



## Endangered Species Act, Sections 7 and 10 Symposium:

February 21-22, 2016

### Evaluation Summary



Please evaluate the workshop by answering the questions below. A rating of 5 is highest, best, or most and 1 is lowest, least, or worst except for rating on registration cost.

Total number of symposium participants: 55

Number of Responses to Evaluation: 32

#### 1) To what extent were your personal/professional objectives satisfied?

N=30, average 4.37 (range 3-5)

##### Comments:

Very informative, but not totally specific to my situation

Speakers were very knowledgeable and responsive to questions

Excellent presenters! Michelle's presentation with the interactive group activity was the highlight of the workshop

The activity was helpful as well. Don't know how else you could improve short of ACTUALLY applying for a permit!

Good talks, just a lot of info to take in in only 2 days

Particularly appreciated the HCP portion

Very informative and knowledgeable instructors

Provide more info upfront that this is ESA for beginners

Include DOJ attorney for legal questions

Got the info I needed. A little more time on Federal process may have been helpful

Overall a great course. Rick and Colleen did a great job explaining section 7 in a simple matter, and

Michelle did a great job with Section 10. Wanted a little more detail on some things, though.

Great discussion of some fairly dry material. Would prefer less unnecessary detail of Recovery Permit minimum qualifications

##### TWS Response:

"ESA for beginners": This was clearly advertised as a symposium to "introduce the fundamental principles and practices involved..." Between that and the simple fact that we were covering three major topics in 1.5 days makes us think that we did our best to provide that info "up front."

DOJ attorney: We didn't consider this, but I suspect that, if you had asked "legal questions," our very experienced presenters likely would have been able to answer at least most questions...

#### 2) To what extent did the classroom environment contribute to the learning experience?

N=30, average 4.27 (range 3-5)

##### Comments:

Hard to hear questions from audience, but like the classroom environment

Very quiet, no outside noise

Lighting was a bit difficult to read the projection screen. Room got cold.

I appreciated the interactive nature of the lectures

I would revise some slides – very hard to read black text on a blue background, or picture backgrounds – or tiny font on both the screen and hard copy. My eyeballs were working hard.

All speakers were very good and knowledgeable; I liked group discussions

I really enjoyed the working group exercise

Liked the group activity; would prefer more activity/interaction

Having notes printed was a big help

The breakout group exercise was helpful  
Great examples/cases to help with learning & applicability of content  
Too dark. Too many PowerPoints  
Lectures provided good info in a clear way while the opportunity for questions enhanced understanding  
First day of slides were hard to read; pictures in background made text hard to read. Yellow text difficult to read  
Interactive presenters were VERY useful and informative  
Great classroom set up, comfortable chairs, small class size

**TWS Response:**

Slide quality: Agreed; we'll try to fix this for the pending PDF versions. As for font size: sorry, but you're always most welcome to move toward the front of the room...  
Room got cold: In the future, please don't wait for the evaluation to tell us about room temperature!

**3) To what extent did the course materials contribute to the learning experience?**

N=30, average 4.43 (range 3-5)

**Comments:**

The binders were great for taking notes. Really appreciated the section separators – very convenient!  
Always good to include PowerPoint slides  
Binder was very helpful!  
The binder is a great reference  
Slides – text a little small / hard to read (paper versions)  
Having notes printed was a big help-Spent more time listening and understanding rather than writing  
PowerPoint slides were sometimes difficult to read.  
Seems like Section 7 and Section 10 handbooks could be included with registration fee  
Use more photos of endangered species in PowerPoints. Don't have so many non-stop PowerPoints → more variety  
Having lectures available in print form helped speed understanding and comprehension of material  
Great having the slides so organized  
PDF slides will be very helpful!  
Loved having the slides printed with room for notes  
Written copy of ESA in binding would have been very useful  
The PowerPoint copies in color were more difficult to see, and harder to take notes with. The black & white versions were better

**TWS Response:**

PowerPoints (in PDF format) should be available in a few weeks.  
Handbooks: We considered offering both handbooks, however since both are under revision, we decided to instead offer links and URLs.  
Copy of ESA: We provided this three years ago, but determined this year that the URL was sufficient  
Difficulty of reading slides: Our apologies; hopefully the URL and PDF versions will be sufficient. Color vs black and white: Noted (and agreed).

**4) To what extent were the objectives stated in the promotional literature or those stated at the beginning of the symposium satisfied?**

N=32, average 4.53 (range 3-5)

**Comments:**

Exceeded my expectations. Appreciated the fact that all sections were taught by Service [=USFWS] staff with different areas of expertise.  
Seems like the objectives were satisfied  
Would have liked more detail

**5) To what extent did the symposium contain significant and current intellectual or practical information?**

N=30, average 4.60 (range 2-5)

**Comments:**

Excellent seminar

Great examples

Provide real-world examples with decisions on species in California and point out “gray areas”

All relevant topics; especially with noting any upcoming agency updates and/or revisions to regulations.

Very relevant information

Very good examples, very relevant and varied examples

Good discussions

Very up to date

People very informative, so well chosen

The 10(a)(1)(A) section of the symposium was hit or miss (mostly miss) since it consisted almost exclusively of the speaker reading the material on the slides. Plus only detail of 10 species with Ventura Office focus; not much need for the 2+ hour block

Very good instruction, especially Michelle

I wish the 10(a)(1)(A) recovery permitting process was not so dominated by Southern California species, and instead was more general in nature. However, the examples were useful, but perhaps a little too long on just the SoCal species

**TWS Response:**

Comments noted

**6) How would you rate the registration fees for the symposium? (5 = Too High, 1 = Too Low**

N=24, average 3.25 (range 2-5) [reminder: our target for this question is 3 or “about right”]

**Comments:**

Reasonable

Appropriate and fitting the level of topics covered

Reasonable for 1.5 days local to LA people

Just right

**TWS Response:** Seems like we were about right. Remember to take advantage of early registration AND member registration rates whenever you can...

**7) I would like to suggest the following topics for workshops/conferences:**

Mitigation – calculating appropriate mitigation at the state and Federal levels

Adaptive management

NEPA use and application

Recovery Plans

Listing and Delisting under the ESA

Compliance with California ESA (or other state ESA programs)

Mitigation banking and mitigation programs

Bats: avoidance and minimize; mitigation; survey techniques

CESA!!

2080(i) permit process and info [California ESA]

Adaptive management

How to do NEPA – CEQA equivalency for projects that have fed and state components

MBTA Workshop – BGEPA Workshop

Low effect HCPs

California red-legged frog

**TWS Response:**

- Bats: We're very pleased that our highly popular Bat Workshops are returning in 2016. Check our website for updates!
- CRLF: TWS-WS is unlikely to offer CRLF workshops, but we encourage members to look at Elkhorn Slough and Bay Area Chapter workshops (including cooperative events with Sonoma County Water Agency) – we think these groups do a great job with this species (as well as pond turtles and California tiger salamanders)
- Others: Some great suggestions (and perhaps some nearly impossible ones...). We'll see what we can do! (about the former...)

**Anything else you'd like to say?****Comments:**

I think the speakers should be more active with the audience so they get more audience participation. They could show more pics or videos of real case studies or examples. The speaker from Hawai'i [Michelle] was great. She is a good example of how to be an active and engaging speaker.

The colors of the slides and the lights in the room make it really hard to see the slides. Some of the print-outs were too dark.

**GREAT WORKSHOP!**

Symposia are always great!

Take away: you can do anything you want-anywhere and USFWS will change the rules to fit your project or ease the work burden for them.

Hard to hear in back – please always repeat questions asked and use microphone

Great job!

Team teaching approach is good

Maybe have some exercises for students to do

Blue slides were difficult to see in this room

With permitting discussion, it would have been good to also have state rep to address local state ESA permitting

I have worked with ESA issues for several years, but these presenters provided some of the clearest information in a relatable manner. Thank you!

Really enjoyed the presenters. They were great public speakers and kept me engaged in their topics Section 7 – I wish we had spent more time with discussions about how to make determinations in the BA, given more examples

**TWS Response:**

- Slide quality: see discussion above
- Microphones: Participants should always feel welcome to make this type of suggestion.
- “Take Away...”: That's a challenging and difficult comment for our response. It's simply not correct; we're not sure if the writer was attempting humor or irony (I guess “we hope so...”). That said, the law does place significant limits on what the FWS can and cannot do; it's TRUE that they cannot say “no way” to a project unless very significant adverse effects (such as a jeopardy opinion) may result. The Service is bound by law to TRY to make a project work for the applicant.
- “State Rep”: Good idea, but not within the objectives of this symposium