

IAIA13 Training Course #1

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS AND FOLLOW-UP IN IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Instructors 97.67 % above 7  
 Larry Canter: EnvImpTr@aol.com "Threshold" for recommending the course again is 80%  
 Bill Ross: ross@ucalgary.ca

Q1. List 2 or 3 worthwhile things you learned and did during the course.	Q2. Identify 2 or 3 things which helped you to work effectively at this course.	Q3. List 2 or 3 things which kept you from being more effective.	Q4. Rate your overall satisfaction with the course by circling the appropriate number. (Very dissatisfied 0, very satisfied 10)	Comment	Q5. Rate the following aspects of the course putting an X in the appropriate column. (Excellent 1, Very good 2, Good 3, Poor 4, Very poor 5)					Q6. Other comments or suggestions with regard to the course, the venue, accommodations or facilities.
					Trainer(s)'s knowledge of the subject.	Trainer(s)'s teaching skills and methods.	Course materials.	Practical exercises.	Time available for content of the course.	
Using matrices/networks to work through CEA. Value of diverse teams and practical/approachable tools-conceptual models. Receiving specific recommendation/direction on applicable papers, case studies, reports (on CD).	Authoritative (understatement!) instructors. Workshops-slightly painful but helpful.	Hard chair! On weekend-not, many options, but a stretch. Worth the effort though.	10		1	1	1	2	2	
Importance of cumulative effect assessment in EIA process. The need collaborative efforts in CEAM.	Workshops. Practical illustrations. Case studies.	limited time.	10	It was very good and practical.	1	1	1	2	3	
The important of the cumulative effect practical application of CE.	The pre-course information received by e-mail. The material distributed.		10		1	1	1	1	1	
Scenario CEAM. Matriz/interaction.	Group task/workshop. Hand out given at the start of course.	None	10		1	1	1	2	2	I thought this was a great overview and conversation starter. I will use information provided in my practice area.
Excellent examples from personal experience. Good list of reference materials.	Very good facilitation.	Lots of material to cover in 2 days.	10		1	1	1	2	2	Perhaps more time to discuss experiences from audience.
VEC based approach to CE. Past, present project and future approach to CE.	My background with Regulatory Agency EIA administrator.	Jet lag	9		1	1	1	1	4	
There are aspects of future (...) that can be addressed in EIA. Cumulative effects need cumulative solutions.	References were great. Workshops were great.	Slower pace of information, ran overtime.	9	Lovely, patient instructors.	2	1	1	1	2	The legalistic aspects of including uncertain events in IA wasn't covered.
Definition of CEAM. Application of CEAM. Challenges of CEA.	Case studies and examples. Interactive sessions and discussions.	Colored pages for pictures and illustration. Examples related to oil and gas exploration and production (upstream) most examples were MIMY related.	9	It was a very good teamy experience and apart from the use of MIMY as examples in most part would have rated it a 101.	1	1	2	3	2	

Ontario Ring of Fire exercise. Suffield NWA case study. Practical exercises/case studies and seeing application of process was a huge help.	The workshop drawing on experience + knowledge of colleagues.	Facilities-temperature (too cold), also chairs very uncomfortable for long term.	9		1	1	1	1	1	This course was excellent. So much to think about & read! Thank you for the references/CD so useful!
A process for carrying out CEA. An understanding of the focus on enviro components (VECs).	Breaks. Opportunity to ask questions.	More illustration, (e.g.. Maps) required. (All wordy slides).	9		1	2	2	3	3	
VECs based process in CEAM. Project impacts vs CE. Explain rationale for conclusions.	Class discussion. Group discussion & presentation.		9	Excellent instructions.	1	2	2	2	2	
Case studies used effectively. US & Canada approaches to same issue.	Practical exercise. Group works.	Large class size prevented debate/discussion in some cases.	9		1	1	1	2	1	Practical exercises would have been more effective with a smaller group-not instructor's fault!
	Mother's Day-essentially the fact it was on a beautiful weekend + family commitments took priority.		9		1	1	1	2	2	
Work by VEC. Use adoptative mgmt.. CEAA needs cumulative solutions.	Past experience. Case studies.	Language barriers. Lack of mining experience.	8.8	Good course!	1	1	2	2	1	Very cold room. Thanks to Larry and Bill!
Content on adaptive management follow up was most useful.	Participants giving examples and case studies. Questions from participants most useful.	Workshop tasks took too much time, workshops based around issues raised by participants would be more useful.	8		1	1	1	3	1	CD with references very valuable, very valuable to have list of references in the manual and instructor referred t references that were relevant to each section.
How to identify VEC's. Analyzing VEC's in periods (Past, present, project, future). How to effectively manage the impacts.	Group work in my group 4 shared a lot of experience. Lectures facilitation. Time plan.	Nothing.	8	Because the class was so interactive and hence the training was made easy and knowledge imparting and sharing was in this class.	1	1	1	1	1	The course is very fruitful to the participants.
Learned the basics concepts of CEA. Understand what "not to do".	Workshop discussions helped. Experiences from other participants was useful.	Some lessons were delivered the "traditional" way which proved challenging! Lots of coffee required.	8	Lots of knowledge in facilitators, but they can use some more modern, dynamic, creative tools to communicate knowledge.	1	3.5	3	3	3	Venue was not conducive for good understanding (very cold, very (...), computer had several problems repetively).
CEsA and Cis.			8	Good instructors.	2	1	2	1	3	Need to divide the course to levels and add more case studies world wild.

Framework and overall structure of CEAM, concept of adaptive management.	Manual w/slides and references, group exercises.	Groups for workshops were too big-everyone wasn't able to effectively participate given the short time to complete. Use more universal examples, e.g. and industrial facility on private land instead of a well drilling operation on government land. Both the mining and well drilling examples relied heavily on Canadian-specific law and policy which made it difficult for international attendees to relate to them.	8		1	2	2	3	3	
How to do cumulative impact assessments. Importance of learning from previous case studies.	hands on sessions of guidance towards best methods and approaches world wide for CA.	Case studies directed internationally for more international scope. I think they talked of focused about US and Canada.	8	I wish there were international case studies.	1	1	2	3	2	
Interacting discussions were useful. Moments when dialogue among attendees useful.	Booklet + resources are excellent. Venue worked well.	Too much time on simple CEA overview. Possibly too much time with Canada & U>S> examples.	8	It would be very useful to cut out introductory material and increase the amount of time to brainstorm with students who have expertise worth sharing.	1	2	2	2	2	
Principles, frameworks, practical tools, grounded in extensive experience.	Manual with slides far acing notes. CD of resources.	Leavy lecture/traditional format. Limited opportunities to exchange experience with other participants.	8	Long days. Found I faded in the afternoon.	1	2	2	4	3	
The frame & structure of CE chapters. Discussions about the nuances of EA & CE.	Good speakers.	Charts & images may have helped explain concepts better. During the NHL playoffs was bad timing. Course was focused on theory/concept CE isn't easy else it'd be implemented all over. More lessons from failed case studies... what to avoid.	8		1	1	2	3	1	
Open forum discussions our current CEA problems. Discussion of best practices + identification of inadequate approaches to CEA.	Guided direction of activities.	I can't think of any.	8		1	1	2.5	3	2	Tasks for working group sessions should be smaller in scope (5-10 minutes, not 20 minutes) + arrange by tables, not by numbered individuals (groups too large).
Applying CEAM methods. Case studies and instructor experience helped make the course practical.	Long breaks. Course book.	Not enough group work.	8		1	1	1	2	2	Excellent course.
Cumulative effects step by step process. Meet/hear from people in similar fields all over the world.	Good course notes and references to follow up on. Very knowledgeable/experienced presenter who were able to provide lots of real life experiences.	After lunch sessions occasionally very heavy - would reserve time to do group work. Building cold + computer (presenters') freezing often.	8	Training very interesting + informative. Training reinforced current understanding, but also provided additional tools which can be applied immediately.	1	1	3	3	2	Practical exercises would rate higher but insufficient time allowed.

Notion of compensating/mitigating to make room for future effects.	Great cross-section of participants. Good facilities. Excellent instructors.	Had trouble relating to Ohio River example.	8			1	1	1	3	2	
Insights into practice. List of references.	See above.	Nothing - (its to what you can do in 2 days)	8			1	1	1	3	3	Not sure whether it was categorized as "beginning level" but it was so more advanced people/practitioners somewhat frustrated.
Always place yourself in the perspective of the VEC. Stating there is significance doesn't necessarily stop a project, include collaborative solutions.	Food	A lot of slides - consider alternative means of sharing info.	8	Great class - thanks.		1	1	1	3	2	
Challenges to CEAM. Methods for CEAM.	Case studies. Group interaction and exercise.	Conditions of the room. No coffee in the morning.	8			1	1	2	2	2	
Experience/perspective from the regulatory/review side of things. Ways to proactively address issues.	Case studies provided and workshop.	Time.	8	More satisfied with Dr. Canter.	LC 1 - BR 2	LC 1 - BR 3	2	2	3		
VEC, VEC, VEC. Cumulative issues need cumulative solutions!	Variety of perspectives of other participants.	Lack of coffee at 9 am.	8			1	2	2	3	2	Room was too cold.
VEC. Cumulative effects require cumulative solutions. There is lots of references mentioned.	Workshops. Engagement of trainers.	Limited to biophysical aspects of CEA for the most part. Could use another 2 days of training - allow for more time on networking.	8	On advance training course in CEA is likely needed.		1	1	1	2	2	Practical exercises and Time available for content just need a few more and more time.
Preliminary scoping practices + interaction matrices. Other case studies from participants.	Good presentations. Experience of instructors + examples. Good workbook.	Lots of material to digest - a challenge. Workshops were rushed.	8			1	2	2	3	3	Room layout was very basic. A small lectern would have been better.
Concept of using environmental sustainability was new and interesting.	The workshops.	Death by PowerPoint!	7.5			1	2	1	2	2	Please include list of acronyms, alphabetism, etc. with definitions in the workbook, package.
Structures approaches to evaluating cumulative effects. Use of sustainability assessment in CE.	I enjoyed the workshop componen	I would have preferred some information, examples and technical tools used in CEA.	7			1	2	3	3	3	I appreciate all the reference material. I think some materials focused on key stages, approaches and tools would have been useful in addition to copies of presentations.
Similarity between cumulative effects assessment. VECs.	Case studies and group exercises. Highlighting important reference materials.	Nor enough group work and break-out sessions. Too much text on slides.	7			1	2	2	3	3	More emphasis on the case study work and break-out sessions next time. Maybe provide some background reading on the case studies ahead of time. Would like to hear more about outcomes and results of various CE studies.
Principles definitions and step wise processes. Identification and use of VEC.	Case studies, group work.	Too many references.	7			1	2	3	2	2	
	References to listed citations for additional reading.	Inadequate time for exercises. More exercises required and more time required for the course.	7	A good course.		1	1	2	1	1	

VEC related CEA assessments "think like a VEC". RFFAs. Use of scenering.	Copies of slides; resources to take away.	Repetition of basic concepts (Albeit necessary with an international audience). Very involved working example (Ring of fire) more (...) might have been better.	7	1	1	1	3	3	
How to create a list of past, present + future impacts to provide to technical effects assessors; matrix for presentation of cum. Effects.	Breakout groups; detailed case study examples (e.g.; suffield).	Incredibly wordy slides; short periods for workshops; outdated examples; lack of graphics + images; short times for discussion.	7	1	3	4	3	2	Please provide flip charts to breakout groups. Please provide current examples. Please provide color + graphics in slides. Examples in day 2 morning were good. Please provide more discussion time.
Importance of CEAM. Methodology to conduct these studies (the explanation of matrixes was great).	Case studies offered in the course. Clarity of slides and presentation material.	Answers to questions were too generic. Not really responding the questions. Too focused on USA/Canada legislation.	7	1	1	1	2	3	
An overview on the subjects. Some advice on models + specifics on the timescale in cumulative effects studies.	The	Too much talk with no clear relevance to the deeper challenges in cumulative impact studies. Too much stg. EIA.	6	2	3.5	3	2	1	Too much talk by canter. Was too much text on slides.
Other approaches + case studies. References + resources on Internet.	Course manual, sound system.	Too long 9-5. Workshops too rushed on slides is abbreviated and speaking is too fast for new material to absorb.		1	2	2	3	4	Very worthwhile and appreciated input and questions of participants and those of many different nationalities.
Interaction with other participants. Consideration of best practice principles to apply to future IA.	Having slides.	Long days, meaning low energy/focus @ end of day.		1	2	2	2	3	Very appreciative of instructions to references + reference material supplied.
<b>AVERAGE</b>									
Q4. (Very dissatisfied 0, very satisfied 10)			<b>8.22</b>						
Q5. Detailed (Excellent 1, Very good 2, Good 3, Poor 4, Very poor)				<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>2.31</b>	<b>2.20</b>	
Q5. General average			<b>1.75</b>						