

Connecting Corridors Workshop

October 29, 2019 – Airdrie, Alberta Participant Survey Summary

Following is a summary of 18 surveys that were submitted at the end of the workshop day. 24 invited expert participants attended the workshop representing a diverse group including colleagues from Alberta, Saskatchewan, Montana and Idaho. Indigenous peoples were represented by two colleagues from the Kainai First Nation and the Blackfeet Tribe. The workshop facilitator provided by the Government of Alberta, Leah Roedler and the two PCF Coordinators, Sasha Harriott and Katheryn Taylor provided the required administrative support. Committee members, Ian Dyson, Nolan Ball, Christyann Olson, Rylee Hewitt and Ron McNeil took leadership roles at each of four group breakout segments of the workshop.

1. In your opinion did the workshop meet the objective to: "Identify specific locations that need to stay connected or be better connected (considering both structural and functional connectivity) to maximize benefits for multiple native species, multiple species types (groups) and multiple habitat types."

Generally participants agreed that the objective was met, although some felt the workshop only partially met the objective. The workshop gave a greater sense of the scale of the project with a high level perspective focussing on patches more than corridors. For some attendees there was affirmation of what is known and there was little new information. An enhancement would be greater depth to address total biodiversity, unusually productive habitats and perhaps two scales, high visibility and high value. Some said it was an effective workshop for identifying high value areas for increasing connectivity. Some wanted more process leading to an actionable map with locations and context.

2. What are important next steps now that this workshop has identified specific locations that need to stay connected or be better connected?

Clearly a subsequent implementation workshop was a priority for attendees. Addressing social license, solidifying selection and prioritization criteria and finding key partners to carry out the work were mentioned along with a request for a succinct report and maps. Attendees wanted communication of the process going forward and an ability to keep in contact with the individuals attending the workshop. Scaling up existing local projects and applied research and building capacity in local municipalities as well as making data open and following through were important next steps.

3. Was there enough time for discussion? Generally yes, although some concern with facilitator rushing too much at some points; concern that the breakout session at 3:15 was not well defined and needed more direction. As well some said no, these types of discussion can never have enough time.

4. Did you have enough background information to contribute meaningfully to the workshop? Please comment:

Yes. Webinar and documents were very helpful

5. How satisfied are you with the workshop?(circle one answer)

Not satisfied – none Satisfied – 12 Very satisfied - 6

6. What did you like most about the workshop?

Opportunity to work with the participants in the workshop; the diversity of the participants

7. What did you like least about the workshop?

Loose instructions, motivation lacked as day went on, rushed, slightly confusing facilitator, some exercises lost focus

Not enough time to dig into a few of the topics

8. What would have made the workshop better?

Shorter activities in the afternoon and more frequent shorter breaks

An overview of what the facilitated activities are accomplishing would have helped
Tie-back at the end of the day to the original goal of the workshop
Inclusion of more organizations that implement including NGO and government
Recommendations for indigenous groups
More maps on the potential threats and conflicts
A tighter spatial focus

9. Other thoughts, ideas and comments or concerns:

Many thank you comments and appreciation of PCF A municipal only workshop with regional planners Follow up workshop for planning and implementations Perhaps contract some of the next steps