

Montana Contaminants Workshop: April 23, 2008  
**Workshop Evaluation Compilation: October 2008**

Feedback is critical for the NPS Air Resources Division to facilitate additional post-WACAP workshops in states beyond Montana. Five workshop participants from varying agencies (EPA, NPS, Montana Department of Agriculture, Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks, and Ministry of the Environment – BC, Canada) shared their opinions with us so that we can better facilitate interagency meetings pertaining to toxic air contaminants and resources sensitive to air quality.

Strongly  
Agree = 1

Strongly  
Disagree = 5

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1. This workshop facilitated interagency communication<br/>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Great!</b></li> <li>• <b>Thanks again, for the warm welcome for your colleagues from north of the border. We benefited greatly from the information exchange.</b></li> </ul>   | <p><b>1.4 – Strongly Agree/ Agree</b></p> |
| <p>2. I understand the implications of WACAP results<br/>Comments</p>   | <p><b>1.8 – Agree/ Strongly Agree</b></p> |
| <p>3. The workshop provided a framework for where Montana is headed regarding contaminants research and outreach<br/>Comments</p>   | <p><b>2.6 – Neutral/ Agree</b></p>        |
| <p>4. The workshop was well paced within the allotted time<br/>Comments</p>   | <p><b>1.8 – Agree/ Strongly Agree</b></p> |
| <p>5. The material was presented in an organized manner<br/>Comments</p>  | <p><b>1.4 – Strongly Agree/ Agree</b></p> |
| <p>6. I would be interested in attending a follow-up workshop on this same subject<br/>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Definitely</b></li> <li>• <b>Yes if there was new data or new implications</b></li> </ul>   | <p><b>2.4 – Agree/ Neutral</b></p>        |
| <p>7. Given the topic, was this workshop:      Too short (2)    Right length (3)    Too long (0)</p>  |   |
| <p>8. In your opinion, was this workshop:      Introductory (0)    Intermediate (5)    Advanced (0)</p>   |   |
| <p>9. Is your agency considering similar types of work: Yes (2)      No (2)      Maybe (1)</p>  |   |
| <p>a. If so, please describe the work your agency is considering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Further mercury and SOC testing</b></li> <li>• <b>FWP will likely start screening for pesticides such as dieldrin and dde's in priority areas along with Hg and PCB work</b></li> <li>• <b>As a provincial regulatory agency we may be putting similar monitoring programs in place in sensitive areas within the same airshed as industry. Such monitoring may be part of an air emission permit. But most long-range transport studies are conducted by the federal Environment Canada teams.</b></li> </ul> |   |

10. Please rate the following:                      Excellent (1), Very Good (2), Good (3), Fair (4), Poor (5)
- a. Presentations                                      **1.6 – Very good/ Excellent**
  - b. Discussion                                         **1.8 – Very good/ Excellent**
  - c. Facilitation of workshop                      **1.4 – Excellent/ Very good**
  - d. Handouts/resources to prepare              **1.6 – Very good/ Excellent**
  - e. MT workshop website                         **1.2 – Excellent/ Very good**

[http://www.nature.nps.gov/air/Studies/air\\_toxics/wacap/mtWorkshop/](http://www.nature.nps.gov/air/Studies/air_toxics/wacap/mtWorkshop/)

11. How could this workshop be improved?

- **The most interesting presentation were rushed with too little time for questions**
- **This was honestly one of the best workshops I have attending. I think the small group was the perfect size for comfortable communication. I think this could easily have been a 2+ day workshop, but as an introduction it was definitely adequate for the purpose. Good job!**

Thank you!