

Racing to Success
2005 Southern Region Water Quality Conference
Lexington, Kentucky
Evaluation
George F. Smith

Background

Racing to Success was held October 23-26, 2005 in Lexington, Kentucky. It was the tenth biennial conference organized and conducted by the Southern Region Water Quality Planning Committee (SRWQPC). The SRWQPC was created by the Southern Extension directors in 1988 to give leadership to regional water quality educational programming.

The three regional focus areas - agricultural pollution prevention, rural environmental protection and watershed management - and the four programs within each focus area provided the framework for the conference. A description of these 12 programs in addition to much more information on the SRWQPC can be found on the web at <http://srwqis.tamu.edu/>

Racing to Success included nine workshops in two half-day sessions, a resource fair showcasing educational resources, two poster sessions with a total of 55 posters presented, five half-day tours, and 67 concurrent presentations. Useful roles for the land grant university in disasters like the Gulf Coast hurricanes were discussed in a focused general session. Also, a block of time was set aside for program teams to meet and review their goals, discuss current efforts and identify projects for the coming year. Many of the 12 teams met; summary reports were given during the closing session.

A total of 178 people from 19 states attended the conference. They came from 1862 and 1890 land grant universities, federal agencies and state organizations.

Racing to Success was funded in part by USDA/CSREES under Agreement Number 2004-51130-03114 through Texas Cooperative Extension. The Cooperative Extension Service of the University of Kentucky and Kentucky State University hosted the conference.

Evaluation

Participants were asked to evaluate each workshop, tour and conference session they attended using a questionnaire provided at registration. They were also asked to evaluate the potential benefits of the conference for themselves, provide comments on conference strengths, suggest possible improvements, and identify potential topics for future conferences. A total of 50 evaluations were returned. Results are summarized below. This is followed by a summary for each session and all participant comments.

Conference Sessions

Participants were asked to estimate the value of the sessions they attended. A four-level Likert type scale was used with 1 representing Poor Value, 2 representing Fair Value, 3 representing Good Value, and 4 representing Excellent Value. They were asked to evaluate only the sessions they attended.

Overall mean scores for the opening session, concurrent paper sessions, poster presentations, and closing session ranged from a low of 2.5 (in the fair range) for one session to a high of 3.7 (upper good range) for five sessions. The overall mean score for all concurrent paper sessions was 3.3 (in the good range). The overall mean score for all poster sessions was 3.2 (also in the good range).

Scores and participant comments for each session are attached. The number of participants evaluating each presentation, the percentage of ratings in each category, mean scores for individual presentations, and the overall mean score for the session are included.

Workshops

The nine workshops were evaluated using the same response scale as that used for the conference sessions. Mean scores ranged from 3.3 (in the good range) to 3.9 (upper good range). The overall mean score for the nine workshops was 3.6 (upper good range). Individual workshop scores and comments are found in the attachment.

Tours

The five tours were also evaluated with the same four-point response scale. Scores for the tours ranged from 3.1 (in the good range) to 3.9 (in the upper good range). The overall mean for the tours was 3.6 (upper good range). Scores and comments on the tours are also included in the attachment.

Conference Impact

Eight statements were included in the evaluation asking participants' perceptions of the conference's impact on their knowledge, ability to plan and conduct educational programs, and on communication, cooperation and collaboration. A five-level Likert type scale was used to ask participants their level of agreement with each statement. A summary is presented in the following table.

As a result of the 2005 Water Quality Conference :	Percent Who Agreed or Strongly Agreed	Mean*
1. My capacity to produce successful water quality and natural resource programs has been strengthened.	90	4.3
2. I had an opportunity to participate in the sharing of successful educational strategies and programs.	90	4.3
3. My knowledge of current and potential water quality and other natural resource issues has increased.	92	4.4
4. I feel that cooperative working relations with Extension and other natural resource professionals at all levels, program areas, and academic disciplines will be enhanced.	88	4.3
5. I feel that working relations within universities between Extension, teaching and research will be enhanced.	80	4.2
6. I feel that coordination and cooperation among the states in the region will increase.	82	4.2
7. I had the opportunity to participate with one or more program teams.	80	4.1
8. I will be able to use information from the conference in my own programs/activities.	100	4.5

* 1=Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3=Neither Agree/Disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

The greatest level of agreement was with the eighth statement, “I will be able to use information from the conference in my own programs/activities. Every respondent either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The next greatest levels of agreement was with the statements “ My knowledge of current and potential water quality and other natural resource issues has increased”, “My capacity to produce successful water quality programs has been strengthened”, and “I had an opportunity to participate in the sharing of successful educational strategies and programs.” Technology transfer is a fundamental purpose of these conferences. These results indicate this purpose was fulfilled; participants believed they increased their knowledge, skills and abilities through the conference.

These eight statements reflect the conference goals. Overall, 80 percent or more of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with all of the statements, indicating the conference achieved its goals.

While still in the good range, the mean score was lowest for the statement “I had the opportunity to participate with one or more program teams.” Several written comments seem to indicate problems with communication about program teams and the opportunities to become involved. This merits consideration in planning future conferences and program team activities.

Conference Strengths

Participants were asked their opinions on the strengths of the conference. Points most often mentioned include the variety and quality of the workshops, tours, posters, and papers presented; networking opportunities; the planning and organization of the conference; the location and meeting facilities; and the hospitality of the host institutions.

Similar comments have been made about past conferences organized and conducted by the SRWQPC. These kinds of responses together with the responses to conference impact statements underline the real value of these conferences to the people in the region doing water quality work at the local, state and regional levels.

Suggestions for Improvement

Participants were also asked what could be done to improve future conferences. Several suggestions for topics including urban issues, program evaluation, linking research and Extension, and disaster response were made. Suggestions about organization and logistics, such as not scheduling activities on Sunday morning, were also made.

Suggestions from past conferences have been incorporated into program planning. The input from this conference will also be considered in planning future conferences and other regional activities.

Additional Comments

Several compliments as well as constructive criticisms were made. Compliments about the hotel staff and the efforts of the University of Kentucky and Kentucky State University in hosting the conference were also included.

All comments are included in the attachment for information and use in planning.

Racing to Success 2005 Southern Region Water Quality Conference Evaluation

Participants were asked to select the category best describing their current employment. The categories and number of participants selecting each one are:

Category	Number
COUNTY/AREA EXTENSION FACULTY/STAFF	25
RESEARCH FACULTY/STAFF	8
EXTENSION SPECIALIST	17
EXTENSION ADMINISTRATOR	0
FEDERAL AGENCY	0
STATE AGENCY	1
STUDENT	0
OTHER	4

Participants were asked to estimate the value of the sessions they attended. A four-level score was used with Poor Value = 1, Fair Value = 2, Good Value = 3 and Excellent Value = 4. The number of participants rating each presentation, the percentage of ratings in each category, the mean scores for individual presentations, the overall mean score for the session, and participant comments follow.

SUNDAY- October 23, 2005

LEVEL OF VALUE

8:30 a.m.- Noon. Workshops

Workshops:	Overall Mean — 3.5					
1. Water Basics 101	N=12	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 50	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.5
2. Animal Waste Lagoon Management	N=9	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 66.6	EXCELLENT 33.4	MEAN 3.3
3. Getting Started in Volunteer Monitoring	N=5	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 40	EXCELLENT 60	MEAN 3.6
4. Stormwater Phase II Runoff	N=7	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 43	EXCELLENT 57	MEAN 3.6
Comments:						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Don't plan Sunday a.m. Workshops! - Liked the demonstrations and activities in the Water Basics workshop - Please don't schedule Sunday mornings. 						

5:30 - 7:30 p.m. Resource Fair and Reception

Resource Fair	N=27	POOR	FAIR 7	GOOD 41	EXCELLENT 52	MEAN 3.4
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A fun time! Good networking opportunity. - Great to have the fun “competitive” activities instead of just getting stuffed with food. - A very friendly get together. - Loved the resource fair! An opportunity to finally <u>share</u> our resources. Great to leave it open thruout the conference & a great way to kick off the conference! - Did not participate but heard good comments. 						

MONDAY-October 24, 2005

8:30-10:00 a.m. General Session

General Session	N=49	POOR	FAIR 4	GOOD 61	EXCELLENT 35	MEAN 3.3
<p>Session Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could benefit from a more exciting talk highlighting some innovative, successful project or technology. - George’s talk was excellent. 						

10:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. - Poster Session/Break

Poster Session	N=50	POOR	FAIR 10	GOOD 66	EXCELLENT 24	MEAN 3.1
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too far from coffee. - Poster presenters need some guidelines. Reduce wordiness. Make it possible for audience to read poster in a reasonable amount of time! - Read them all. - Would like to see a set time other than break to view posters. 						

10:30 a.m.- Noon - Concurrent Sessions

I. WHAT IS QUALITY DRINKING WATER?							Overall Mean — 3.3						
1. Primacy in Kentucky: Providing Safe Drinking Water	N= 10	POOR	FAIR 30	GOOD 40	EXCELLENT 30	MEAN 3.0							
2. Tap Water vs. Bottled Water: Which is Better?	N=12	POOR	FAIR 8.3	GOOD 41.7	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.4							
3. Consumer Confidence Reports	N=9	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 55.5	EXCELLENT 44.5	MEAN 3.4							
<p>Session Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third presentation should have used examples, too regulatory, not enough success stories. - Too many slides in PowerPoint in first presentation. He did a better job when just talking & explaining things to the group. Bottled water presentation was good & interesting. - Speakers were very informative. 													

II. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT		Overall Mean — 3.33				
1. Master Gardener Programs	N= 8	POOR	FAIR 25	GOOD 37.5	EXCELLENT 37.5	MEAN 3.2
2. Building Teams to Address Rural-Urban Water Quality Issues	N=9	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 44	EXCELLENT 56	MEAN 3.6
3. An Assessment of Storm Water Runoff Issues in Pine Bluff, White Hall, the University of Arkansas-Pine Bluff and Jefferson County	N=10	POOR 10	FAIR	GOOD 40	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.3
Session Comments:						

III. WATERSHED ASSESSMENT		Overall Mean — 3.0				
1. An Integrated Approach of Research, Outreach and Management in the Tallapoosa River Basin	N= 7	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 57	EXCELLENT 43	MEAN 3.4
2. Monitoring Water Quality and Nutrient Dynamics for the Middle Tallapoosa Watershed Using Remote Sensing and GIS Techniques	N=7	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 100	EXCELLENT	MEAN 3.0
3. Sediment and Bacteria TMDL Technical Advisory Groups in Georgia	N=7	POOR 14	FAIR 14	GOOD 58	EXCELLENT 14	MEAN 2.7
Session Comments:						

IV. WATERSHED EDUCATION NETWORK (WEN)		Overall Mean — 3.4				
1. What is the WEN Partnership with EPA?	N= 6	POOR	FAIR 17	GOOD 66	EXCELLENT 17	MEAN 3.0
2. CSREES Southern Region Water Quality Agent Training	N=6	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 67	EXCELLENT 33	MEAN 3.3
3. Watershed Academy Successes	N=6	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 33.3	EXCELLENT 66.7	MEAN 3.7
Session Comments: - Very useful information. - Hard to choose only one session, many good ones at once.						

V. IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPLIANCE WITH CAFO RULES		Overall Mean — 3.1				
1. USDA Cost Share Programs Used to Prevent Point Source Pollution of the Floridian Aquifer in the SW Georgia Flint River Basin	N= 4	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 100	EXCELLENT	MEAN 3.0
2. Tillage, Crop Rotation and Poultry Litter Management Influences on Soil Properties	N=1	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 100	EXCELLENT	MEAN 3.0
3. A Web CT-Based Certified Animal Waste Vendor Training and Education Program	N=3	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 66.7	EXCELLENT 33.3	MEAN 3.3
4. Implementation of Management Practices to Reduce Pollution Potential Contributed by Livestock Waste	N=4	POOR	FAIR 25	GOOD 50	EXCELLENT 25	MEAN 3.0
Session Comments:						

VI. AGRICULTURAL NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT		Overall Mean — 3.0				
---	--	---------------------------	--	--	--	--

1. Pecan Tree Water-Nutrient Management Model	N= 9	POOR 33	FAIR 11	GOOD 56	EXCELLENT	MEAN 2.2
2. The PPM Calculator - A Model for Pasture Phosphorus Management and Implementation of TMDLs	N=9	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 67	EXCELLENT 33	MEAN 3.3
3. Development of Web-Based Farm Mapping Tool for NMP	N=8	POOR	FAIR 12.5	GOOD 75	EXCELLENT 12.5	MEAN 3.0
4. Comparison of P-Indices in the Southern Region	N=12	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 50	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.5
Session Comments:						

Noon - 1:00 p.m. BOX LUNCH (provided)

BOX LUNCH	N=40	POOR	FAIR 10	GOOD 40	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.4
Comments: - Good Food! - A good boxed lunch - Wow! - Good idea!						

1:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. TOURS

TOURS	Overall Mean — 3.6					
Watershed Management	N= 14	POOR	FAIR 14	GOOD 57	EXCELLENT 29	MEAN 3.1
Kentucky “Unbridled Spirits” Water Quality	N=14	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 14	EXCELLENT 86	MEAN 3.9
Agricultural Pollution Control	N=7	POOR	FAIR 14	GOOD	EXCELLENT 86	MEAN 3.7
Rural/Urban Interface	N=3	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 33.3	EXCELLENT 66.7	MEAN 3.7
Karst Hydrogeology Workshop and Tour	N=14	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 21	EXCELLENT 79	MEAN 3.8
Tour Comments: - The karst tour was the best tour I have attended at a regional conference. Outstanding! - Watershed management was a great tour even with bad weather. Excellent speaker talking about accomplishments and mistakes; really beneficial to hear. Great job! - Karst tour was very interesting. Could have been a bit shorter. - Enjoyed the rural-urban interface tour very much. Presenters able to interject some political shortsightedness and knowledge gaps trained engineers have concerning H ₂ O - Watershed management tour too far away. I spent two hours on the bus to & from. - Excellent breadth of tours; great variety; beautiful landscapes along the drive. Also, particularly enjoyed the way the folks at the distillery tied everything to water quality/quantity. - Rural- Urban Interface - Thanks, I learned, always a fun experience. - The karst workshop & tour had very interesting information. I enjoyed the demonstrations.						

4:30 p.m.- 8:00 p.m. A KENTUCKY EVENING

A KENTUCKY EVENING	N=35	POOR	FAIR 10	GOOD 18	EXCELLENT 72	MEAN 3.5
Comments: - Nice entertainment. - Amazing entertainment with bluegrass music, atmosphere and good food! - This will be on my next trip itinerary! - Really enjoyed it. - Food and entertainment good. Closer to hotel better, more flexible. Do not have to stay the whole 2-3 hours. - Loved the food, music, company! Great evening & great exposure to KY. A great memory for this meeting! - Enjoyed the Bluegrass music; Nice location. - Good food, great entertainment. - Too crowded but the food and entertainment was great.						

TUESDAY - October 25, 2005

8:30 a.m. - Noon Concurrent Workshops

Workshops	Overall Mean — 3.7					
Nutrient Management for Lawns & Landscapes	N= 14	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 14	EXCELLENT 86	MEAN 3.9
Soil Moisture Measurement for Irrigation Scheduling	N=4	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 25	EXCELLENT 75	MEAN 3.75
On-Site Wastewater Workshop	N=4	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 50	EXCELLENT 33.3	MEAN 3.5
Using Livestock and Poultry Environmental Management	N=12	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 41.7	EXCELLENT 58.3	MEAN 3.6
Practical Methods for Addressing NPS Issues with Local Officials	N=9	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 33	EXCELLENT 67	MEAN 3.7
Workshop Comments: - I really enjoyed how some of the presentations in the Lawns & Landscape workshop (#1) included a look at several states. - On-site workshop: Good presentation & time for discussion. Great job! - Workshops could have been shorter - two hours max. - Enjoyed the EMS workshop. I wish we could have had more time for that workshop. - NPS Workshop- Diverse issues with good exchange. - Presenter in the EMS workshop gave a little <u>too</u> much detailed information. Group discussion was very good. - Addressing NPS Issues with Local Officials workshop was very good. - Wish there had been more time in the “Addressing NPS Issues” workshop!						

8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. Concurrent Session

I. WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION AND RESEARCH	Overall Mean — 3.2					
1. Status of Water Quality in the Wheeler Lake Basin of Northern Alabama	N= 7	POOR	FAIR 28.7	GOOD 57	EXCELLENT 14.3	MEAN 2.8
2. The Extension Watershed Specialist Program Approach to Meeting TMDLs in Kansas	N=4	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 25	EXCELLENT 75	MEAN 3.75
3. Enhancing Water Quality Education Using Demonstration Sites	N=5	POOR	FAIR 20	GOOD 20	EXCELLENT 60	MEAN 3.4
4. Spavinaw Creek Water Quality Education BMP Demonstration Project	N=4	POOR	FAIR 25	GOOD 50	EXCELLENT 25	MEAN 3.0
Session Comments:						

10:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. - Poster Session/Break

Poster Session	N=21	POOR	FAIR 4.8	GOOD 71.4	EXCELLENT 23.8	MEAN 3.2
Comments: - The regional posters were very informative.						

10:30 a.m. - Noon Concurrent Session

I. WATERSHED RESTORATION		Overall Mean — 3.3				
1. Improving Water Quality in Pond Creek: Using GIS to Identify Nonpoint Source Pollution and Develop a Remediation Strategy	N= 7	POOR	FAIR 28.6	GOOD 28.6	EXCELLENT 42.8	MEAN 3.1
2. Design and Evaluation of Golf Course BMPs Along the Albermarle Sound	N=7	POOR	FAIR 14.3	GOOD 57.1	EXCELLENT 28.6	MEAN 3..1
3. Stream Restoration and Lessons Learned in North Carolina	N=8	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 25	EXCELLENT 75	MEAN 3.75
Session Comments:						

Noon - 1:00 p.m. LUNCH (provided)

An Overview of eXtension	N=41	POOR 5	FAIR 24	GOOD 49	EXCELLENT 22	MEAN 2.9
Comments: - Great use of time - a speaker during lunch. - Heard info before, always from an administrator , never from a faculty member. What's in it for me? - Skeptical of this project at the moment. - Good overview of this program, helped increase my knowledge of what this is all about. -Needed to leave more time to answer audience questions.						

1:00 - 2:30 p.m. Concurrent Sessions

I. PRIVATE DRINKING WATER WELLS		Overall Mean — 3.7				
1. Abandoned Well Education Program	N= 9	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 33.3	EXCELLENT 66.7	MEAN 3.7
2. “Well ... What Do You Know? An Introduction to Protecting Your Well and Drinking Water” Educational Video	N=7	POOR	FAIR 14.3	GOOD 14.3	EXCELLENT 71.4	MEAN 3.6
3. Just Testing the Waters	N=7	POOR	FAIR 14.3	GOOD 14.3	EXCELLENT 71.4	MEAN 3.6
4. Beyond Traditional Wellhead Inspections with a Down-Well Camera	N=10	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 20	EXCELLENT 80	MEAN 3.8
Session Comments:						
- Excellent information - “well” presented. - The video shown in the first presentation was very informative.						

II. NONPOINT EDUCATION FOR DECISION MAKERS: SOUTHERN CASE STUDIES OF EFFECTIVE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS		Overall Mean — 3.5				
1. Tips on Working with Local Officials	N= 8	POOR	FAIR 25	GOOD 37.5	EXCELLENT 37.5	MEAN 3.125
2. Effective Communication Skills: Essential for Building NPS Pollution Partnerships	N=6	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 16.7	EXCELLENT 83.3	MEAN 3.8
3. Water Education in Rural Landscapes: The Coastal South Carolina Experience	N=6	POOR	FAIR 16.7	GOOD 16.7	EXCELLENT 66.6	MEAN 3.5
Session Comments:						
- The presentation on the Coastal S.C. Experience (#3) was very, very good.						

III. PESTICIDE MANAGEMENT				Overall Mean — 3.4		
1. Pesticides Can Do The Unexpected	N= 6	POOR	FAIR 16.7	GOOD	EXCELLENT 83.3	MEAN 3.7
2. Pesticide Loss From Agricultural Lands	N=7	POOR	FAIR 14.4	GOOD 42.8	EXCELLENT 42.8	MEAN 3.3
3. FIFRA and Pesticide Management Plans: A Road to Protecting Our Water Quality	N=8	POOR 12.5	FAIR 25	GOOD	EXCELLENT 62.5	MEAN 3.125
4. Pesticide Use, Storage and Disposal as Related to Water Quality	N=7	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 42.8	EXCELLENT 57.2	MEAN 3.6
Session Comments: - #1. Very interesting!						

IV. INSIGHTS INTO WATERSHED STEWARDSHIP PROGRAMS				Overall Mean — 3.7		
1. Panel Discussion	N= 6	POOR	FAIR 17	GOOD	EXCELLENT 83	MEAN 3.7
Session Comments:						

V. PASTURES AND MORTALITY MANAGEMENT				Overall Mean — 3.4		
1. Comparison of In-Vessel and Traditional Composting Units	N= 12	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 66.6	EXCELLENT 33.4	MEAN 3.3
2. Promoting Grazingland BMPs to Livestock Producers	N=13	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 46.2	EXCELLENT 53.7	MEAN 3.5
3 Bacteria Runoff Relative to Stocking Rates	N=13	POOR	FAIR 7.6	GOOD 46.2	EXCELLENT 46.2	MEAN 3.4
4. Pasture Walks for Rotational Grazing in the Jourdan River Watershed, Hancock County, Mississippi	N=13	POOR	FAIR 7.6	GOOD 61.6	EXCELLENT 30.8	MEAN 3.2
Session Comments: - #1 had very good presenter. #2 - Good Info. Rick Evans (#3) does a great job.						

VI. IRRIGATION MEANS AND METHODS				Overall Mean — 2.5		
1. Basics of Irrigation Scheduling	N= 2	POOR 50	FAIR	GOOD 50	EXCELLENT	MEAN 2.0
2. Innovations in Subsurface Turf Irrigation	N=1	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 100	EXCELLENT	MEAN 3.0
Session Comments:						

2:30 p.m.- 3:00p.m. Poster Session/Break

Poster Session	N=28	POOR	FAIR 11	GOOD 57	EXCELLENT 32	MEAN 3.2
Comments: - Hardly no presenters at their posters. - Good cookies! - Got a couple good ideas from both poster sessions.						

3:00 - 4:30 BMP RUN/WALK TOUR

BMP RUN/WALK TOUR	N=12	POOR	FAIR 8	GOOD 42	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.4
Comments: - Great Option! - So important to have a break with some physical activity . . . Let's keep doing that! - Great event-Poor weather! - Nice break! - Too cold and wet. Wish I could have gone. . . . - It conflicted with team meetings.						

WEDNESDAY - October 26, 2005

8:15a.m. - 9:45 a.m. - Concurrent Sessions

I. EMERGING ISSUES		Overall Mean — 3.7				
1. Emerging Issues for Drinking Water and the Drinking Water Industry	N= 8	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 25	EXCELLENT 75	MEAN 3.75
2. Atrazine: The Problem and Education Effort	N=7	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 14	EXCELLENT 86	MEAN 3.8
3. Infrastructure Security for Public Water and Wastewater Utilities	N=4	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 50	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.5
Session Comments: - The emerging issues presentation (#1) needed more time to really present. Great subject matter.						

II. 4-H YOUTH EDUCATION		Overall Mean — 3.7				
1. 4-H Multi-State Water Camp	N=5	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 20	EXCELLENT 80	MEAN 3.8
2. 2005 Kentucky 4-H Camp Water Curriculum	N=7	POOR	FAIR 14	GOOD 14	EXCELLENT 72	MEAN 3.6
3. Water Drop Patch Project	N=5	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 40	EXCELLENT 60	MEAN 3.6
Session Comments: - Fantastic information.						

III. ALTERNATIVE USES AND OFF-FARM TRANSPORT OF LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY MANURE		Overall Mean — 3.7				
1. Dairy Manure Compost for Erosion Control Projects	N= 11	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT 100	MEAN 4.0
2. Using Compost and Mulch Materials in Erosion Control Applications	N=10	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 20	EXCELLENT 80	MEAN 3.8
3. Composting of Turkey Brooder Litter in South Carolina: A Case Study	N=9	POOR	FAIR 11	GOOD 33	EXCELLENT 56	MEAN 3.4
4. Oklahoma's Poultry Litter Transport Program	N=10	POOR	FAIR 10	GOOD 20	EXCELLENT 70	MEAN 3.6
Session Comments:						

IV. ORGANIC BY-PRODUCTS UTILIZATION	Overall Mean — 3.6					
--	---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

1. Biosolids Utilization; Facts for Discussion with the Public	N= 6	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 33	EXCELLENT 67	MEAN 3.7
2. Compost Utilization in Urban Landscapes	N=6	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 67	EXCELLENT 33	MEAN 3.33
3. Beneficial Reuse of Ground Engineered Wood Products	N=5	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 40	EXCELLENT 60	MEAN 3.6
4. Evaluation of Hatchery By-Products	N=7	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 28.6	EXCELLENT 71.4	MEAN 3.7
Session Comments:						

V . WATER MANAGEMENT ISSUES		Overall Mean — 3.1				
1. Water Policy and Agricultural Redevelopment in Alabama	N= 4	POOR	FAIR 25	GOOD 25	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.25
2. A Tool for Urban Water Conservation: Automated Weather Network Evapotranspiration	N=6	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 67	EXCELLENT 33	MEAN 3.33
3. Decision Making in Times of Scarce Water Resources	N=6	POOR	FAIR 50	GOOD 16.	EXCELLENT 33.3	MEAN 2.8
Session Comments:						

VI. AGRICULTURAL POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAMS: PARTNERSHIPS AND INCENTIVES		Overall Mean — 3.3				
1. Building Partnerships Through Arkansas Master Farmer	N= 8	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 37.5	EXCELLENT 62.5	MEAN 3.6
2. Water Quality Education Curriculum Development for Agricultural Producers	N=11	POOR	FAIR	GOOD 55	EXCELLENT 45	MEAN 3.4
3. Environmental Stewardship Education for Mississippi Agricultural Producers	N=10	POOR	FAIR 10	GOOD 60	EXCELLENT 30	MEAN 3.2
4. Working with Experiment Stations and Producer Groups	N=8	POOR 12.5	FAIR 12.5	GOOD 37.5	EXCELLENT 37.5	MEAN 3.0
Session Comments:						

9:45 a.m. Poster Session/Break

Poster Session	N=30	POOR	FAIR 13	GOOD 63	EXCELLENT 24	MEAN 3.1
Comments: - Poor attendance. - Most already gone.						

10:00 a.m. - Noon GENERAL SESSION

GENERAL SESSION	N=32	POOR	FAIR 6	GOOD 44	EXCELLENT 50	MEAN 3.4
Comments: - Interesting, but not relevant to a lot of us in attendance. - Interesting, too long. Keep to hour, no longer.						

Participants were asked if the Conference reached its eight goals using the following scale: SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE; D = DISAGREE; N

= NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE; A = AGREE; SA = STRONGLY AGREE. A five-level score was used with SD=1,D=2, N=3, A=4, and SA=5. The number of participants evaluating each goal, the percentage in each category, and the mean score for each goal follow.

As a result of the 2005 Water Quality Conference:

1.	My capacity to produce successful water quality and natural resource programs has been strengthened.	N=50	SD	D	N 10	A 52	SA 38	Mean 4.3
2.	I had an opportunity to participate in the sharing of successful educational strategies and programs.	N=49	SD	D	N 10	A 47	SA 43	Mean 4.3
3.	My knowledge of current and potential water quality and other natural resource issues has increased.	N=50	SD	D	N 8	A 42	SA 50	Mean 4.4
4.	I feel that cooperative working relations with Extension and other natural resource professionals at all levels, program areas, and academic disciplines will be enhanced.	N=50	SD	D	N 12	A 50	SA 38	Mean 4.3
5.	I feel that working relations within universities between Extension, teaching and research will be enhanced.	N=50	SD	D	N 20	A 40	SA 40	Mean 4.2
6.	I feel that coordination and cooperation among the states in the region will increase.	N=50	SD	D 2	N 16	A 38	SA 44	Mean 4.2
7.	I had the opportunity to participate with one or more program teams.	N=49	SD 4	D 2	N 14	A 39	SA 41	Mean 4.1
8.	I will be able to use information from the conference in my own programs/activities.	N=49	SD	D	N	A 47	SA 53	Mean 4.5

In your opinion, what were the strengths of the 2005 Water Quality Conference?

- Workshops
- Great talks and time to visit, meet and discuss issues with other states. Great facilities, excellent coordination by planning and coordinating team. The breaks, lunches and on-your-own time were so wonderful to network and meet others from other states. My first meeting with this group, it was a great conference that I really benefited and enjoyed! Thanks.
- I appreciate the interaction with others involved with water quality work as well as the sharing of research based and other information.
- Excellent organization and presentation selection. Host group (KY) were great in all aspects!
- Learning about successful programs in other states and even the failures. I believe that we will all leave here with numerous ideas of programming efforts to pursue. The workshops were excellent methods to convey program ideas & more hands-on learning.
- Karst tour was incredibly interesting! Accommodations and food.
- Well organized. Good speakers. Excellent tours. Excellent hospitality and food. Good accommodations.
- Great opportunity for networking.
- Well planned.
- Teams. Workshops. Tours.
- Well organized.
- Coordination between the states (i.e. Extension, university to agencies and visa versa). Response teams that will be held accountable to achieve recognition, effects, reporting! Coordination across the board alongside with these state programs and/or institutes and national agencies coming together to deliver educational programs, tolls and funding for the American public to become more aware of water quality issues. To become more PROACTIVE to not wait until a problem occurs but to beat the problem per say to the surface. Extension with its continual and quick information, CSREES and its services, and the EPA (other federal agencies) can supply tools such as the CCRs used to inform the public of water usage. Great conference, need more!!
- The main positive was the ability to network with others working in similar program areas from around the Southern region.
- Technical presentations. Workshops should be shorter. There aren't many agents coming so we really don't need all the training sessions. Also, reduce concurrent sessions. I missed a lot of presentations.
- Dinner/ music venue was outstanding!
- Like minded folks sharing ideas and knowledge.
- The quality of all programs I attended was of a very high level. I was not disappointed in any of them. The sharing of programs, ideas, and information was most appreciated. The host team did a super job. Food and breaks were very good.
- Variety of topics to select from. Variety of background & program area of presenters. Great meals. Excellent hotel staff. Fantastic time!
- Concurrent sessions.
- I thought the program team meetings were especially productive. It seemed more collaboration, more planning to conduct multi-state activities, seeking outside funds was/were evident. Also, great job of providing adequate time between sessions & in evenings to conduct additional meetings or establish communication with others- a great product of these meetings.
- Diverse topics covered. Hospitality and organization of host institution. Conference facilities. Resource fair highlighting

institutions and materials.

- Excellent idea to have this every other year. Great breadth of participation - # of states, # of different practitioners, county agents to researchers. Beautiful location. Competent and congenial conference staff. Good opportunities for social interaction and to meet others.
- Very good sessions related to water quality. Good planning for time and excellent food. Poster session was great!
- Excellent topics that addressed water issues.
- I got a lot out of this program. I was daily trying to balance work and personal activities yet I managed to absorb your input for future activities.
- I managed to get some personal input for urban use & my state water quality efforts.
- The new technology!
- Good opportunity to network.
- Good pace of daily activities, never felt overwhelmed with the schedule or that there was too little on the agenda.
- Very good line-up of presenters, very qualified, presented useful information
- This was the most informative and inspirational conference I have ever attended! Very well run.
- (1) Networking. (2) Fun field trips help networking too! (3) Posters. (4) Lots of choices in terms of presentations.
- Networking.

What could be done to improve the Conference in the future, including ideas for specific programs?

- Provide more opportunities for participants to get out into town or surrounding area independently (restaurants, trails, etc.) Some of us who did not have cars felt a bit confined.
- When different states have similar programs to present, have them work together on presentations rather than repeating the same concepts again & again.
- Better on-line registration- title submission & abstracts.
- Include CD with presentations (this could be done after conference)
- Allow participants and teams to set agenda e.g., don't dictate breakout sessions, allow volunteer papers to do this.
- Make arrangements for better weather!
- More on disaster response or preventative measures. Mass euthanasia due to disease outbreaks in animals (i.e., BSE, avian influenza, animal mortality).
- Conference could be less "spread-out". (consolidate into 2-3 days) Eliminate half-days (Sunday and Wednesday).
- Hotel accommodations could be and should be less isolated. Perhaps walking distance to downtown shops, restaurants, etc.
- Having meetings on Sunday is a bad idea. As a water professional, I have to be out overnight and away from family during the week. I do not like being gone on the weekend. Given changes in airline travel, there is little economic value to staying overnight on Saturdays. Running the conference Tuesday morning through Thursday evening would reduce the work/family life balance issues. One of the major issues facing Extension employees is work/ family time balance. Anything we can do to help Extension employees reduce time away from home would be appreciated.
- Increase focus on urban issues.
- Basic and advanced research acknowledgment. Mostly Extension work presented.
- Don't have program/workshops on Sunday morning.
- Don't schedule programs on Sunday morning.
- Start Sunday afternoon, finish up Tuesday afternoon (2-3 pm) 2 nights, save on travel cost, etc. Tighten up schedule to have 3 day conference (2 nights).
- Evaluating success of Extension programs (program accountability). How educational programs have specifically addressed water quality issues (reductions seen in nutrients, bacteria, N, P, etc). Linking research and Extension activities. Role and use of materials of other state and federal agencies within the states.
- Sunday workshops should have been in the afternoon, 2-5 pm, so that participants might not have to arrive the day before. Have field trips not on Day 1 of conference; it interrupted the flow of the conference too much since there was only one concurrent presentation session before field trips.
- It would have been better if the program handbook contained 2 additional pages for note taking during the sessions.
- Done well, some agenda conflicts but one time delivery is best.
- Watershed training symposium: (1) What are we looking for & how to determine what needs to be done. (2) Agencies that can help implement the needs of what needs to be done. (3) How to evaluate the work being done - is what we are doing really working.
- Should have poster presenters stand by to answer questions.
- Program teams seemed very unorganized/lacking leadership/unclear objectives. Not sure where I can contribute.
- Temperature control in the meeting rooms.
- A few less concurrent sessions, too much dilution of participants.
- Need to further encourage more participation (attendance) of county Ag & Family Consumer Science agents.

Any Additional Comments?

- Tours were very positive and went over well.
- I enjoyed my stay! Looking forward to the next conference.
- Program team meetings . . . what were they?
- None of the speakers touched on the water quality issues I'm addressing. Increase presentations on algae & plant management,

estuarine issues, urban issues. Also, I was asked to bring a presentation on the impacts of hurricanes on Florida but wasn't given the opportunity to present. Why was Florida forgotten - insult!

- Too many concurrent sessions Monday-Tuesday.

- There are too many conferences. I'm not sure how to deal with this but if this could be a joint conference, kill two birds with one stone. Maybe just have the annual WQ conference.

- The hotel was most accommodating. The staff offered assistance readily.

- My second conference, great job.

- My only complaint would be to make it known when the workshops will be conducted & if they will be conducted during concurrent sessions much earlier in the registration/ pre-conference process. I just thought this would help folks plan their travel/ sessions more efficiently.

- Another good one!

- Good to hear what other regions are doing. Some new approaches that were good to hear.

- Very good program.

- Thanks for all your hard work. Great conference!