

- These restoration projects require intensive data-gathering and planning by an interdisciplinary team of hydrologists, geomorphologists, fisheries biologists, botanists, and surveyors, and benefit from review by other technical experts. ~

For further information, contact:

Barbara Ellis-Sugai
Forest Hydrologist
Siuslaw National Forest
4077 Research Way
Corvallis, OR 97333
Tel: (541) 750-7056
E-mail: bellisugai@fs.fed.us

Johan Hogervorst
South Zone Hydrologist
Siuslaw National Forest
4480 Hwy 101, Bldg G
Florence, OR 97439
Tel: (541) 902-6956
E-mail: jhogervorst@fs.fed.us

References

Adams, P.W., A.J. Campbell, R.C. Sidle, R.L. Beschta, and H.A. Froelich. 1986. *Estimating stream flows on small forested watersheds for culvert and bridge design in Oregon*. Oregon State University, Forest Research Laboratory, College of Forestry, Corvallis, Oregon. *Research Bulletin* 55. 8 p.

Giese, T.P. 1996. *Phosphorus export from the Clear and Mercer Lake watersheds, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon*. M.S. thesis, 136 p.

Jennings, M.E., W.O. Thomas Jr., and H.C. Riggs. 1993. *U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 94-4002: nationwide summary of U.S. Geological Survey regional regression equations for estimating magnitude and frequency of floods for ungaged sites*. 196 p.

Roelof, S. 2002. *Of fire and fog: representing landscape processes and catalyzing nonlinear transformation in a Coast Range riparian zone*. M.S. thesis draft. University of Oregon, Department of Landscape Architecture, Eugene, Oregon.

Rosgen, D. 1996. *Applied river morphology*. Wildland Hydrology [consultant], Pagosa Springs, Colorado. 363 p.

Williams, G.P. 1986. *River meanders and channel size*. *Journal of Hydrology* 88:147-164.

Results of Streamline Reader Survey 2004

Robin Pike

THANK YOU to everyone who participated in our reader survey this past fall. The survey was designed to help us assess our performance and, most importantly, solicit your feedback on areas for improvement and suggestions for future articles. Overall, respondents told us that we are on track in presenting objective and reliable watershed management information. Here are the highlights of the survey.

Streamline articles are technically reviewed and those readers polled trust information presented in Streamline.

Of those polled, 42% were unaware that all articles published in Streamline undergo a technical peer review. As a result, we will better communicate the measures we use to ensure that reliable and sound information is extended. Despite this finding, 92% of those surveyed indicated that they either have a lot of trust (25%) or a fair amount of trust (67%) in Streamline. Only 5% of the respondents indicated that they had little trust in Streamline as an information source.

Streamline is relevant, scientifically sound, user friendly, and easy to access. Most readers prefer the current format.

Of those completing the survey, 90% indicated that they prefer the current mix of short newsletter-style and longer technical articles. Preference for print versus online versions of the publication was more evenly split among respondents, with 51% favouring online access, 41% print, and 8% both publication formats. We will seriously consider these data if limited funding in the future does not allow us to produce print versions.

Regarding our publication format, most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that articles in Streamline are relevant and applicable (92%), scientifically sound (82%), readable in style (94%), well laid out (84%), easy

Jack Minard of the Tsolum River Restoration Society, Courtenay, B.C., won our survey draw-prize—a \$75 gift certificate to Chapters.

Table 1. Client satisfaction in Streamline's format

Question: In your opinion, are Streamline articles...	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Somewhat disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
1. Relevant and applicable	26	66	7	1	0
2. Scientifically sound	19	63	17	1	0
3. Readable in style	27	67	4	2	0
4. Well laid out	31	53	15	0	1
5. Easy to access	36	56	7	1	0
6. Innovative in content	14	52	30	4	0



Table 2. Reader suggestions for future content

Proposed article topic / content direction	Rank ^a
More of the same mix	1
Watershed/stream restoration	2
Monitoring/assessment	3
More forestry	4
Fish habitat/fisheries	4
Methods and techniques	5
Riparian issues and science	5
Water conservation/social issues	5
Stewardship	6
Water chemistry, quality, and health	6
Hydrology/Watershed processes	6
Non-forested watersheds/urban watershed management	6
Biology/Biodiversity	6
Broaden scope to include international case studies	6
Standards/BMPs/Policy	6
Groundwater	7
Less forestry	8
Wildfire effects	8
Opinion pieces	8
Current updates from around B.C.	8

^aReader suggestions were grouped into the above categories. The number of suggestions per category was tallied and rank was assigned (1 to 9). Tied rank values represent categories with an equal tally.

to access (92%), and innovative in content (66%). As a result we are not planning to change the format. Complete results, including percentage of neutral responses and those in disagreement, are presented in Table 1.

Streamline articles elevate readers' knowledge of watershed management science and issues. Those readers polled indicated that they are happy with the current mix of topics and recommended that Streamline continue to feature diverse topics.

Respondents were asked to comment on how Streamline has improved or

assisted them in their work activities or decisions. Most commonly, respondents stated they use Streamline to increase their awareness and (or) background knowledge of watershed management issues and science. A few readers said they use Streamline articles for teaching and training.

Readers were also asked if they could identify a favourite article over the last 2 years. Many suggestions were put forward, the most common being "Shade and Stream Temperature" by P. Teti, followed by "Wildfires and Watershed Effects in the Southern B.C. Interior" by D. Scott and R. Pike.

Readers also offered feedback on the types of articles they want to see in

future issues. We grouped the 105 suggestions into categories (Table 2). Notably, most of these suggestions support the current direction of Streamline's expanded watershed management mandate. The most common response was for a continuation in the diversity of topics covered.

Streamline is providing timely access to information, thus increasing knowledge of watershed management research, hydrologic processes and the effects of watershed management.

Finally, we asked readers if we were achieving our objectives (Table 3). While these results are qualitative and have their limitations, 74% agreed that we're giving them timely access to information, 93% indicated that Streamline increases their knowledge of current B.C watershed management research and expertise, and 76% indicated that Streamline increases their knowledge of natural hydrologic processes and the effects of watershed management. Overall, the survey results will greatly assist us in managing Streamline, leveraging financial support, and ultimately offering a reader-focused and relevant publication. ~

If you would like to provide further feedback on Streamline or suggest an idea for an article, please contact Robin Pike at

(250) 387-5887, or by e-mail at Robin.Pike@forrex.org.

Table 3. Client satisfaction in Streamline's performance against objectives

Question: Does Streamline...	Strongly agree (%)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Somewhat disagree (%)	Strongly disagree (%)
1) Provide timely access to watershed management information?	21	53	25	1	0
2) Increase your knowledge of current B.C. watershed management research and expertise?	38	55	6	1	0
3) Increase your knowledge of natural hydrologic processes and the effects of watershed management?	19	57	23	1	0