Appendix F. Polling Response Statistics by Participant Affiliation

Supplemental Cross-tabulations: Frequencies and Means & Medians

(Note: Total percentages and means vary slightly from group rankings and chart totals due to missing affiliation data)

Characteristic?		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
What has been your role in the RCN program?	Applicant	5%	3%	33%	8%
	Administrative	23%	19%	8%	18%
	State Review Team	0%	35%	8%	20%
	Tech Review Team	5%	27%	0%	15%
	Not involved	68%	16%	50%	38%
	Total	22	37	12	71
What has been your role in the LCC program?	Steering Committee	9%	26%	27%	21%
	Technical Committee	41%	13%	18%	23%
	Project Participant	9%	0%	9%	4%
	Not Involved	41%	61%	45%	52%
	Total	22	38	11	71
I spend the largest proportion of my time on this regional initiative:	LCC	50%	3%	18%	20%
	RCN	9%	26%	18%	20%
	JV	5%	11%	9%	8%
	FHP	14%	3%	9%	7%
	SWG	0%	50%	9%	28%
	Other	23%	8%	36%	17%
	Total	22	38	11	71
On average, about what percentage of your duty time do you typically spend on regional conservation responsibilities?	None	9%	8%	0%	7%
	1%-25%	41%	73%	17%	54%
	26%-50%	9%	16%	17%	14%
	51%-75%	9%	3%	8%	6%
	76%-100%	32%	0%	58%	20%
	Total	22	37	12	71
I attended Albany 1	Yes	9%	32%	9%	21%
	No	86%	61%	82%	72%
	What's Albany 1?	0%	3%	9%	3%
	Don't remember	5%	5%	0%	4%
	Total	22	38	11	71
My position in regional conservation is:	Director	9%	11%	9%	10%
	Administrator	23%	16%	9%	17%
	Program Manager	5%	41%	18%	26%
	Biologist	27%	30%	36%	30%
	Other	36%	3%	27%	17%
	Total	22	37	11	70
Do you agree that a common framework is needed for regional conservation?	Very strongly	55%	32%	45%	41%
	Strongly	36%	43%	45%	41%
	Somewhat	5%	19%	9%	13%
	Slightly	5%	5%	0%	4%
	Total	22	37	11	70
Does the general set of elements describing a conservation framework make sense to you?	Yes	21%	3%	45%	15%
	Fairly well	58%	75%	45%	65%
	Needs work	21%	19%	9%	18%
	Reworked	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Total	19	36	11	66
Based on your experience with conservation planning, decision-making, and delivery, are there any key elements or concepts missing from this framework?	All there	14%	3%	56%	13%
	Most there	57%	62%	11%	54%
	Some missing	19%	32%	22%	27%
	Not sure	10%	3%	11%	6%
	Total	21	37	9	67

Mapping Project Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Priority Habitat Mapping a) Accuracy (QA/QC)	Strongly disagree	0%	6%	22%	7%
	Disagree	16%	16%	0%	13%
	Neutral	21%	34%	11%	27%
	Agree	53%	28%	44%	38%
	Strongly agree	11%	16%	22%	15%
	Total	19	32	9	60
Priority Habitat Mapping b) Model validation	Strongly disagree	5%	3%	11%	5%
	Disagree	20%	30%	0%	23%
	Neutral	15%	21%	44%	23%
	Agree	55%	30%	33%	39%
	Strongly agree	5%	15%	11%	11%
	Total	20	33	9	62
Priority Habitat Mapping c) Linkages to other databases	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	5%	24%	0%	15%
	Neutral	16%	33%	44%	30%
	Agree	47%	30%	44%	38%
	Strongly agree	32%	12%	11%	18%
	Total	19	33	9	61
Priority Habitat Mapping d) Finish mapping all systems (Canada, lakes)	Strongly disagree	5%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	15%	12%	11%	13%
	Neutral	10%	24%	11%	18%
	Agree	40%	39%	0%	34%
	Strongly agree	30%	24%	78%	34%
	Total	20	33	9	62
Priority Habitat Mapping e) Usable product (expectations, limits)	Strongly disagree	5%	3%	0%	3%
	Disagree	15%	18%	11%	16%
	Neutral	10%	18%	33%	18%
	Agree	25%	36%	33%	32%
	Strongly agree	45%	24%	22%	31%
	Total	20	33	9	62
Priority Habitat Mapping f) Define audiences (JV, FHP, academia)	Strongly disagree	11%	12%	0%	10%
	Disagree	21%	39%	20%	31%
	Neutral	32%	24%	60%	32%
	Agree	26%	24%	20%	24%
	Strongly agree	11%	0%	0%	3%
	Total	19	33	10	62
Priority Habitat Mapping g) Communications, tool kits, user guides	Strongly disagree	5%	3%	0%	3%
	Disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Neutral	10%	9%	11%	10%
	Agree	20%	30%	56%	31%
	Strongly agree	65%	55%	33%	55%
	Total	20	33	9	62
Priority Habitat Mapping h) Priority focus areas using map output	Strongly disagree	5%	6%	0%	5%
	Disagree	20%	21%	0%	18%
	Neutral	15%	15%	44%	19%
	Agree	15%	33%	22%	26%
	Strongly agree	45%	24%	33%	32%
	Total	20	33	9	62
Priority Habitat Mapping i) Add layers (land use, threats, refugia, exotics)	Disagree	15%	3%	0%	6%
	Neutral	10%	24%	10%	17%
	Agree	30%	21%	40%	27%
	Strongly agree	45%	52%	50%	49%
	Total	20	33	10	63

Priority from higher to lower	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Priority Habitat Mapping g) Communications, tool kits, user guides	4.400	5	20	4.303	5	33	4.222	4	9	4.323	5	62
Priority Habitat Mapping i) Add layers (land use, threats, refugia, exotics)	4.050	4	20	4.212	5	33	4.400	5	10	4.190	4	63
Priority Habitat Mapping d) Finish mapping all systems (Canada, lakes)	3.750	4	20	3.758	4	33	4.444	5	9	3.855	4	62
Priority Habitat Mapping e) Usable product (expectations, limits)	3.900	4	20	3.606	4	33	3.667	4	9	3.710	4	62
Priority Habitat Mapping h) Priority focus areas using map output	3.750	4	20	3.485	4	33	3.889	4	9	3.629	4	62
Priority Habitat Mapping c) Linkages to other databases	4.053	4	19	3.303	3	33	3.667	4	9	3.590	4	61
Priority Habitat Mapping a) Accuracy (QA/QC)	3.579	4	19	3.312	3	32	3.444	4	9	3.417	4	60
Priority Habitat Mapping b) Model validation	3.350	4	20	3.242	3	33	3.333	3	9	3.290	4	62
Priority Habitat Mapping f) Define audiences (JV, FHP, academia)	3.053	3	19	2.606	2	33	3.000	3	10	2.806	3	62

a. Priorities from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total.

Question:		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Do you agree on the need to set population targets/conservation goals?	Very strongly	63%	44%	56%	52%
	Strongly	21%	44%	44%	38%
	Somewhat	11%	8%	0%	8%
	Slightly	5%	0%	0%	2%
	Not at all	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Total	19	36	9	64

Biological Assessment Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Biological Assessment Priorities 1. Deliver the results (synthesis) of the projects (products)	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Neutral	11%	8%	11%	9%
	Agree	56%	43%	44%	47%
	Strongly agree	33%	46%	44%	42%
	Total	18	37	9	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 2. Development of habitat focus areas and corridors.	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	11%	11%	13%	11%
	Neutral	32%	16%	13%	20%
	Agree	26%	43%	50%	39%
	Strongly agree	32%	30%	25%	30%
	Total	19	37	8	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 3. Create distribution maps	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Neutral	32%	19%	13%	22%
	Agree	42%	43%	50%	44%
	Strongly agree	26%	32%	38%	31%
	Total	19	37	8	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 4. Conduct Structured Decision Making Workshop	Strongly disagree	0%	8%	0%	5%
	Disagree	21%	25%	22%	23%
	Neutral	58%	42%	33%	45%
	Agree	11%	22%	33%	20%
	Strongly agree	11%	3%	11%	6%
	Total	19	36	9	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 5. Identify focal areas that represent the best examples	Strongly disagree	11%	0%	0%	3%
	Disagree	11%	14%	22%	14%
	Neutral	42%	31%	33%	34%
	Agree	16%	25%	33%	23%
	Strongly agree	21%	31%	11%	25%
	Total	19	36	9	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 6. Expand surveys for regionally important species	Strongly disagree	5%	3%	11%	5%
	Disagree	11%	11%	0%	9%
	Neutral	42%	24%	33%	31%
	Agree	26%	38%	44%	35%
	Strongly agree	16%	24%	11%	20%
	Total	19	37	9	65

Biological Assessment Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Biological Assessment Priorities 7. Capacity of species to adapt	Strongly disagree	0%	6%	22%	6%
	Disagree	11%	9%	44%	15%
	Neutral	44%	37%	11%	35%
	Agree	33%	43%	11%	35%
	Strongly agree	11%	6%	11%	8%
	Total	18	35	9	62
Biological Assessment Priorities 8. Cross-cutting understanding of aquatic habitat changes	Strongly disagree	5%	5%	14%	6%
	Disagree	5%	5%	14%	6%
	Neutral	21%	43%	29%	35%
	Agree	26%	27%	43%	29%
	Strongly agree	42%	19%	0%	24%
	Total	19	37	7	63
Biological Assessment Priorities 9. Assessment of the completeness/representativeness	Strongly disagree	5%	3%	0%	3%
	Disagree	5%	6%	11%	6%
	Neutral	21%	25%	33%	25%
	Agree	37%	36%	22%	34%
	Strongly agree	32%	31%	33%	31%
	Total	19	36	9	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 10. More complete vulnerability/threat analysis	Strongly disagree	16%	0%	0%	5%
	Disagree	32%	25%	22%	27%
	Neutral	47%	39%	33%	41%
	Agree	0%	19%	44%	17%
	Strongly agree	5%	17%	0%	11%
	Total	19	36	9	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 11. Develop a process to develop regional representative species goals	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	16%	11%	0%	11%
	Neutral	16%	16%	13%	16%
	Agree	16%	35%	63%	33%
	Strongly agree	53%	38%	25%	41%
	Total	19	37	8	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 12. Marine, aquatic, plants data gaps and representative species	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	6%	11%	11%	9%
	Neutral	11%	35%	44%	30%
	Agree	56%	30%	11%	34%
	Strongly agree	28%	24%	33%	27%
	Total	18	37	9	64

Biological Assessment Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Biological Assessment Priorities 13. Development and evaluating models to identify adequate streamflow	Strongly disagree	5%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	5%	8%	0%	6%
	Neutral	21%	42%	56%	38%
	Agree	47%	19%	22%	28%
	Strongly agree	21%	31%	22%	27%
	Total	19	36	9	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 14. Immediate needs for emerging impacts	Strongly disagree	16%	0%	0%	5%
	Disagree	11%	14%	0%	11%
	Neutral	11%	11%	25%	13%
	Agree	47%	41%	63%	45%
	Strongly agree	16%	35%	13%	27%
	Total	19	37	8	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 15. In the new SWAPs recommend adopting a consistent format/template	Strongly disagree	0%	5%	0%	3%
	Disagree	5%	11%	0%	8%
	Neutral	16%	24%	13%	20%
	Agree	32%	32%	38%	33%
	Strongly agree	47%	27%	50%	36%
	Total	19	37	8	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 16. Consensus on a pilot process to develop regional population goals	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	11%	8%	13%	9%
	Neutral	32%	38%	13%	33%
	Agree	32%	30%	63%	34%
	Strongly agree	26%	24%	13%	23%
	Total	19	37	8	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 17. An SGCN analyses for preparing WAP revisions	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	5%	16%	0%	11%
	Neutral	5%	30%	33%	23%
	Agree	63%	24%	11%	34%
	Strongly agree	26%	30%	56%	32%
	Total	19	37	9	65
Biological Assessment Priorities 18. A pilot(s) goal setting exercise for either species of suites of species and habitats	Strongly disagree	5%	5%	0%	5%
	Disagree	16%	16%	13%	16%
	Neutral	16%	35%	38%	30%
	Agree	37%	24%	13%	27%
	Strongly agree	26%	19%	38%	23%
	Total	19	37	8	64

Priority from higher to lower	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Biological Assessment Priorities 1. Deliver the results (synthesis) of the projects (products)	4.222	4.000	18	4.297	4.000	37	4.333	4.000	9	4.281	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 11. Develop a process to develop regional representative species goals	4.053	5.000	19	4.000	4.000	37	4.125	4.000	8	4.031	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 3. Create distribution maps	3.947	4.000	19	4.000	4.000	37	4.250	4.000	8	4.016	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 15. In the new SWAPs recommend adopting a consistent format/template	4.211	4.000	19	3.649	4.000	37	4.375	4.500	8	3.906	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 17. An SGCN analyses for preparing WAP revisions	4.105	4.000	19	3.676	4.000	37	4.222	5.000	9	3.877	4.000	65
Biological Assessment Priorities 2. Development of habitat focus areas and corridors.	3.789	4.000	19	3.919	4.000	37	3.875	4.000	8	3.875	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 9. Assessment of the completeness/representativeness	3.842	4.000	19	3.861	4.000	36	3.778	4.000	9	3.844	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 12. Marine, aquatic, plants data gaps and representative species	4.056	4.000	18	3.676	4.000	37	3.667	3.000	9	3.781	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 14. Immediate needs for emerging impacts	3.368	4.000	19	3.973	4.000	37	3.875	4.000	8	3.781	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 13. Development and evaluating models to identify adequate streamflow	3.737	4.000	19	3.722	3.500	36	3.667	3.000	9	3.719	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 16. Consensus on a pilot process to develop regional population goals	3.737	4.000	19	3.703	4.000	37	3.750	4.000	8	3.719	4.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 8. Cross-cutting understanding of aquatic habitat changes	3.947	4.000	19	3.486	3.000	37	3.000	3.000	7	3.571	4.000	63
Biological Assessment Priorities 6. Expand surveys for regionally important species	3.368	3.000	19	3.703	4.000	37	3.444	4.000	9	3.569	4.000	65
Biological Assessment Priorities 5. Identify focal areas that represent the best examples	3.263	3.000	19	3.722	4.000	36	3.333	3.000	9	3.531	3.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 18. A pilot(s) goal setting exercise for either species of suites of species and habitats	3.632	4.000	19	3.351	3.000	37	3.750	3.500	8	3.484	3.500	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 7. Capacity of species to adapt	3.444	3.000	18	3.343	3.000	35	2.444	2.000	9	3.242	3.000	62
Biological Assessment Priorities 10. More complete vulnerability/threat analysis	2.474	3.000	19	3.278	3.000	36	3.222	3.000	9	3.031	3.000	64
Biological Assessment Priorities 4. Conduct Structured Decision Making Workshop	3.105	3.000	19	2.861	3.000	36	3.333	3.000	9	3.000	3.000	64

a. Priorities from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total.

Note: Order of priorities listed above differs slightly from actual group ranking order due to missing affiliation data. See Appendix E for actual ranking based on group voting.

Conservation Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Conservation Priorities 1. Influence other agencies to better incentivize conservation on a local level	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	6%	16%	14%	13%
	Neutral	19%	24%	29%	23%
	Agree	56%	46%	43%	48%
	Strongly agree	13%	14%	14%	13%
	Total	16	37	7	60
Conservation Priorities 2. Manage for species of economic concern or constituent importance and SGCN	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	12%	14%	17%	13%
	Neutral	47%	41%	50%	43%
	Agree	24%	38%	17%	32%
	Strongly agree	18%	5%	17%	10%
	Total	17	37	6	60
Conservation Priorities 3. Identification of habitat focus areas with (Regional to local) process	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	6%	3%	0%	3%
	Neutral	18%	25%	29%	23%
	Agree	41%	33%	43%	37%
	Strongly agree	35%	39%	29%	37%
	Total	17	36	7	60
Conservation Priorities 4. Expand streamflow predictive model from CT river basin to the Region	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	12%	14%	29%	15%
	Neutral	41%	33%	43%	37%
	Agree	29%	22%	0%	22%
	Strongly agree	18%	28%	29%	25%
	Total	17	36	7	60
Conservation Priorities 5. An information delivery mechanism should be a requirement	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	14%	3%
	Disagree	6%	19%	0%	13%
	Neutral	12%	11%	14%	12%
	Agree	41%	28%	29%	32%
	Strongly agree	35%	42%	43%	40%
	Total	17	36	7	60
Conservation Priorities 6. Take existing RCN products and fund a communication specialist	Strongly disagree	6%	11%	0%	8%
	Disagree	6%	5%	0%	5%
	Neutral	25%	14%	14%	17%
	Agree	38%	30%	0%	28%
	Strongly agree	25%	41%	86%	42%
	Total	16	37	7	60

Conservation Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Conservation Priorities 7. Next generation of habitat connectivity work defines ecological purpose	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	13%	19%	29%	18%
	Neutral	31%	27%	71%	33%
	Agree	25%	43%	0%	33%
	Strongly agree	31%	8%	0%	13%
	Total	16	37	7	60
Conservation Priorities 8. Work with implementers/users, translate the information into usable tools	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	6%	3%	0%	3%
	Neutral	6%	8%	0%	7%
	Agree	53%	46%	33%	47%
	Strongly agree	35%	43%	67%	43%
	Total	17	37	6	60
Conservation Priorities 9. Target science translation (outreach) efforts to areas/species	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	12%	6%	14%	8%
	Neutral	18%	28%	14%	23%
	Agree	35%	44%	29%	40%
	Strongly agree	29%	22%	43%	27%
	Total	17	36	7	60
Conservation Priorities 10. Develop suite of regionally standard Best Management Practices for invasives	Strongly disagree	13%	8%	0%	8%
	Disagree	20%	14%	25%	17%
	Neutral	27%	24%	25%	25%
	Agree	27%	35%	13%	30%
	Strongly agree	13%	19%	38%	20%
	Total	15	37	8	60
Conservation Priorities 11. Illustrate how conservation design tool can lead to adaptive management	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	6%	9%	13%	8%
	Neutral	22%	23%	50%	26%
	Agree	39%	43%	25%	39%
	Strongly agree	33%	23%	13%	25%
	Total	18	35	8	61
Conservation Priorities 12. Provide cookbook or catalog of on-the-ground implementation details	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	11%	11%	14%	11%
	Neutral	11%	22%	29%	19%
	Agree	50%	30%	29%	35%
	Strongly agree	28%	38%	29%	34%
	Total	18	37	7	62

Conservation Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Conservation Priorities 13. Overlay and integrate existing datasets to delineate landscapes	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	6%	14%	25%	13%
	Neutral	28%	19%	13%	21%
	Agree	28%	39%	13%	32%
	Strongly agree	33%	28%	50%	32%
	Total	18	36	8	62
Conservation Priorities 14. Provide information on landscapes of regional significance to conservation partners	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Neutral	24%	11%	0%	13%
	Agree	35%	62%	14%	49%
	Strongly agree	35%	27%	86%	36%
	Total	17	37	7	61
Conservation Priorities 15. A framework for building and aligning conservation capacity	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	8%	13%	6%
	Neutral	22%	33%	0%	26%
	Agree	44%	36%	63%	42%
	Strongly agree	28%	22%	25%	24%
	Total	18	36	8	62
Conservation Priorities 16. Engage society and major stakeholders	Strongly disagree	0%	5%	14%	5%
	Disagree	6%	14%	0%	10%
	Neutral	24%	30%	29%	28%
	Agree	18%	32%	29%	28%
	Strongly agree	53%	19%	29%	30%
	Total	17	37	7	61
Conservation Priorities 17. Develop comprehensive toolbox	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	13%	2%
	Disagree	0%	8%	13%	7%
	Neutral	29%	28%	13%	26%
	Agree	35%	42%	50%	41%
	Strongly agree	35%	22%	13%	25%
	Total	17	36	8	61
Conservation Priorities 18. Develop conservation designs for multiple representive species	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Neutral	24%	32%	50%	32%
	Agree	29%	43%	38%	39%
	Strongly agree	47%	22%	13%	27%
	Total	17	37	8	62

Priority from higher to lower	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Conservation Priorities 8. Work with implementers/users, translate the information into usable tools	4.176	4.000	17	4.297	4.000	37	4.667	5.000	6	4.300	4.000	60
Conservation Priorities 14. Provide information on landscapes of regional significance to conservation partners	3.941	4.000	17	4.162	4.000	37	4.857	5.000	7	4.180	4.000	61
Conservation Priorities 3. Identification of habitat focus areas with (Regional to local) process	4.059	4.000	17	4.083	4.000	36	4.000	4.000	7	4.067	4.000	60
Conservation Priorities 12. Provide cookbook or catalog of on-the-ground implementation details	3.944	4.000	18	3.946	4.000	37	3.714	4.000	7	3.919	4.000	62
Conservation Priorities 18. Develop conservation designs for multiple representive species	4.235	4.000	17	3.838	4.000	37	3.625	3.500	8	3.919	4.000	62
Conservation Priorities 5. An information delivery mechanism should be a requirement	3.941	4.000	17	3.917	4.000	36	3.857	4.000	7	3.917	4.000	60
Conservation Priorities 6. Take existing RCN products and fund a communication specialist	3.688	4.000	16	3.838	4.000	37	4.714	5.000	7	3.900	4.000	60
Conservation Priorities 9. Target science translation (outreach) efforts to areas/species	3.706	4.000	17	3.833	4.000	36	4.000	4.000	7	3.817	4.000	60
Conservation Priorities 13. Overlay and integrate existing datasets to delineate landscapes	3.778	4.000	18	3.806	4.000	36	3.875	4.500	8	3.806	4.000	62
Conservation Priorities 15. A framework for building and aligning conservation capacity	3.889	4.000	18	3.722	4.000	36	4.000	4.000	8	3.806	4.000	62
Conservation Priorities 17. Develop comprehensive toolbox	4.059	4.000	17	3.778	4.000	36	3.375	4.000	8	3.803	4.000	61
Conservation Priorities 11. Illustrate how conservation design tool can lead to adaptive management	4.000	4.000	18	3.743	4.000	35	3.375	3.000	8	3.770	4.000	61
Conservation Priorities 16. Engage society and major stakeholders	4.176	5.000	17	3.459	4.000	37	3.571	4.000	7	3.672	4.000	61
Conservation Priorities 1. Influence other agencies to better incentivize conservation on a local level	3.625	4.000	16	3.568	4.000	37	3.571	4.000	7	3.583	4.000	60
Conservation Priorities 4. Expand streamflow predictive model from CT river basin to the Region	3.529	3.000	17	3.583	3.500	36	3.286	3.000	7	3.533	3.000	60
Conservation Priorities 7. Next generation of habitat connectivity work defines ecological purpose	3.750	4.000	16	3.351	4.000	37	2.714	3.000	7	3.383	3.000	60
Conservation Priorities 10. Develop suite of regionally standard Best Management Practices for invasives	3.067	3.000	15	3.432	4.000	37	3.625	3.500	8	3.367	3.500	60
Conservation Priorities 2. Manage for species of economic concern or constituent importance and SGCN	3.471	3.000	17	3.297	3.000	37	3.333	3.000	6	3.350	3.000	60

a. Priorities from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total.

Note: Order of priorities listed above differs slightly from actual group ranking order due to missing affiliation data. See Appendix E for actual ranking based on group voting.

Question		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Your primary discipline relative to regional conservation is:	Wildlife	13%	53%	50%	42%
	Fisheries	20%	26%	13%	23%
	Marine	20%	0%	0%	5%
	Watqual/hydrol	13%	0%	0%	4%
	LandEcol	20%	6%	25%	12%
	HumDimen	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Forester	0%	3%	13%	4%
	Other	13%	12%	0%	11%
	Total	15	34	8	57

Monitoring Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Monitoring Priorities 1. Implement the NE Monitoring and Performance Framework	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	6%	0%	4%
	Neutral	27%	24%	25%	25%
	Agree	47%	32%	50%	39%
	Strongly agree	27%	35%	25%	32%
	Total	15	34	8	57
Monitoring Priorities 2. Monitoring protocol for wetland and terrestrial habitat quality	Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	33%	12%	14%	18%
	Neutral	20%	26%	29%	25%
	Agree	27%	47%	43%	41%
	Strongly agree	13%	15%	14%	14%
	Total	15	34	7	56
Monitoring Priorities 3. Monitoring system to inform management at multiple scales	Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	9%	25%	9%
	Neutral	13%	29%	38%	26%
	Agree	53%	41%	25%	42%
	Strongly agree	27%	21%	13%	21%
	Total	15	34	8	57
Monitoring Priorities 4. Establish relationship(s) between representative species & target species	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	13%	3%	25%	9%
	Neutral	27%	32%	25%	30%
	Agree	27%	35%	50%	35%
	Strongly agree	33%	29%	0%	26%
	Total	15	34	8	57
Monitoring Priorities 5. Reporting on success of SWG grant-funded work	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	7%	0%	0%	2%
	Neutral	21%	9%	13%	13%
	Agree	43%	24%	50%	32%
	Strongly agree	29%	68%	38%	54%
	Total	14	34	8	56
Monitoring Priorities 6. Long term monitoring and performance evaluation	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	7%	6%	0%	5%
	Neutral	20%	15%	38%	19%
	Agree	27%	26%	25%	26%
	Strongly agree	47%	50%	38%	47%
	Total	15	34	8	57

Monitoring Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Monitoring Priorities 7. Metrics to assess effectiveness of technical assistance	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	13%	6%	13%	9%
	Neutral	40%	33%	38%	36%
	Agree	27%	42%	38%	38%
	Strongly agree	20%	18%	13%	18%
	Total	15	33	8	56
Monitoring Priorities 8. Link species numbers to habitat acreage (or integrity)	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	19%	21%	25%	21%
	Neutral	19%	42%	25%	33%
	Agree	31%	33%	50%	35%
	Strongly agree	31%	3%	0%	11%
	Total	16	33	8	57
Monitoring Priorities 9. Develop a shared regional database	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	19%	6%	14%	11%
	Neutral	19%	29%	14%	25%
	Agree	44%	35%	43%	39%
	Strongly agree	19%	26%	29%	25%
	Total	16	34	7	57
Monitoring Priorities 10. Conduct analysis of expected outcomes of specific management actions	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	12%	38%	12%
	Neutral	13%	45%	13%	32%
	Agree	69%	30%	38%	42%
	Strongly agree	13%	12%	13%	12%
	Total	16	33	8	57
Monitoring Priorities 11. Establish Uniform Monitoring Practices that can be applied across large areas	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	6%	9%	13%	9%
	Neutral	13%	15%	13%	14%
	Agree	44%	32%	25%	34%
	Strongly agree	38%	44%	50%	43%
	Total	16	34	8	58
Monitoring Priorities 12. Develop a decision matrix to determine when to monitor	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	31%	15%	25%	21%
	Neutral	56%	29%	38%	38%
	Agree	6%	38%	25%	28%
	Strongly agree	6%	18%	13%	14%
	Total	16	34	8	58

Monitoring Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Monitoring Priorities 13. Identify and leverage existing federal monitoring programs	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	13%	6%	0%	7%
	Neutral	0%	26%	14%	17%
	Agree	38%	40%	43%	40%
	Strongly agree	50%	29%	43%	36%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Monitoring Priorities 14. Identify surrogates (e.g., habitats, species groups) to monitor challenging priority species	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	19%	6%	13%	10%
	Neutral	6%	26%	38%	22%
	Agree	50%	56%	25%	50%
	Strongly agree	25%	12%	25%	17%
	Total	16	34	8	58
Monitoring Priorities 15. Monitoring response of target spp or habitat changes that occur as a result of NRCS (Farm Bill)	Strongly disagree	7%	9%	25%	10%
	Disagree	0%	11%	25%	10%
	Neutral	47%	29%	25%	33%
	Agree	40%	40%	13%	36%
	Strongly agree	7%	11%	13%	10%
	Total	15	35	8	58
Monitoring Priorities 16. Inventory of monitoring efforts - all organizations, including citizen science	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	13%	2%
	Disagree	20%	20%	25%	21%
	Neutral	27%	29%	13%	26%
	Agree	33%	40%	38%	38%
	Strongly agree	20%	11%	13%	14%
	Total	15	35	8	58
Monitoring Priorities 17. Specific performance criteria and reporting must be a required part of all RCN projects	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	6%	6%	25%	8%
	Neutral	13%	23%	13%	19%
	Agree	50%	40%	38%	42%
	Strongly agree	31%	31%	25%	31%
	Total	16	35	8	59
Monitoring Priorities 18. Ensure accurate monitoring of representative species	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	13%	2%
	Disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Neutral	13%	24%	13%	19%
	Agree	38%	48%	50%	46%
	Strongly agree	50%	24%	25%	32%
	Total	16	33	8	57

Priority from higher to lower	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Monitoring Priorities 5. Reporting on success of SWG grant-funded work	3.929	4.000	14	4.588	5.000	34	4.250	4.000	8	4.375	5.000	56
Monitoring Priorities 6. Long term monitoring and performance evaluation	4.133	4.000	15	4.147	4.500	34	4.000	4.000	8	4.123	4.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 11. Establish Uniform Monitoring Practices that can be applied across large areas	4.125	4.000	16	4.118	4.000	34	4.125	4.500	8	4.121	4.000	58
Monitoring Priorities 13. Identify and leverage existing federal monitoring programs	4.250	4.500	16	3.914	4.000	35	4.286	4.000	7	4.052	4.000	58
Monitoring Priorities 17. Specific performance criteria and reporting must be a required part of all RCN projects	4.063	4.000	16	3.971	4.000	35	3.625	4.000	8	3.949	4.000	59
Monitoring Priorities 1. Implement the NE Monitoring and Performance Framework	4.000	4.000	15	3.912	4.000	34	4.000	4.000	8	3.947	4.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 4. Establish relationship(s) between representative species & target species	3.800	4.000	15	3.912	4.000	34	3.250	3.500	8	3.789	4.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 18. Ensure accurate monitoring of representative species	4.375	4.500	16	3.939	4.000	33	3.750	4.000	8	4.035	4.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 14. Identify surrogates (e.g., habitats, species groups) to monitor challenging priority species	3.813	4.000	16	3.735	4.000	34	3.625	3.500	8	3.741	4.000	58
Monitoring Priorities 9. Develop a shared regional database	3.625	4.000	16	3.765	4.000	34	3.857	4.000	7	3.737	4.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 3. Monitoring system to inform management at multiple scales	3.933	4.000	15	3.735	4.000	34	3.250	3.000	8	3.719	4.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 7. Metrics to assess effectiveness of technical assistance	3.533	3.000	15	3.727	4.000	33	3.500	3.500	8	3.643	4.000	56
Monitoring Priorities 10. Conduct analysis of expected outcomes of specific management actions	3.813	4.000	16	3.424	3.000	33	3.250	3.500	8	3.509	4.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 2. Monitoring protocol for wetland and terrestrial habitat quality	3.067	3.000	15	3.647	4.000	34	3.571	4.000	7	3.482	4.000	56
Monitoring Priorities 16. Inventory of monitoring efforts - all organizations, including citizen science	3.533	4.000	15	3.429	4.000	35	3.125	3.500	8	3.414	4.000	58
Monitoring Priorities 8. Link species numbers to habitat acreage (or integrity)	3.750	4.000	16	3.182	3.000	33	3.250	3.500	8	3.351	3.000	57
Monitoring Priorities 12. Develop a decision matrix to determine when to monitor	2.875	3.000	16	3.588	4.000	34	3.250	3.000	8	3.345	3.000	58
Monitoring Priorities 15. Monitoring response of target spp or habitat changes that occur as a result of NRCS (Farm Bill)	3.400	3.000	15	3.343	4.000	35	2.625	2.500	8	3.259	3.000	58

a. Priorites from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total.

Note: Order of priorities listed above differs slightly from actual group ranking order due to missing affiliation data. See Appendix E for actual ranking based on group voting.

Information Management Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Information Management Priorities 1. Provide workshops to improve collaboration	Strongly disagree	0%	11%	0%	7%
	Disagree	13%	14%	0%	12%
	Neutral	20%	11%	29%	16%
	Agree	60%	40%	29%	44%
	Strongly agree	7%	23%	43%	21%
	Total	15	35	7	57
Information Management Priorities 2. Provide appropriate counseling services	Strongly disagree	27%	12%	14%	16%
	Disagree	0%	12%	0%	7%
	Neutral	20%	15%	29%	18%
	Agree	27%	24%	0%	22%
	Strongly agree	27%	36%	57%	36%
	Total	15	33	7	55
Information Management Priorities 3. SWAP database development that also links to TRACS	Strongly disagree	7%	0%	14%	4%
	Disagree	13%	12%	14%	13%
	Neutral	27%	18%	43%	24%
	Agree	33%	48%	14%	40%
	Strongly agree	20%	21%	14%	20%
	Total	15	33	7	55
Information Management Priorities 4. Easy access to information for policy makers in Congress	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	0%	9%	0%	5%
	Neutral	27%	14%	17%	18%
	Agree	47%	43%	17%	41%
	Strongly agree	27%	34%	67%	36%
	Total	15	35	6	56
Information Management Priorities 5. Integrate regional habitat classification into MoveBank database	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	38%	17%	17%	23%
	Neutral	38%	46%	67%	46%
	Agree	13%	17%	0%	14%
	Strongly agree	13%	20%	17%	18%
	Total	16	35	6	57
Information Management Priorities 6. Create regional geospatial database that can be shared	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Disagree	6%	9%	29%	11%
	Neutral	6%	9%	0%	7%
	Agree	44%	47%	29%	44%
	Strongly agree	44%	32%	43%	37%
	Total	16	34	7	57
Information Management Priorities 7. Tie in data on species monitoring to quickly assess regional status	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	19%	9%	0%	10%
	Neutral	25%	29%	43%	29%
	Agree	38%	49%	43%	45%
	Strongly agree	19%	14%	14%	16%
	Total	16	35	7	58

Information Management Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Information Management Priorities 8. Establish a module in TRACS to better capture SWAP	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	6%	11%	0%	9%
	Neutral	44%	26%	43%	33%
	Agree	31%	43%	29%	38%
	Strongly agree	13%	20%	29%	19%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 9. Support development of SWAP database to promote consistancy	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	0%	9%	0%	5%
	Neutral	31%	9%	29%	18%
	Agree	25%	41%	43%	37%
	Strongly agree	44%	41%	29%	40%
	Total	16	34	7	57
Information Management Priorities 10. Leadership commit funding and staff to evaluate	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	13%	6%	43%	12%
	Neutral	19%	46%	0%	33%
	Agree	38%	20%	43%	28%
	Strongly agree	31%	29%	14%	28%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 11. Institutionalize long term datasets on a Regional cooperative basis	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	19%	3%	14%	9%
	Neutral	25%	11%	29%	17%
	Agree	38%	54%	29%	47%
	Strongly agree	19%	31%	29%	28%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 12. Require data analysis for funded projects	Strongly disagree	6%	17%	14%	14%
	Disagree	25%	17%	14%	19%
	Neutral	19%	29%	29%	26%
	Agree	31%	26%	43%	29%
	Strongly agree	19%	11%	0%	12%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 13. Ensure that all spatial databases are designed to interface	Strongly disagree	13%	3%	0%	5%
	Disagree	0%	3%	29%	5%
	Neutral	31%	43%	0%	34%
	Agree	31%	40%	57%	40%
	Strongly agree	25%	11%	14%	16%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 14. Develop a managed lands database to document management	Strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	2%
	Disagree	0%	12%	29%	11%
	Neutral	25%	18%	0%	18%
	Agree	56%	47%	43%	49%
	Strongly agree	13%	24%	29%	21%
	Total	16	34	7	57

Information Management Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Information Management Priorities 15. Conduct a information needs assessment based on Framework	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	13%	6%	0%	7%
	Neutral	6%	26%	14%	19%
	Agree	13%	37%	43%	31%
	Strongly agree	69%	31%	43%	43%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 16. Regional habitat management database includes spatial & tabular data	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	0%	9%	14%	7%
	Neutral	19%	14%	0%	14%
	Agree	63%	49%	71%	55%
	Strongly agree	19%	29%	14%	24%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 17. Support regional information management needs assessment	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	6%	9%	0%	7%
	Neutral	6%	17%	0%	12%
	Agree	25%	34%	67%	35%
	Strongly agree	63%	40%	33%	46%
	Total	16	35	6	57
Information Management Priorities 18. Create data sharing agreements between all members	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	0%	11%	0%	7%
	Neutral	13%	23%	17%	19%
	Agree	50%	37%	17%	39%
	Strongly agree	38%	29%	67%	35%
	Total	16	35	6	57
Information Management Priorities 19. Support an urgent needs assessment process	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	13%	3%	0%	5%
	Neutral	6%	26%	29%	21%
	Agree	19%	57%	29%	43%
	Strongly agree	63%	14%	43%	31%
	Total	16	35	7	58
Information Management Priorities 20. Develop a way for states, LCCs and other partners to immediately access	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Disagree	0%	6%	0%	3%
	Neutral	6%	0%	14%	3%
	Agree	31%	51%	14%	41%
	Strongly agree	63%	43%	71%	52%
	Total	16	35	7	58

Priority from higher to lower	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Information Management Priorities 20. Develop a way for states, LCCs and other partners to immediately access	4.563	5.000	16	4.314	4.000	35	4.571	5.000	7	4.414	5.000	58
Information Management Priorities 17. Support regional information management needs assessment	4.437	5.000	16	4.057	4.000	35	4.333	4.000	6	4.193	4.000	57
Information Management Priorities 9. Support development of SWAP database to promote consistancy	4.125	4.000	16	4.147	4.000	34	4.000	4.000	7	4.123	4.000	57
Information Management Priorities 15. Conduct a information needs assessment based on Framework	4.375	5.000	16	3.943	4.000	35	4.286	4.000	7	4.103	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 4. Easy access to information for policy makers in Congress	4.000	4.000	15	4.029	4.000	35	4.500	5.000	6	4.071	4.000	56
Information Management Priorities 6. Create regional geospatial database that can be shared	4.250	4.000	16	3.971	4.000	34	3.857	4.000	7	4.035	4.000	57
Information Management Priorities 18. Create data sharing agreements between all members	4.250	4.000	16	3.829	4.000	35	4.500	5.000	6	4.018	4.000	57
Information Management Priorities 19. Support an urgent needs assessment process	4.313	5.000	16	3.829	4.000	35	4.143	4.000	7	4.000	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 16. Regional habitat management database includes spatial & tabular data	4.000	4.000	16	3.971	4.000	35	3.857	4.000	7	3.966	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 11. Institutionalize long term datasets on a Regional cooperative basis	3.563	4.000	16	4.143	4.000	35	3.714	4.000	7	3.931	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 14. Develop a managed lands database to document management	3.688	4.000	16	3.824	4.000	34	3.714	4.000	7	3.772	4.000	57
Information Management Priorities 10. Leadership commit funding and staff to evaluate	3.875	4.000	16	3.714	3.000	35	3.286	4.000	7	3.707	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 7. Tie in data on species monitoring to quickly assess regional status	3.563	4.000	16	3.686	4.000	35	3.714	4.000	7	3.655	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 8. Establish a module in TRACS to better capture SWAP	3.375	3.000	16	3.714	4.000	35	3.857	4.000	7	3.638	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 3. SWAP database development that also links to TRACS	3.467	4.000	15	3.788	4.000	33	3.000	3.000	7	3.600	4.000	55
Information Management Priorities 1. Provide workshops to improve collaboration	3.600	4.000	15	3.486	4.000	35	4.143	4.000	7	3.596	4.000	57
Information Management Priorities 13. Ensure that all spatial databases are designed to interface	3.563	4.000	16	3.543	4.000	35	3.571	4.000	7	3.552	4.000	58
Information Management Priorities 2. Provide appropriate counseling services	3.267	4.000	15	3.606	4.000	33	3.857	5.000	7	3.545	4.000	55
Information Management Priorities 5. Integrate regional habitat classification into MoveBank database	3.000	3.000	16	3.400	3.000	35	3.167	3.000	6	3.263	3.000	57
Information Management Priorities 12. Require data analysis for funded projects	3.313	3.500	16	2.971	3.000	35	3.000	3.000	7	3.069	3.000	58

a. Priorites from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total.

Note: Order of priorities listed above differs slightly from actual group ranking order due to missing affiliation data. See Appendix E for actual ranking based on group voting.

Most Important 2-yr Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 1. Communications, tool kit, users guide	Lower	0%	0%	0%	0%
	2	14%	3%	0%	5%
	3	36%	14%	14%	20%
	4	14%	34%	43%	30%
	Higher	36%	49%	43%	45%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 2. Layers (land use, threats, refugia, invasives)	Lower	0%	6%	14%	5%
	2	21%	23%	14%	21%
	3	36%	37%	14%	34%
	4	21%	20%	29%	21%
	Higher	21%	14%	29%	18%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 3. Finish mapping all systems (Canada, lakes)	Lower	0%	6%	0%	4%
	2	14%	11%	0%	11%
	3	21%	23%	29%	23%
	4	29%	23%	14%	23%
	Higher	36%	37%	57%	39%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 4. Usable product (expectations, limits)	Lower	0%	6%	14%	5%
	2	14%	17%	14%	16%
	3	7%	11%	43%	14%
	4	29%	43%	29%	38%
	Higher	50%	23%	0%	27%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 5. Mapping, accuracy and validation	Lower	7%	12%	29%	13%
	2	7%	12%	14%	11%
	3	14%	26%	43%	25%
	4	50%	26%	0%	29%
	Higher	21%	24%	14%	22%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 6. Deliver the results (synthesis) of the projects	Lower	0%	0%	14%	2%
	2	0%	9%	0%	5%
	3	14%	3%	0%	5%
	4	57%	29%	29%	36%
	Higher	29%	60%	57%	52%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 7. Develop a process to develop regional representative species goals	Lower	0%	14%	14%	11%
	2	14%	17%	14%	16%
	3	14%	23%	14%	20%
	4	21%	20%	29%	21%
	Higher	50%	26%	29%	32%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 8. In the new SWAPs recommend adopting a consistent format	Lower	14%	11%	14%	13%
	2	21%	11%	0%	13%
	3	0%	20%	14%	14%
	4	21%	29%	43%	29%
	Higher	43%	29%	29%	32%
	Total	14	35	7	56

Most Important 2-yr Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 9. Create distribution maps for regional responsibility/high concern species	Lower	14%	6%	0%	7%
	2	14%	3%	0%	5%
	3	21%	26%	0%	22%
	4	14%	35%	71%	35%
	Higher	36%	29%	29%	31%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 10. Development of habitat focus areas and corridors	Lower	14%	6%	14%	9%
	2	7%	17%	0%	13%
	3	43%	17%	14%	23%
	4	7%	40%	29%	30%
	Higher	29%	20%	43%	25%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 11. Working with implementers/users, translate the information	Lower	7%	9%	14%	9%
	2	14%	9%	0%	9%
	3	14%	17%	43%	20%
	4	43%	26%	0%	27%
	Higher	21%	40%	43%	36%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 12. Provide information on landscapes of regional significance	Lower	0%	0%	0%	0%
	2	21%	12%	14%	15%
	3	29%	32%	0%	27%
	4	36%	29%	43%	33%
	Higher	14%	26%	43%	25%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 13. Identification of habitat focus areas with a step up step down	Lower	7%	0%	17%	4%
	2	14%	11%	0%	11%
	3	36%	37%	0%	33%
	4	21%	20%	33%	22%
	Higher	21%	31%	50%	31%
	Total	14	35	6	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 14. Provide cookbook or catalog of on-the-ground implementation	Lower	7%	9%	14%	9%
	2	14%	20%	29%	20%
	3	43%	26%	0%	27%
	4	21%	29%	29%	27%
	Higher	14%	17%	29%	18%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 15. Develop conservation designs for multiple representive species	Lower	0%	0%	0%	0%
	2	14%	26%	0%	20%
	3	29%	40%	50%	38%
	4	14%	23%	17%	20%
	Higher	43%	11%	33%	22%
	Total	14	35	6	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 16. Take existing RCN products and fund a communication specialist	Lower	7%	23%	17%	18%
	2	7%	9%	0%	7%
	3	36%	20%	17%	24%
	4	43%	26%	17%	29%
	Higher	7%	23%	50%	22%
	Total	14	35	6	55

Most Important 2-yr Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 17. Overlay and integrate existing datasets to delineate landscapes	Lower	0%	9%	0%	6%
	2	21%	9%	0%	11%
	3	29%	29%	0%	26%
	4	29%	37%	40%	35%
	Higher	21%	17%	60%	22%
	Total	14	35	5	54
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 18. An information delivery mechanism should be a requirement of every future RCN	Lower	14%	17%	43%	20%
	2	7%	26%	14%	20%
	3	14%	23%	14%	20%
	4	36%	23%	0%	23%
	Higher	29%	11%	29%	18%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 19. Immediate need for reporting on success of SWG grant-funded work	Lower	0%	3%	0%	2%
	2	0%	0%	0%	0%
	3	21%	9%	0%	11%
	4	29%	14%	57%	23%
	Higher	50%	74%	43%	64%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 20. Establish Uniform Monitoring Practices	Lower	0%	20%	14%	15%
	2	15%	14%	0%	13%
	3	8%	20%	14%	16%
	4	31%	26%	29%	27%
	Higher	46%	20%	43%	29%
	Total	13	35	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 21. Long term monitoring and performance evaluation	Lower	0%	3%	0%	2%
	2	7%	17%	14%	14%
	3	14%	20%	0%	16%
	4	29%	31%	57%	34%
	Higher	50%	29%	29%	34%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 22. Identify and leverage existing federal monitoring programs	Lower	0%	6%	0%	4%
	2	0%	17%	14%	13%
	3	15%	26%	0%	20%
	4	31%	31%	14%	29%
	Higher	54%	20%	71%	35%
	Total	13	35	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 23. Ensure accurate monitoring of representative species	Lower	0%	6%	29%	7%
	2	14%	29%	29%	25%
	3	36%	26%	14%	27%
	4	14%	34%	29%	29%
	Higher	36%	6%	0%	13%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 24. Specific performance criteria and reporting for RCNs	Lower	14%	23%	29%	21%
	2	29%	17%	14%	20%
	3	14%	11%	29%	14%
	4	14%	26%	29%	23%
	Higher	29%	23%	0%	21%
	Total	14	35	7	56

Most Important 2-yr Priorities		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 25. Develop a way for states, LCCs and other partners	Lower	14%	3%	0%	5%
	2	7%	12%	14%	11%
	3	36%	18%	14%	22%
	4	7%	29%	0%	20%
	Higher	36%	38%	71%	42%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 26. Support and engage in the forthcoming regional information management needs	Lower	0%	0%	0%	0%
	2	0%	15%	0%	9%
	3	29%	12%	29%	18%
	4	14%	50%	29%	38%
	Higher	57%	24%	43%	35%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 27. Support development of SWAP database to promote consistancy	Lower	7%	3%	14%	5%
	2	7%	18%	14%	15%
	3	14%	15%	0%	13%
	4	36%	29%	43%	33%
	Higher	36%	35%	29%	35%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 28. Easy access to information for policy makers in Congress	Lower	14%	9%	14%	11%
	2	0%	18%	0%	11%
	3	57%	9%	29%	24%
	4	14%	24%	29%	22%
	Higher	14%	41%	29%	33%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 29. Create data sharing agreements between all members	Lower	14%	17%	29%	18%
	2	14%	29%	14%	23%
	3	21%	17%	0%	16%
	4	21%	26%	29%	25%
	Higher	29%	11%	29%	18%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 30. Create regional geospatial database that can be shared	Lower	29%	9%	29%	16%
	2	0%	26%	0%	16%
	3	21%	20%	0%	18%
	4	14%	23%	29%	21%
	Higher	36%	23%	43%	29%
	Total	14	35	7	56
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 31. Institutionalize long term datasets on a Regional cooperative basis	Lower	29%	9%	29%	16%
	2	7%	24%	0%	16%
	3	14%	35%	57%	33%
	4	29%	18%	14%	20%
	Higher	21%	15%	0%	15%
	Total	14	34	7	55
Most Important Priorities Next 2 Years 32. Regional habitat management database with spatial and tabular data	Lower	7%	14%	29%	14%
	2	7%	14%	0%	11%
	3	43%	23%	0%	25%
	4	29%	26%	43%	29%
	Higher	14%	23%	29%	21%
	Total	14	35	7	56

Priority from higher to lower	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
19. Immediate need for reporting on success of SWG grant-funded work	4.286	4.500	14	4.571	5.000	35	4.429	4.000	7	4.482	5.000	56
6. Deliver the results (synthesis) of the projects	4.143	4.000	14	4.400	5.000	35	4.143	5.000	7	4.304	5.000	56
1. Communications, tool kit, users guide	3.714	3.500	14	4.286	4.000	35	4.286	4.000	7	4.143	4.000	56
26. Support and engage in the forthcoming regional information management needs	4.286	5.000	14	3.824	4.000	34	4.143	4.000	7	3.982	4.000	55
3. Finish mapping all systems (Canada, lakes)	3.857	4.000	14	3.743	4.000	35	4.286	5.000	7	3.839	4.000	56
21. Long term monitoring and performance evaluation	4.214	4.500	14	3.657	4.000	35	4.000	4.000	7	3.839	4.000	56
25. Develop a way for states, LCCs and other partners	3.429	3.000	14	3.882	4.000	34	4.286	5.000	7	3.818	4.000	55
22. Identify and leverage existing federal monitoring programs	4.385	5.000	13	3.429	4.000	35	4.429	5.000	7	3.782	4.000	55
9. Create distribution maps for regional responsibility/high concern species	3.429	3.500	14	3.794	4.000	34	4.286	4.000	7	3.764	4.000	55
27. Support development of SWAP database to promote consistancy	3.857	4.000	14	3.765	4.000	34	3.571	4.000	7	3.764	4.000	55
11. Working with implementers/users, translate the information	3.571	4.000	14	3.800	4.000	35	3.571	3.000	7	3.714	4.000	56
12. Provide information on landscapes of regional significance	3.429	3.500	14	3.706	4.000	34	4.143	4.000	7	3.691	4.000	55
13. Identification of habitat focus areas with a step up step down	3.357	3.000	14	3.714	4.000	35	4.000	4.500	6	3.655	4.000	55
4. Usable product (expectations, limits)	4.143	4.500	14	3.600	4.000	35	2.857	3.000	7	3.643	4.000	56
17. Overlay and integrate existing datasets to delineate landscapes	3.500	3.500	14	3.457	4.000	35	4.600	5.000	5	3.574	4.000	54
8. In the new SWAPs recommend adopting a consistent format	3.571	4.000	14	3.514	4.000	35	3.714	4.000	7	3.554	4.000	56
28. Easy access to information for policy makers in Congress	3.143	3.000	14	3.706	4.000	34	3.571	4.000	7	3.545	4.000	55
10. Development of habitat focus areas and corridors	3.286	3.000	14	3.514	4.000	35	3.857	4.000	7	3.500	4.000	56
7. Develop a process to develop regional representative species goals	4.071	4.500	14	3.257	3.000	35	3.429	4.000	7	3.482	4.000	56
15. Develop conservation designs for multiple representive species	3.857	4.000	14	3.200	3.000	35	3.833	3.500	6	3.436	3.000	55
20. Establish Uniform Monitoring Practices	4.077	4.000	13	3.114	3.000	35	3.857	4.000	7	3.436	4.000	55
5. Mapping, accuracy and validation	3.714	4.000	14	3.382	3.500	34	2.571	3.000	7	3.364	4.000	55
32. Regional habitat management database with spatial and tabular data	3.357	3.000	14	3.286	3.000	35	3.429	4.000	7	3.321	3.500	56
30. Create regional geospatial database that can be shared	3.286	3.500	14	3.257	3.000	35	3.571	4.000	7	3.304	3.500	56
16. Take existing RCN products and fund a communication specialist	3.357	3.500	14	3.171	3.000	35	3.833	4.500	6	3.291	4.000	55
2. Layers (land use, threats, refugia, invasives)	3.429	3.000	14	3.143	3.000	35	3.429	4.000	7	3.250	3.000	56
14. Provide cookbook or catalog of on-the-ground implementation	3.214	3.000	14	3.257	3.000	35	3.286	4.000	7	3.250	3.000	56
23. Ensure accurate monitoring of representative species	3.714	3.500	14	3.057	3.000	35	2.429	2.000	7	3.143	3.000	56
24. Specific performance criteria and reporting for RCNs	3.143	3.000	14	3.086	3.000	35	2.571	3.000	7	3.036	3.000	56
29. Create data sharing agreements between all members	3.357	3.500	14	2.857	3.000	35	3.143	4.000	7	3.018	3.000	56
18. An information delivery mechanism should be a requirement of every future RCN	3.571	4.000	14	2.857	3.000	35	2.571	2.000	7	3.000	3.000	56
31. Institutionalize long term datasets on a Regional cooperative basis	3.071	3.500	14	3.059	3.000	34	2.571	3.000	7	3.000	3.000	55

a. Priorities from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total.

Note: Order of priorities listed above differs slightly from actual group ranking order due to missing affiliation data. See Appendix E for actual ranking based on group voting.

Quality of Workshop Format		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Quality of Workshop Format a) Pre-workshop arrangements & communications	Poor	0%	6%	0%	4%
	Average	0%	24%	0%	16%
	Good	62%	30%	67%	41%
	Excellent	15%	36%	33%	31%
	No answer	23%	3%	0%	8%
	Total	13	33	3	49
Quality of Workshop Format b) Registration process	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	8%	3%	0%	4%
	Good	31%	30%	0%	29%
	Excellent	62%	67%	100%	67%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	13	33	2	48
Quality of Workshop Format c) Breakfasts, lunches and breaks	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	15%	12%	0%	13%
	Good	15%	45%	50%	38%
	Excellent	69%	42%	50%	50%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	13	33	2	48
Quality of Workshop Format d) Workshop facilities (meeting & sleeping rooms)	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	38%	16%	0%	21%
	Good	38%	56%	67%	52%
	Excellent	23%	25%	33%	25%
	No answer	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Total	13	32	3	48
Quality of Workshop Format e) Convenience of meeting location and time	Very poor	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Poor	0%	9%	0%	6%
	Average	15%	9%	67%	15%
	Good	62%	53%	33%	54%
	Excellent	23%	25%	0%	23%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	13	32	3	48
Quality of Workshop Format f) Poster Session	Poor	8%	0%	0%	2%
	Average	0%	22%	0%	15%
	Good	23%	28%	33%	27%
	Excellent	54%	22%	67%	33%
	No answer	15%	28%	0%	23%
	Total	13	32	3	48
Quality of Workshop Format g) New York State Museum Reception	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	0%	0%	100%	2%
	Good	8%	28%	0%	22%
	Excellent	69%	56%	0%	59%
	No answer	23%	16%	0%	17%
	Total	13	32	1	46

Quality of Workshop Process		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Quality of Workshop Process a) Context and purpose of workshop	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	17%	10%	0%	11%
	Good	42%	71%	100%	64%
	Excellent	42%	19%	0%	24%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	12	31	2	45
Quality of Workshop Process b) Regional conservation framework session	Poor	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Average	9%	25%	0%	20%
	Good	64%	66%	67%	65%
	Excellent	27%	6%	33%	13%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	11	32	3	46
Quality of Workshop Process c) Session presentations (habitat mapping, biological assessments, conservation delivery, etc.)	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	9%	24%	0%	19%
	Good	82%	70%	67%	72%
	Excellent	9%	6%	33%	9%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	11	33	3	47
Quality of Workshop Process d) Table discussion sessions	Poor	9%	0%	0%	2%
	Average	9%	7%	50%	9%
	Good	45%	57%	50%	53%
	Excellent	36%	37%	0%	35%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	11	30	2	43
Quality of Workshop Process e) Group discussion sessions	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	27%	28%	0%	26%
	Good	45%	59%	67%	57%
	Excellent	27%	13%	33%	17%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	11	32	3	46
Quality of Workshop Process f) Highest Priority Next Steps Session	Very poor	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Poor	9%	6%	0%	7%
	Average	36%	36%	50%	37%
	Good	45%	48%	50%	48%
	Excellent	9%	6%	0%	7%
	No answer	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	11	33	2	46
Quality of Workshop Process g) Conclusion & Closing Remarks	Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Average	8%	13%	0%	11%
	Good	8%	20%	33%	17%
	Excellent	31%	13%	33%	20%
	No answer	54%	53%	33%	52%
	Total	13	30	3	46

Desired Outcomes & Expectations		Primary affiliation?			
		Federal	State/Prov	NGO/Un/Oth	Total
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... a) Develop consensus on a conservation framework	Strongly disagree	8%	0%	0%	2%
	Somewhat disagree	8%	3%	0%	4%
	Neutral	17%	6%	0%	9%
	Somewhat agree	33%	71%	0%	58%
	Strongly agree	33%	19%	100%	27%
	Total	12	31	2	45
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... b) Review and evaluate RCN & LCC projects	Strongly disagree	0%	7%	0%	4%
	Somewhat disagree	15%	40%	33%	33%
	Neutral	23%	3%	0%	9%
	Somewhat agree	38%	47%	33%	43%
	Strongly agree	23%	0%	33%	9%
	No answer	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Total	13	30	3	46
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... c) Review progress toward RCN & LCC program goals	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	0%	2%
	Somewhat disagree	31%	19%	33%	23%
	Neutral	31%	35%	67%	36%
	Somewhat agree	31%	29%	0%	28%
	Strongly agree	8%	6%	0%	6%
	No answer	0%	6%	0%	4%
	Total	13	31	3	47
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... d) Increase partner engagement in RCN & LCC programs	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Somewhat disagree	15%	17%	67%	20%
	Neutral	31%	33%	0%	30%
	Somewhat agree	31%	30%	0%	28%
	Strongly agree	15%	17%	33%	17%
	No answer	8%	3%	0%	4%
	Total	13	30	3	46
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... e) Discuss challenges, needs, and opportunities for RCN & LCC programs	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Somewhat disagree	8%	7%	0%	7%
	Neutral	8%	10%	0%	9%
	Somewhat agree	38%	33%	50%	36%
	Strongly agree	46%	50%	50%	49%
	Total	13	30	2	45
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... f) Explore collaborative opportunities for RCN & LCC programs	Strongly disagree	0%	0%	33%	2%
	Somewhat disagree	8%	10%	0%	9%
	Neutral	23%	3%	0%	9%
	Somewhat agree	46%	77%	33%	65%
	Strongly agree	23%	10%	33%	15%
	Total	13	30	3	46
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... g) Reach a common understanding of RCN & LCC partner roles	Strongly disagree	0%	10%	33%	9%
	Somewhat disagree	38%	20%	0%	24%
	Neutral	8%	37%	33%	28%
	Somewhat agree	38%	33%	0%	33%
	Strongly agree	8%	0%	33%	4%
	No answer	8%	0%	0%	2%
	Total	13	30	3	46

Evaluation	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Quality of Workshop Format g) New York State Museum Reception	4.900	5.000	10	4.667	5.000	27	3.000	3.000	1	4.684	5.000	38
Quality of Workshop Format b) Registration process	4.538	5.000	13	4.636	5.000	33	5.000	5.000	2	4.625	5.000	48
Quality of Workshop Format c) Breakfasts, lunches and breaks	4.538	5.000	13	4.303	4.000	33	4.500	4.500	2	4.375	4.500	48
Quality of Workshop Format f) Poster Session	4.455	5.000	11	4.000	4.000	23	4.667	5.000	3	4.189	4.000	37
Quality of Workshop Format a) Pre-workshop arrangements & communications	4.200	4.000	10	4.000	4.000	32	4.333	4.000	3	4.067	4.000	45
Quality of Workshop Format d) Workshop facilities (meeting & sleeping rooms)	3.846	4.000	13	4.097	4.000	31	4.333	4.000	3	4.043	4.000	47
Quality of Workshop Format e) Convenience of meeting location and time	4.077	4.000	13	3.875	4.000	32	3.333	3.000	3	3.896	4.000	48

a. Ratings from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total, where 5="Excellent," 4="Good," 3="Average," 2="Poor," 1="Very poor" ("N/A (not present or don't know") eliminated for purposes of this analysis.

Evaluation	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Quality of Workshop Process d) Table discussion sessions	4.091	4.000	11	4.300	4.000	30	3.500	3.500	2	4.209	4.000	43
Quality of Workshop Process g) Conclusion & Closing Remarks	4.500	5.000	6	4.000	4.000	14	4.500	4.500	2	4.182	4.000	22
Quality of Workshop Process a) Context and purpose of workshop	4.250	4.000	12	4.097	4.000	31	4.000	4.000	2	4.133	4.000	45
Quality of Workshop Process e) Group discussion sessions	4.000	4.000	11	3.844	4.000	32	4.333	4.000	3	3.913	4.000	46
Quality of Workshop Process c) Session presentations (habitat mapping, biological assessments, conservation delivery, etc.)	4.000	4.000	11	3.818	4.000	33	4.333	4.000	3	3.894	4.000	47
Quality of Workshop Process b) Regional conservation framework session	4.182	4.000	11	3.750	4.000	32	4.333	4.000	3	3.891	4.000	46
Quality of Workshop Process f) Highest Priority Next Steps Session	3.545	4.000	11	3.485	4.000	33	3.500	3.500	2	3.500	4.000	46

a. Ratings from highest to lowest on basis of rounded mean scores for Total, where 5="Excellent," 4="Good," 3="Average," 2="Poor," 1="Very poor" ("N/A (not present or don't know") eliminated for purposes of this analysis.

Note: Order of priorities listed above may differ slightly from actual group ranking order due to missing affiliation data. See Appendix E for actual ranking based on group voting.

Evaluation	Primary affiliation?											
	Federal			State/Prov			NGO/Un/Oth			Total[a]		
	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N	Mean	Median	Valid N
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... e) Discuss challenges, needs, and opportunities for RCN & LCC programs	4.231	4.000	13	4.267	4.500	30	4.500	4.500	2	4.267	4.000	45
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... a) Develop consensus on a conservation framework	3.750	4.000	12	4.065	4.000	31	5.000	5.000	2	4.022	4.000	45
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... f) Explore collaborative opportunities for RCN & LCC programs	3.846	4.000	13	3.867	4.000	30	3.333	4.000	3	3.826	4.000	46
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... d) Increase partner engagement in RCN & LCC programs	3.500	3.500	12	3.483	3.000	29	3.000	2.000	3	3.455	3.000	44
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... b) Review and evaluate RCN & LCC projects	3.692	4.000	13	2.931	3.000	29	3.667	4.000	3	3.200	4.000	45
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... c) Review progress toward RCN & LCC program goals	3.154	3.000	13	3.172	3.000	29	2.667	3.000	3	3.133	3.000	45
Desired outcomes and expectations of workshop were achieved... g) Reach a common understanding of RCN & LCC partner roles	3.167	3.500	12	2.933	3.000	30	3.000	3.000	3	3.000	3.000	45

a. Ratings from highest to lowest on the basis of rounded mean scores for Total, where 5="Strongly agree," 4="Somewhat agree," 3="Neutral," 2="Somewhat disagree," 1="Strongly disagree" ("N/A or no opinion" eliminated for purposes of this analysis).

Note: Order of priorities listed above may differ slightly from actual group ranking order due to missing affiliation data. See Appendix E for actual ranking based on group voting.