

Mid-Atlantic Stream Restoration Conference 2007 Evaluation Dialog/Comments

What topics would you like to see in future agendas?

more dialogue among "experts"

Statistical evaluation of quantitative objectives from pre and post monitoring of designs based on form and designs based on a more process-approach.

I would like to see more time devoted to the panel discussion, or perhaps have more than one panel discussion.

field trips if possible or field based discussions

Ecological Restoration

In-stream structure design strategies, more lessons learned, fish passage, ecological components of restoration

Measured impacts of stream restoration on chemical, biological and physical quality of the stream.
Additional attention to melding the methods of Rosgen, Wilcock, and Simon. This was started at the panel discussion but more needs to be done

TECHNIQUES FOR STEEP GRADIENT STREAM RESTORATION

As there's a growing scientific consensus, reflected in presentations given in this year's conference, that there's a lot more to stream restoration than Rosgenite channel reconfiguration, the conference needs to address this and broaden. Water-quality restoration, for instance, would seem to be an activity that's being widely implemented that could be addressed at the conference.

Continue to provide lessons learned. I think this is very important.

Wetland construction in conjunction with the stream relocation work.

More research findings. What are graduate students and extension professors finding that change or reaffirm our practices.

- more discussion on what works/more projects highlighted
- more information on funding sources and ways to get outside agencies/organizations involved

More of the same

More on urban stream restoration, it's different dealing with the constraints of homeowners/agencies that never deal with streams rather than open park settings and open minded agencies.

Dam removal, levee removal, riparian restoration--detail on specific ecosystem types and techniques, conservation biology.

effects of mining on water quality of headwater streams

When I was first exposed to Rosgen style stream restoration, academia ignored. Eight years later, they are all at the conference. We are clearly at a point where those who practice stream restoration can now learn along with the open minded teaching and research professionals that have come forward. The fun and excitement of the 2007 MASRC should now be followed up with quiet dialog between the leaders in the field to figure out how to develop and incorporate analytical tools into the empirical process of stream restoration.

Practitioner presentation of stream restoration results (e.g. what were the goals and were they met and how do we know?). State restoration programs, challenges and successes.

More problems and designs for urban areas. That is where jurisdictions are having problems

more representation from regulatory agencies

Would love to see stream grouting presented as a restoration method to include successes/failures, methods and technics etc.

Continued emphasis on lessons learned and areas of controversy among practitioners and researchers.

Continued discussion on form vs process

further discussion on stream restoration monitoring. Methods/results

biological assessments of restoration: I think it is important for designers to here/talk to ecologists to assess sucess/failures of restorations from a biological prespective.

I feel there is need for more discussion of urban stream restoration.

Actual projects with cost/lesson learned

Monitoring Data and discussions regarding monitoring evaluation and criteria for "success"

Continued discussion of the latest in stream retoration technology including what is working and what is not working with an emphasis on cost effective measures.

- * Nutrient management/trading BMPs.
- * Research on biological effectiveness of retoration.
- * Do dwnstream mandates foster upstream benefits (e.g. Chesapeake Bay nitrogen loading is a driver but P loading is the issue in streams)?
- * Restoration to promote denitrification ("legacy nitrate")
- * Cultural/social interfaces to promoting stream restoration - getting the landowner buy-in.

Actual design updates.

Post construction monitoring. long - term success. projects monitored more than 10 years after construction. this conference was engineering heavy, maybe work in more ecology if possible. seemed like a lot fewer watershed organizations were represented this time. where were they?

1.Comprehensive alternatives to Rosgen's channel design methodology, with monitored examples 2.Restoration in areas with high sediment loads and extreme flow variability.

More Construction & Contractor related issues.

More policy/restoration implementation topics discussed

water quality benefits of stream restoration

Working in the wet - policy regs

The mid atlantic is overwhelmed with minning impacts to streams(both surface and deep). Perhaps some case studies on these types of restorations.

Coal mine stream mitigation issues

- 1) How/when practitioners apply form-based versus process-based methods.
- 2)Current research in stream restoration / fluvial geomorphology. This is very important to practitioners who have limited access to published literature.
- 3) A workshop/training on a process-based stream restoration method, with case studies.
- 4) A field component:

Permitting associated w/ stream restoration.

Guidance on selecting appropriate sites for stream restoration to use as mitigation.

Stream restoration related to ecology

More on failures and why.

I would like to see more of the same. There were often things going on at different locations at the same time and I could not be in two places at once.

continue with the sessions on experience from practitioners. any new research on new techniques.

Discussions among academics and practitioners to develop working definitions of a "Natural Stream" and a "Stable Stream"

Additional discussion between practitioners on the form vs process approach from a real-world construction point of view, not just academic.

Expanded areas for regional curves.

More on stream morphology evolution.

Continue the debate between the Rosgen method and classical fluvial geomorphology.

Sediment Transport

Natural Channel Design Methods

More from the biology and/or aquatic ecology side of things. i.e. monitored responses of bugs/fish, issues with establishing riparian veg etc.

I would like to see more discussion about how stream restoration fits into the larger picture of water resource management in North America.

Scientific data on the impacts of stream/wetland restoration.

Water Quality through stream bank stabilization. Measuring the amounts of nutrients (nitrogen & phosphorus) in bank material and how many pounds of N & Ph are introduced into a stream system on an annual basis.

Expansion of Mountaintop Removal topics

evaluating biological lift from restoration

I would love to see a long session with a number of different speakers presenting "Restoration Projects Gone Wrong," and why they went wrong. Have folks present their failures and why they failed. I am tired of success stories.

I would like to hear more about UK's stream creation on valley fill areas

Costs associated with stream restoration; maybe an example of a project from start (conceptual, locality/state/federal process, engineering, plan processing, costs) to finish (construction, monitoring)

advanced lessons learned, which should have been done as a second day. A lot of the examples were basic and more than 10 years behind for some of us on the east coast.

More lessons learned

Urban stream restoration

stormwater treatment,

groundwater infiltration,

more real world applications and faults,

more on the topic of restoring the ecological function of a stream and what the real purpose ecological function serves

Include more design-specific presentations.

Hydrology and Hydraulics, advances in the science and tools (HecRAS, Geomorph, TR20, SWMM, etc.)

Panel discussion and the move toward adopting a universal stream classification system

Additional fundamental courses for those new to the field

Integrating modeling with Design.

stream restoration in rural areas within short stretches of stream

enhancement vs. restoration

I feel the society or some members within the society are focused on their specific goals of individual projects. For instance, while talking to several individual with varying ecological disciplines, most practicing stream ecologist within the consulting sector, develop mitigation plans based on a watershed level; however, only restore a small 1000-2000 ft reach, which because the client is only responsible for X amount. Mitigation plans based upon a reach approach to restore a watershed, I feel would be acceptable if future mitigation is anticipated within the watershed, building upon existing mitigation.

I feel that conferences such as the Mid-Atlantic conference would be a prime audience to discuss collaboration between, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers USACE, State Natural Resource agencies, Watershed Groups, Consultants, NRCS, etc. Ultimately, a plan should be developed that would allow a consultant that has a potential project, in any given major watershed, to research a central mitigation data base maintained by the USACE. This would greatly help stream ecologist to develop a plan to mitigate a stream reach that would have a greater impact upon the watershed. Basically, it would be nice to see conference talks that illustrate the need for private consultants and regulatory agencies working together to restore watersheds not reaches and to discuss mechanisms for this process.

Please feel free to give me a call, if you wish to discuss this further, 859-623-0499.

Implementation/construction challenges

Presentations of monitoring protocol and data.

Fieldtrips for on-site evaluations and discussions. Inexpensive habitat additions that mimic natural stream channel design (Scott Carney PA Fish and Boat).

A workshop to review and tour designed projects to evaluate what worked/didn't work/new approaches, etc.

As a practitioner it's important to see real work, real structures, real data. Give me examples of those. Be careful about getting speakers who are dry, especially those that tend to present for highway projects.

urban stream restoration, successful stream habitat reestoration, long-term monitoring, placement/location of planned stream restoration

Integrating wetlands into stream design

Longterm studies of different projects and how they've done over time and at various flows - Channel modifications, wetland restoration and embedded culverts.

Mountaintop removal valley fills and reforestation of surface mines

More discussion on smaller headwater stream restoration approaches.

Design discharge

more on ecological response to stream restoration: are we helping, hurting, or having no influence on biota response

Sediment Transport

I think this group should continue to critically evaluate the Rosgen methodology as well all other methodologies currently used.

Sampling and computing sediment load, use of the various sediment equations, (Parker, Meyer; Peter; Muller etc)

I would like to see a more detailed discussion of critical design issues such as design discharge. While this topic was discussed very generally, it was not covered at all in any of the breakout discussions. Given that this is the keystone of all of Rosgen's parameters, I believe exploring the identification of bankfull features would be a very beneficial discussion.

More in the way of Stream restoration techniques. Riparian and aquatic habitat influences. Much less in the way of theories and why stream restoration is not possible.

Big picture open discussions and panel presentations.

Case studies with adequate Q&A

Stream replacement and relocation

Case Studies on longevity of projects
Comparative studies of different restoration approaches for similar streams
Economic benefits of stream restoration
Quantitative ecosystem services provided through stream restoration

I enjoyed seeing more of the practitioner side of things, however, I really enjoy seeing academic talks and discussions. I went to mostly academic break out sessions, maybe if there was a few more breakout sessions where you could get more practical discussions going.

more examples of on the ground projects and techniques utilized

Biology/Ecology of Stream Restoration

Stronger application of stream restoration techniques to urban projects.

More biology. Legacy sediment.

I would love to see topics related to stream restoration projects in very urban situations where our floodplains are extremely limited. I would also like to see individuals actually present specific problems they have faced with a project, ways they have overcome those hurdles, and how all of us can learn from other projects. I think that it would be a great addition to an already excellent conference.

Stream restoration monitoring, ie long term stability

What did you like most about the conference?

the Thurs panel

The panel discussion question and answer session.

The keynotes speakers and the panel discussion session.

That it included a large diversity of opinion and approaches on Stream Restoration practice.

Opportunities to interact with so many engineering firms

Panel discussion/speakers were great, and I really enjoyed lessons from the speaker/contractor from Gleim - nice perspective from the non-designers.

Chance to interact with all types of businesses in the exhibit area

The technical presentations were interesting and helpful.

the overall amount of activities throughout the day

Excellent speakers

the quality of speakers was remarkable, the idea of the open forum on the last day was great

The social was nice to mingle with clients and speakers from earlier in the day.

Opportunity to exchange ideas with others and the location.

Good speakers. Great facility.

Rhe panel discussion on the last afternoon

Day 3

CAGE MATCH

The panel Thursday morning.

Panel discussion brought together the top people in the field and offered a variety of opinions. Excellent although I wouldn't have minded allowing even more time for this.

Topics were timely and interesting. Unlike many conferences there were often multiple talks that I wanted to attend at the same time.

panel session

The panel presentations and discussion forum was invaluable.

- lessons learned/case studies
- panel session

targeted good mix of municipal, academia and consulting
All-Star cast of participants
Showed regional flavor throughout the mid-Atlantic

Introduction to the different thoughts are stream design. As a part of the construction/implementation of the designs it was interesting to see how and why decisions are made.

Location

The panel, though I wish there had been more time for questions/interactions with the crowd and perhaps more policing of the length of answers provided by the panel.

The presenters were first rate. Really knew their stuff.
Food was good except for second day lunch wraps.
Location was great.

speakers were knowledgeable and have contributed to the development of the science

The quality of speakers

Sharing ideas, seeing old friends and making new ones.

The panel discussion.

Mixing with other stream designers

panel discussions/networking

Enthusiasm in which material was presented.

EXCELLENT speaker lineup. Panel discussion extremely helpful.

Facility was nice

Speakers assembled for the conference

The opportunity to hear and share ideas. Also there were several good presentations and the Thursday discussion provided an excellent opportunity to hear what some of the innovators in the field are doing. Great cast of characters.

interaction with peers

the range of topics, the panel of experts, and venerable speakers

1 preconference workshops
2 having the panel speakers all together in one room
3 venue

Difficult to pick just one thing. I liked all of it

Lunch with Red

panel discussion and interaction amongst all those in the stream restoration biz.

The breakout sessions were very informative.

The opportunity to interface with other stream professionals

Good location.

The plenary speakers and panel discussion.

Number of stream restoration leaders present.

all the speakers were great. everyone I heard were experts and wonderful speakers. they had valuable experience that was great to have shared.

It was impressive to have such prominent panel speakers and to have them debate their ideas face-to-face. That was a unique experience.

Quality/caliber of presenters. Organization.

The panel discussion.

The discussion among the "heavy hitters"

The panel discussion

narrow focus on stream restoration

"Reds" Wolman and the panel discussions

Wolman presentation

The group for the panel discussion on Thursday was excellent. You did a great job on assembling many nationally recognized experts in the field.

The quality of speakers and seeing old friends.

Speakers

Generally well executed with good speakers and relevant topics.

Very informative. Good presenters. Good networking opportunities.

The panel discussion with Rosgen, Simon, etc.

The debate

The abundance of good sessions with good speakers and relevant topics.

The facilities were beautiful! A wide range of topics discussed by a wide range of the professions involved in the field of stream restoration

The panel discussion regarding the Rosgen Method vs classical fluvial geomorphological principles.

I really looked forward to the panel discussion and all the individual panel speaker presentations

The presentations by Dave Rosgen, Richard Hey, and Will Harman were great. Very practical, very useful and designed to get projects on the ground based on the best available information. We need to get a lot of projects done in a very short period of time or we'll just watch the species go belly up. We don't have the luxury of time, we need to move with what we have, combined with judgement that only comes from experience. These 3 presenters are giving us those tools and more talks from experienced project implementers like them would have been helpful.

the facility was very nice

We had excellent participation from the stream restoration community and the facility was great.

Opportunity to meet new people.

Good atmosphere. Speakers were passionate about their topics.

Panel Discussion. Exhibits.

It was well structured and a good deal of information was presented

seeing dedicated scientists working toward restoration

The facility and location were really nice, although too small. I also really enjoyed hearing Dorothy Merritt's talk.

networking with like minded individuals

meeting with others to discuss projects and new approaches and techniques

The variety of attendees
Panel discussion

the atmosphere and the people and the subject... and the speech by Gordon "REDS" Wolman

Excellent quality of the presentations...both breakout and panel. Open discussion about differing stream restoration methods.

Seeing Rosgen, Richard Hey, Peggy Johnson, and others.

The panel discussion in general.

The RiverMorph workshop provided by George Athanasakes and Mike Adams. This was an excellent workshop. It was very well done and the materials provided were excellent. The instructors were very well prepared and their was not a single glitch to the presentation. These guys are awesome.

I only attended the panel session, which I thought went well.

The open discussions

Interaction with professionals from other states and areas of expertise.

Overall it was a very good conference and I'm glad that I went.

the presentation of lessons learned. I feel we can truly learn from past experiences.

interaction with others involved in stream restoration

focus, good size, well represented group of individuals from industry, academia, and govt.

Lots of other practitioners from the area to talk to

I expected that everything presented would be about David R. Methods. I was pleased to see all the different styles and/or ideas regarding the diversity of stream restoration methodology.

High level of technical and policy accumen in attendance at the conference

The panel discussion.

The location. The art in the conference area was very enjoyable and cultured. It added something to the conference that was a highlight.

A pre-conference 1-day NSD intro for novices.

The panel discussion was excellent. It did seem to be a Dave bashing session but he has big shoulders. And the main issue is theory versus practice. Putting it on the ground far exceeds the implication of a theory. It's the implementation of the theory that's important.

high profile panel - i got the most from simon and think he needs to be invovled in the next one.

The panel discussion

The presentation setup. Noted speakers and diversity of opinions in their presentations. Very good.

Mountaintop removal valley fills

Reds Wolman

Setting and location was excellent.

the panel discussion

Interaction with colleagues and peers.

Panel discussion

Peer interaction.

the tuesday presentation - very imformative

The open panel discussion

The panel discussion and presentations given in the large room.

Panel Discussion - Especially the topic. Need much more time for interaction and discussion.

The sharing of ideas from the presenters.

Natural channel design discussion

Introduction of new technology and experience.

Panel discussion and overall diversity of techniques, form, and approach. This is very much needed to move the NSD protocol to the next level in the industrial/commercial client base.

Interaction among participants
Excellent range of topics
Excellent speakers, overall

The large number of people there allowed a great deal of interaction with practitioners with similar problems and also

academics who have very good ideas to bring forth more thought.

the diversity of backgrounds, knowledge, and share of information

the credentials of the speakers

The opportunity to hear the opinions of some of the most proficient practitioners and researchers in the field.

The opportunity to participate in the breakout session with the most pre-eminent professionals in the US and abroad was the conference highlight. Kudos to all who arranged that session. The audio and visuals were excellent in the ballroom. The dual screen visuals were excellent. The food was certainly very good.

Very nice facility, good food, central location. Good mix of presentations.

Exemplary panelists.

Outstanding facility and speakers

Panel discussion.

The panel discussion was excellent. Having a wide range of beliefs sitting together and constructively discussing pros and cons of each.

That's hard to answer. The whole conference was great.

What did you like least about the conference?

posters--not enough

The rooms not being big enough for everyone to have a seat.

lack of space/seating in the break out rooms.

The facility was too small to accommodate the large number of people. Also, the poster session was not well advertised and not accommodated in the schedule. I didn't even know there were posters until the entire conference was over!

Your success became a challenge - sessions were so full it made it difficult. I know you know this.

Seating for the breakout sessions was very cramped, both in that seats were too close together (no elbow room), and that many people ended up sitting on the floor or standing. Maybe the sessions that I went to were more popular than the others (and that other rooms were less full?), but it seemed that there were more people there than the facility could comfortably accommodate.

needed more seats for some sessions

The conference was so heavily overbooked that it was claustrophobic and even dangerous. If the fire marshal had shown up the entire affair would have been shut down. This seriously marred what should have been an outstanding conference.

nothing - might consider a warmer time of the year for more leisure activities either at night or an extra day

Not enough of an academic presence

the rooms for the breakout sessions were too small, the facility while very nice was too small for the crowd

The rooms were way too small to see the speakers. This is a big blunder.

Limited seating and food

The facilities for breakout sessions. A pre conference sign-up would have helped you find out how many people were going to be in each session. Even with finding that out the rooms available were not adequate for the numbers in attendance.

Not enough time to network.

Poster session was hidden.

The venue is out of the way and there are not enough rooms for lodging and the breakout and meeting rooms did not hold the number of attendees that this event drew.

Room capacity, scheduling of concurrent sessions, poor signage for concurrent sessions - session letters and room names were not easy to match up. It was hard to move between sessions. I completely missed the poster session room.

Lack of local restaurants and bars.

LACK OF SPACE IN BREAKOUT ROOMS

Some spaces were mismatched with the level of interest. I think that people like me, who waited until just before the conference to register, probably deserve a lot of the blame for this, by making it harder to plan.

The breakout session rooms were all overcrowded with many people standing and sitting in aisles.

Poster session room was poorly marked and was probably overlooked by many attendees.

Rooms were too small - but I thought the location was very good.

space - not enough room in breakout sessions particularly - could not get into sessions I wanted to see.

Due to the date of the conference and change from daylight savings time, it was hard to take advantage of the location's outdoor amenities (once the first day's sessions were adjourned). I would consider moving the date back so that attendees can get outside of the hotel if desired.

- limited seating for breakout sessions
- end time on the last day

Some of the presentations did not offer opportunity for Q&A/discussion

Not as many exhibitors as I would have liked.

The panel sessions seemed a bit short for the amount information.

It would have been very nice if the concurrent sections had a printed schedule in the booklet so you could move from one session to another more easily.

Not enough rooms at Rocky Gap! Had to travel to somewhere else.
Sessions were very cramped with not enough chairs, including lunch and breakfast.

the panel discussion seemed to be a series of attacks on the Rosgen method. Emphasis on alternatives is fine, but this seemed to be a venting of frustration.

Conference rooms were too small-not enough seats to provide for everyone. Some people who also paid full price to attend the conference had to stand outside the conference rooms & strain to listen (if they could hear the speaker at all) because all chairs and even standing room was full.

Could not get into any of the morning breakout sessions. Very disappointing.

Too much time sitting. Maybe shorter breaks more often?

The rooms for the breakout sessions were too small.

Some of the presenters were of poor quality, (e.g. spotty). I think you focussed on quantity and not quality, though there were certainly some quality presentations

i was unable to attend afternoon sessions of the second day because i could not get in the room

degree of marketing injected into presentations, felt like I was being sold a car. waiting for unappetizing food.

Could have been geared more to on the ground practitioners. Types and examples of projects used under specific conditions.

Breakout session rooms TOO SMALL!! I could not always attend the session that most interested me. The Wednesday afternoon sessions were ALL filled to overflowing - Very difficult to get into ANY session!

Seemed somewhat over booked for the facility

I thought the pannel discussion was a great idea, but was disappointed in the question/answer session. The Q&A had too many pie in the sky questions that diverted from the real issues at hand related to the two camps. In particular, the way the questions were asked Rosgen did not really get a chance to respond to his critics. If this is ever done again, it should be ran more like a debate with each side having 5 minutes to talk. The pie in the sky questions asked to all 6 pannelist burned a good 20 minutes of discussion. I though the Bankfull vs Design flow picked by an ecologist discussion at the end was great and wished that the entire Q & A session addressed the key differences in opinion in a similar manner. In the future the questions should be preset with agreement from both camps.

The rooms for the break out sessions were too small.

redundant presentations. I think I saw the same slide a total of eight times in three separate presentations by the same company.

too crowded break-out sessions

I would have liked for there to have been more time for the panel discussion and more space for the break-out sessions

1 need to determine room size requirements beforehand

Lunch with Peggy Johnson

I thought the panel discussion could have addressed or focused a little more details of Simon, Kondorf and Wilcox oppostion of the D.Rosgens philosophy towards stream restoration design.

The facility was either unprepared to handle the number of people or CVI overbooked the conference. There was not enough room for everyone in the main room or the breakout rooms. The panel discussion was a little tedious with several academic speakers who were big on theory but have never built a stream restoration project.

The conference venue could not physically accommodate the breakout sessions. All of the sessions were standing room only.

Not enough seating in conference rooms.

The poster session. It will be a difficult decision to attend again if the posters do not become better integrated into the conference. Exposure to my work was minimized by format and room location. My travel funds would have been better spent at a difference conference due to this alone. Posters should have been with the exhibits, as that was where people spent most of their time mingling - it was where the coffee, food and buzz was located. If it truely takes two rooms for posters an exhibits then setup some of each in both or have refreshments in both. The science and engineering presented in posters took a back seat to marketing (exhibits). Ironically the exhibitor participants were largely competitors of one another, yet at the conference to learn more about restoration science and engineering.

during the final panel discussion - could have used the power point to and have someone type in each question. seemed like the speakers sometimes forgot what the question was. gave each of them too long to answer and encouraged all to answer when it wasn't always necessary. should have taken the questions on the cards and started with the best - tossed the rest

The breakout session rooms were too small, especially for the Sediment Transport session.

Sediment transport breakout was placed in too small a room and many were not able to attend. I thought the panel discussion was too short and with so many long answers to each question not many questions were addressed. And just when we started to see some real debate the time was up.

There was not enough space in the presentation rooms for everyone who wanted to attend. I did not attend a Wed afternoon session because I couldn't get in the room.

Some of the breakout sessions seemed to have repetitive topics

The morning sessions for sediment transport...the room was way too small and I couldn't hear a majority of the speakers

too many people for the space--everything I attended had folks standing in the back of the rooms

The crowds and limited space for the break off sessions

Limited available seating for sessions

The breakout sessions only allowed time for a total of one or two questions for the presentors. I think more time should be allowed for questions after the presentations and this a great opportunity for exchange of ideas. The several of the rooms were very small and resulted in people standing or sitting on the floor during presentations.

Plenary rooms too small.

Poor organization. Many abstracts did not make it to the printout, and are still not on the website. The poster presentations should have been placed where they could be seen - not in a small back room where no one looked. The small rooms for the breakout sessions were ridiculous - by asking people which sessions they were likely to attend during registration, this could have been better organized. Hotel registration was a sham too.

Seating was limited.

There was too much overlap in the morning and afternoon session. I felt I saw the same presentation (with even repeat pictures) 4 times between Underwood and Joe Berg. Even the presentation on Thursday by Will Harman was very similar to his presentation the day before.

Several of the presentations between the Regional Scale Initiatives & Lessons Learned overlapped and were repetitive (Underwood, Berg, Michelsen).

There were apparently too many people for some of the rooms. It was very crowded. A tribute to the conference though!

Too many good sessions scheduled at the same time and it was difficult to pick which one to attend

The chairs were EXTREMELY uncomfortable.

Too much at once, not enough time to get out of it all that I wanted to. No morning coffee.

Too many sessions were held at the same time so other topics were missed. Only have 2 or 3 concurrent sessions rather than 4. Break the sessions in the shorter time periods, 2 or 3, to allow for people to switch between more easily without interrupting speakers. Larger rooms for presentations so people aren't standing and sitting on the floor.

Lack of adequate seating in the breakout rooms.

Concurrent sessions must be run on time. Many talks did not start or end on time.

Lunch was good but the facility did not provide an adequate amount and many were late for the luncheon speaker or had to eat during the talk which disturbed others at the same table.

I didn't think the panel discussion really lived up to its potential. I was a little disappointed afterward, having wanted more questions answered.

The conference was advertised as a practitioners conference. The academics who overwhelmed the presentations did not have any practical experience and had the nerve to put up slides that said "No lazy thinking." Who did they think was at the conference? I was embarrassed by the stone throwing at Dave Rosgen. The Rosgen critics were totally unprofessional and needed to get off their high horse and realize that people outside of the university system have good ideas too. I was also very disappointed because several presenters in the break out sessions used the exact same slides of the exact same project and that was for storm water management. That reflects a severe lack of field and project experience in terms of stream restoration. This could have been a super conference if there had been less pontificating from inexperienced academicians and more talk from folks who actually implement projects. It's easy to design on paper and make up models, the rubber meets the road during implementation in the real world.

the breakout rooms were very crowded

Posters should have been more prominently displayed.

Unfortunatley the break out rooms were too small for the crowds we had, so several of the session were full with standing room only. This kind of thing is impossible to predict, but it does detract from the presentations if everyone can't be seated.

Some of the presentation rooms were a bit small.

Seating. I prefer seats with tables. The breakouts I attended were very crowded.

Too many sessions going on at once that I wanted to attend. I am glad that you put the presentations on line so that I could look at the ones I missed.

Limited and somewhat biased presentations related to Mountaintop Removal

I saw \$\$ dollar signs floating over 90%of the attendees. There was not enough emphasis placed on biological restoration...too many enginners or wannabes that dont understand biology.

I felt that the speakers were too narrowly focused on highly specific issues of little larger relevance.

Break out rooms were too small for attendees to sit comfortably.

It was too crowded. I could not get into any morning "breakout sessions".

too much emphasis on the form and process based issues - although it is very important to understand when developing a program.

Having to choose among the break-out sessions

the cold weather

The conference length...an additional day of panel discussions would have been good...

The pre-conference workshop was not very helpful. The WARSSS topic is excellent, but is a challenge to cover in 1 day. I recommend that Rosgen teach that class himself at least for the first few times.

Repetitive presentations, total 3 presentations (Keith Underwood, Joe Berg, etc.) about Coastal plains, regenerative stormwater, etc. While the presentations were good, this was excessive and on the expense of other presentations that could have been given. The similarities should have been caught at the pre-screening phase and the topics should have been combined into one effective presentation.

The facility was not large enough for our group and the employees obviously were not used to handling a situation like ours. They were actually vacuuming in the hallway when we were overflowing out of the conference room doors listening to one of our speakers. Not good. I wouldn't use that facility again. Food options were terrible and the prices were too high.

Lack of/uncomfortable seating, greatly discouraged attendance at some sessions

Some of the meeting rooms were small. There were some personal agendas being expressed (Dam Removal)that went passed the techniques and benefits of Dam removal and onto a soapbox of how NSD gets all of the money.

-rooms for the breakout sessions weren't large enough, could not get into the session I wanted in the morning.

I thought that the individual rooms for the talks were too small. Many had standing room only, and some people could not attend due to lack of room.

I think my pre-conference workshop was a little over my head for having an ecology background.

hearing the same talk on the same project 4 times

Standing room only in breakout sessions (which is better than empty seats, but still crowded)

Rooms for breakouts were too small.

Some of the speakers, particularly for the panel discussion, obviously did not prepare a talk for this session and just presented a canned talk that was irrelevant (Hey, Simon, Rosgen).

In the future, it would be nice if coffee and water were provided all day. Outside the conference rooms.

Location was good but the facilities for the conference were too small. The breakout rooms could not handle the crowds. Display area was nothing special with a small representation of organizations and significant booth fee

The facility while very nice, was a bit small for the breakout sessions and in the main room as well. Also, I did not receive a ticket for a free cocktail. If you are providing something for everyone, make sure you actually have enough. Some of the presentations were repetitive, same slides etc.

Participants were rude. Break sessions should not have been available the whole time. Participants wandered in and out of the conference area to get coffee, etc and were a HUGE distraction. The food quality was good, but there wasn't enough. The serving staff too quickly moved the food from the tables before I had enough to eat. Disagreement is always good, but I felt the last day panel discussion was a WASTE of my time. I didn't think that the panel served any purpose other than to act like a Jerry Springer show. I felt overwhelmed by the level of discussion and the heavy reliance on engineering. The conference should have been strictly marketed to engineers.

Some cramped rooms

nothing really

one of the main things i was interested in was related to dam removal, but i did not see a project or hear a speaker specifically address the stabilization of the legacy sediments.

Certain breakout sessions did not have enough seating.

1) I would have liked to have seen some more discussion on the some of the incorrect aspects of Kandolf's presentation as well as a review of his two projects by Rosgen. 3) The need to choose between sessions and smallness of the rooms.

Overbooked. There was not even standing room in many of the sessions and there was little time built in the schedule between sessions to see the exhibits and posters. The posters were hidden in a back room. The panel discussion was poorly moderated.

The organization needs some help. There was not a detail schedule in the program, which meant you had to wonder around to see who was talking when. The boards that detailed this information moved around, and that was inconvenient.

Room sizes were too small to accommodate attendees comfortably.

I thought there was too much anti Dave Rosgen.

small breakout rooms

The break-out sessions were too crowded and overall the conference was over-booked for the size of the facility.

Wed afternoon presentations seemed a little weak and too general. Perhaps less experienced people enjoyed them.

It seemed that the break-out sessions, the lunch, and the facility overall was overwhelmed by the volume of people that attended. While appreciate CVI expanding the capacity of the conference, I hope that in future conferences, CVI will anticipate the number of interested people and book an appropriately sized facility.

The small breakout sessions were in rooms too small. Would like to see more quality presentations given to all.

Breakout sessions - especially the space available in each room.

Breakout session rooms were not nearly large enough.

The fact that I could only stay for the first day.

The rooms were very crowded and ability to carry-on networking was limited. Although, the conference was attended by

many of our competitors and I think that inhibited a lot of open discussion. Stream Restoration is a small niche that may be getting crowded.

The three on the panel Simon, Wilcock and Kondolf did not have background or experience enough to be credible critics. Simon and Kondolf appeared to be on ego trips but were not qualified to comment on a process they were not familiar with.

Lack of seating and crowded space.

The Breakout Sessions did not have adequate room for everyone.

The last afternoon - the last two speakers should probably have been first in the morning. Few stayed after the panel discussion to hear them. People came to hear the panelists debate their respective positions; instead, they heard responses to questions from the floor. The attraction was to find out why there is such polarization among panelists, when, I think, many participants felt it needed to be both-and, not either-or.

There was a lot of information given, but often not enough time for discussion and questions afterwards.

I thought the conference focused more on stream hydrology/dynamics, which is good. However, I was expecting more restoration techniques, and different projects to be highlighted.

breakout rooms were too small

The crowded rooms and confusion about which session took place at what time and in what room (especially with an agenda that had the pages out of order!). It would have been helpful to have time slots assigned in the handout. Also, several of the anticipated presentations were cancelled.

As I am sure most everyone noted, the rooms for the breakout sessions were far too small to adequately seat all attendees. That made it very difficult to hear and see the presentations as folks were constantly trying to maneuver for a seat or space. It also made it difficult to move from session to session to listen to other presentations.

Smallish rooms for breakouts. Poster session was squirreled away in a corner, perhaps it could be located more central to where people gather, perhaps in the same room as the Exhibitors.

Crowded conditions.

Inexperience in stream restoration made some of the topic matter difficult to follow.

Breakout rooms were too small. The conference should have ended after the panel discussion.

I think that the break out sessions are good, but space was extremely limited in the afternoon breakout sessions. Perhaps having one of them in the larger conference room might have worked better. Also, maybe having two more projectors and screens for individuals in the back of the room to see.

The breakout sessions needed more space.

Break out sessions should not have been broken up by lunch. The panel discussion question selection (of submitted questions) did not lend to the discussion that was anticipated by attendees.

Please list any other additional comments, suggestions, etc., here:

need more opportunities for posters

The reception was very lovely. It added a very nice touch to the whole conference. Having the breaks in the exhibit area provided a great opportunity for the vendors to get visits.

Thank you - excellent job

Rooms were too small for some of the breakout sessions, especially sediment transport. The high registration fee deterred some of my colleagues and students from attending.

The best conference I've attended in a very long time!

Limit your attendance numbers to reflect the resources available. Provide handouts from each panelest, if avialable, next time. Allow a better break during plenary sessions. Many went over and ran into other sessions or negated the break time. I never went near the posters b/c they were not integrated into the other activities and the social was not directed that way at all. Add a bar to that area to coax people in that direction.

I was disappointed at not being able to get into the breakout session that I wanted in the afternoon due to lack of space.

The breakout sessions need to be shorter (no more than one hour) with time in between to network. Additional time needs to be set aside for networking, which is why most people supporting the conference attend.

Thanks for a great conference!

Floating between sessions would be much easier if the rooms were arranged slightly differently- when the only aisle is down the center of the room, that really hinders moving between sessions.

All in all the conference was great.

Your attempt to hold an objective panel discussion on the "natural channel design" controversy was laudable. I think the structure was a bit constrictive, however, especially the manner in which the Q&A was conducted. Only a very few questions were actually fielded by the audience, and some of the questions selected from the notecards were "softball" pitches in that they did not get to the meat of the controversy between the researchers and practitioners regarding some of the scientific underpinnings or inadequacies of the natural channel design approach. What was also missing was the opportunity for the panelists to question each other on the scientific issues.

Post papers, etc. on the web site in addition to the video of the panel discussions.

- end with panel discussion or whatever "highlight" for the next conference - speakers put effort into closing presentations that many did not stay for
- allow more time for questioning the 'experts'/discussion time
- allow for travel time the last day/half day
- offer more concurrent breakout sessions
- time of year/location considerations
- Overall, very informative and well put together. This was my first MASRC and it was good to be with so many people with a common goal/interest.

Great job

Overall a very informative and pleasant time. The staff did a nice job coordinating and keeping everything on schedule.

From a logistics standpoint, it would have been helpful if they could have had more than 2 food tables set up so you wouldn't miss the chance to connect with folks over lunch because you were still in line. Minor detail, but might help in planning next time.

Overall, excellent conference. Good topics, good speakers. Only kink in it was the facility was too small for all the people who attended.

Paula and CVI did a great job.

More space! There was standing room only in nearly all breakout sessions.

We need to address urban area problems, or just say we cannot fix these areas

CVI did a great job, I look forward to 2009.

I thought the pannel discussion was a great idea, but was disappointed in the question/answer session. The Q&A had too many pie in the sky questions that diverted from the real issues at hand related to the two camps. In particular, the way the questions were asked Rosgen did not really get a chance to respond to his critics. If this is ever done again, it should be ran more like a debate with each side having 5 minutes to talk. The pie in the sky questions asked to all 6 pannelist burned a good 20 minutes of discussion. I though the Bankfull vs Design flow picked by an ecologist discussion at the end was great and wished that the entire Q & A session addressed the key differences in opinion in a similar manner. In the future the

questions should be preset with agreement from both camps.

Suggestion: Limit project-based presentations to those that have been fully constructed and, if possible, monitored for several years. Also, posters were in an out of the way location. They would have been better appreciated if they were set up in the hallway outside the conference rooms, lobby, etc.

Make the next conference longer and schedule unstructured time for networking in addition to the social evening.

Great food

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$Ethics and stream restoration. Why people with limited knowledge are in this bussiness?\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$

Excellent social events, excellent location. Rocky Gap a great facility. Consider having here again.

Maybe a site visit (rotating bus schedule) to a local restored stream.

Oral session heads should make announcements regarding posters in his or her session. Given the limited number of posters in each session, the poster titles and authors could have been placed on a powerpoint slide to to be read off at the oral session.

Facility and food was very nice.

this is a great meeting of the minds. please keep up the great work. the posters were a bit out of the way and I'm not sure most people even saw them. could have moved them to the hallway during the exhibit reception or something to give them more visibility.

Other than inadequate space for breakout sessions, the facility was excellent. Rooms were nice, good food on premises, quiet scenic area. I highly recommend this location for future conferences, if better conference rooms (for breakouts) can be obtained.

Looking forward to the next one!

Overall, an excellent conference, well planned and well organize. The Panel was outstanding and provided more infomration that one could possibly take in and all was straight from the author's mouth.

Was worth the time

Wireless internet at the resort was not free.

Great line up of presenters...by far the most enjoyable conference I have attended.

Keep up the good work.

- 1)Some talks were interrupted by the rattling of doors as people entered and exited. Doors should be fixed so as not to make noise when people open and close them, or perhaps a staffer could be placed by the door to open and close them quietly.
- 2)In addition, many sessions were overflowing, the sediment transport session for example -- I wanted to attend that session but could not because of the crowd. Need bigger rooms.
- 3)A content comment: Many presentations were based on the Rosgen method and yet the main point of the panel discussion was the flaws in the Rosgen system. Rosgen's method is well packaged, Simon/Willock/Kondolf's is not, and thus practitioners will continue to use the Rosgen method, despite its purported flaws. Can Simon refine his tiered process-based method and offer trainings?
- 4) Food was great!

I would suggest that presentations be reviewed to avoid overlapping within the afternoon sessions as well as within the entire conference.

Seems like too much was crammed into the 2 days. Make the conference longer.
The poster session wasn't advertised well. Didn't even see the room w/ the posters until after lunch on the last day.

Excellent location. Warm weather would have been nice.

make the conference one day longer to accommodate only 2 parallel sessions at the same time.

The moderator for the dam removal plenary session was ineffective.

In the future, have a work group or panel discussion of the terms that we all use but don't necessarily agree on like "natural" and "stable." If a channel is stable but unnatural, should we restore it? What about a natural, but unstable channel? As a profession I think we need to better address our goals.

Overall a very good conference. CVI should be commended for bringing this much needed and timely group of specialists together to discuss what is a somewhat unique but relevant topic.

Overall, a good conference. Perhaps if you do a panel discussion again, limit audience questions to just those that were written down.

You owe Dave Rosgen an apology for having to sit through that panel of folks that attacked him personally just because he actually does projects when all they can do is criticize.

I thought the conference went very well. The schedule was tight and I know we got behind on several occasions, but I didn't hear any negative comments. In the future I suggest we have it at a location that has more restaurants nearby.

Very good conference and well organized.

It would have been nice to have more time for questions during the panel discussion

for the panel discussion, I think some of the questions were answered a bit monotonously, that is to say each panelist repeated the same points of the panelist before them

Excellent conference!!! Another great job by CVI!!

The panel discussion was very good. I would like to see a follow up on how the panelist could work together to further advance the science and art of stream restoration and not the advancement of a particular style of restoration.

Perhaps having more prerequisites for the pre-conference classes would have helped me to choose a class that better fit into my background.

speakers need to be vetted with more scrutiny.

The posters were tucked into a hole in the wall. Most people didn't ever notice or know about it, making the poster-makers' efforts seem like a waste.

The rooms were not large enough to house the number of people attending.

Break-out different sessions or tracks. Do two separate conferences. One for all the RUDE engineers and then one for all the practical people that put these projects on the ground.

My only concern is that many of the policy makers and funders (and academics!) are novices in terms of technical restoration practice. It is vital for us to bring them up to speed before engaging them in meaningful evaluation of the practice.

i'm sure you've heard this already, but the conference room sizes were way too small for the crowd.....also, while this was a very quaint location and prob involving the most spectacular fall views i've had in my life, getting there was inconvenient.

The panel discussion had a great list of people. It may have been helpful to solicit and/or develop questions for the panel members prior to the conference. It would have also helped if the moderator had more of an active role in controlling the primary responses and rebuttals.

Please do not allow a moderator to present in the same session. This can lead to significant time delays, and reduced attendance for a particular speaker.

I was disappointed that the panel discussion got cut off (ran out of time)right when they started to discuss bankfull discharge.

I think you need a slightly larger venue, however I did enjoy the atmosphere of the Rocky Gap Conference center

It was only possible to get to one of The courses on tuesday. Perhaps set it up so that attendess could go to one course on say Tuesday and the other on Wednesday. This would mean a 4 day meeting or perhaps the Wednesday afternoon stuff could be moved to the evening.

Ensure the facility is large enough, or there is a registration cut off, for those in attendance.

Unfortunately I cannot accurately rate the entire conference since I was only there for the pre-conference workshops.

Great job by the conference planners. I would have preferred a more urban location to allow for more informal gathering after hours.

Congratulations and thankyou to the entire CVI staff for a well run and managed conference. You should all feel good about a job well done!!

I wish the rooms for the presentations had been larger, the room schedules were added to the programs, and that the presentation sessions were on a more strict schedule so that it would be possible to better rotate through the sessions so that I could better get out of the conference what I wanted by attending the individual presentations that I wanted. This year that was hard to do.

More time for panel discussion. the panel had excellent people, but there was not enough time for questions to be throughly discussed.

The Rocky Gap facility was very accommodating otherwise.

Overall, I believe this was one of the best conferences I have attended in a long time. The quality of the presentations, the speakers, the easy access to the conference location, the food, the lodging, the friendliness of the conference organizers and the staff at the conference center were excellent. Again, highest kudos to CVI.

I suggest that you provide email addresses on attendee lists. Include steering committee members on the attendee list as well as the committee list.

Provide tables and chairs at the social - standing eating drinking and talking amongst the din is a real bummer.

All and all this was a great conference. It was very easy to see that there was a lot of time and effort put forward, especially behind the scenes. Thank you so much and I can't wait for the next Conference!

This year's conference will be hard to beat, but I'm sure that you'll do your best to outdo yourselves for the next one!

I sent a poster to the meeting, but did not attend. Therefore, I have no basis in which to judge the successes/failures of the meeting. So far no one has contacted me about the poster I presented.