

<b>Presenter</b>	Eileen K Straughan Straughan Environmental Services, Inc.
<b>Category</b>	<b>Effectiveness of monitoring protocols</b>
<b>Title</b>	Effectiveness Monitoring for Stream Restoration; Can we Improve Methods, Processes and Communication?
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The Maryland Water Monitoring Council and the Maryland Stream Restoration Association created a stream monitoring charrette in 2008 to vet monitoring protocols and performance data; cost/benefit questions regarding restoration ensued.</p> <p>The main question was developed: Effectiveness Monitoring for Stream Restoration - Can We Improve Methods, Process &amp; Communication? Guiding questions: How can we illustrate restoration project success? Can we learn from and improve stream assessment, design, and project execution?</p> <p>In the meeting, John Griffin, Secretary of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, gave the keynote address stressing the need for solutions for the bleak health of the Chesapeake Bay and regaining credibility within the public. Plenary speakers were William P. Stack, P.E., Chief Water Quality Management Section, Baltimore City Department of Public Works, Dr. Margaret A. Palmer, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, and Dr. Peter Wilcock, Geography &amp; Environmental Engineering, National Center for Earth-surface Dynamics, Johns Hopkins University. Mr. Stack addressed why stream restorations are performed, stressing infrastructure defense and severe erosion. Stream restoration also tackles Clean Water Act goals. Dr. Palmer illustrated that of 317 projects 11% had before &amp; after data and site monitoring, and 10% related monitoring data to original goals. She advised tiered monitoring requirements, and scientific basis for metrics. Dr. Wilcock asked; are stream monitoring data gathered and used effectively? Restoration goals need to be precise, and projects viewed as “experiments”, which can be problematic. Dr. Wilcock suggested a Maryland Stream Restoration Monitoring Center, which could define monitoring practices, offer access to monitoring data, manage monitoring efforts, study data, and revise design methods.</p> <p>Members broke into four groups focused on: water quality, geomorphic, biological, and recreation/aesthetics. Groups addressed the question; how and what should be monitored?</p> <p>Results summarized in the presentation. Members were asked to contribute to the stream restoration monitoring database.</p> <p>The presentation will center on the need to improve focus, quality, access and availability of stream restoration monitoring data in Maryland.</p>