

ITEM 7- Tabulated Annual Meeting Survey Results

Tabulated Annual Meeting Survey Results

GENERAL	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree strongly	Blank		
1. Do you support coordination of RMP projects with the CEP?	18	14	3		3		
PULSE							
	Very relevant	Somewhat relevant	Not relevant but interesting	Not relevant			
2. How relevant is the Pulse to issues that concern you or your organization?	22	11	5				
3. What particular aspect of the Pulse do you find most useful?	1 Very useful	2	3 Somewhat useful	4	5	6	7 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	Somewhat relevant	Not relevant but interesting	Not relevant			
	18	6	4				
5. What particular aspect of the Annual Monitoring Results do you find most useful ?	1 Very useful	2	3 Somewhat useful	4	5	6	7 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			

ITEM 7- Tabulated Annual Meeting Survey Results

ANNUAL MEETING EVALUATION							
	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
11. (a) General Organization	25	13					
11. (b) Timing/Length	17	19	1				
11. (c) Event Location	29	5	1				
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not Satisfied			
12. Were you generally satisfied with this meeting?	17	14	4	1			
13. Please rate the following	excellent	very good	fair	poor			
a) Introduction	9	14	4				
b) USGS Study of the Bay since 1960	13	9	7				
c) Adapting the RMP to answer important questions	3	20	6	1			
d) RMP Highlights in 2005	10	20	4	2			
e) PBDE Flame retardants in San Francisco Bay	17	12	6				
f) The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project and	20	12	6				
g) Hamilton Army Airfield Mercury Studies	9	8	17	2			
h) Mercury and PCB TMDL Implementation	12	20	5				
i) Sediment Budget for San Francisco Bay	20	14	4				
j) A Multibox Model of the Fate of PCBs	11	19	6				
k) An Improved Model of PCB Food Web	12	17	7				
m) Pollutant Loads to the Bay	10	17	6				
n) TMDL's for Bay Tributaries	15	13	2				
o) What we have found in the Bay Area SWAMP?	7	16	5				
14. How could this meeting have been improved?	More time for Q/A	Less time for Q/A					
a)	20						
	Too technical	Just right	Not technical enough				
b)	2	25	3				
	More emphasis on management issues	Less emphasis on management issues					
c)	10	5					
	Natural Resource Manager	Water Quality Manager/Regulator	Environmental Compliance Manager	Academia	Public Interest Group	Agency/Industry Scientist	Consultant
15. Audience category		10	4	4	3	12	4