

# Workshop Evaluation Summary

Western Washington Watershed Planning Act Workshop:  
Moving from Planning and Implementation to Beyond  
9 AM to 4 PM, October 22, 2009 @ Thurston County Fairgrounds Expo Building

---

## Workshop Evaluation

*There were 32 returned evaluations out of 47 all-day participants. This is a 65 % response rate.*

---

Depending on your role in watershed planning or plan implementation activities  
please circle the appropriate responses below.

**NOTE:** The following 7-point scale was used for participants to show their responses:

Very Dissatisfied			Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied				Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

---

### 1. Your overall satisfaction with the TOPICS: Averaged response = 5.8

The most helpful or valuable topics? Implementation Success Stories (10); Long term Funding/Sustainability (8); Permit Exempt Wells (7); Where We're At [Ken and Evan], history, present, legal contexts (6); Demystifying the Numbers/Design criteria (3); Future of water resources management (1); Salmon/Watershed Integration (1); All very helpful; new to topics (1); Even if funding stops; please continue meetings for ongoing integration. It would be helpful to have one presentation of updates on each WRIA and their implementation progress (1); Overall good range of topics (1).

The least helpful or valuable topics/other topic needs or ideas? Demystifying the Numbers/Design criteria (5); Permit exempt wells; a bit redundant given earlier (Ken – Evan) info (4); Skagit story should have local presenter (1); Too much exempt well history/case law (1); Need to focus on actual results achieved vs. objectives; and not just \$ and coordination. Avoid allusion of success w/o proof (1); Real issue of lack of local confidence in there being a water shortage [related to 'Demystifying the Numbers' presentation] (1); U of Idaho Survey, too predictable (1); [Get more] different topics from various planning units (1).

### 2. Your overall satisfaction with the FORMAT: Averaged response = 5.8

What you liked most about the format? Good variety of topics/speakers and different areas of state (9); Timing/Kept moving/good facilitation (5); Ability for presentation Q/A (3); Opportunity to network/breaks (3); Bringing groups together – a good start (1)

What you liked least about the format/other ideas? Not enough Q/A, dialogue or idea exchange time (9); Need better way to share info amongst or between WRIAs statewide (2); Need to repeat questions/provide microphone to audience (1); More time for Funding Alternatives presentation (1); Start at 10 AM (1); Should be annual (1).

### **3. Your overall satisfaction with the PRESENTERS: Averaged response = 5.8**

What you liked best about any presenters? Staff knowledge/disposition (5); Well presented/to the point/engaged (4); Ken and Evan's policy and futures (4); Good PPT Presentations (2); Brought in right people (1); More of Gordon White type presentation/discussion and less presentation [re: Future] (1); Lower Columbia detail (1); Mark Swartout and Jeff Breckel good presentations and they were 'local' folks; Bernadette-Graham Hudson's presentation; this is our future (1); Don had a really important topic ; but got into too much detail then ran out of time to cover bigger picture. However; manner of presentation gave clear impression of the [exempt well] difficulties ECY/Water Resources Program wrestles with (1)

What you liked least about any presenters/improvement suggestions? Exempt well presentation needed more focus; better preparation and message for important topic/more discussion (6); DOH presentation was hard to track/unorganized/too many assumptions about what others are familiar with (2); No handouts available (1); Some PPT Clunky/Some good (1); Matrix or coalesce groups at same planning phase to share/discuss the process (1); Many unanswered legal questions; bring in AAGs (1); Ineffective Materials (1); Poorest presenters from ECY (1); A planning unit member's take-away from Gordon's presentation was that the member was not reassured that ECY is really supportive of watershed planning as a high priority activity (1); Ken Slattery should be available all day (1)

### **4. Your overall satisfaction with the LOCATION: Averaged response = 5.9**

What you liked most about the location? Easy to find/park (8); Clean/convenient/no distractions (7); Public facility use/no frills (2); Room Temp (1); Not in Seattle (1); Good for Olympia area, would like location closer to where majority are (1).

What you liked least about the location/other suggestions? Starting at 9 AM in Oly a bit early Tacoma is more central (2); More than a 2-hour drive (2); Dim lights for projection (1); Alderbrook/Glen Ayr (1); Locally produced food if possible (1); Too far south but understand location choice (1).

### **5. ACCOMMODATIONS (Lunches; Beverages/Snacks; Room Setup; Facility; Etc.): Averaged response = 6.2**

What you liked most about the accommodations? Good food/lunch choices (15); Good facility/layout (7); Acoustics (3);

What you liked least about the accommodations/other suggestions? Uncomfortable chairs for daylong meeting (5); Acoustics poor/Better [sound ] & speakers (5); BYO lunch or buffet to reduce costs or have participants pay (2); Didn't get right order (2); Add non-dairy creamer (1); Have tap water (not bottled) available (1); Flies (1).

END: Compiled by B. Zachmann Oct 30 – Nov 3, 2009