



## GPR 2002 Survey Results

Thank you for your feedback on GPR 2002.  
Steven Koppenjan, General Chair

I registered for GPR 2002:	On-line	By Fax	On-site	Other
	52%	23%	10%	16%

**SCALE: 1 = Poor, 3= Fair, 5 = Average, 7 = Good, 10 = Excellent**

How would you rate GPR 2002 conference: 8.5

What did you think of GPR 2002 web site: 8.2

Preliminary Program page 8.1

Author's/Presenter's Info page 8.2

Call for Papers page 7.7

I looked at almost every page on the web site: YES = 80% NO = 20%

I prefer the conference information on the web & email rather than mailings: YES = 98% NO = 2%

Seven major email announcements were made. Do you prefer to receive MORE= 0% THE SAME = 91% LESS = 9%

The conference Final Program was 8.5

How did your experience at GPR 2002 rate compared to other conferences you have attended recently? 8.1

Did you feel you received your money's worth at GPR 2002? 8.4

How would you rate the facilities (i.e. Radisson Hotel, meeting rooms)? 7.7

How would you rate the conference food? 8.4

How would you rate the conference banquet? 8.4

How would you rate the general location of Santa Barbara? 8.8

How were the Field Demonstrations? 6.6

Do you plan on attending GPR 2004? YES = 61% MAYBE = 37% NO = 2%

Would you like to see Field Demonstrations at GPR 2004? YES = 60% MAYBE = 34% NO = 6%

Would you prefer to have the Proceedings on HARDCOPY = 0% CD = 11% BOTH = 89%

Would you be interested in purchasing a CD-ROM with all of the proceedings from GPR'96, GPR'94 & GPR'92? YES = 57% NO = 43%

# GPR 2002 Survey Results

**SCALE: Disagree = 1, Strongly Agree = 10**

The papers presented were of high quality and of the standards that I expected? 7.7

The papers presented were not commercial? 7.9

## Did any particular paper seem to be commercial?

1. A "commercial" paper can be interesting.
2. No (5 times)
3. Yes
4. None of the papers I saw were too commercial, no one stepped over.
5. No, thought that everyone was well behaved in that regard. Possible exception of Annan-Sensoft on Thursday afternoon, but even this was not obscene.
6. Annan - Application of GPR to map concrete to delineate embedded structural elements and defects.
7. A paper presented by GSSI seemed commercial on Thursday
8. A couple

## Any suggestions for the web page or the next conference's web page?

1. No - good updates
2. No, it was great
3. Update more frequently
4. No
5. Very informative
6. None
7. Move graphics, modern design
8. A search engine to look through the abstracts, letters, etc
9. Put the papers or abstracts online? (see AP2000 web site)
10. More user links
11. Need to direct authors to authors pages
12. Intersecting links

## What was the most informative web page?

1. Final program
2. Early program info
3. Hotels and lodging; PDF: instructions to authors
4. Transportation
5. All
6. Preliminary schedule, accommodation, and transportation
7. The one which you register, with location, hotel, information, and preliminary program.
8. Author's pages

## Was any information omitted that you expected to see on the web page?

1. No (7 times)
2. More choice of hotels
3. The direction to the hotel is not as clear as I expect. Put a detailed map of the vicinity of Radisson like GPR2000
4. Need to direct authors to authors pages

## I would be interested in attending a GPR tutorial or workshop in the odd years (non conference years)

YES = 42%      NO = 55%      MAYBE = 3%

# GPR 2002 Survey Results

## General comments on the GPR 2002 conference:

1. Best venue of any conference EVER!
2. Great conference, very well organized and more than usual value for the money. Good idea to have short intros. to posters. Impressed with level of organization including interface of program and social activities (including banquet)
3. I found the conference of a really high standard: good papers, well presented, lots of access to authors and other delegates. I also enjoyed the social time.
4. Like 'every other year' format
5. Good job! (5 times)
6. It was good. Well done!
7. Well organized, went smoothly.
8. Excellent, well-focused conference (3 times)
9. Excellent organization
10. Very well organized and executed.
11. Very well organized event.
12. Congratulations on organizing such a marvelous conference
13. Congratulations on a truly successful scientific and engineering event. The content was uniformly exceptionally high compared to other meetings.
  
14. Put posters in the afternoon and talks in the morning. Have juice at coffee break in the morning instead of pop
15. Perhaps better to have talks in the morning and posters in the afternoon. It's easier to concentrate on talks earlier in the day.
16. Would be nice to have a bound copy of all abstracts in the order of the sessions, so you could take THAT with you to talks to make notes ( proceedings too cumbersome).
17. Very good work! The only negative aspect to me is the meeting room: a bit noisy.
18. Downstairs room window needs shades!
19. I think the manufacturers display area should have been larger and all in one room
20. Don't put talks with similar topics at the same time on two parallel sessions.
21. Just expensive for those funding themselves-not a great deal of choice on cheap lodgings. The only hotel was closed and generally students were not catered for in this conference.
  
22. I'd like to see more/better computer and internet facilities.
23. Fairly good organization. Need more computers to access the internet!
24. It was my first conference. I would like to see additional content/papers geared towards users, and less technical in nature. ie: your customers.
25. Need to have other professionals and users come to the conference. If we are going to keep talking about GPR to other believers then maybe we only need a conference every 3-4 years. Give exhibitors more say in the location of the meetings.
  
26. Field Demos: Should have been direct performance comparisons of GPR systems during field demonstrations, perhaps over better known features (there were too many "possibility" "maybe" "perhaps" used by operators.)
27. Field Demos: it would have been good if all demonstrators did the same area and the results compared.
28. Field Demos: So many people that and too little space around equipment.
29. The tutorial #2 must be more "tutorial" not like a little conference - but the technical level was good!

## What would happen to you if the use of GPR were banned by the FCC/NTIA?

1. Catastrophe!
2. We aim to lose 70% of our business
3. I would loose about 25% to 50% of my teaching, research and consulting
4. It would substantially reduce our R&D project
5. Out of business
6. Would get a new job
7. I would need to start over with my dissertation
8. Shift research direction



## GPR 2002 Survey Results

9. I will need to focus research in different area.
10. Stop professional activities in the field of pavement inspections
11. It would significantly affect my research as a hydrologist
12. Concentrate on other projects but would be a significant career backstep.
13. It will be a problem for high resolutions and shallow projects.
14. Get back to inductive EM, try to stay in near surface geophysics
  
15. I'd still use it even if illegal
16. It is bad
17. Nothing, I use low frequency GPR
18. Not much-we used BHR underground
19. Not much
20. No idea
21. It is Impossible
  
22. (Assuming Australia follows we would have to concentrate on our other US example.) Core business that utilize other methodologies I.e. mag.DC res, EM, gravity, remote sensing. However GPR accounts for a substantial portion at our business. It would hurt!!!!
23. It would probably influence the situation in Europe as well
24. Nothing in the short term: I work in boreholes in another country
25. Depends on how reflects on Europe!
26. I work in Europe so it depends on the impact on Europe regulations

### What is the single most important item associated with GPR?

1. Fun
2. Acquisition & schedule plan
3. Depth, resolution of water content
4. Deep penetration to sense geological structures
5. Resolution
6. Vivid direct display of subsurface
7. Inversion
8. New ideas, new constructions, new methods
9. Utilities
10. Limestones
11. Dam foundation

### What is the your first consideration before using a GPR?

1. Ground conductivity
2. Elect. conductivity
3. Soil and target characteristics
4. Objective of the survey site/site conditions
5. Noise sources, suitability
6. Ease and data analysis
7. Will it solve the problem I have
8. Will it work for my survey goal
9. Will it work?
10. Where am I!
11. Ability to work in resident soil conditions.
12. Ability to do post processing of data, ability to separate antennas to obtain velocity.

# GPR 2002 Survey Results

## What frequencies or antennas do you use the most?

1. 50 - 100 MHz (3 times)
2. 25 - 500 MHz, predominantly 100 MHz
3. 100MHz (2 times)
4. 100 MHz, 200 MHz
5. 100-400 MHz
6. 100, 500 MHz
7. 200 MHz
8. 200/400 MHz
9. 200-500 MHz
10. 400 MHz
11. 100-200 MHz and 900 MHz
12. 50-1500 MHz
13. 100 MHz - 1.5GHz
14. 200-500 MHz
15. 250 - 500 - 1 GHz - 1.6 GHz
16. 400 MHz, multiple low frequency (80-15 MHz)
17. 80, 200, 400 and 900 MHz
18. 900 MHz to 1.5 MHz
19. 1 GHz
20. 800, 900, 1500 MHz
21. 2.5 GHz
22. 1.5-7.6 GHz
23. All
24. 100 MHz - borehole antenna
25. 100-400 MHz Borehole

**Do you generally make decisions based on:** Field Data (30%), Lab Post-Processed Data (53%) or Both (17%)

## When you purchased or designed your GPR what was the most important specification?

1. Flexibility (2 times)
2. Resolution flexibility
3. Resolution and Penetration
4. Versatility
5. Modularity (2 times)
6. Multi-channel capability
7. Convenience and cost
8. Availability of all (antennas), cost
9. Bistatic configurations
10. Fidelity
11. Dynamic range
12. Accuracy
13. Company reputation
14. Interpretation of scanned data
15. Borehole
16. Geotechnical, environmental, geological, minerals exploration

# GPR 2002 Survey Results

## What is your application of GPR?

1. Archaeology
2. Archaeology, engineering, environment, pavement
3. Borehole
4. Borehole use for hydrological characterization
5. Environmental and engineering geophysics (consulting)
6. Environmental, archaeological
7. Engineering & environment
8. Engineering geology applications
  
9. NDT-concrete
10. NDT on buildings, contaminants, demining, subsurface utilities
11. Non-destructive testing of traffic infrastructure
12. NDE
13. Dams, Highway, Geotechnical
14. Geology
15. Geological studies-paleoclimate, earthquakes, lavaflows, mars applications
16. Geotechnical, exploration,
17. Geotechnical, hydrological,
18. Groundwater
19. Water content profiling
20. Glaciers, permafrost, archaeology
21. Teaching, environmental, geological, and engineering
  
22. Road survey
23. 3D large-scale utility mapping
24. Utility, NDT, Architecture
25. Utilities: location
26. In-mines: BHR
27. In-mine, engineering problems
28. De-mining/mine detection (2 times)
29. Many different applications
30. Wide ranging