**Denver “Building Consensus” Workshop Post- Survey Summary 9/19/13**

**28 completed surveys out of 38 participants (74% response rate)**

***Developed and compiled by Oregon Sea Grant, OSU – Jennifer Lam and Sam Chan; with reviews by the planning team***

The planning committee invited all participants in the "Building Consensus in the West - A Multi-State Vision for Watercraft Inspection Programs" workshop in Denver on August 13-15, 2013 to take an online evaluation survey after the workshop. An important use of the survey is to gather the post workshop thoughts to guide future actions on building consensus.

The top 3 rated elements: refreshments, opportunities to network, and moderators/facilitators.

Respondents thought agenda was aggressive and it was too fast paced and rushed, needed to be better direction for the legal team, needed follow up with scenarios on last day – whole group and moderators seemed to fizzle out, reporting was off between two groups, AIS coordinators should have met in advanced of the AGs

Respondents strongly agree the workshop stimulated their learning, they will be able to use and advanced what was accomplished in the workshop, and the workshop met their expectations.

Open-ended comments include: rushed workshop, need clearer criteria for legal team, didn’t know updating UMPS at the workshop, outcome materials should be sent to participants (esp. draft model legislation), and AIS should have met first.

**Please provide some specific suggestions for improving the visuals (e.g. PowerPoint) used during the workshop**

Respondents suggested larger font, less content per slide, multi-color was hard to read, have model law outline always visible.

**For your applications, what would be effective ways to communicate progress and outcomes from the workshop?**

Respondents suggested email, website, webinar, shared document drive, final report/action plan.

**What could we do in the future to improve integration and synergy between the AIS Coordinators and Legal team?**

Respondents suggested having the legal team come a few days later since the AIS team had a lot more ground to cover and legal team needed more information, more time together so legal team can get better perspective from AIS team debates, swap members from each team to be a part of working group discussions, specific items should be given to AGs for input, prepare a list of questions/needs of each group

**What could be done to make the workshop more relevant to you and the entity you represent?**

Respondents stated a time period with “what troubles is your state having” brainstorming period, do not only get input from a couple AIS coordinators ahead of time – made workshop irrelevant to some, legislation needs to be either mussels or completed generalized, successful future outputs, how to get support from politicians to obtain funding

**Did you find the workshop to be a useful form of professional development or continuing education?**

* 100 % of respondents said yes
* The majority of respondents agree with the definitions; however, there were 2 disagree entries for definitions “inconclusive” and “undetected”
* Respondents had comments on not using inconclusive because it doesn’t help move the ball, 2 is a small number considering potential for error, uncomfortable with undetected label for waters that have been tested positive but have been downgraded, wording of “infested is pejorative and not objective – suggested “established”, suspect and inconclusive may not be relevant to model law, definitions should have a time element, prefer undetected to negative because you can’t really confirm negative
* The top three criteria respondents listed successful were building consensus on terminology, co-learning, and opportunity to refine definitions and standards
* Comments: reciprocity needs to be entire workshop on own, at times it seemed like group members agreed just to move the conversation rather than work on the issue, need to communicate definitions through legislative toolkit
* The most important parking lot tasks: Determine and agree on a minimum standard and criteria to verify scientifically valid detection (e.g. 2 PCR ok vs. microscopy?), Develop statistically valid sampling protocol, Create database on water bodies being monitored for presence of AIS, Focus on low risk conveyance reciprocity and develop seal program

**Would model language on a reward program for reporting AIS violations, which lead to prosecution or effective intervention, be useful in your state?**

* Mixed reviews from respondents, many said maybe depends on the criteria of the reward program but it’s not a high priority

**To assist the legal team in developing model legislation, what terms might be needed to define a conveyance inspection process (e.g. conveyance inspections often include visual and tactile)? Please list up to four additional terms describing inspection and sampling (e.g. water).**

* Respondents listed decontaminate, inspection, impound, certified inspector, encrusted, wet/dry, quarantine, contaminated, standing water, education, unverifiable water, dry time requirements, water body, live aquatic bait, clean drain dry, sample collection

**To complete drafting of the model legislation, what additional feedback or information do we need on definitions, management needs and protocols from the AIS coordinators?**

* Respondents listed whether self-decontamination is allowed, what indicators for marking clean or dirty, concrete terms and definitions, work with AIS coordinators on specifying authorities needed to achieve specific management objectives, sampling criteria, understand scope of responses triggered by detection, need consensus for minimum level of oversight necessary to control AIS

**Additional Comments overall:**

* Arizona could be host for next meeting
* These workshops are a huge step in getting each state to come together
* The fact that this workshop was very well organized will possible affect me attending another one
* Survey too long
* Design model law with the flexibility to address a broader suite of invasive species associated with watercraft conveyance
* Lawyers need to be challenged to think more broadly -- study, or talk to their colleagues who are involved with, other similar kinds of regulatory programs
* The underlying workshop premise that the flow of information would be from the program group to the legal group may have been too open-ended and not focused enough to be workable.    Rather than have program needs sent to the lawyers to turn into model legislation, like “straw” into “gold,” what actually worked best in practice at the workshop was when the lawyers conceived of potentially useful provisions (e.g., in the vein of “ this or that procedural mechanism might be nice to have”) and then thought to ask the program folks if that’s what they wanted as a policy matter