. its dependence on other strategies, etc). Similarly, a Low priority Strategy might be implemented in the near term, if, for example, it is easy to execute and delivers immediate value.

All priority ratings are *relative*. The assignment of a low priority to an Implementation Strategy does not mean that it is unimportant, but simply that it is less critical than the items to which a high or medium rating has been assigned.

Participants

The following steering committee members participated in the priority-setting exercise:

- Will Brune
 - Paul Dest
 - Molly Docherty
 - Stewart Fefer
 - Maureen Hoffman
 - Tin Smith
 - Rob Snyder
 - Wolfe Tone
 - Barb Welch
 - Lori Cary-Kothera
 - Jim Connors
 - Ezra Milchman
 - Chris Fichtel
-

Results of Priority-Setting

#	Implementation Strategy	Priority
1.1	Adopt coastal priorities of Beginning with Habitat and support a process to supplement and refine coastal focus areas and address coastal habitat gaps.	High *
1.2	Support a process to (a) define and map existing public and working access; (b) identify areas with a shortage of access; and (c) prioritize areas for additional access.	Medium *
1.3	Support a process to (a) define meaning and methodology for scenic/cultural features; (b) support efforts to use this methodology in 3-5 regional areas to identify, evaluate, and prioritize at regional level, and (c) create process to review regional priorities to identify statewide coastal priorities which would then direct MCPI resources.	Low *
1.4	Develop and implement proactive local and regional conservation action plans that will work to protect high-priority coastal resources, including those identified by the Initiative.	High
1.5	Conduct Strategic Conservation Learning Circles to develop effective model processes and training materials for delivery to interested stakeholders.	Funds already dedicated
1.6	Convene coastal practitioners and scientists, and facilitate roundtables and public forums to advance understanding of the relationships between land protection measures and marine resource management in a coastal landscape.	Low

* MCPI views habitat, access, and scenic/cultural features as equally important resources to be protected along the Maine coast. Each of these strategies describes the tasks necessary to fill information gaps about important coastal resources. These priorities only define the relative importance of the tasks to be conducted between 2005 and 2007 related to inventory, evaluation and prioritization.

#	Implementation Strategy	Priority
2.1	Focus capacity-building grants and staff resources on a limited number of recipients (3-5) while assuring broad-based geographic distribution of funds along the coast. Funding and staff resources will be directed to efforts that promote (a) greater regional focus, and/or (b) collaboration, and/or (c) sustainable capacity.	High
2.2	Allocate some portion of capacity-building funds for smaller grants to other coastal land trusts to support specific capacity-building projects.	Medium
2.3	Assess GIS and other mapping technology needs of local land trusts for mapping, analysis, and planning services, and create and enhance capacity to address those needs.	Medium
2.4	In areas where regional consolidation is viable, provide resources and support discussions for interested land trusts.	Medium
2.5	Provide financial and other support to strengthen Maine's Conservation Easement Registry, coordinated by MCHT, to provide data required to help assure long-term responsible stewardship.	Funds already dedicated

#	Implementation Strategy	Priority
3.1	Develop communication plan and materials for coastal decision-makers in government, business, and other organizations that identifies important messages and describes relevant conservation tools.	Medium
3.2	Encourage dialogue among land conservation organizations and groups focused on other issues about the connections between coastal land conservation and the important work of other groups.	Low
3.3	Develop a comprehensive and broad-based fundraising plan to dramatically increase the financial support provided by local, regional, and national funders for protection projects, land trust operational support, stewardship endowments, and easement defense.	High
3.4	Develop and manage a table summarizing funding sources to make available to Maine coast land trusts.	Low
3.5	Engage Coalition participants in advocating to secure federal, state, and local funding for coastal land conservation.	High