

**Upper Klamath Basin Science Workshop
Water and Water Related Resources
February 2004**

**Conference Evaluation Form
Questions & Answers Received**

- I. Did the information presented in this workshop meet your expectations and needs? Please explain.**
1. Yes. It was somewhat fragmented, expected since this was the first meeting of its kind in the basin.
 2. Presenters did an excellent job; participation by audience was similarly excellent. Much information about the biology, ecology and aquatic conditions was shared. Some suggestion that more is known than previously may have been believed. More attention to further analysis of existing data sets; and discussions of priorities will assist our agency planning.
 3. For the most part, yes. Although I appreciate how through many of the presentations were (presenting many preliminary results, graphs) I really appreciated the more results-oriented talks.
 4. Yes. Exceeded expectations actually. Good input on Hydro, investigations very weak on basic wetland-algae research.
 5. Exceeded expectations-excellent coverage of the broad spectrum of research activities, also viewpoints of stakeholders.
 6. Yes. Learned many new facts, ideas even in areas where I was relatively well-informed.
 7. Yes.
 8. Mostly. I'd hoped for more participation from mere stakeholders---our needs and expectations.
 9. Provided a good and timely update on contemporary studies. While executive summaries of presentations are helpful, a website with power of presentation would help review.
 10. Sucker section-Yes. The major needs were brought out as a result of the presentations.
 11. Yes. Tremendously helpful at gaining additional perspective on research/needs of others.
 12. It did not meet my "needs", but that probably would not be possible. It did meet my expectations, but my expectations will be higher next time.
 13. Information is useful if for nothing else than to provide opportunity to conjoin research/technical works that may overlap. Secondly, importance of "who" involved in Klamath Basin.
 14. Yes, great exchange during the day. Adding a night-time mixer/entertainment would increase opportunities to talk.
 15. Yes.

16. Good overview of the diversity and equality of research and ?
17. Yes.
18. Yes
19. Yes, scientist perspectives led to better understanding of complex issues and were well presented. Synthesis and discussions were informative and helpful.
20. Yes. A broad range of topics and many experts in the field.
21. Yes, I think it was a good start in identifying the current state of the science and start working toward some consensus on needs to be done next.
22. The information presented exceeded my expectations-lots of really good information that helps tie up information “voids” that occur when agencies do not communicate with each other.
23. Yes & No! Separation of Upper Basin from the rest of the Klamath does a disservice to developing holistic solutions. Separating water and fish into concurrent sessions prevented or hindered the sharing of information.
24. Yes.
25. Yes. The day 2 & day 3 technical sessions were informative and stimulating.
26. Good information, although much/many main point had been made last year, but '03 updates were very useful. I'm much better updated on current state of various research projects.
27. Yes.
28. Very good. I was hoping for secure based overview of past/ongoing studies and also what we don't know. Some presenters were more honest than others about the limitations of their interpretations and recommendations. Overall it was very helpful and valuable.
29. Conference exceeded expectations. As someone from outside the Klamath Basin, the conference provided a real perspective on scientific progress in addressing ecological problems of the watershed.
30. Yes.
31. They did. The overview of the Basin and research in the Basin was excellent. I came away with more background information than I expected. I can use designing research for my need in wetlands/rivers.
32. Yes it did. As a newcomer to the issues surrounding the Klamath Basin, this workshop was an excellent opportunity to gain an understanding about the history of situation and the current efforts of answer the questions being asked.
33. This was very well done in all respects. I liked the science focus and the emphasis on science needs.
34. NO. Upper Klamath Basin Workshop title was misleading It truly was a workshop addressing Sucker Biology & Water management

- associated with Sucker Management. Should have addressed a varied group of information and impacts on several species.
35. Yes-note that I work on a related service, but not in Klamath Basin. By its nature, this was an informational sharing session for Klamath researchers, and therefore, much of these discussions didn't pertain to broader application.
 36. Somehow the Sucker and Hydro people should be hearing each others issues. Some presentations should involve both groups- Wetland restoration, water management, and what that means to fish habitat, life cycles and survival, etc.
 37. Fairly well, I only attended the first day.
 38. Yes, Need more often.
 39. Yes- I felt it very important for the various researches to be kept abreast of others work. This was accomplished.

II. Was the mix between presentations and follow-up discussions useful and productive? Please explain.

1. Good mix
2. Very productive discussions, leading to well identified information needs and discussions of difficulties in filling need.
3. Mostly yes, splitting up into smaller work groups will encourage greater discussions.
4. Good time for responses to presentations.
5. Yes, ample opportunity for discussions of each presentation.
6. Yes. Especially option to interact later via email.
7. Yes. Very good mix.
8. It was a good beginning.
9. Yes work well and kept on schedule. Difficulty in that, couldn't see contemporaneous papers in WQ and fisheries.
10. Yes. This aspect of the workshop was extremely productive. An annual workshop of this form should occur to continue to focus needs.
11. Yes. Involvement of audience was crucial to the workshop needs.
12. Extremely useful. Definitely the strength of the workshop. Leaving plenty of time for discussion was a great move!
13. Very useful to allow discussion to continue after presentations for exchange of ideas. As often, a presentation is a "spring board" for ideas.
14. Yes. Good mix of presentations and discussion.
15. Yes. Breaks 20-30 min. to allow follow up conversations.
16. Yes. It is important to have folks interact with researchers and provide constructive input.
17. Should try to provoke more discussion. Not just Q&A.
18. Some questions were not answered because of timing constraints.
19. Yes. Slightly redundant, but necessary.

20. Yes. Do you have the opportunity to give suggestions and comments and then discuss future research?
21. For some reason, there didn't seem to be many questions after some good talks. There was however good discussions after the talks informally between people.
22. Yes. This was a nice change from past meetings where there was little or no chance of in-depth discussions.
23. Some Yes and some NO. A lot of interesting discussions took place, however, when the discussion left on tangent, the majority of those time the moderator did not try to redirect the discussion back toward the goals of the workshop. That is, some items were discussed too long and a lot of times were dominated by one or two individuals.
24. Eh! The value depends on the objective at the workshop. It seems this follow-up discussion should have stated desired outcomes, such as additional needs, opportunities with other studies for collaboration. How can we improve our research and monitory efforts.
25. Yes.
26. Yes. It really added to the flow of information and stimulation of research findings and needs.
27. Follow-up discussions were extremely valuable and lead to new or improved research needs.
28. Good discussions were common. Although usually dominated by only a few people, but tough to deal with that and the opportunity was there for others to comment. Good not to go all day before opening it up for discussion.
29. Yes.
30. Yes. Good time allowed for questions and discussions. This was especially helpful when presenters were explicit about there unknown and puzzling data. In these cases, audience members had very insightful ideas or possible interpretations.
31. Yes. At this stage, dividing the conference by disciple was extremely useful. In the future a conference emphasizing the interaction of Hydrology-Water Quality and fisheries as a central theme would be essential to make various discipline scientists thank in the context of the total watershed.
32. Yes.
33. Yes. It was very important hearing the least 10 min of dialogue. I would have liked to seem more time for dialogue of the more controversial wrc/intr disciplinary group interactions.
34. Yes. But it could have been better. Some of the presentations attempted to provide too much information. I realize this is a not uncommon.
35. Yes. Ample time was allowed for lengthy discussion (with the exception of Bill Lewis).

36. Yes...it always take an audience some time to get used to this format (I've facilitated something very similar on lamprey)
37. Yes.
38. Excellent follow-up discussions---need generation with sucker sections.
39. Yes-leaving 10-15min for discussion was very valuable. Idea exchange and input was obtained from numerous informal folks.

III. What specific information was of greatest value to you? Please describe below.

1. Markle presentation, outside reviewers talks, Bro/Wrd joint water quality/sucker study.
2. Summary of information about biology and ecology of suckers and beginners of integration (water quality, circulation, fish)
3. Beau Freeman & Eric Henry's presentations. They had specific recommendations on what exactly could be done to solve water resource & water quality problems in the Basin.
4. Hydro, other WQ contrib. (e.g. Mike Deas)
5. Descriptions of current wetland research by different groups- I now know what topics are being investigated and what research to be studied.
6. Specific information about data collection methods, assumptions made and methodology used to arrive at results, revealing strengths and weaknesses of reported results and degree of certainty associated with resulting management initiatives.
7. Scientific presentations.
8. The comments of the scientists related to major changes on water management...that there is not enough data to get more wetlands, inquire more land, etc.
9. Interim results in fish radio tagging studies UKL. Linkage with simultaneous WQ monitoring studies- invaluable!
10. Identifying major "needs". This list can now be used to direct future work and ultimately development of management and recovery plans.
11. Really appreciated hearing from Ralph Cheng briefly on the Sucker Ecology Session. I think his program could provide huge. Also hearing from outside reviewers about some successes in their programs was great in providing promise and direction.
12. Doug Markles elucidation of avenues of logic available to decision-makers and researchers regarding measurement of linkages among sucker life stages.
13. Discussion following my presentation on proposal work has provided ideas that might have initially been overlooked by me while there was still time to change the direction of the proposal.
14. Making contract with other researchers, and learning what types of works are occurring. The "big picture", ecosystem-type presentations (e.g., lake circulation, nutrient processing, ground water) were most helpful.

15. The communication with other participants. The outside reviewer participation was excellent.
16. Learning what is being done.
17. Circulation in UKL, Sprague River Modeling.
18. All information was of great value to gain a broader perspective of complex ecosystem issues.
19. Getting everyone who does research on suckers in the basin together in one room to share research, ideas, and information.
20. The groundwater information from USGS. There is a need for more updates in their findings.
21. Can't point to any one thing, but gained a great deal of valuable information.
22. As a fishery biologist studying suckers, I think the information of greatest value would have been the water quality issues in the basin. Although the sucker session and water session was separated, two water people gave brief talks in the fish session. I think I got the greatest value out of their talks mostly because I did not know the different types of research they were working on here in the basin.
23. Doug Markle's presentation on analysis approaches. In day 2 this information suggested that we need to agree on how we want to make decisions before we start arguing about the decisions.
24. Water quality/quantity. This workshop has been a great opportunity for information exchange.
25. Technical information on days 2&3 was great!! Great exchange of research information and ideas.
26. Great info from invited folks in sucker ecology session. Lake hydrologic model.
27. Specific science behind recommendations for things such as lake levels, benefits or problems with wetland restoration, options for reducing algae bloom. Interesting to see some new ideas on how to study and solve these problems, especially by people who are not "wedded" to a certain recommendation. (i.e. lake levels are best way to improve sucker habitat)
28. Sources and fates of water and nutrients. There was much more monitoring and research than I was aware of.
29. The Lewis talk, Gregory talk, (ones perspective). Geographical overview of the basin. Talks related to wetland research, nutrient cycling, lake ecology.
30. The sucker ecology sessions were of greatest value to me. They showed me how much we don't know about the suckers, but they also showed how much has been learned in only a relatively short time.
31. Questions about over winter survival issues were interesting. Questions about non native species were seemingly important. Stan Gregory's presentation was powerful.

32. Understanding strength on weakness of life stages as relates to adult sucker insight.
33. The talk by Dr. Lewis most valuable based on data and what information you could conclude from that data.
34. What was going on elsewhere in US, Sucker Management, Sucker Science, Science Admin. Impromptu additions to Sucker Sessions from water quality sessions.
35. Updates on research as opposed to more general talks on methods or what might be done.

IV. What specific areas would you suggest for improving future science workshops? Please describe below.

1. Enhanced integration of sucker ecology and physical hydrology. For example why separate the Adams and Wood talks (joint studies?) Design meeting format to facilitate collaboration across discipline and organizational lines.
2. Summary of information about Hydrology & Ecology of suckers and beginnings of integration (water quality, fish)
3. More condensation of conclusive results & specific recommendations. More time dedicated to networking.
4. Force integration. Upper and lower basin science. Integrate sucker fish-WQ-Hydro will intensify urgency of need for restoration.
5. More coverage of the full spectrum of biota in the ecosystem-algae, phytoplankton grazers, planktivores, insects, in lake macrophytes, etc. These all play important roles that must be understood if UKL is to be returned to a state that can support healthy populations of endangered fish.
6. Need a better written description, probably from managers or stakeholders. As to the goals from their perspective. These goals should be as specific as possible.
7. Allow a short power point or video by Klamath Water users on science impact—decision by agencies impact on our lives.
8. There needs to be a better integration of fisheries and water quality studies. Some sort of joint session to stimulate. Fertilization and use of existing data sets.
9. “bringing down the wall”. We need ways to foster discussions between the various resource disciplines. A more “mixed” format for the meeting could be useful for a few key presentations. This was done for a few presentations and was very useful.
10. Shorten, (or eliminate?) management needs.
11. It is critical that we integrate disciplines next time. NO CONCURRENT SESSIONS. Plan an agenda based more on geography-UKL, Sprague River, etc. and mix the presentation among disciplines. Have a full day set aside at the end-have a researchers panel and a managers panel, and exchange thoughts and needs to improve communication between the two.

12. Little opportunity to attend split session. (concurrent sessions).
Outside reviews are important. Continue to allot discussion time beyond the usual question/answer period as most stimulation/ideas come from these periods.
13. Again-nighttime mixer/event to increase opportunities to talk.
Improve manager needs talks, this would help guide research better.
Also a ½ day session with 8-10 min talks – with easily understood results (for managers)
14. Single integrated session of discipline presentations.
15. Too much talk, not enough plans.
16. Reduce redundancy. Issues provided for in written form need not be reexplained.
17. An area of improvement would be to identify some key questions or area of investigation and the select topics that support a specific topic-in order to formulate some specific recommendations.
18. Some of the discussion sessions in the fish ecology section were too long and discussion got away from the topic for that session. Maybe shortening discussion periods and having the facilitator direct participants back to the topic would have helped guide these sessions better.
19. I very much enjoyed the water talks in the fish ecology session and in future workshops linked talks such as the USGS fish behavior and Water quality talks. Should be given back to back (or at least considered for that) instead of an impromptu decision to have that occur.
20. We need specific, achievable, tangible outcomes from these types of meetings. Pre-work meeting to develop format of presentation so that biologist and hydrologists can share information based on study area.
21. This type of workshop needs to happen yearly.
22. My suggestions would be to tighten the schedule so that concurrent sessions were not necessary. It would have been nice if the managers could have been present for all the talks so that they would have a better idea about both needs and scientific methods.
23. Better integration about water and fish issues. Many presentations on the other side I would have liked to have heard. Tough, though, to keep it short without concurrent sessions.
24. Include presentations on effects of changes in water allocation on private businesses especially farming. I realize this is not the hours of ESA and resulting research, but the result of exposed actions, both in terms of fish habitat and water quality, but also economic impacts, need to be kept in mind, especially when so many scientists are not long term residents of the area they're studying.
25. In same length of conference mix both fish and water quality/quality issues for the total audience. This may require a tighter highly focused theme.

26. Handouts of presentation. Have a proceedings published of technical papers.
27. A large map of the Klamath Basin should be hung in each room where presentations are held. Each presenter could then delete/remove the slides in their presentations showing where they worked. This could allow 1-2 min per presentation for more science.
28. Perhaps there could be fewer concurrent sessions. I would have liked to hear more about research on water issues and the physical sciences.
29. Status of other species and impacts from lake level management.
30. Hold this session at the college in classroom setting for ergonomics.
31. Drop the managers agency advertising sessions or at least give them only 5-10min per agency to state needs. Broaden focus to biology for other issues than just sucker biology i.e., land management, interstate WQ and biology.
32. Many of us are interested in fish, WQ, and hydrology. I would like to see consecutive rather than concurrent sessions.

V. If this workshop was repeated, what would you prefer for the frequency, length, location, and time of year?

1. This meeting was a good model for the future.
2. Timing was good. Interim synthesis meetings every 2-3 years.
3. Once year. Great location (prefer KFalls) one week seems a bit long (prefer 2-3 days)
4. Timing and location excellent.
5. 1 per year, 2 days, Klamath, summer.
6. Winter good---this was good timing.
7. At least yearly-timing in year good for presentation annual progress- as late as early march would be ok.
8. Annually, Jan or Feb, four days.
9. Every year, 2 years. Good length, location, time.
10. Nov-Dec; I would be willing to spend a week; Klamath Falls is a good location, annual meetings are appropriate.
11. Technical working group—annual/bi-annual, 2-day conf, in Nov-Jan. timeframe, in Klamath Basin. Agency contribution with tech—bi annual, 1 day discussion, winter, Klamath Basin.
12. Overall, this was a good meeting- doing this every 2 years would be appropriate.
13. 1 day
14. Once per year, Feb, 3 days max.
15. Once per year, KFalls, 2 days.
16. like
17. Length, frequency, location, & time of year----all good.

18. Time of year was great, as was length & location. I would like to see this type of conference occurring on a yearly or biyearly basis in the future.
19. Good time of year. Shorten day sessions.
20. I think an annual meeting would be good. Length, location, and time of year were all fine.
21. At most, the frequency should be once per year. I think K Falls was a great location and if it changes it should be still in the Klamath Basin. The time of year should never be during the data collection (sampling season) portion of the year.
22. At least once per year on large scale and twice per year in specialty. Length is just about perfect, location is ok, time of year, has to be around this time of year.
23. Yearly, 3days, Klamath falls, winter.
24. The Shilo in Klamath was perfect. Time of year was good, with little conflicts with holidays and field sessions.
25. An added day would be beneficial if it would remove the necessity for concurrent sessions.
26. This worked quite well, timing & location- wise.
27. Every 2 years.
28. If it is annual, it should be 2 days. If a 4 day conference, then every other year. Also, try to avoid concurrent sessions. I would have liked to see some talks in other sessions. Need careful screening of talks, a few were very repetitions.
29. Repeat biannual, march or just past snow season, but before start of field season.
30. 2-3 days, Klamath, spring.
31. I would attend 2 days of scientific presentations. Three or even four eight-hour days listening to talks, overwhelms my patience and sometimes conversations. Perhaps Lower Klamath workshop might be near the mouths.
32. I think this workshop should be repeated every 2 years. Having the workshop in Klamath is appropriate. 4 days is plenty of time; mid-winter is probably the best time to ensure good attendance by the right people.
33. No preference
34. same
35. Klamath Falls, Length-should be a 2 ½ day; day 1 do in the pm, day 2 is a full day, last day finish up in the am. Time of year is perfect.
36. Annual, same location and time

VI. What next steps would you recommend to keep discussions going on future science needs and priorities?

1. We need a more formal planning and collaboration structure-both for scientist-scientist and scientist-managers outer actions, to structure research needs.

2. Formation of technical working groups; articulations of management goals for recovery and restoration.
3. Smaller work groups with appointed leaders. Give people responsibility.
4. Set research priorities from content and this workshop.
5. Interaction between managers and scientists must take place at design phase of research projects so that most relevant questions are investigated.
6. Development of specific technical working groups that might meet monthly.
7. Website of data—OIT, coordinated with agencies, managers, even stake holders.
8. Organizing discipline workshops with notification via USBR website-these might be fall events as prelude to this type of conference.
9. Develop a science “steering committee” that can take “needs” identified in an annual workshop such as this and summarize and prioritize.
10. Development of a master plan for Basin Science. Also an independent scientific review team.
11. I suggest forming TWIG’s to focus on specific research and policy needs that have been identified. At least one significant management rep should be involved in each TWIG.
12. Multiple agency/ interest/ discipline taskforce with representation of evolving science needs and authority to set priorities (perhaps more use of local & outside task groups?)
13. Form sub-groups, which would meet every 2 years alternating with the 2 year general meeting. This should be funded.
14. Technical work groups set up to focus on the important priorities.
15. meetings for peer review of available literature and periodically of how new literature is produced.
16. Regular meetings- re invite people to give updates on their recent findings. Start an on-line scientific newsletter with links similar to the California water news emails.
17. Scheduling and holding a meeting in the near future (next year)
18. Allow both disciplines (fish & water) to participate in each others presentations and discussions. This would be helpful for both future needs & priorities.
19. Process and structure we need formal and informal groups with structure for participation. We need better ways of sherry information (websites, list serves, journals, and newsletters)
20. Yearly conferences such as this one, and technical committees to meet more often to make sure info flows and plans are coordinated.
21. Arrange science & management workshop and at some point created plans & documents that have some weight in terms of policy & content-procedures etc. that will be followed by all involved.

22. Email discussions group, so people can be informal and discuss things such as development of strategic plan, strategy, standard approach types of things.
23. Periodic lower level meetings such as informal interdisciplinary updates of previous years results.
24. Have meetings on biannual basis.
25. This workshop was sponsored by several agencies, but I am not sure whether any one agency has been designated as the lead agency for following up on the suggestions for future research, or to act as a clearinghouse for data collection.
26. This session went so well, I hate to try to suggest alternatives.
27. It will take leadership and commitment for someone to take the lead to continue.
28. Formal management committees, formal working groups with changes.
29. Continued contact between those specific researchers who could provide input on study design and review results.

VII. Would a science workshop like this be worthwhile in the Lower Klamath River Basin?

1. Yes
2. yes
3. I don't know
4. yes, but force integration of work in both areas.
5. yes
6. Workshops & conference would be invaluable to LKR issue
7. Yes! Followed by synthesis of relevant basin wide issues from both workshops.
8. Yes
9. Yes. I think it would be useful (perhaps) every other year to have joint upper and lower basin meetings.
10. Most likely such a workshop is needed- Also, a joint workshop between upper and lower basin to bring together ideas from entire watershed.
11. yes
12. Very important
13. yes
14. yes
15. yes
16. Yes, It would probably be a longer conference
17. yes
18. yes
19. yes only so long as we have an additional workshop to address the integration of the upper and lower basin.
20. yes with focus on the lower basin issues and how the upper basin issues may influence lower basin issues.

21. yes. But I would likely not attend
22. Yes. Very much so. Needs to happen
23. Yes, absolutely. I'm guessing that's a system simpler system & how they relate to what comes in from above are important, obviously.
24. Yes with some talks to provide linkage to upper Klamath.
25. yes
26. yes I would attended
27. I have no opinion on this.
28. yes
29. Sort of-it would be helpful to understand suckers but would give little incite into ecosystem issues.
30. Yes Upper Klamath is its own little world.
31. Yes but would be less interesting because the landscape is much less diverse.
32. Absolutely, sooner the better.
33. Yes

VIII. Please share any other general comments or reactions you might have.

1. A very timely, productive meeting. Need to continue and build on this to structure future research.
2. Independent reviews-excellent learning from others experiment with T&E species, degraded habitats and ecosystems.
3. Thank you! I have a renewed interest and vigor in the issues surrounding the Basin.
4. Get on with This integration and management of science or face a one million dollar outside NRC type assessment in future. (NRC effort cost \$600,000+ shouldn't have been necessary!)
5. It would be very beneficial to arrange a venue that would encourage extended discussions among participants. Best might be poster sessions with refreshments, possibly encouraging participants to include a poster along with their sessions presentation so that detailed discussions of their work are facilitated.
6. Great workshop.
7. A scientist (several) said there is no correlation between lake levels/river flows and fish survival. We do not know how wetlands effect fish, PH & water quality and Tran evaporation impact, many similar findings make me nervous by permanent solutions like land/water acquisition with incomplete or flawed data. It will impact me, my neighbors & our entire local economy.
8. Concurrent sessions reduced potential information exchange. Need for interdisciplinary, integrated studies/presentation in evident.
9. Managers need to better articulate what they expect and what questions they need addressed from the technicians.
10. Thank you organizers! You worked really hard and I really appreciate your efforts! Encourage collaboration between organizations and disciplines in future meetings.

11. background, personal success, findings presentations rather than focusing on future needs, discussion of ideas, openings for criticism.
12. good to see movement toward common data collection (i.e., remote sensing, land use, vegetation data) and a web-based database for water quality data, bibliography, etc.
13. good work
14. Need to integrate lower and upper basin in a single workshop. Have presentation more focused on key issues or topics rather than just inviting researchers to present info they want to present. Give presenters guidance to present info most useful to group.
15. coffee was terrible
16. You are to be congratulated on your efforts for moving the process forward.
17. I would like to see a session on integrated science being done or planned.
18. Overall direction of science activities needs to have overall coordination and direction to make the best use of funding and energies and to focus on priority needs.
19. Please try to keep “side bar” conversations to a minimum, and require all cell phones be turned off during presentations.
20. I don't really feel that the 1st day of this workshop provided much useful info. Its easy to see why stakeholders get so frustrated dealing with bureaucrats.
21. I'm not sure how much the senior managers can get in a couple of hours. The summaries on Friday was good, but they should have the videos available so they can look at individual follow they're interested in, learning more details see better what went on.
22. Another need- with so many multidisciplinary studies ongoing, need to develop formalized QA/QC .
23. Thank you for doing a really thorough job putting on the workshop. It was clear a lot of work went into designing it. Running during the week and I am sure that your summary will be great.
24. My impression is that a lot of time & effort were spent in making this workshop happen (and it shows), but not enough time has been spent on deciding where to go from here or how to get there.
25. Many people worked hard to see there sessions succeed. Rip Shively and Dennis Lynch are to be congratulated for their leadership. Great job.
26. Get away from single species investigations and get into ecosystem/community impacts.
27. A keynote speaker to start the session off would have been nice, entertaining and energizing.
28. Try to engage local stakeholders further.
29. Don't hold concurrent sessions.