

1. Do you support coordination of RMP projects with the CEP?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree strongly	Blank		
	18	14		3		3	
PULSE							
2. How relevant is the Pulse to issues that concern you or your organization?	Very relevant	Somewhat relevant	Not relevant but interesting	Not relevant at all			
	22	11		5			
3. What particular aspect of the Pulse do you find most useful?	Very useful		Somewhat useful			Not useful	
a) Management section		7	13	9	7		1
b) Status and Trends Section	7	10	11	6	2	1	
c) Features Section	6	12	14	2	2	1	
ANNUAL MONITORING RESULTS							
4. How relevant is the Annual Monitoring Results to issues that concern you and your organization ?	Very Relevant	Samewhat relevant	Not relevant but interesting	Not relevant at all			
	18	6	4				
5. What particular aspect of the Annual Monitoring Results do you find most useful ?	Very useful		Somewhat useful			Not useful	
a) Presentation of Data	3	11	8	3	3	1	
b) Statistical Analyses of the Data (Box plots and Cumulative Distribution Frequency)	4	7	11	4	1	3	
6. Would you prefer to see Annual Monitoring Results presented :	In an Expanded Form	In Its Current Format	AS a synopsis of Data with Summary Tables				
	4	17	8				
NEWSLETTER							
7. How well does the Newsletter keep you informed about environmental science and management in the San Francisco Bay?	Well Informed	Somewhat Informed	Not Very Informed	Does not keep me Informed			
	9	17		2			
8. Does the newsletter have an appropriate balance between science and management?	Yes	No					
	18	4					
9. Are the articles written at an appropriate technical level?	More Technical Level	Appropriate level	Too Technical				
	4	22					
Web Query							
10. How many times per year do you anticipate using the web query tool?	1 to 2 times	3 to 5 times	5 to 10 times	more than 10 times			
	13	10		5	3		
ANNUAL MEETING EVALUATION							
11. (a) General Organization	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
		25	13				
11. (b) Timing/Length	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
		17	19	1			
11. (c) Event Location	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
		29	5	1			
12. Were you generally satisfied with this meeting?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not Satisfied			
	17	14		4	1		
13. Please rate the following							
a) Introduction	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
		9	14	4			
b) USGS Study of the Bay since 1960	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
		13	9	7			
c) Adapting the RMP to answer important questions	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
		3	20	6	1		
d) RMP Highlights in 2005							

	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
e) PBDE Flame retardants in San Francisco Bay	10	20		4	2			
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
f) The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project and Bay Water Quality	17	12		6				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
g) Hamilton Army Airfield Mercury Studies	20	12		6				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
h) Mercury and PCB TMDL Implementation	9	8		17	2			
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
i) Sediment Budget for San Francisco Bay	12	20		5				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
j) A Multibox Model of the Long-Term Fate of PCBs in the Bay	20	14		4				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
k) An Improved Model of PCB Movement Through the Bay Food Web	11	19		6				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
m) Pollutant Loads to the Bay	12	17		7				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
n) TMDL's for Bay Tributaries	10	17		6				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
o) What we have found in the Bay Area SWAMP?	15	13		2				
	excellent	very good	fair	poor				
	7	16		5				
14. How could this meeting have been improved?								
a)	More time for Q/A	Less time for Q/A						
	20							
b)	Too technical	Just right	Not technical enough					
	2	25		3				
c)	More emphasis on management issues	Less emphasis on management issues						
	10	5						
15. Audience category	Natural Resource Manager	Water Quality Manager/Regulator	Environmental Compliance Manager	Academia	Public Interest Group	Agency/Industry Scientist	Consultant	
		10		4	4	3	12	4