2019 Maine Land Trust Census

Pisgah Hill, New Gloucester, photo courtesy of Royal River Conservation Trust
Maine Coast Heritage Trust thanks Stephen Shennan and Gary Stern of Stern Consulting International for their support in survey design, analysis and reporting.
The Maine Land Trust Network distributed its survey to 84 potential respondent groups; 76 land trusts responded, 72 of whom completed the survey in its entirety. A summary of response data is presented below, generally organized in the order presented in the survey. In some instances, questions have been reordered to better group by topic, though all questions retain their original numbering. Since the census relies on voluntary responses from land trusts numbers should be taken as representative rather than exact, though every effort has been made to be as comprehensive as possible.

In the course of the census the Maine Land Trust Network collected four key statistics on land trust holdings: the number of owned properties, acres owned, the number of properties under easement, and acres held under easement. These statistics are presented below in sum, as well as subdivided by region. In total, Maine land trusts own or hold easements on 2,684,992 acres, which are made up of 1,840 owned parcels and 1,854 held in easement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION 1 - SOUTHERN MAINE</th>
<th># OF PROPERTIES OWNED</th>
<th># OF ACRES OWNED</th>
<th># OF EASEMENTS</th>
<th>EASEMENT ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>13,398</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION 2 – CASCO BAY</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION 3 - MIDCOAST</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>16,187</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>21,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION 4 - PENOBSCOT BAY</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>19,527</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>14,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION 5 - DOWNEAST</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>71,956</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION 6 - WESTERN MOUNTAINS</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>29,597</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>44,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION 7 - INLAND</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84,163</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION 8 - STATEWIDE</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>390,304</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1,951,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (ALL REGIONS)</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>627,381</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>2,057,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4 – Size of Boards**

How many people currently serve on your Board of Directors?\(^1\)

N=75

Average number of board members: 13.7
Fewest: 5
Most: 24

---

\(^1\) For complete list of land trusts and their region see Appendix A.

\(^2\) The 2019 census includes data from the Appalachian Mountain Club (~75,000 acres) that was not included in the 2015 census. Additionally, please note that 2015 data included easements on land trust and government owned conservation lands. To avoid double counting roughly 150,000 acres of conserved lands in Maine, the 2019 census includes only easements on lands not owned by land trusts or government.

\(^3\) Organizations with more than 20 board members did not submit a number; data for the three such organizations is taken from their websites.
Question 5 – Age of Board Members
Please indicate how many of your Board members are: 39 years old or younger; 40-64 years old; 65 or older.
N=74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLTN CENSUS DATA - 2019</th>
<th>US CENSUS DATA - Maine 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg. % of board members 39 or younger:</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. % of board members 40-64:</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. % of board members 65 or older:</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 of 74 organizations have at least 1 board member 39 or younger.
72 of 74 organizations have at least 1 board member 40-64.
71 of 74 organizations have at least 1 board member 65 or older.

Question 6 – Residency of Board Members
Please indicate what percentage of your Board members live in Maine as their primary residence.
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88% of all boards are comprised primarily of in-state members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Board Members Living in Maine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer Choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7 – Number of Board Meetings
How many times per year does your full Board meet?
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77.3% of all boards meet 6 times or more per year.
46.7% of all boards meet 10 times or more per year.

80% of staffed organizations’ boards meet 6 or more times per year.
64% of non-staffed organizations’ boards meet 6 or more times per year.

46% of staffed organizations’ boards meet 10 or more times per year.
50% of non-staffed organizations’ boards meet 10 or more times per year.

Boards of statewide organizations meet considerably less often, with none meeting more often than 6 times per year. Of nine statewide organizations, two meet 3 times per year, four meet 4 times per year, and three meet 6 times per year.
Question 8 – Feedback on Boards
We’d like to know a bit more about your Board. For the following statements, please select 1-5, where 5 indicates that you strongly agree with the statement and 1 indicates that you strongly disagree.

$N=75$

### Responses to Board Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5 - Strongly agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 - Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Our Board is energetic and engaged.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Our organization sometimes struggles to recruit Board members.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Our Board supports the organization through pro bono skills (e.g. accounting, legal work).</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Our Board has a clear expectation that 100% of Board members will support the organization financially.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Our organization has difficulty recruiting younger members to the Board.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The composition of our Board reflects the socioeconomic diversity of the communities we serve.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Our Board seeks community input in defining and pursuing the organization’s goals.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Our organization has a clear Board leadership succession plan.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Responses

Maine land trusts feel strongly that they have energetic and engaged boards, the members of which are willing to support their organizations financially and through pro bono professional services. They also feel as if board members generally seek out community input and reflect that input in organizational goals.

Land trusts tend to express more struggles with “compositional” issues related to their board, namely in general recruitment, recruitment of young people specifically, succession planning, and socioeconomic diversity of board members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Avg. rate of agreement (maximum of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Board is energetic and engaged.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Board has a clear expectation that 100% of Board members will support the organization financially.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Board seeks community input in defining and pursuing the organization’s goals.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Board supports the organization through pro bono skills (e.g. accounting, legal work).</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization has a clear Board leadership succession plan.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization has difficulty recruiting younger members to the Board.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our organization sometimes struggles to recruit Board members.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The composition of our Board reflects the socioeconomic diversity of the communities we serve.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 9 – Board Committees**
Which of the following are active committees of your Board?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lands</td>
<td>77.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship/Trails</td>
<td>76.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Investment</td>
<td>74.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Nominating</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Fundraising</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach/Communications</td>
<td>48.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy/Advocacy</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Committees</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active committees not mentioned above but submitted by respondents include: executive(x5), conservation(x2), events(x2), accreditation, agricultural advisory committee, community forest advisory committee, dam removal, ecological advisory committee, merger committee, personnel, research, and technology.

**Question 10:**
What is your board’s greatest strength?

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 71 chose to do so; their responses included 127 separate comments divided into 13 broad categories. Of those 13 categories, the top four comprised approximately half of all comments.4

The top four categories are:
- Passion for and dedication to the organizations they serve (19 comments)
- Thoughtful, nuanced approaches to effective decision making (14 comments)
- Deep connection to the communities in which the organization operates (13 comments)
- Contributions of skills and experience by board members (13 comments)

**Question 11:**
What is the biggest concern regarding your board?

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 70 chose to do so; their responses included 91 separate comments divided into 12 broad categories. Of those 12 categories, the top four comprised nearly two-thirds of all comments. It is important to note that many of the issues reported deal with board composition.5

The top four categories are:
- Issues surrounding recruitment of new – and especially younger – members (20 comments)
- Lack of succession plan for leadership positions (15 comments)
- Concerns about fundraising (11 comments)
- Diversity and demographic representation of boards (10 comments)

---

4 For a full list of sorted responses to Question 10 please see Appendix B.
5 For a full list of sorted responses to Question 11 please see Appendix B.
**Question 12 – Volunteers**

Not including board members, how many active volunteers did your land trust have during the past year?
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Maine land trusts had a **median of 35** volunteers in 2018.

Approximately **8,368** people volunteered their time to Maine land trusts in 2018. Excluding one very large statewide organization, **6,368** people volunteered their time. Just over **two thirds of respondents had 100 or fewer volunteers** in 2018, but these account for only 18% of all volunteers counted. If we consider small, medium, and large categories, the distribution is evenly divided into thirds:

**DISTRIBUTION OF LAND TRUSTS BY VOLUNTEER COUNT**

- 25% 0-25 volunteers
- 25% 26-99 volunteers
- 25% More than 100 volunteers

---

**Question 13 – Paid Staff**

Not including periodic consultants, does your organization have paid staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 75
Questions 14+15+16+17 – Employment Numbers
We asked land trusts to tell us how many people they employ in a variety of capacities, including both full and part-time employees as well as their “full time equivalents” (FTEs). On the whole, 58 land trusts reported employing nearly 500 employees in some capacity, of which nearly 300 are full-time employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Total – All Orgs</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many people do you employ as paid staff?</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many full-time, year round employees?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many part-time or seasonal employees?</td>
<td>233.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many full-time equivalent (FTE) employees does your organization have?</td>
<td>360.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17 – Distribution of FTEs
Please enter your organization's total number of FTEs.
N=56

Distribution of organizations by staffing size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of FTEs</th>
<th># of Orgs</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 FTE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1.99 FTEs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.99 FTEs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.99 FTEs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4.99 FTEs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 FTEs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 FTEs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median = 3 FTEs
TOTAL = 360.9 FTEs

Question 18 – Executive Director
Does your organization have an Executive Director?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Executive Director</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Executive Director</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Executive Director</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 10 organizations indicating they have a part-time Executive Director, one ED worked 1-10 hours, three worked 11-20 hours, two worked 21-30 hours, and four worked 31-35 hours.
**Question 20 – Executive Director Salaries**

What is your Executive Director's annual salary?

N=50

Annualized median salary and salary range, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Maine (8):</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$65,625</td>
<td>$48,000 - $115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casco Bay (5):</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$57,030</td>
<td>$50,000 - $74,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcoast (8):</td>
<td>$76,570</td>
<td>$74,535</td>
<td>$69,000 - $87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot Bay (6):</td>
<td>$67,100</td>
<td>$66,705</td>
<td>$48,000 - $84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast (5):</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$69,520</td>
<td>$52,400 - $80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mountains (8):</td>
<td>$62,725</td>
<td>$63,445</td>
<td>$41,600 - $80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland (2):</td>
<td>$56,545</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (8):</td>
<td>$129,375</td>
<td>$124,100</td>
<td>$80,000 - $165,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statewide Nonprofit Wages

The following table from MANP’s 2018 Report on Nonprofit Wages + Benefits in Maine, which includes data from all sectors of Maine nonprofits, is provided for comparison.

**Selected Gross Annual Wages* by Budget Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Size</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
<th>Deputy Director</th>
<th>Development Director</th>
<th>Program Director</th>
<th>Office Manager</th>
<th>Case Manager</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $250K</td>
<td>$52,811</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$40,248</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250K-$500K</td>
<td>$68,578</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$47,112</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K-$1M</td>
<td>$75,566</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$49,213</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M-$5M</td>
<td>$104,853</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$63,918</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5M-$10M</td>
<td>$141,024</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$66,061</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $10M</td>
<td>$164,611</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$82,285</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on average hourly wages.  **Under 4 respondents

**Question 31 – Annual Operating Budget**

N=68

Mediun Annual Operating Budget: $194,220

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th># OF ORGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-50,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-100K</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-250K</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,001 - 500K</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,001-1MIL</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$1MIL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 With only two respondents, median and average are the same. Range has been excluded from Inland land trusts.

Median annual operating budget and range, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Maine (11):</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$15,000 - $1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casco Bay (9):</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$1,000 - $353,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcoast (10):</td>
<td>$357,500</td>
<td>$67,775 - $867,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot Bay (10):</td>
<td>$151,825</td>
<td>$200 - $616,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast (6):</td>
<td>$219,763</td>
<td>$53,000 - $1,258,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mountains (10):</td>
<td>$161,280</td>
<td>$35,000 - $1,917,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland (3):</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$91,000 - $276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (9):</td>
<td>$852,000</td>
<td>$76,000 - $9,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data suggests considerable diversity of scale among Maine land trusts both within and between regions.

**Question 21+22 – Stewardship Director**

Does your organization have a Stewardship Director?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Stewardship Director</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Stewardship Director</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Stewardship Director</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 58

**Stewardship Directors’ Hours**

![Chart showing the distribution of hours worked by stewardship directors.]

**Question 23 – Stewardship Director Salary**

N=31

For organizations with a full-time stewardship director or where data allowed part-time rates to be annualized, the **median salary for stewardship directors was $50,000**; the average was slightly higher at approximately $51,350. Almost twice as many organizations with stewardship directors of some kind had full-time rather than part-time coverage for the role, and overall the majority of staffed organizations have at least a part-time stewardship director.

---

8 With only 3 responding organizations providing budget data for this region a median or average is less useful than range.
**Question 24+25+26 – Development Director + Salary**

Does your organization have a Development Director?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Development Director</td>
<td>65.52%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Development Director</td>
<td>29.31%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Development Director</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is considerable variation in both the job duties and the salaries assigned to development directors. For a more comprehensive sense of development salaries in Maine, see also the MANP chart (above, page 7) which includes data from all nonprofit sectors.

**Slightly fewer than one third of land trusts employ a development director** in any capacity, and in those land trusts **the median salary for a development director is $53,000**. There is considerable range in the salaries ($33,000 - $150,000), with the average considerably higher than the median at $66,000. While outliers at the high end skew the average, salary distribution is fairly regular – three salaries are in the 30k range, three in the 40k, three in the 50k, two in the 60k, and one each in the 70k, 80k, and 90k ranges.

**Question 27 – Employee Benefits**

Please indicate whether your organization offers employee benefits, either through a plan or by providing a stipend. N=53

Other benefits that organizations provide include: contributions to HSA accounts, family/paternity/maternity leave, life insurance, and flexible hours.

---

9 Includes one annualized salary; there was insufficient data for the remaining two part-time development directors, so their salary data has been excluded from calculations. The result is useable data from 16 land trusts total, full-time and annualized.
**Question 28**
What are your organization's greatest challenges in attracting and retaining qualified staff?

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 55 chose to do so; their responses included 66 separate comments divided into 7 broad categories. Of those 7 categories, the top three comprised nearly two-thirds of all comments. One of these top categories was affirming satisfaction with current staffing.¹⁰

The top three categories of challenges with regard to staffing are:
- Offering competitive compensation packages, especially with regard to benefits like health insurance (27 comments)
- No staffing concerns (16 comments)
- Difficulties attracting qualified staff in remote or rural locations (9 comments)

In considering the next generation of conservation professionals, concerns about compensation and benefits accord generally with recent research conducted by the Land Trust Alliance focused on millennials in the conservation workforce. 60% of respondents to an LTA survey of millennials indicated that improvements to benefits offered are what they would most like to see, and 34% – the largest single group – indicated that they found salary and benefits to be the most frustrating part of working for a land trust.

Despite concerns about compensation, satisfaction with the job remains high among millennials, in accordance with the second category above. 41% of millennial respondents to LTA’s survey indicated that the mission and people they work with are things they enjoy, with a further 34% saying the work aligns with their personal values.

**Question 29 – Household Support**
Land trusts define community support in different ways. For the purposes of this survey, please tell us the total number of households that support your organization as members and/or donors.

N=72

Median number of households: 450

62,641 total households across all respondents¹¹

---

¹⁰ For a full list of sorted responses to Question 28 please see Appendix B.
¹¹ There are approximately 554,061 households in Maine (US Census Bureau, 2017). Some households may support more than one land trust.
### Median number of households supporting and range, by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Maine (12):</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>50 – 850 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casco Bay (9):</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>35 – 700 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcoast (11):</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>250 – 1,600 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot Bay (10):</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6 – 1,250 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast (7):</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0 – 1,020 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mountains (11):</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>25 – 2,140 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland (4):</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>125 – 1,000 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide (8):</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>25 – 12,000 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 30 – Fundraising
Which best describes your fundraising model?
N=66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundraising Model (all land trusts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board led with minimal or no staff support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board led with extensive staff support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff led with extensive Board support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff led with minimal Board support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundraising Model (Staffed ONLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board led with minimal or no staff support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board led with extensive staff support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff led with extensive Board support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff led with minimal Board support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 32 – Capital Raised
Over the past five years, what is the total amount of Capital your organization has raised for land protection? In answering this question, please include Capital funds your organization raised and spent (including related costs) to buy fee lands and/or conservation easements, as well as instances where your organization facilitated a transfer of funds to a landowner from another funding source.
N=64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>$1,098,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER QUARTILE (12th)</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER QUARTILE</td>
<td>$2,622,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total raised over the past 5 years by ALL respondents:** $188,139,608

12 Lower quartile is calculated as the median of the bottom 50%; upper quartile is calculated as the median of the top 50%.
Distribution of organizations by amount raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT RAISED</th>
<th># OF ORGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1000-100,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-500,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-1MIL</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1MIL-5MIL</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN $5MIL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 33 – Specific Funds

Land trusts often set aside funds designated for certain uses. These funds may be called endowments, dedicated funding, reserves, or other similar names. For each of the following purposes, please share whether your fund is at the desired level, as well as the approximate amount your land trust has in designated funding for that purpose. When responding to this question, please do not consider Terrafirma membership.

N=67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>At desired level</th>
<th>Below desired level</th>
<th>No fund</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating reserve</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal defense only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined account for monitoring, stewardship, and legal defense</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and stewardship only</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land protection (fee or easement)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median amount</th>
<th>Lower Quartile$^{13}$</th>
<th>Upper Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating reserve (51)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal defense only (21)</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$39,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED account for monitoring, stewardship, and legal defense (36)</td>
<td>$371,600</td>
<td>$188,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and stewardship only (25)</td>
<td>$192,650</td>
<td>$79,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land protection (fee or easement) (36)</td>
<td>$183,500</td>
<td>$71,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 54 – Stewardship Funding

How concerned are you about your organization’s ability to maintain adequate funding for stewardship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all concerned</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little concerned</td>
<td>57.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 73

$^{13}$ Lower quartile is calculated as the median of the bottom 50%; upper quartile is calculated as the median of the top 50%.
**Question 35 – Cost in Time and Money of Various Activities**

Please consider the following organizational functions and estimate how each is changing in financial cost and also in amount of employee/Board time being spent. N=72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost in Money and Time for Specific Activities*(N=72)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The "Decreasing" category has been excluded from this chart; fewer than 4 respondents identified any category as decreasing in either cost or time.
Questions 40+41 – Taxes

Land trusts were asked to indicate which of six different tax strategies their organization has made use of in the past year for properties they own (fee lands). The available strategies for fee lands are:

- Full tax payments: based on a property tax assessment of the land’s development value.
- Payments in lieu of taxes (PILOT): voluntary payments made after receiving property tax exemption.
- Property tax exemption: receive property tax exemption and make no payments in lieu of taxes (PILOT).
- Enroll in the Tree Growth current use tax program: tax payments made at a reduced rate based on the value of land as commercial forest rather than development value.
- Enroll in the Open Space current use tax program: tax payments made at a reduced rate based on the value of land as open space for public benefit rather than development value.
- Enroll in the Farmland current use tax program: tax payments made at a reduced rate based on the value of land as agricultural rather than development value.

Land trusts also conserve lands with conservation easements on privately owned lands. Most of these lands are enrolled in Tree Growth, Open Space, or Farmland current use tax programs, but some are subject to full tax payments based on property tax assessment of the value of those lands. Land trusts also hold conservation easements on lands owned by other land trusts or government – these lands were not included in the census under conservation easement acreage to avoid double counting.

Total Acres Held by Tax Treatment (Fee Lands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Strategy Description</th>
<th># of LTs using tax strategy</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enroll in the Tree Growth current use tax program</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>422,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive property tax exemption and make payments in lieu of taxes (PILOT)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll in the Open Space current use tax program</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive property tax exemption and do not make payments in lieu of taxes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make full tax payments</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll in the Farmland current use tax program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACRES</td>
<td></td>
<td>627,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizations can make use of any and all of these approaches, and indeed the most common approach reported was to use a variety of tax strategies (42/68 respondents). Just under 40% of land trusts (26/68) used only a single tax strategy.

The full distribution is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Tax Strategies</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 tax strategy</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tax strategies</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tax strategies</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 tax strategies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 tax strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land trusts were also asked to report the total amount they paid in taxes for the previous tax year. Organizations which a) paid taxes (of any kind) or made payments in lieu of taxes and b) reported their payment data in the census can be represented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment Range</th>
<th># of LTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $5000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5001 - $10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 - $20,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 - $75,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $75,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowest Total Tax Payment in Previous Tax Year: $70
Highest Total Tax Payment in Previous Tax Year: $100,163
Lower Quartile: $2,867
Upper Quartile: $14,846

Maine’s nonprofit land trusts are entitled to receive property tax exemption for most fee lands that they own. Despite this fact the majority of land trusts pursue a variety of tax strategies, not just claiming the full property tax exemption to which they are usually entitled. Every land trust makes decisions based on its own finances, conversations with local officials, and the specific attributes of its properties.

While the local financial impact of these tax choices varies, the financial impact to the State as a whole is minimal. When looking at all land trust conserved lands – those owned as fee lands and those protected with conservation easements – about 95% of these lands in Maine are on the tax rolls. And on most of the remaining acres, land trusts make a payment in lieu of taxes.

Land owned by land trusts – the vast majority of which yields tax payments in some capacity – provides a broad spectrum of benefits to Maine’s citizens and visitors. These properties protect drinking water supplies, conserve natural resources, and support economic activities including commercial fishing, logging, farming, and tourism. Many other activities take place on the tapestry of public and private conservation lands including hunting, water access, motorized and non-motorized recreation, wildlife viewing, and hiking.
Question 42 – Land Protection Priorities
Respondents were asked to indicate how important various reasons were for protecting land on a scale of 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important). What emerged was a strong consensus on the top reasons for protecting lands and more variation below. Three categories received a ranking of very or extremely important (4 or 5) from more than 80% of organizations, and in all seven priorities were marked with top importance by more than half of respondents. There were two categories that more than half of land trusts thought not at all or hardly important (1 or 2). The charts below present responses in two ways: first by showing in declining order the categories most widely considered important, then by showing the categories most generally considered less important, also in declining order. N=73

Categories Rated as Very or Extremely Important (4+5)

Categories Rated Hardly or Not at All Important (1+2)
Question 43 – Joint Land Protection Projects
To what extent are you working with neighboring land trusts or other groups on joint land protection goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing shared projects</td>
<td>52.78%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more projects each year</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A project every few years</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely if ever</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 72

Question 44 – Expectations for Future Action
As you look ahead to the next 5-10 years, do you expect the scale (by which we mean a combination of numbers of transactions and/or acres conserved) of your land protection to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay about the same</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase a little</td>
<td>31.94%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase a lot</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease a little</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease a lot</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 72

Question 47 – Easement Violations
Have you experienced any conservation easement violations in the last 5 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 70
**Question 48 – Easement Violations and Resolutions**

If you have experienced an easement violation in the past five years, with whom did the issue arise and how was the dispute resolved?

N=35 respondents reporting 55 total incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party causing the violation</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The original donor</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new owner</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abutter or third party</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The method of dispute resolution was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispute resolution</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation: CE not amended</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation: CE amended</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved through legal proceedings</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue is unresolved</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 49 – Protecting Easements**

Does your organization currently place double layers of protection (e.g. easements, declaration of trust) on your fee owned lands?

### Answer Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>54.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>34.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't own lands</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 50 – Easement Amendments**

How many easements have you amended in the past year? In the past five years?

N=67

| Land trusts with at least one amendment in past year | 19 |
| Land trusts with at least one amendment in the past FIVE years | 30 |

Highest number of amendments made by ONE land trust in past year: 4
High number of amendments made by ONE land trust in past five years: 18
### Question 51 – Reasons for Amendments

If you made any amendments, what reasons led to them? (choose all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical language oversight</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deal with a violation</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To tighten an easement</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 22

Other reasons for amendment include accommodating neighboring landowners (5), adding land/expanding the easement (4), adjustment to easements (2), to install a fish passageway (1), and tax compliance (1).

### Question 46 – Easement Ownership

When asked to estimate what percentage of easements were still held by the original owner, 68 land trusts responded. The median answer was 67%, while the average was slightly lower at 63%. **Four in five report that half or more are still held by the original owner**, while approximately a fifth of land trusts report 90% or greater of their easements are still held by the original owner.

### Question 52 – Management Plans

Approximately what percentage of your organization's fee properties have management plans?

The vast majority (55/71) responding land trusts have management plans for most of their fee properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Properties with Management Plans</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately what percentage of your organization's fee properties have management plans? (detail view)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% – 25%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% – 50%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% – 75%</td>
<td>9.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% – 99%</td>
<td>28.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 71
Question 53 – Baseline Documentation
As of December 31, 2018, approximately what percentage of your land trust’s conservation easements had a baseline documentation report?

![% of Easements with Baseline Documentation Report]

Question 54 – Easement Monitoring
During the past year, approximately what percentage of your land trust’s conservation easements was monitored at least one time?
N=70

![% Easements Monitored Annually*]

*Categories receiving no responses (0-24% and 51-75%) are excluded in the chart above.

Nearly all conservation easements are monitored annually.

Question 56 – Stewardship Concerns
What are your organization’s THREE biggest challenges or concerns in terms of fee property stewardship? (N=69)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing maintenance</td>
<td>85.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasives</td>
<td>49.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse/competing uses</td>
<td>46.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>31.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner relations/ownership changes</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of climate change</td>
<td>20.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect/underuse</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal challenges</td>
<td>11.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 45
Please describe one or more ways climate change is affecting your organization’s plans or activities.

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 63 chose to do so; their responses included 89 separate comments divided into 8 broad categories. Of those 8 categories, the top three comprised nearly three-quarters of all comments. 14

The top three categories of comments on the effects of climate change are:
- Conservation planning, including climate resiliency and sea level rise (33 comments)
- Effects on preserve management (18 comments)
- Outreach and education surrounding the issue (15 comments)

Question 57
Please explain or elaborate on your challenges and/or concerns with regard to fee property stewardship.

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 56 land trusts chose to do so; their responses included 112 separate comments divided into 13 broad categories. Of those 13 categories, the top three comprised more than half of all comments. 15

The top three categories regarding fee property stewardship are:
- Maintenance costs in time, money, and volunteer power (27 comments)
- Invasive species and the effect on the native habitat (22 comments)
- Managing properties usage and competing uses (19 comments)

---

14 For a full list of sorted responses to Question 45 please see Appendix B.
15 For a full list of sorted responses to Question 57 please see Appendix B.
**Question 58**

Please explain or elaborate on your challenges and/or concerns with regard to conservation easement stewardship.

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 56 land trusts chose to do so; their responses included 61 separate comments divided into 8 broad categories. Of those 8 categories, the top three comprised more than half of all comments.\(^{16}\)

The top three categories regarding conservation easement stewardship are:
- Issues stemming from changes in land ownership (18 comments)
- Easement violations (7 comments)
- A lack of resources to conduct efficient monitoring (6 comments)

**Question 59 - Trails**

Please estimate the total miles of publicly accessible trails on your conserved properties.

97% of responding land trusts (71/73) have publicly accessible trails

Maine land trusts reported providing approximately **2,256 miles** of publicly accessible trails

Average # of miles (estimated): 28 miles

Median # of miles: 14

**Question 60 – Land Uses**

Maine land trusts allow various activities on at least one of their properties at the following rates. N=65

The most common other response is snowmobiling (7), which some may have reported under “motorized vehicles.”

---

\(^{16}\) For a full list of sorted responses to Question 58 please see Appendix B.
Questions 61+62 – Water Access

Are there public or commercial water access points on any of your conserved lands?
N=72

Those responding **YES** reported the number of water access points on their properties, which fall within the following ranges.\(^\text{17}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># OF ACCESS POINTS</th>
<th># OF LAND TRUSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 5 ACCESS POINTS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TO 10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 TO 15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 15 ACCESS POINTS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents report **more than 340** water access sites.

Question 63 – Partnerships and Collaborations

What type of partnerships/collaborations have you been part of in the past year? (choose all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership with other community organization(s) on programming</td>
<td>76.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership with school(s) on programming</td>
<td>67.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership with another land trust(s) on programming</td>
<td>57.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership with another land trust(s) on acquisition</td>
<td>54.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership with government (municipal, state or federal) on stewardship</td>
<td>50.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership with another land trust(s) on stewardship</td>
<td>47.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/partnership with government (municipal, state or federal) on acquisition</td>
<td>46.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of collaboration/partnership, if any</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other types of collaboration listed by respondents include specific collaborations with other land trusts, work with colleges/universities, summer camps, local groups like historical societies, and a few partnerships with for-profit organizations. Many of these fall into one of the categories listed above.

---

\(^\text{17}\) Excludes responses such as “many” which cannot be quantified. As a result this may **underestimate** total access points.
Question 64 – Organizations and Collaborations - Detail
Please indicate any of the following types of organizations you have collaborated with in the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local schools/education organizations</td>
<td>88.73% 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal government</td>
<td>85.92% 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>69.01% 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>66.20% 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges or universities</td>
<td>64.79% 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational activity/sports groups</td>
<td>61.97% 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth groups (e.g. Boy/Girl Scouts)</td>
<td>60.56% 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development groups (incl. Chambers of Commerce)</td>
<td>54.93% 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>53.52% 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic or fraternal organizations</td>
<td>46.48% 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals/wellness/public health organizations</td>
<td>36.62% 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>22.54% 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered 71

Questions 65 + 66 - Advocacy
Maine land trusts were asked about their involvement in public policy advocacy at the municipal, state, and federal level. Trusts were then asked to indicate what types of contact they had with officials at the municipal and state level. N=72

Involvement in Policy Advocacy, Municipal and State
- 76.1% Municipal level
- 77.5% State level
- 52.1% Federal level
- 31% of land trusts involved in some capacity
- 18% of land trusts very or extremely involved

Types of Contact, Municipal and State
- 38.9% Minimal contact
- 34.7% Social contacts
- 33.3% Hosted a tour
- 31.9% 21st Century members/donors
- 13.9% 21st on Board
**Question 67 – Accreditation Status**

Land trusts reported the following status with regard to accreditation. 
N=73

Which best describes your land trust’s current accreditation status or plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are accredited</td>
<td>42.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are an accreditation registered applicant</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are preparing to apply for land trust accreditation and plan to register in</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the near future (please specify year below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are preparing to apply for land trust accreditation, but do not have a</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not planning to apply for land trust accreditation.</td>
<td>23.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not eligible to apply for accreditation.</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Trust Accreditation Status**

- Accredited
- Registered Applicant
- Will apply soon
- Will apply at some point
- Not planning to apply
- Not eligible

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 68**

Please share any comments about accreditation.

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 44 land trusts chose to do so; their responses included 70 separate comments divided into 8 broad categories. Of those 8 categories, the top three comprised over two-thirds of all comments.18

The top three categories of comments on accreditation are:

- Benefits of accreditation, especially strengthening processes and internal organization (19 comments)
- The cost in time and money to attain accreditation (18 comments)
- Concerns about the value of accreditation (11 comments)

**Question 69**

Please note any topics of interest or issues that may be important for Maine’s land conservation community to learn more about or address.

Respondents were invited to offer their thoughts in written, open-ended responses to this question. 25 land trusts chose to do so; their responses included 54 separate comments divided into 10 broad categories. Of those 10 categories, the top four comprised half of all comments.19

Reponses to this question showed a wide array of concerns, the top four categories being:

- Messaging and education to engage a broad audience (8 comments)
- Financial constraints and rising costs (7 comments)
- Finding and supporting the next generation of conservationists (6 comments)
- Collaboration within the land trusts community (6 comments)

---

18 For a full list of sorted responses to Question 68 please see Appendix B.
19 For a full list of sorted responses to Question 69 please see Appendix B.
### APPENDIX A – Land Trust Regions

The following is a division of Maine land trusts and related organizations into eight regions for the purposes of census data analysis. Please note that some classifications may have changed since 2015 census to account for external circumstances like the merging of previously separate organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arundel Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddeford Pool Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blandings Park Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Trail Alliance</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Small Heritage Trust, Inc.</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Works Regional Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebunk Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebunkport Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittery Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumpscot Regional Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saco Bay Trails</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saco Valley Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford-Springvale Mousam Way Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Rivers Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve &amp; Laudholm Trust</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham Land Trust*</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Land Trust, Inc.</td>
<td>Region 1 - Southern Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Elizabeth Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chebeague and Cumberland Land Trust, Inc.</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeport Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorham Trails, Inc.*</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Diamond Island Land Preserve</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside Conservation Trust of Casco Bay</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaks Island Land Preserve</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Trails</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal River Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Portland Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 2 - Casco Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boothbay Region Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick-Topsham Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damariscotta Lake Watershed Association**</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damariscotta River Association***</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Merrymeeting Bay</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges River Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpswell Heritage Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec Estuary Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medomak Valley Land Trust**</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcoast Conservancy</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monhegan Associates</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster River Bog Association</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemaquid Watershed Association***</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phippsburg Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 3 - Midcoast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Hill Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Mountains Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Pond Mountain Conservation Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islesboro Islands Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven Conservation Partners</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orono Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinalhaven Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 4 - Penobscot Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabtree Neck Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 5 - Downeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>Region 5 - Downeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast Lakes Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 5 - Downeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast Salmon Federation (Downeast Rivers Land Trust)</td>
<td>Region 5 - Downeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenchman Bay Conservancy</td>
<td>Region 5 - Downeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant River Wildlife Foundation</td>
<td>Region 5 - Downeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodie Wheaton Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 5 - Downeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lakes Alliance (formerly Belgrade Lakes)</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotat Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothills Land Conservancy</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Lovell Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 – Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loon Echo Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoosuc Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Appalachian Trail Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Wilderness Watershed Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeley Lakes Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Woods Trustees</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A – Land Trust Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Trust</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Saco Valley Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Foothills Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 6 - Western Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androscoggin Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 7 - Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Mountain Club</td>
<td>Region 7 - Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Wilson Pond Area, Inc.</td>
<td>Region 7 - Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 7 - Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebasticook Regional Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 7 - Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper St. John Land Trust</td>
<td>Region 7 - Inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Society of Maine</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Audubon</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Coast Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Farmland Trust</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Forestry Foundation, Inc.</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Wilderness Trust</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Woodland Owners Association of Maine</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conservation Fund</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature Conservancy in Maine</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>Region 8 - Statewide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Merged with Presumpscot Regional Land Trust  
**Merged with Midcoast Conservancy  
*** Merged to create Coastal Rivers Conservation Trust in 2019
APPENDIX B – Open-ended Responses

The following is a complete list of responses to open-ended census questions organized by category. Please note that sensitive and/or identifying information has been removed and some responses have been lightly edited for clarity.

Q10 - What is your board’s greatest strength?

Dedication to the Organization (19 comments)

- Commitment to building a strong institution
- Very engaged - they care deeply about the coast, conservation, the staff, the mission.
- The amount of passion and hard work they bring to the organization
- Passion for the mission
- Total commitment to the future of the watershed and doing whatever is needed to ensure it is protected.
- Dedication to the land trust.
- Commitment of its members
- Love for the organization.
- The primary strength of our board is that we have very committed Board members.
- There continues to be a quorum present at each meeting, there are at least two Board members on each committee and someone unfailingly volunteers for carrying out each task at hand. Over the past two years, the Board has unanimously and consistently voted to commit to taking the lead with any steps necessary to enable the sustainability and survival of the organization.
- They are committed to the work.
- Commitment to organization
- The Board has a strong commitment to the organization's long-term goals.
- Personal commitment to our mission
- Dedication to the land trust goals.
- They are dedicated to the mission and goals of our organization.
- The Board is deeply committed to our mission.
- Enthusiasm for our work

Thoughtful, Effective, and Collaborative Decision Making (14 comments)

- It’s thoughtful deliberation on issues both large and small.
- Excellent process/deliberation around land acquisitions and other projects
- Highly intelligent - really good contributions and committee and board meetings
- Ability to integrate a variety of opinions
- Welcome open discussions in decision making.
- The expertise of our board
- Our board is very good at understanding the complex nature of our offerings and how our brand as an organization is different from other traditional environmental and land trust groups.
- Experience in a diversity of backgrounds from finance, business, conservation, and forestry which leads to a diversity of opinions and great board discussion and decision-making.
- Perhaps our Board's greatest strength is an awareness of our weak spots. The willingness of the directors to learn new information and skills, to ask questions and seek help when needed is key to our effectiveness.
- The ability to work collaboratively and thoughtfully to make decisions that are in the best interest of the organization as a whole.
- Our board's greatest strength is its willingness to really help us think strategically about all three pillars of our work, land, water, and community, as well as our organizational health.
- Our Directors are respected community leaders and are committed to the Trust's mission, sound governance, and financial sustainability. A strategic plan (updated every five years) and a science-based land conservation assessment (updated ~ every seven years) guide the Board's decisions.
- They have good ideas and are willing to put them into action.
- Their ability to listen and embrace diverse opinions and in the end come to consensus.

Connection to Community (14 comments)

- Connected to community
- Our board's greatest strength is the love of place that we work to conserve. Everyone on our board has spent years in the region, and some have generations of family who have lived here. Each and every board member is deeply connected to this area and is completely committed to our mission and work.
Our Board is also acutely tuned in to the communities we serve, with deep community connections (while less than 25% of our Board is from Maine, we also serve NH, where the other 75%+ reside; in other words, none of our Board members are “from away”).

They are committed to the community.

Our board members have long histories residing on an island and have an understanding of the significance of land conservation and a deep commitment to the mission.

Deep abiding love of and dedication to our area.

They know their community and want to do what they can to make it better.

They are committed to the community.

Our board is a community board, with links to businesses and individuals in our communities of southern Maine.

With a small geographical range, our board has ties across town that help spread our message and gather good will with residents and town government.

working on projects to conserve open space in collaboration with the city

They are very engaged with the community.

Knowledge of the local landscape

Contribution of Skills (13 comments)

- The broad skill set of its members.
- We currently have a diverse set of skills represented on the Board, and everyone brings passion to our work.
- diversity of skills
- They bring a diversity of personal traits and professional expertise
- Provide important expertise in various fields
- Professional skill set
- Being engaged and volunteering skills
- offering strengths and particular skill sets
- They use their areas of expertise to enhance our organization.
- They also come to the board with specific knowledge of finances, facilities, HR, legal.
- Our board is a professional board: they serve by virtue of their position and knowledge (e.g., wildlife refuge manager knows all about our stewardship mission, our Coastal Program director fully understands our link to the federal Coastal Zone Management Act). Thus, they have a deep understanding of the mission of our organization.
- Board members have a variety of personal interests and professional experience that they contribute to the organization and to the successful working of the board.
- They bring strong background in natural resources and natural history.

Hands-on Approach (13 comments)

- They are all clearly working for the betterment of the organization, though often in different ways - actively volunteering.
- They are roll up your sleeve sort of worker bees.
- A willingness and dedication to serve on a hands-on board that requires a large time commitment from its director
- Committed and hardworking!
- many board members who are willing to volunteer a great deal of time.
- Board members are game to visit prospective properties, lead walks, lead trail work, meet with interested parties, work with the town, getting training, etc.
- Willingness to get involved.
- Commitment of time and energy.
- willingness to step in to get critical work done.
- Attending board and committee meetings. Showing-up.
- extraordinary generosity of time and services.
- We have very involved board members
- The board members are engaged, contributing in many ways to the work outside of monthly board meetings.

Diversity (12 comments)

- A range of both long-time and newer board members
- We are both regionally and organizationally diverse. We are not a traditional land trust but rather a conservation, recreation, education organization that also owns land. We leverage all our assets to serve our mission of integrating a wide array of people from a diverse set of socioeconomic and regional backgrounds to the outdoors and to conservation.
- Age and demographic diversity
Because the board members have varying professional backgrounds we get a range of perspectives as we plan projects and deal with issues.

- Our board is very diverse in age, gender and experience.
- The demographic diversity of our Board results in an atmosphere of free thought and thoroughly considered decision making.
- Life experience
  - Its diversity brings a strong mix of skill sets and input to any discussion.
- This is a national board. They bring a wealth of perspective on conservation finance.
- The greatest strengths are that the board has diverse experiences, skills and perspectives and that the board is a community.
- Our board includes members who have executive level experience in major Maine conservation organizations and other successful NGOs, have managed Maine and international businesses, have broad legal experience in land acquisitions and conveyance and have educational training and experience in biology and biochemistry.
- Our Board is comprised of a diverse group (age, professional backgrounds) of individuals with wide-ranging knowledge and experiences.

Board Continuity (10 comments)
- Experience and continuity.
  - We have been fortunate to have the same seven members on the Board for the past 20 years.
  - Several longtime members
  - Many of our board members are founding members.
  - Led by the older members with input from the younger when necessary.
  - Experience. Most of the board members have been on for more than three years with 4 members > 30 years.
  - At the next annual meeting one board member will be retiring and we already have a replacement lined up.
  - We have many long-time board members who continue to put great energy into the Trust.
  - The board is extremely knowledgeable about the organization's history.
  - The fact that the Board is so broadly capable and so intimately familiar with many years of conservation work means that they are able to give pertinent advice when it is needed.

Commitment to Conservation (7 comments)
- Willing to take strong stands for those without voices - i.e. fish, wildlife and habitat.
  - Commitment to land protection.
  - commitment to conservation
  - personal commitment to land conservation
  - It's enthusiasm for keeping Maine's wildlife and habitat healthy and vibrant.
  - Environmentally conscious group of dedicated individuals.
  - They are very engaged with conservation

Fundraising (6 comments)
- Fundraising (x2)
  - Active engagement in fundraising
  - They back that up with funding - do their part to contribute to the fiscal health of the organization.
  - Significant commitment in terms of fundraising for the organization
  - a focus on identifying projects and developing new sources of financial support for those projects.

Good Teamwork (5 comments)
- Together the board is easygoing, convivial and supportive in its deliberations.
  - They work constructively with one another and are an efficient governing body. This is best showcased through highly effective meetings that occur every other month.
  - Many of the board members meet for dinner before board meetings and go on adventures outside of ALT related outings.
  - The board enjoys working together, has a great rapport
  - The Board works together well.

Attendance (2 comments)
- Meetings are well attended by members.
  - Directors are very good about attending meetings with few misses

Supporting Staff (2 comments)
- They are supportive of staff and do what they can to assist them.
  - Great faith in staff and staff support
Miscellaneous (10 comments)
- Financial Management
- Persistence. Ours is a small group that keeps going.
- Deep commitment to our roots in science
- Willing to innovate and take risks
- Professionalism, education levels, and an honest desire to see all the properties succeed.
- There is generally less discussion about financing than about doing what is right and sensing what is wrong.
- They are honest and dedicated.
- They understand the bigger picture and want to see the organization fill its highest and best need.
- Professionalism and clear thinking.
- land management

Q11 - What is the biggest concern regarding your board?

Recruitment of New and Younger Members (20 comments)
- Recruiting younger Board Members.
- Recruiting younger members so that we ensure that the board remains just as strong into the future
- Our biggest concern is the recruitment of new and younger board members.
- They are aging and it is difficult to recruit new members let alone younger members.
- recruiting younger board members.
- Recruitment of younger members to the board
- Recruiting the next generation of board members with the same level of commitment and passion for the work.
- Not attracting new members.
- Replacement of older, experienced board members to sustain the organization.
- Lack of new members
- Several key members about to be terming out and recruitment of replacements in such a rural area.
- Board development and our ability to find more skilled, dedicated and visionary people to serve.
- Our board has been together a long time and while we add new members, a lot of the older ones remain.
- My biggest concern is that we continue to recruit new talented people.
- Our biggest concerns related to board development, recruitment of new board members, and keeping new board members active.
- Recruiting new directors and current director burn-out
- Recruitment of new directors and burn-out of current members
- Finding people willing to be officers
- The land trust needs more members and funding for larger projects.
- Recruitment

Succession Planning (15 comments)
- Depth of bench and/or succession planning. We have a diverse set of skills and attributes among the Board right now, but should any of several key Board members leave, we will be scrambling to replace them.
- Succession planning
- Board succession
- We do not have a good succession plan.
- leadership succession
- Succession. No one seems eager to step up to be president.
- Executive Succession
- Succession plan.
- Leadership succession
- Board succession
- There are challenges (for an older board) for succession planning.
- Succession planning is a growing challenge
- finding candidates to hold office on the board.
- creating a board leadership succession plan.
- Need to find new members willing to step into a leadership role over the next several years.

Fundraising (11 comments)
- fund raising- that is the board's greatest weakness
- Not sufficiently involved in fundraising
Developing a fundraising plan that will permit us to accomplish our goals and finding the resources to hire a land steward.

direct fundraising from donors.
The teamwork around recruiting, cultivating and engaging donors is not always easy. Director and staff carry majority of the fundraising burden.
We also struggle with getting board members to engage in dialogue one on one with potential donors.
Fundraising, especially asking for the 'big' gifts, is a weakness on our board.
Our board has not planned for themselves to be big fundraisers.
Not a fundraising board because it is composed of professionals. Not only do they not have lots of money, they are spending their time providing professional services so it's hard to ask them to fundraise.
Lack of interest and experience with fundraising.
Inability to be "givers and getters" when it comes to fundraising.

Diversity and Representation (10 comments)
Not diverse, many folks from the same mold, background, areas.
The Board could use more diversity and networking circles that benefit transaction fundraising.
Not representative of many/most of the communities where we work.
The board would like to better reflect the diversity of the communities we serve.
Recruitment of women.
lack of socioeconomic and age diversity
Expanding geographic diversity and other forms of diversity.
Challenge to think about how to have the Board reflect the full array of diversity in Maine
Our board is less diverse than we would like
The Board is almost exclusively older white men. (1 board member is under 40 (but male), and 1 is female)

Lack of Time/Energy/Engagement (9 comments)
Not as energetic as I'd like.

having time to do all needed activities
There is a lot that could be done, and we don't get to it all. Some board members commit more time than others.

Maintaining engagement and interest on a year-round and not just seasonal basis.
Too much work by too few people
Younger members sometimes don't have a lot of extra time to give.

Serious commitment.

Lack of participation, beyond meeting attendance, by a significant portion of the board.
With so many non-profits in our region, almost all of our board members are actively serving on multiple other boards at the same time. They are forced to divide up their time and financial contributions.

Learning Curve (7 comments)
We have been spoiled with an exceedingly devoted President who will be retiring from that exalted role this year. We will have co-presidents and have bolstered our committees substantially to compensate- but there will be a time of imbalance with the shift.

Need to strengthen board orientation and training
They are still in transition from an operational board to a more governance-focused board. They are still learning to stay out of the weeds. That is coming.
The greatest challenge is always to maintain a proper balance. We want enthusiastic board members that are engaged, thoughtful and helpful. Sometimes we would like a little more effort in some and sometimes we'd like a director to scale it back a little and not outpace the staff or Board goals.
Currently, they are reviewing their decision-making method in accordance with the committees (including Executive Committee). For example what decisions get made at committee level and which ones need to come to the board.
The diverse nature of the organization sometimes makes specialization hard for board members. The size and complexity of our organization makes the learning curve for new board members quite challenging at times. It takes almost a full yearly cycle of board meetings before people get a full grasp of the breadth of the organization.
Transition of responsibilities from Board to Staff.

Age of Board (3 comments)
The aging nature of our board.
Age of members.
Our board is older than we would like.

Building on Success (2 comments)
• A continuing concern from the last census is a diluted focus on strategic issues and fiduciary obligations because of the needed attention to the high pace of land acquisition successes. With our newest strategic plan, the Board will need to pay closer attention to the fundraising and development aspects of the organization as well as put forth a dedicated effort to get out ahead of large strategic objectives (e.g. the building of a headquarters).
• How to stay at this high-water mark

Experience (2 comments)
• It's understanding (or lack of) of what it takes to keep the lights on AND not get distracted by non-mission issues.
• Experience on board and with non-profits

Organization (2 comments)
• We do not have a strong committee structure to take on tasks and see them through to completion.
• The distance between us in the off-season which means it is difficult to have face to face meetings. We use electronic methods whenever possible.

Board Fatigue (2 comments)
• We are running into board donor fatigue.
• Burning them out

No Concerns (2 comments)
• Right now, both boards are excellent -- fully committed to the true purpose of our organizations, and that is the advancement of knowledge and protection of coasts and estuaries with our headquarters at a spectacular coastal site.
• no concerns

Miscellaneous (6 comments)
• Keeping them engaged as we transition to adding staff (albeit only two part-time staff at a combined FTE of .75)
• We are a volunteer organization.
• On occasion, some retired Board members have a little too much time to spend at the office.
• Attracting the next generation of landowner and providing services that appeal to them without offending or neglecting our base membership.
• Our long-time director also serves as our pro-bono General Counsel. It is hard to imagine a day when he is not in that capacity.
• Lack of connections or desire to network in the community.

Q28 – What are your organization’s greatest challenges in attracting and retaining qualified staff?
Compensation and Benefits; Health Insurance (27 comments)

Compensation and Benefits (21 comments)
• Entry level pay for people early in careers leads to transitions.
• Pay level and benefits
• Being able to raise enough ongoing operating funds to pay competitive salaries and offer good benefits.
• Funding to pay them.
• Ability to pay a desirable salary.
• Offering compensation and benefits that allow for a living wage in an expensive area
• Dependable funding source(s) to allow us to provide expanded benefits and competitive salaries.
• Wages and benefits
• Low salary, small size and therefore perceived vulnerability of organization
• One of the issues that sometimes looms is with the positions we have that require a Ph.D, as it is difficult to compete with universities or larger non-profits in salaries and benefits.
• Being able to pay them enough to come and stay
• Competitive salaries
• Ability to offer more benefits. While I feel that our base compensation rates are fair, we still see considerable turn-over due to life changes among our staff; a key incentive to keep those staff happier would be to increase the amount of benefits available to them.
• Very small budget
• Low compensation
• Salary competitiveness with larger land trusts.
• Pay (x2)
• Offering competitive wages/ hours and benefits so that professionals can make the financial commitment to living and working in a rural community.
Low compensation
Challenges in retention typically extend from the dynamics that are familiar to most nonprofit organizations -- less funding to support staff than would be ideal and lower salaries than are available elsewhere.
We are limited by our capacity to manage more staff and fundraise for operational budget required.

Health Insurance (6 comments)
Health insurance costs continue to rise, but our ability (or sense of our ability) to increase the stipend to match that increase is limited.
We offer well-paying jobs with decent benefits, so we have to meet fundraising goals to maintain that. Health insurance is the biggest challenge. We give 15% of base salary at present, which is generous, but not necessarily enough to meet the demands of the insurance market. That's a huge budget line and I worry that it is not sustainable. If we can't sustain it, however, we may well lose people. The single biggest thing MLTN could do for all of its members is find a way of pooling resources for insurance.
We thankfully have done a great job retaining staff. However, a major challenge is the cost and quality of health insurance as a benefit which is needed for retaining and attracting quality staff.
Health insurance will be increasingly important.
Lack of health insurance
being unable to afford to pay for their health and dental insurance.

No Challenges (16 comments)
No particular challenge. We have been able to attract terrific people.
We have a very high retention rate.
Have experience no difficulty identifying suitable employees and have no turnover so far, so none to date.
We only use part-time contract employees. We have been able to find people whose MWWT responsibilities fit well with the rest of their work and personal lives. We compensate them fairly and have found that they tend to stick around.
We don't have significant issues retaining good staff - very low turnover.
We have an excellent less-than-quarter-time Dev. Dir that has been with us for 5-6 years, and we only just started our first ED, so we haven't found the challenges yet. We were overwhelmed by how many very well-qualified candidates we got for the half-time ED position.
Retention does not seem to be a major problem for us at the moment.
None
We have increased benefits and pay in addition to offering a variety of work experiences/tasks based on staff interests to help attract and retain staff. For annual seasonal positions, we offer competitive pay and again, a variety of experience/tasks to attract candidates.
We have had good continuity of staff since we first hired staff in 2007. Two people worked for [a similar organization] previously. Another two now.
Mission, Appalachian Trail is a big selling point, prestige of organization, work org does.
At this point in time, we have not experienced major challenges in attracting and retaining staff.
I believe that we offer a very competitive salary and benefits package (or will as of the start of next fiscal year), and I'm sure that this will help with retention.
We have never had much trouble attracting talented staff, and routinely draw qualified applicants from around the country during job searches. Our strong reputation and resonant mission have proven to be very effective recruiters.
Our organization hasn’t experienced many challenges with attracting and retaining qualified staff. When we have an open position, the applicant pool typically includes several candidates that are highly qualified. It can be challenging to make the ultimate decision about to whom to extend an offer from a group of talented and desirable applicants. We’ve also experienced what we would consider to be a very low turnover rate, and few have left for reasons related to job satisfaction or compensation.
We don't really have a challenge in attracting staff and always have a large number of qualified candidates for new positions.

Location (9 comments)
Some of our hires are in rural areas of the State, especially Washington County. We've been very fortunate to be able to hire excellent staff in those areas now, but there is always a concern that if/when we have to replace them, it will be a thin field of applicants.
Remote geographic location.
Remote and rural location;
Geographic challenges
The Augusta area has not always been viewed as a dynamic place to work and live - fortunately that is changing!
Our service area is in rural Midcoast Maine which may not be seen as a desirable place to raise a family.
location
The remote location of the job
It is tricky in a rural community to find part time staff with the background and or skills we need.
Shortage of Applicants (6 comments)

- Shortage of passionate qualified applicants.
- Finding people with the necessary skill sets and qualifications.
- We are experiencing a staff turnover, and the issue is getting qualified applicants.
- Finding the skills necessary to accomplish diverse tasks and fitting in well with a small staff.
- We've been very fortunate to find some really talented staff over the past few years. But, it seems hit or miss. As ED, I've sometimes found only 1 or 2 candidates that I'd want to hire out of the applicant pool. Again, we've been quite fortunate. But, if just one or two people in the applicant pools had been different, it would be a very different story.
- Just getting skilled employees to apply for open positions is my first concern, though this hasn't proven to be a major problem yet.

Part-time and Seasonal Employees (4 comments)

- We have difficulties some years finding a qualified summer intern. We need to find the resources to either hire two summer interns or a part time steward.
- We have had funding recently for part time positions. We have hired and trained them and then they have left for full time positions.
- Part-time hours only
- Part time positions

Long Hours (2 comments)

- number of hours per week
- a quantity of work that will always exceed the number of hours available

Housing Issues (2 comments)

- Availability of funds to fully support paid positions and lack of year-round housing options.
- Year-round housing is limited on the island and that limits the potential pool of qualified staff.

Miscellaneous (5 comments)

- There aren’t a lot of opportunities for professional advancement within our organization, and it is possible that this poses a future challenge to retaining qualified staff as our current staff mature within their positions. This possible challenge is purely speculative.
- For many, working for our organization has been a stepping stone on to bigger and better things for many staff.
- old and aging local population.
- We could do a better job of fostering the next generation of conservation staff, including greater diversity. We do not have an internship program, nor a thriving volunteer program, nor the capacity to recruit, support, and manage high school, college and post-college age people towards a career in conservation in Maine.

Q45 – Please describe one or more ways climate change is affecting your organization’s plans or activities

Conservation Planning (33 comments)

General Climate Resiliency - acquisition

- Marsh migration and climate resiliency layers are now central to our lands planning efforts
- We’ve included TNC’s climate resiliency modeling in our strategic conservation planning. We use several models, including Nature's Network. Downeast Conservation Network has also focused extensively on this. So far, we've incorporated climate into planning and acquisition. We haven't done restoration or forestry related to climate.
- Increasing urgency to conserve climate resilient areas
- We are exploring additional ways to engage in our local community’s climate planning goals... and are considering resilience in our latest round of conservation planning.
- As part of recent conservation planning, we integrated the map data of terrestrial climate resilience that has developed for a recent initiative.
- We think seriously about resiliency on all potential land projects.
- Increased sense of urgency to protect places with above average climate resilience scores based on TNC science.
- TNC’s climate change resiliency data is built into our strategic conservation priorities.
- We are focusing our land protection efforts in areas with high climate change resiliency.
- Climate Resiliency is a bigger factor as we evaluate potential projects.
- We now consider climate resilience when reviewing conservation projects.
- Resilience data increasingly part of our acquisition planning
- Greater emphasis in targeting for protection parcels with climate resiliency and ecological flow.
- We have included a map of climate resiliency in our new Conservation Plan, but that’s about as far as we've gotten.

Coastal Resiliency / Marsh Migration / Sea Level Rise

- Marsh migration and climate resiliency layers are now central to our lands planning efforts
- We will no longer conserve an island if sea level rise projections show that more than 20% of its area will be eventually be submerged.
Climate change has led to a policy of pursuing lands for marsh restoration and coastal climate resiliency acquisitions.

- We are prioritizing projects with landscape features that add to the diversity of our holding in addition to looking for opportunities to facilitate marsh migration.
- We have incorporated most recent mapping and other predictive resources into our strategic conservation plan. Therefore, we are giving a higher priority to protecting lands that would provide buffer in the face of the climate change impacts.
- Our planning work for 2019 is going to integrate our water and land conservation programs with a focus on climate change, marsh migration, and the health of our estuaries, the latter of which is an economic driver or our region.
- Many of the properties that we have already protected are in regions that are in the top 20% in Maine in resiliency to sea level rises based on their size, potential for the salt marshes to migrate inland and the possibility of soil accretion. Going forward we are increasingly focusing our efforts on protecting properties with these attributes.
- Might be a consideration in evaluation of a candidate property for protection-both in terms of habitat and financial values.
- We have become more involved with community-based climate resiliency by being asked by towns to assist with planning and preparation for future effects of rising sea waters and stronger storm events (flooding!).
- Our organization evaluates all shorefront projects to ensure that climate change and sea level rise will not impact the property’s agricultural conservation values. We recognize that farmland conservation has the added benefit of carbon sequestration, but this is not a current criteria in our land protection considerations.
- Sea level rise and marsh migration are very much on our minds as we look at our current land protection efforts, and what we might focus on in the future.
- Sea level rise is taken into consideration before protecting coastal lands.
- We look for opportunities to buffer land that will be inundated by rising sea levels.
- We have a much stronger focus on conservation and restoration of coastal wetlands.
- We are closely monitoring sea level change models related to [local properties] and its tributaries to ensure salt marsh can migrate and upland buffers remain.
- Focused on sea level rise at one of our properties

**Wildlife Habitat Protection**

- Increasing urgency to conserve climate resilient areas and to conserve habitat for species that are struggling. Increasing stewardship demands. Increasing pests. Changing the ecosystem we are working with and to protect.
- Might be a consideration in evaluation of a candidate property for protection-both in terms of habitat and financial values.
- Protection of rarer habitats (wetlands, elevation, pockets of rare vegetation) as they are likely to increase in importance for species stressed by climate change.

**Preserve Management (18 comments)**

**Invasive Species**

- The term “climate change” is a republican construct designed to diminish the threat of our human driven warming of the planet’s atmosphere and waters. Global warming is causing our organization to address the spread of invasive plant and insect species.
- Invasive species
- Mapping and management of invasive species.

**Train Design and Maintenance**

- It is also impacting the ways in which we look at trail design.
  - tricky nordic trail grooming

**Ticks**

- Often increase in ticks- people's fears about hiking in the woods
- Manage our preserves and trails to reduce visitor’s exposure to ticks.
- We are including climate resiliency and management actions in our management plans, drafting guidance documents on managing for resiliency…

**Rainfall / Flood Concerns**

- That said, we are trying to prepare for more heavy rain events in our stewardship work (e.g., culvert replacement)...
- In addition, DLLT has improved stream crossing infrastructure for more frequent flood events.

**Erosion**

- Climate change has made us more aware of erosion issues specifically due to increasing frequency of high intensity rainfall.
- We are currently seeing an increase in storm intensity resulting in significant amounts of water through our water control structures - culverts, ditches, swamps, ponds, etc. We will be reassessing our water control structures both natural and artificial as to their ability to handle increased run off.

**Forest Management**

- We have also needed to adjust our forest management activities to accommodate shortened operable conditions (Hard frozen ground) for our winter operations.
- Forest management to promote resilient species
- We also emphasize growth of southerly forest communities in our forest land management (eg. northern hardwoods).
- Forest management plans need to consider changing forest communities by promoting increases in plants with more southerly affinities.
We are active in carbon offset markets for greenhouse gas emissions. We are expecting the endangered species upon which we are focused to be strongly impacted by climate change, thus we are focused on keeping forests as forests - we think it is our best hope for mitigating climate change. Adaptation to climate change impacts is not a highly ranked priority for us, as we feel that one of the best ways to combat climate change is to keep doing what we have been doing: preserving more land. We are focused more on connectivity.

**Research/ Monitoring (5 comments)**

- At the same time, we have been working with the Climate Table, other ag. groups in the state, the University of Maine, American Farmland Trust, and some other groups in the region to organize an assessment of the benefits of natural climate solutions like healthy soils practices and farmland protection in the Northeast across a variety of factors (climate change mitigation, adaptation, water quality, and farmer profitability). This assessment could be used to inform the updating of Maine’s Climate Action Plan as well other policy efforts. We are in the infancy of this project and so have not yet applied for funding, etc.
- Climate change has made clamming more difficult. We work with clammers to monitor water quality and temperature changes.
- We are closely monitoring sea level change models related to [one of our properties] and its tributaries to ensure salt marsh can migrate and upland buffers remain.
- Climate change is a major focus of our research, education, and training activities. The theme is built into many of our projects.
- Mapping and management of invasive species.

**Increased Urgency (4 comments)**

- We are protecting vulnerable shorelands which provides resiliency.
- Adaptation to climate change impacts is not a highly ranked priority for us, as we feel that one of the best ways to combat climate change is to keep doing what we have been doing: preserving more land.
- We are focused on keeping forests as forests - we think it is our best hope for mitigating climate change.
- We are expecting the endangered species upon which we are focused to be strongly impacted by climate change, thus we are trying to conserve and improve all the available habitat we can-- and increasingly focusing on conservation at higher altitudes.

**Forest Sequestrations (2 comments)**

- We are also active in carbon offset markets for greenhouse gas emissions.
• We have established a forest land carbon sequestration committee.

Protecting Habitat for Specific Species (2 comments)
• Our conservation efforts have always been focused on protecting habitat for waterfowl, particularly Black Ducks, and for migratory shorebirds. This habitat is found on shorefront properties that have inter-tidal wetlands and an upland buffer that shields the birds from disturbance. Initially we were unaware that these same properties would be even more important in this time of climate change and sea level rise.
• One watershed includes numerous wild trout ponds. We are committed to taking actions, such as shading streams, to keep water temperatures as cold as possible.

Miscellaneous (9 comments)
• Climate change increases the urgency of conserving large-scale forest projects. We are embarking on an aggressive campaign to increase the capital to use for such projects in Maine and elsewhere.
• It has not changed our activities, but some board members are heavily lobbying for it to be part of our educational activities and choice of conservation projects. We have included a map of climate resiliency in our new Conservation Plan, but that's about as far as we've gotten. With the hiring of our first Exec Dir (who will start in two weeks), we hope this can become a real priority.
• Climate Change is not having a large impact on our work except in one area. We have a conservation area which we have worked closely with larger groups to conserve. This area will probably see impacts to its tidal marshes which will impact the waterfowl and wading bird habitat here and we are in discussion with both organizations as to any and all steps we can take to help mitigate any foreseeable problems.
• Beach erosion, sea level rise
• hope to support more local agriculture.
• The conservation of wetlands have increased in priority for conservation organizations. Focused funding, such as the MNRC P, supports efforts to conserve these areas, but more funds are needed.
• We are increasingly interested in water. Not just wetlands, but also source water.
• Increasing community benefits from forest and farm lands.
• Increasing messaging, dialog, passions

Q57 – Please explain or elaborate on your challenges and/or concerns with fee property stewardship

Ongoing Maintenance (27 comments)

Time and Effort (9 comments)
• On-going maintenance - the challenge is volunteer labor in a seasonal community.
• With the increasing pace of conservation, this means there is more land to care for in perpetuity.
• At some properties, the lack of local land stewardship has resulted in maintenance falling behind.
• Ongoing maintenance - forest management, road costs, trail costs
• Ongoing maintenance (is) a constant concern.
• One of the biggest challenges is making sure that public access trails are well maintained.
• Maintenance has become an issue as we have begun holding large forest blocks that will need a level of management that is new to us.
• ongoing maintenance is self-evident and will always be there.
• Trail maintenance --soil compaction leading to wet areas which need gravel

Financial Cost (8 comments)
• Financial ability to maintain trails
• Maintenance is also underfunded.
• Increased stewardship costs due to increased use.
• trail maintenance costs are a concern
• With annual giving down and the costs of stewardship increasing, ability to steward the properties to their fullest requirements will continue to be a challenge and maintenance may become more selective.
• Cost of ongoing maintenance, particularly staff cost.
• Ongoing maintenance, such as boundary line maintenance is a significant cost and will often require technical help.
• Finding financial resources to meet stewardship needs as we work to maximize benefits to our communities.

Staffing and Volunteers (5 comments)
• Trespass and inappropriate use that needs immediate attention takes staff away from tasks we would rather be doing. Need more staff.
• The pace of our conservation efforts make it challenging to maintain enough staff and volunteer help to maintain things properly.
• Maintenance has, and always will be a challenge. Our organization has just hired a year-round, additional stewardship staff, but its natural to expect the more lands that are conserved, the more staffing will be required.
• Since becoming an all-volunteer organization, it is more difficult to oversee all maintenance activities, including keeping up with trail maintenance and boundary marking. It has also been more challenging to raise funds for capital improvements.
• Need a dedicated work force to maintain trails. Certain trails require a lot of maintenance and get little use.
Public-Facing (5 comments)
- We want to make sure our properties represent to the community our commitment to professionalism and excellence. We see well-maintained trails, campsites, signage and buildings as a way to project those values, and so it concerns us deeply when we don't have the funds or volunteers to meet our own standards. We feel poorly maintained properties do us a disservice in our attempts to explain and promote community confidence in us.
- The lack of maintenance reflects poorly on the organization.
- Ensuring our trails are in good shape for our visitors
- With 5 public access preserves and one that is in the works, our responsibilities to maintain these preserves for the public have grown and upkeep of these visitor amenities and trails requires more staff and volunteers.
- We want to make sure our properties represent to the community our commitment to professionalism and excellence. We see well-maintained trails, campsites, signage and buildings as a way to project those values, and so it concerns us deeply when we don't have the funds or volunteers to meet our own standards. We feel poorly maintained properties do us a disservice in our attempts to explain and promote community confidence in us.

Invasive Species (22 comments)

General (16 comments)
- Beyond Invasives, our organization really has few concerns at this point.
- Invasives are everywhere.
- Invasives will always be a concern.
- Invasives - greatest concern is the ponds with invasive fish and plants.
- The use of chemicals [to combat invasive species] can be a polarizing issue in the community.
- Invasives - Oriental bittersweet and barberry are winning the battle!
- Invasives are a constant concern.
- Way down on the curve for invasive species management.
- Climate change impacts include habitat loss due to spread of invasive species.
- Preventing the further spread of invasive species.
- All land will be impacted by shifting weather patterns, invasives, and species migration.
- Invasives become a larger problem and one that we must address soon if they are not to become overwhelming.
- Invasives are a self-evident issue and will always be there.
- Invasives are so extensive we cannot remove them all on any of our properties.
- We are experiencing major invasive species inundations on a lot of our properties which require a huge amount of our Stewardship Director's and volunteers' time to address. It often feels like a losing battle.
- Invasive plants are becoming a greater concern on all of our properties.

Effect on Native Environment (4 comments)
- Several of our properties are being overwhelmed by buckthorn and browntail moth.
- We have an over-population of deer and a lot of invasive species pressure on our properties.
- Extent of invasives and their adverse effect on native critter habitat.
- The invasives are degrading habitat for wildlife and outcompeting native flora.

Cost (2 comments)
- More and more invasives. Never ending! Expensive to deal with.
- One of the ongoing challenges with invasives management is sustainability of work completed. Professional management is expensive and can require multiple methods of attack including chemical spraying.

Managing Use (19 comments)

Management Capacity (11 comments)
- We do not have the capacity to manage trail building as we would like. I think the funds and labor are available, it's the oversight/project management that is lacking. Again, we hope a new Exec Director will help with this (if not by managing trail building, then by relieving board members of other duties so we can).
- Even where trails exist, our properties are grossly underused, partly due to lack of advertising capacity on our part, and maybe lack of community interest. But also, we hesitate to advertise too strongly for fear of overuse - it is a hard line to walk.
- Two of our newest properties have multiple recreational uses planned (or ongoing) on them. We have concerns about the competition between these uses. On one property in particular, where we have established a parking area and are allowing back-country skiing, we are already "at capacity" only three months after construction. This issue is pervasive throughout the White Mountain National Forest area, and is not isolated to our properties or our work; ongoing discussions with the WMNF include setting up systems to limit use, such as permitting, ticketing, or quota systems. Implementation of any reduction in public use fraught with difficulty, and will take many small steps to accomplish.
- We are responsible for over 10 miles of heavily used trails within the city limits of a service community. Not all our users are thoughtful about their impact on trails - eg mountain biking in the mud.
- We recently acquired a property that has community based recreation which will be a concern going forward.
Some of our parcels acquired through cluster development donations have had the most challenges (abutters' encroachment, ATV's, that type of problem) and we haven't had the manpower to develop relationships with abutters and define public uses.

We are seeing a great deal more use of our trails and lands and work to create a proper balance so that use doesn't become abuse. We are seeing a lot more dogs on our properties and want to make sure that that remains a positive thing.

Over 18,000 + hikers/outdoor enthusiasts visit our conservation area each year. We are trying to manage for this increase in use.

Monitoring and addressing misuse is an ongoing problem.

Overuse to the extent that habitat is compromised.

Many of our preserves are being "loved to death". We are being forced to close sections of trail to let the grounds recover.

**Competing Uses (8 comments)**

- manage competing trail use
- competing users - fat bikes, dog owners, mtn bikes, skiers....and then hunters and trappers....
- We’ve seen an increasingly common challenge with local/membership opinion on balancing traditional use vs. more reduced impact recreation.
- Community relations requires an on-going educational effort in a small island community where people's "good intentions" are sometimes in conflict with the conservation values being protected.
- Our organization is seeing an increase in the diversity of users (e.g. hikers, dog walkers, mountain bikers, ATVers, hunters, etc). We are experiencing more clashes between users and are having to navigate managing fee owned lands to accommodate a wide array of users.
- There is an important balance between protecting a parcel for habitat/ecological value AND for people.
- We have been dealing with a number of competing use issues, specifically, dog waste on trails, unauthorized bikes, erosion caused by a permitted snowmobile trail.
- Competing uses of our trail systems. Skiers vs. Bikers, walkers, etc. especially in the winter.

**Public Relations and Perceptions (7 comments)**

- We often struggle with local misconception of why we purchase land and the way we manage it.
- Community relations requires an on-going educational effort in a small island community where people's "good intentions" are sometimes in conflict with the conservation values being protected.
- Not in my back yard issues are also on the rise.
- Community relations are always an issue, though not in a negative way. It's just that we have to continue to reach out and engage.
- Not all our abutters are in favor of public access in their neighborhood, which has created some interesting challenges and dynamics.
- Our service area is relatively small and some members of our community feel that we have acquired enough land already.
- We need to work harder at getting the word out about our work and engaging with the community.

**Volunteer Recruitment (5 comments)**

- We rely upon volunteers to get our work done and as we grow, our stewardship needs also grow. We struggle with finding enough volunteers to help and part of this is a problem with communicating overall with the community at large.
- Stewardship is almost entirely volunteer.
- Would love a volunteer coordinator.
- Monitoring, however, is fundamental to protection and in our case it must be done by volunteers. Finding adequate help is always a concern.
- Our land trust also has difficulties in attracting and retaining future volunteers for fee lands, amid declining and aging populations.

**Climate Concerns (5 comments)**

- Climate change - rising pond water temperatures
- logging season shortened with climate change...
- We are concerned about erosion on our islands and the protection of our lighthouse from more frequent wash overs of the island.
- Climate change impacts include habitat loss due to spread of invasive species.
- Climate change may result in increased stress on ecosystems.

**Inappropriate Uses (5 comments)**

- Abuse from vandals and misuse is an ongoing problem, especially as law enforcement support decreases.
- In addition we have experienced significant vandalism in the form of rogue trail-blazing in the last year.
- Minor infringements that need to be resolved.
- Trespass and inappropriate use that needs immediate attention takes staff away from tasks we would rather be doing. Need more staff.
- inappropriate use
Financial Issues (3 comments)
- The community forest is a working forest, and our ability to maintain and pay taxes on our fee lands depends, in part, on timber product markets which are currently poor. Our organization is committed to providing motorized use on our fee lands, but maintaining roads and trails is one of our largest expenses, and can be affected by inappropriate use.
- We choose to pay taxes under current use taxation programs to support the communities where we own land. When we do forest management/harvesting activities, we reach out to our neighbors and the community to explain what we have planned to prevent concern. Ongoing maintenance, such as boundary line maintenance is a significant cost and will often require technical help. With our property count increasing from 36-50 over the next two years, funding and effort will need to become an even greater priority. Invasive plants are becoming a greater concern on all of our properties. The issue is similar to boundary line maintenance. The threat from invasives is increasing, thus the required funding and effort will also increase.
- Lack of funds to construct projects.

Landowner Relations (3 comments)
- Landowner relations is full-time work. Ongoing maintenance is expensive and time-consuming.
- we haven't had the manpower to develop relationships with abutters
- The impacts of climate change are twofold. We have shore holdings which will be impacted by sea-level rise and all land will be impacted by shifting weather patterns, invasives, and species migration.

Relationship with Municipality (2 comments)
- Working with towns continues to be a challenge. They are under tough budget constraints because of revenue sharing and education funding formulas, and take it out on us. They need to be good partners, but at times there are strained relations.
- There is a constant criticism of fee owned land that are tax exempt and little recognition of the value of these preserved lands.

Managing Expectations (2 comments)
- People expect more amenities than in the past and have less experience in being in remote/wild places.
- Pressure to allow uses that might degrade habitat and conflict with existing uses.

Difficulty Monitoring (2 comments)
- Our properties are remote and most of the land is inaccessible. Monitoring is resource intensive.
- Because our organization’s conservation efforts are focused on protecting wildlife habitat, benign neglect is not an unsatisfactory approach to stewardship. With the exception of the one water-access property we have done very little to provide recreational opportunities on our properties and we definitely don’t have the manpower to do more. Because most of our properties abut undeveloped land we generally don’t have issues with encroachment. Though we don’t allow motorized vehicles on our properties we still need to make sure that ATVs don’t go on walking trails or drive on the marshes and someone needs to walk the existing trails to check for trash.

Legal Challenges (2 comments)
- Legal challenges are property specific. In particular, where access to conservation lands places challenges for RLHT - ie. The Rapid River. While most legal challenges are as the result of overlooked, pre-determination of language in a deed, the Rapid River lands have multiple layers of management, restrictions/covenants, and use. We've learned a lot in 25 years - the primary being the consideration of stewardship staff input in advance of land closing.
- Increasingly dense neighborhoods with abutters lawyered up.

Miscellaneous (8 comments)
- Collectively, our Board members typically and regularly spend time on just about all our holdings and are able to keep eyes on these properties' on-going status.
- Most desire is to promote trails which creates the problems listed in question 56 Trails should be planned regionally to take advantage of best places.
- Our stewardship of fee properties, including an extensive trail system that crosses fee and easement properties, is low key, but steady.
- Having trained/experienced personnel (staff and volunteer) is a challenge; There isn't the amount of land management experience in the organization that I would prefer to have. Difficulty with time management/prioritization of efforts.
- MFT acquires farmland with the intent to sell it as soon as possible, subject to a conservation easement, to a qualified farmer. In the meantime, we must maintain the land and infrastructure while trying to anticipate how a future owner might want to use the property. We must balance the cost of mowing, repairs, and staff time while also trying to keep the property marketable and safe. It is challenging to decide how much to invest in building repairs or removal if you don’t know how a farmer may want to use the infrastructure.
- Our local logger is about to retire
- Primarily related to efforts to track and keep natural ecology, plus maintain public access mandated in our mission in as natural and unobtrusive manner as possible.
Q58-Please explain or elaborate on your challenges and/or concerns with regard to conservation easement stewardship.

Owner Turnover (18 comments)

General
- Changing ownership.
- Easement ownership changes

New owners not supportive of conservation
- Change in ownership. Several CE's were donated by landowners who have devoted a great deal of time to trail development and maintenance. We anticipate that in the future, when these lands change hands, some of the new landowners will not have the same commitment to this work.
- On some easements, there has been a change of ownership and the new owners are not as receptive to the conservation easement.
- Two of our easements changed hands last year, with a third on the market. One passed on to the next generation. I am concerned that these new owners may not be as invested in the easement as the grantors were.
- We have had a couple of our eased properties acquired by owners not interested and/or uniformed about conservation. These few easements require a lot of resources.
- One of the biggest challenges is communications with second generation easement landowners, who do not have the same spirit and often, mindset, of the original easement landowner.

Time it takes to educate and build relationship with new owners / interested buyers
- Educating new land owners of easement properties and getting them to understand and buy in to the purposes of the conservation easement
- Sometimes hard to get second or third generation landowners to take the easement seriously and comply with prior notification.
- Efforts to create working relationships with new owners could also be a challenge in the future.
- The amount that are coming up for sale is placing a burden on staff time as potential buyers are more and more demanding with requests for information and issues they see with the easements.
- As CEs change ownership, the time needed to manage them increases. We made the decision (based on legal concerns) that CEs would only be monitored by land trust staff, basically one person, the Stewardship Director, who is not full time. As in fee stewardship, time management and prioritization are difficult.

New owners not following terms of easement / legal concerns
- Legal challenges at easement properties will probably increase as we continue to move beyond the original grantors. Without staff in place (at this time), it is a major concern how we will deal with legal challenges. that might crop up.
- Landowner relationships/ownership changes where new owner doesn't necessarily understand the CE obligations and that leads to the increased potential for legal challenges.

New owners pushing limits of easements
- An easement that allows substantial development in a building envelope and is now owned by a new owner who wants to push the limits on that.
- Lately we have had one landowner who seems to push the boundaries of the easement which they acquired with the purchase of their property. Since we are a small land trust in a small area, community relations are very important to us and we struggle with dealing with easement violations while also maintaining good neighborly relations. We will not be taken advantage of but also do not want to alienate people through tough action. We work very hard to find the right balance.

Difficulty communicating with new owners
- Change of ownership and inability to contact new owner.
- No particular challenges, but clearly good communication with next generation landowners continues to be essential

Violations (7 comments)
- Always comes down to violations - CE land owners who interpret the easement differently than we do!
- An elderly CE donor violated the easement by subdividing the property and gifting a portion to his son for a house lot. He was very elderly and confused, and the son was either uninformed or dishonest, and no title search was done before the transfer (the transfer took place immediately after our annual monitoring visit). Fortunately, several board members are very active in the community and heard of the transfer before the son did any building on his new land. Thanks to the hard work of a few very diplomatic board members, the situation was resolved by the son returning the land to his parents, and no legal action was needed.
- Minor infringements that need to be resolved.
- Another challenge is the inconsistency/vagueness in the language of our earliest written easement documents, which can be difficult to navigate when dealing with a pending violation or established violation.
- Most of our challenges relate to landowners acting quickly in the interest of the farm business without properly notifying us or seeking approval. These issues most often involve landowners proceeding with a timber harvest without providing a certified plan, building permitted structures without notification or approval, or failing to provide conservation plans. We continue to seek
opportunities for educating and reminding landowners of their easement restrictions, including annual visits, landowner newsletter, a year-end survey, and frequent check-ins with landowners with a history of misunderstandings.

- We have been very lucky, but I foresee having violations and problems as new owners take over and as developmental pressure rises.
- Only one landowner, who seems to feel the easement does not apply to him.

Lack of Resources to Monitor (6 comments)

- We have a lot of easements to monitor, but we get very close to monitoring them all every year. We make monitoring a full board responsibility, and sometimes a few don't get done.
- Finding enough stewards, getting them to complete monitoring by the end of the year.
- Reliance on volunteers for significant monitoring
- Our greatest concern would be monitoring. In that regard we have just hired a new worker who will take that over.
- Our properties are remote and most of the land is inaccessible. Monitoring is resource intensive.
- We made the decision (based on legal concerns) that CEs would only be monitored by land trust staff, basically one person, the Stewardship Director, who is not full time. As in fee stewardship, time management and prioritization is difficult.

Difficulty Communicating with Landowners (5 comments)

- It's difficult to get in touch with landowners sometimes. Landowners do not keep us as informed as we would like.
- Difficulty reaching new owners, keeping contact information up-to-date, communications regarding required notifications (e.g., in the event of timber harvesting to provide forest management plan).
- We hold several easements on land associated with cluster subdivisions that are owned by homeowners' associations. It is often difficult communicating with the homeowners' association folks and getting them to address issues that may come up.
- Change of ownership and inability to contract new owner.
- Maintaining good land ownership relationships.

Lack of Understanding Easements (5 comments)

- Another problem is that both our landowners and monitors do not well understand our easements. We aspire to write up shorthand "cheat sheets" summarizing each CE but haven't gotten to it.
- We have had a couple of our eased properties acquired by owners not interested and/or uniformed about conservation. These few easements require a lot of resources.
- Only one landowner, who seems to feel the easement does not apply to him.
- Most of our challenges relate to landowners acting quickly in the interest of the farm business without properly notifying our organization or seeking approval. These issues most often involve landowners proceeding with a timber harvest without providing a certified plan, building permitted structures without notification or approval, or failing to provide conservation plans. We continue to seek opportunities for educating and reminding landowners of their easement restrictions, including annual visits, landowner newsletter, a year-end survey, and frequent check-ins with landowners with a history of misunderstandings.
- Erroneous understanding that if the property is protected by easement, it also is accessible to the public automatically.

Need for Volunteer Stewards (5 comments)

- We use volunteer stewards which takes a lot of training. Can have a high turnover.
- Need more members to share the work.
- We are committed to ramping up the number of non-Board Member stewards
- Maintaining quality control with mostly all volunteer stewards.
- Dealing with maintenance activities on the easements with public access also requires large amounts of volunteer work to keep up with.

Move to Paid Staff (4 comments)

- We have some complicated easements that would benefit from professional stewardship.
- We are looking to move more of our stewardship "in house" and to have volunteers do less stewardship in the future. This is necessitated by the added complexity of the easements themselves, most of which are now purchased interests with different responsibilities added for the third-party holders.
- Establishing a volunteer monitoring commission--this past year all easements were monitored by staff, which is not a sustainable model for the future.
- This is a job probably better done by an employee, and not a volunteer. Our volunteers put in a lot of effort, but a more professional approach would serve us better. The high value of land in southern Maine has made it much more difficult to legally defend easements, as landowners have great incentive to maximize their profit when it comes time to sell and can afford to be legally aggressive.

Amendments (3 comments)

- We have determined a need to modify at least one existing easement in order for us to address invasive plants.
• Also, several CE owners have requested amendments, but so far, they have all been deterred from pursuing it by our very detailed amendment policy and the prospect of legal bills.
• We are being asked casually at this point to make a change in one easement and we want to make sure that if we do make changes they are positive for all.

Miscellaneous (8 comments)
• We don't have much with challenges in CE stewardship, other than timing. The short seasons and multiple other stewardship commitments for land trust stewards, occurs all in a relatively short period of time.
• Nothing significant. Even small issues can take a lot of time, however.
• None so far, always easy to find people to walk in the woods....
• Nothing unusual comes to mind. Given that all of our easements are still with the same owner, that isn't surprising.
• We've been lucky, and not experienced any issues with regard to stewardship on easements.
• Establishing relationships with neighbors of easement properties as how they manage their properties can affect the conservation values of the easement property. Issues with boundary lines with neighbors are sometimes a problem in this regard.
• It appears very difficult to modify any element, even when extremely minor changes might help accommodate objectives of adjacent landowners.
• older easements with inadequate boundary markings

Question 68 - Please share any comments about accreditation.

Benefits of Accreditation (19 comments)

Processes and Internal Organization (9 comments)
• Accreditation, and the renewal process, have helped to ensure that we adopt and use best practices associated with all aspects of our work.
• It forced us to get a lot of things formalized, in order, and documented - through the app process, a wealth of information was extracted from the brains of a few founding board members and gotten onto paper (or docs) that are accessible to all board and staff (if only more were interested...)
• It has significantly improved our procedures.
• Gaining Accreditation has its merits to really improve an organization's processes and sets up the organization for best practices.
• Having clear systems, policies, and procedures in place is very helpful and has strengthened our organization.
• It is worthwhile to all staff (and new staff can come up to speed on policies and procedures, but it is very time consuming).
• The initial accreditation process was VERY helpful for us to get our house in order.
• We were motivated to participate in the accreditation application process as we felt that bringing our organizational practices into stronger alignment with LTA Standards and Practices, in order to qualify to apply, would be beneficial for our organization as a whole.
• Staff feel that being accredited and meeting the Standards and Practices is a risk management benefit to our organization, in that it ensures that it has and will continue to have mechanisms for preserving institutional knowledge and supporting organizational longevity regardless of staff comings and goings.

Financial (2 comments)
• It has given our donors confidence in their investment in us.
• Staff also feels that being accredited means we will have the resources that we need to do our jobs well, as our procedures outline all of the operational steps we need to be effective and efficient in our work.

Value to Board (2 comments)
• Board members who participated learned a lot about the organization.
• It has provided our Board members confidence we are doing things right in areas of operation for which they lack expertise.

General (6 comments)
• It has gained our organization a lot of respect and support from all circles, especially when it is explained that it shows greater fiscal accountability etc. etc.
• I have been through the accreditation process (twice). Becoming an accredited land trust is a wonderful achievement and I know that Oceanside is a much stronger land trust for having gone through the process.
• Accreditation has been extremely important and valuable for our land trust.
• It was a ton of work, but so worth it.
• We generally feel that the process of preparing to be accredited was worthwhile, in spite of the time commitment involved in preparing and submitting the application itself.
• Hallelujah! We crossed the finish line - our members are very proud of this milestone. It was a worthwhile process, our shop is in good order.

Time Consuming and Expensive Process (18 comments)

Time (11 comments)
We nearly applied for accreditation just before we lost our staffing (2016). Even after a lot of work towards that goal, we came up short on several items.

So much work!
Accreditation is a ton of work
Our very small land trust, lacks the funding, the resources, the manpower, the knowledge - the everything (!) - to even attempt an application.
Accreditation and re-accreditation was a very difficult and costly undertaking for us as a small land trust. We had to divert attention and time from land conservation work to achieve accreditation and renewal.
While I think it is a worthwhile goal, accreditation is really out of the realm of possibility for small land trusts.
The work load to complete it is quite onerous, especially for an all-volunteer organization.
This is difficult with an all-volunteer board.
With no paid staff it is impossible for our organization to do the paperwork that is required for accreditation.
This will take a large commitment of staff and board time
Accreditation is too time-consuming.

Expense (7 comments)

The accreditation process, which is extremely difficult to take on, even for a well-funded funded trust, is now well beyond our means.
In the future when we have enough funding to hire staff, it is something that we will consider.
Accreditation is expensive
Accreditation and re-accreditation was a very difficult and costly undertaking for us as a small land trust. We had to divert attention and time from land conservation work to achieve accreditation and renewal.
Quite honestly, I'm sure that our community would regard it as a total misappropriation of the funds they have contributed.
I do not think that accreditation is affordable for the smaller organizations
It's too expensive

Concerns About Value (11 comments)

It has not led to tangible benefits from increased fundraising or other opportunities as of yet.
We are getting ready for re-accreditation and have SERIOUSLY considered whether or not to renew.
In the 5 years since we received accreditation, we have not personally experienced many of the "benefits" of accreditation which were originally touted.
Accreditation was a process that was healthy for the organization in terms of getting itself into policy and procedure shape.
We are still considering the overall value of the time and money it takes to be accredited
Question the cost/benefits vs simply adherence to standards and practices
I am not sure our organization has seen any financial benefit from it
Concerned that the effort would burn out current good energy.
The Board much prefers to spend its resources on mission related work and does not see the value of accreditation.
With current levels of staffing and other competing demands, accreditation is not viewed as a priority.
Our organization is a bit of a unique land trust with a limited scope of activities, so accreditation is not seen as critical.

Planning to Reapply (5 comments)

We are eager to renew.
reaccreditation in process
Currently going through re-accreditation.
We are preparing for renewal of accreditation later this year.
We are concerned and working toward the 2020 re-accreditation.

Working On It (5 comments)

We have passed many procedures and are working on our records management.
We are on a slow track to accreditation.
We have hired a new employee to lead us through this process.
We are working to be ready.
We have adopted the LTA Standards and Practices and joined LTA to begin our preparation. We are also taking the time to review policies, organize files, write management plans, mark boundaries, etc. When we get reasonably close to done, we will get into the queue for accreditation.

Renewal Costs (4 comments)

Specifically speaking to renewal of Accreditation, this is an expensive way to confirm that we already have in place best practices.
5-year renewals are not reasonable. It is an expensive and time-consuming process and the renewal period should be at least 8 or 10 years.
The reaccreditation process was less onerous but was a great deal of work with less tangible benefit.

Re-accreditation every 10 years instead of every five would be adequate, and would save countless hours of valuable staff time!

Specific Concerns About Accreditation (3 comments)

- I was told in the beginning that it was a voluntary process and would not be used against organizations who did not go for accreditation but since it has been out for a while, I have noticed more grant opportunities limiting themselves to only accredited organizations. I appreciate the standards that land trusts should aspire to but do not appreciate the shift in attitude that the good organizations are the ones which are accredited. This would be a significant issue if we were trying to raise funds from organizations that require accreditation, but our funding generally comes from governmental grants and we have long-standing relationships with the granting authorities.
- I am concerned that strict compliance with the guidelines may force land trusts to leave properties with imperfect titles or imperfectly defined boundaries without land trust protection even when the habitat is important for wildlife or when they should be protected to allow for climate change.
- Concerned that accreditation would stifle or inflate costs of current pragmatic nimbleness on small acquisition projects.

Redundant (2 comments)

- Our organization has accepted the Standards and Practices as its operations standard. It reviews the standards annually and incorporates implementation / improvements into annual work plans.
- We are committed to the standards as a framework for gradual improvement, at a level doable by a small board.

Miscellaneous (3 comments)

- Our organization is evaluating LTA accreditation, and considering future application.
- We were also re-accredited last year.
- We are accredited in the US and have recently done second round of accreditation.

Q69 - Please note any topics of interest or issues that may be important for Maine’s land conservation community to learn more about or address.

Messaging (8 comments)

Need for Inclusive Messaging (6 comments)

- Diversity and cultural competence - How will we be relevant to Maine's growing communities of immigrants?
- how do we communicate better with the old timahs - the hunters and snowmobilers and foresters with whom we share so many of the same goals, but we have trouble trusting each other and believing we are all on the same side?
- Lack of representation in the professional conservation community in Maine from native Mainers.
- We see a turnover in the population so that fewer and fewer people know about the town they are moving in to. Will their level of support be the same as those who had lived on the land for generation?
- We are trying to learn how we can make ourselves more relevant to the communities we serve in Maine. For us, this entails reaching our seasonal and permanent residents in new ways and helping all who live here appreciate and enjoy nature by getting them to experience the out of doors in new ways. It is a learning process for us and we hope we can share with others what we learn as we also hope to learn from others.
- Expansion of community engagement programming in a strategic and effective way.

Education (2 comments)

- Education Programs
- More information on the involvement of land trusts in and use of nature-based education practices.

Financial Concerns (7 comments)

Overcoming Financial Constraints (4 comments)

- Long-term financial sustainability in the absence of merger.
- It is extremely difficult to be a functioning trust without staffing. We are working towards that goal, but raising funds to support employees remains elusive.
- Fundraising: for operations & stewardship.
- Long-term funding for stewardship.

Increasing Costs (3 comments)

- We see rapidly increasing prices (although we’ve said that most years) and properties going on the market at a far faster place. Many of the lands that are on our wish list are currently in play.
- A more trails are established and used maintenance costs are going to increase. Chips on trails need to be replaced with gravel which means wider trails to accommodate small tractors and trailers to move the grave.
- An interest for our land trust and many other land trusts is health insurance. The high cost of health insurance is prohibitive to land trusts (many with small staffs) in regards to attracting and retaining highly qualified staff. Additional help from MLTN or LTA would be an important focus in the coming years, as costs continue to rise.
The Next Generation (6 comments)
- We are challenged that children don't spend as much time in nature as they once did. Who will be the leaders and supporters of the organization in the future?
- Change in culture in terms of how families spend their free time
- Cultivating the next generation of conservationists
- Aging population is a concern
- Land trusts do a great job of connecting people with nature and especially youth with nature
- Aging volunteer and decrease in rate of volunteerism in Maine and nationally

Collaboration (6 comments)
- How to be more collaborative and efficient, particularly for small capacity-strapped land trusts in Maine.
- Being a good neighbor - why it's bad to invade your neighboring land trusts service area...
- We're all on the same team - things you can do to support your neighboring land trusts, and build support yourself.
- The Land Trust community has the opportunity to build broad base support for trails and trail access. We should be strategic across the state taking into account landscape, users, etc.
- Can there be a statewide communications effort for Maine land trusts?
- Stronger partnerships with Municipalities and community members particularly in rural Maine.

Climate Change (3 comments)
- Focus on climate resiliency and climate change adaptation and consideration in conservation going forward
- Specific, direct effects of climate change on our coastal and upland natural communities
- We are concerned about the effects of rising tides and stronger storm surges and need to find practical ways to address all such issues.

Indigenous Communities (2 comments)
- Lack of representation in the professional conservation community in Maine from tribal groups.
- Increased focus on sharing access to conservation lands and waters managed by Maine's land trust community with Maine's Indigenous people

Merging Organizations (2 comments)
- How to merge
- Merger with other land trusts - best practices, etc.

Liability Concerns (2 comments)
- Liability and volunteers, liability and outings, rentals and liability
- Liability of recreational use of our trails, especially mountain biking on difficult trails.

Water-Specific Issues (2 comments)
- Freshwater conservation and aquatic connectivity projects - expand to be in the realm of land trust work
- Altered river flows from hydro, in particular big hydro, is another huge issue, well studied in the past but pretty much ignored now as it adversely affects nutrient flow, marine and freshwater fisheries and climate change. Hydro is anything but green. Despite common misperception and Central Maine Power's sales pitch. Good quick summary article in Winter 2019 issue of FOMB newsletter at www.fomb.org

Best Practices (2 comments)
- The longer I'm here the more I'm missing actual technical training sessions or current professional issues such as acquisition current practice, funder current thinking, etc.
- best practices for resolving infringements.

Miscellaneous (14 comments)
- Our organization is interested in working with MLTN and/or LTA in facilitating a much more streamlined process(es) for state and federal permitting, and possibly creating a valuable template (or method) for local land management groups that makes permitting easier on non-profit organizations.
- We are concerned in some cases that there is less concern about public rights to property and a greater emphasis on private property.
- Invasive exotic mapping and control
- Ticks!
- Restoration projects - funding available through MNRCP and other sources
• Mission Based Investing.- we should be investing in companies that support our mission. Could we have a forum/workshop with experts?
• Land Conservation Task Force's vision for more conserved places near population centers: what this will look like in terms of public access, managing for multi-use, and co-existing with in-fill development and increased density in villages and towns.
• Benefits of logging and ways that land trust can manage their working forest lands to benefit wildlife and people.
• Management of intensive and damaging recreation - bikes, ATVs, horses...
• I was surprised to hear that no land trusts (that I could find) have experimented with using goats, sheep, or other livestock specifically for grassland management or invasive species control. We are exploring that as an option for 2020.
• Leadership succession planning
• The issue of increasing radiofrequency radiation [RFR] from wireless proliferation. In 50 years of environmental work I consider this the most important toxics issue of our time. MLTN members should study up, starting with an excellent website of the Environmental Health Trust, www.ehtrust.org. We have issues of "insect apocalypse' and high rate of species extinction. RFR proliferation is playing a major role in these as well as influencing climate change.
• While the LMF bond is crucial to the land trust community, the importance to public access to these lands is not addressed for the creation of trails, stewardship, maintenance, etc.
• overnight and daily rentals of facilities (yurts, cabins, barns) and tax exemption
For more information, contact Warren Whitney or Donna Bissett:
Maine Coast Heritage Trust, 1 Bowdoin Mill Island, Suite 201
Topsham, ME 04548. (207) 729-7366
wwhitney@mcht.org / dbissett@mcht.org
Maine Land Trusts
This map depicts the service areas of Maine's 85 non-profit land conservation organizations.

For more information, visit the Maine Land Trust Network website:

www.mlttn.org