

**Strategic Planning Meeting Summary**

Thursday, September 13, 2012

9:00am-4:00pm

City of Long Beach Family Health and Education Center

3820 Cherry Ave

Long Beach, CA 90712

**Attendees:**

**BPSOS:**

Alex Pham

**Cabrillo:**

Alfonso Montiel

**CDFG:**

Rebecca Hartman

**City of Long Beach:**

Monica Cardenas

**DTSC:**

Tim Chauvel

Tayseer Mahmoud

**Heal the Bay:**

James Alamillo

Frankie Orrala

Vanessa Alcantar

Serena Lomonico

**HCC:**

Cecilia Chan

Rebecca Soong

**ITSI:**

Bob Lindfors

Riz Sarmiento

**LACPH:**

Salwa Mina

Carolyne Anderson

Marita Santos

Carrie Tayour

Robert Vasquez

Evenor Masis

**LASD**

Chi-Li Tang

**NOAA/MSRP:**

Gabrielle Dorr

Dave Witting

**OCHCA:**

Jessica Warren

Mozhgan Mofidi

**OEHHA**

Robert Brodberg

**SMBRC:**

Guangyu Wang

**SGA:**

Nicole Sintov

Stephen Groner

Tiffany Jonick

Paula Combs

**USC Sea Grant**

Linda Chilton

**USEPA:**

John Chesnutt

Judy Huang

Lori Lewis

Jackie Lane

**I. Introduction and Agenda Review - EPA**

John Chesnutt (EPA) opened the meeting by welcoming and thanking all partners for their attendance, as well as continued participation in the project. He also stated that he is very excited to be a part of the project and hopes he can pull it into the other projects he's working on. EPA Facilitator, Lori Lewis, then walked partners through the day's agenda and invited partners to introduce themselves. As a part of introductions, Lewis requested partners identify one thing they are proud of and one thing they are frustrated with from the last year.

**II. Monitoring & Capping Update - Judy Huang (EPA) and Robert Lindfors (ITSI)**

[Link to presentation](#)

- As a part of Monitored Natural Recovery, EPA will be monitoring the breakdown of DDTs, PCBs, and DDE, sediment movement, deposition and transport, water quality, level of DDT and PCBs in fish tissue, tracking white croaker and barred sand bass, and reductive dechlorination.
- EPA hopes to prevent erosion of contaminated sediment by winter storms, reduce flux of dissolved contaminants from the sediment into the water column, reduce exposure and uptake of contaminants by benthic organisms with the Clean Sediment Cap.

Comparing 2002/2004 sediment data with data from 2009, EPA noted:

- PCBs are reducing in the sediment but not in the fish. They do not have an explanation for why one thing is showing a reduction but not the other.
- R. Lindfors proposed that the ocean “appears” to be naturally cleaning up the Superfund Site, particularly PCBs, but they don't know why or how this is occurring. J. Huang is meeting with the Palos Verdes Technical team in October about why and how the site is dechlorinating. As of right now, she cannot provide any answers of when fish will be safe to eat.
- R. Lindfors said they are tracking fish to see where they are picking up contaminants. He explained that this is the largest fish tracking study in the world. Although it was difficult catching white croaker and tagging them over the span of 2 years, the study tagged close to 90 fish. J. Huang said this study is based on a fundamental question: where are white croaker specifically picking up the contaminants.
- **Questions/Comments:**
  - Partners had confusion regarding the color coding of the maps, which R. Lindfors and J. Huang explained.
  - Partners requested clarification of the sediment measurements (0-2 cm deep).
  - James Alamillo (Heal the Bay) cautioned EPA on using the terms “mother nature is cleaning the site” until we know that is exactly is happening.
  - Dave Witting (NOAA) brought up that the Angler Outreach team should be sent photos of fish with tags in case any of the anglers catch a tagged fish.
  - Partners asked about timing for the technical meeting, which will be held sometime in mid-October.

**III. Seafood Consumption Study Update - Tiffany Jonick (S. Groner Associates, Inc.)**

[Link to presentation](#)

- Purpose of the study is to understand seafood consumption habits along the PV Shelf impacted area, to update the EPA's human health risk assessment.
- Surveying started in February 2012
- The survey team consists of 6 surveyors with language fluency in Spanish, Cantonese, Vietnamese, and Tagalog
- Currently achieving a 79% response rate (exceeding a goal of 75%), 450 surveys were collected (below the goal of 563)
- For every 3 anglers seen in '94, today only 1 is still fishing.
- Sport fishing companies are the most challenging - boat captains are very suspicious of any sort of surveying activity.
- New survey goal: Approach 33% more anglers while keeping response rates high at 79%
- **Questions/Comments:**
  - Gabrielle Dorr (MSRP/NOAA) suggested having an educational night with party boat captains.
  - Carrie Tayour (LACPH) suggested gift cards/incentives for party boats.
  - D. Witting mentioned that barred sand bass are the "bread & butter" for party boats. Suggested that going to Captains is a dead-end and that approaching people before and after the boat trips is a better idea.
  - R. Lindfors suggested using social media to reach party boat customers.
  - Rebecca Hartman (CDFG) said she would email T. Jonick the contact information for the head of the party boats.
  - Guangyu Wang (SMBRC) commented that though even if the data is limited, it is still very valuable and to keep collecting what we can.
  - G. Dorr (MSRP/NOAA) mentioned that Chris Lowe (person conducting the fish tracking) has worked with party boat captains and may be able to help. D. Witting said Lowe has had similar problems with the captains.
  - Monica Cardenas (City of Long Beach) mentioned that there is a chart in the back of the Aquarium of the Pacific that shows when the boats went out and what was caught. Suggested this data might be useful.
  - Salwa Mina (LACPH) asked if the survey could be a requirement when fishermen renew their license.

**IV. Pier Outreach - Nicole Sintov (S. Groner Associates, Inc.) and Frankie Orrala (Heal the Bay)**

[Link to pier outreach presentation](#)

[Link to pier outreach evaluation presentation](#)

- From July 1, 2011- June 30, 2012 a total of 8,873 anglers were reached
- There haven't been many white croaker in the last few years, but there was an increase of white croaker this summer (theorizing the increase was a result from the warmer water this summer.)
- A total of 1069 anglers were surveyed from July 2011 - June 2012.
- Compared to anglers who did not receive outreach:
  - A greater proportion of those who did receive outreach reported awareness of DNC fish contamination

- A smaller proportion of those who did receive outreach stated that they usually threw back DNC fish
- A greater proportion of those who did receive outreach stated they usually do not eat DNC fish
- A greater proportion of those who did receive outreach stated that they usually give DNC fish to friends/family
- **Questions/Comments:**
  - D. Witting asked about the reference “received outreach”- does this mean they received outreach in the last year or any time before. N. Sintov explained that it means any time before.

**V. Montrose Settlements Restoration Program Update—Gabrielle Dorr (MSRP)**  
[Link to presentation](#)

- Priorities for restoration project are fishing and habitat, Bald Eagles, Peregrine Falcons, and Seabirds
- Goals of fishing restoration project:
  - Provide Public Information to Restore Lost Fishing Services
  - Construct Artificial Reefs and Fishing Access Improvements
- MSRP conducts outreach to anglers and their families. Their outreach message revolves around fishing being a great and positive thing to do, and making angler and families aware of guidelines.
- Status of Belmont Pier Artificial Reef: Biological surveys for artificial reef placement next to Belmont Pier in Long Beach have been completed, reef concept designs have been developed, and expecting reef to be built in winter 2013.
- There are 7 projects located on Channel Islands and Baja Pacific Islands.
- 20 fish species have been observed by the fish cam and garnered 5,800 views (1,000 new views after advertising).
- The bald eagle webcam has received 160,000 unique visitors from over 145 countries- resulting in 1.5 million hits each year.
- MSRP is an active participant in the Palos Verdes Technical Exchange Group and Messaging Work Group and long term partners with FCEC.
- **Questions/Comments:**
  - T. Jonick asked for clarification on the reefs slated for creation. G. Dorr said there are a couple of subtidal reef projects: The Belmont Pier artificial reef would increase fishing opportunities for anglers because it will attract a larger variety of fish. The Palos Verdes Shelf reef is more of a fish habitat restoration- kelp (resistant to the contamination) will be restored to certain areas and will in turn attract fish.

**I. Strategic Thinking Session: SWOTE Analysis**

After completing the morning session, where the group looked backwards to see our status of completing EPA’s IROD, the group was broken into 5 small groups in the afternoon to look forward and evaluate the program’s Strengths, Weaknesses,

Opportunities, Threats, and External Environment (S.W.O.T.E). Each station had a different topic and facilitator. The small groups rotated in 15 minute intervals. The topics for each station were as follows: What are internal *Strengths* we have that we can use to our advantage? What are internal *Weaknesses* that we need to be mindful of? What external *Opportunities* exist that can help us achieve or exceed our plans? What external factors would be *Threats* to achieving some of our goals? What world factors would be *External Threats* to achieving some of our goals? The session was an opportunity to build upon each other's ideas, share our insights with the entire group, and better understand the links with our FY13 activities.

➤ **Program Goals Overview (Context for SWOTE)–J. Huang**  
[Link to presentation](#)

- Before everyone broke off into smaller groups, J. Huang presented an overview of this year's goals to provide context for the afternoon's SWOTE analysis.
- The enforcement program will continue with California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and health inspectors. CDFG will patrol the catch ban area, enforce the daily bag limit, and conduct joint inspections with health inspectors. Health inspectors will continue to visit local market to see if contaminated white croakers are being sold.
- Field work will wrap up and data analysis will begin for the seafood consumption study will occur to ensure that EPA is measuring risk based on current numbers.
- All elements of the public outreach and education work will continue, such as pier outreach (and evaluation), community outreach, and online electronic outreach.

The final assigned groups:

| <u>Group 1</u>   | <u>Group 2</u> | <u>Group 3</u>  | <u>Group 4</u>  | <u>Group 5</u>   |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Judy Huang       | James Alamillo | Monica Cardenas | Dave Witting    | Carolyn Anderson |
| Guangyu Wang     | Jessica Warren | Frankie Orrala  | Rebecca Hartman | Marita Santos    |
| Salwa Mina       | Linda Chilton  | Bob Lindfors    | Riz Sarmiento   | Gabrielle Dorr   |
| Chi-Li Tang      | Tim Chauvel    | Cecilia Chan    | Mo Mofidi       | Rebecca Soong    |
| Alfonso Montiel  |                |                 | Alex Pham       | Serena Lomonico  |
| Vanessa Alcantar |                |                 |                 |                  |

➤ **First Station: Internal Strengths**  
Facilitator: Stephen Groner (SGA)

*Questions posed by the facilitator:*

- What are internal strengths that exist within the program that can help us achieve or exceed the goals Judy outlined?
- What are some of the strengths this group possesses?
- What are some resources that you've noticed our group has?
- What are things we have that we can use to our advantage?

*Notes from group:*

1. Passion/Care/Dedication
2. EPA support

- a. Supportive partners
- b. Supportive management
3. Diversity: agencies, background, and knowledge
  - a. Communication amongst levels (aspects of program)
  - b. Cross-pollination between agencies/programs
4. Ability to collaborate
  - a. Continual communication throughout the year
5. Emails, meetings, conference calls, and trainings
6. Positive group culture
  - a. Tangible results
  - b. Evaluations (continually trying to improve)
  - c. People feel their voice counts
  - d. No question is stupid, no criticism of people, and open communication
  - e. Ability to participate positively
7. Everybody wants to succeed
8. Trust in turning to each other
  - a. Tight networking
9. Science based decision
  - a. Builds credibility of program
10. Concept → End Product
11. Strong stakeholder process/engagement
12. Attractive/good food/eaters
13. Creative and open to new ideas (thinking outside the box)
14. Consistent funding source
15. Clearly defined goal
16. Fun group
17. Numbers of people/Numbers of group participation
18. Education
  - a. Ability to reach people with outreach
19. Continuity of EECA → IROD
20. Strong collective model for addressing environmental issues

➤ **Second Station: Internal Weaknesses**

Facilitator: Tiffany Jonick (SGA)

***Questions posed by the facilitator:***

- What are some internal weaknesses that might prevent us from reaching the goals Judy outlined?
- What are some shortcomings or complications that we should be mindful of?
- What are some weaknesses that you've noticed about the group?
- Since you've been with the project, are there detrimental things that have been repeated year after year? What are these?

***Notes from group:***

1. Communication - among large group

- a. Tracking what other groups do
  - b. Data generation, translation, dissemination, and sharing
  - c. Diversity
  - d. Segmented knowledge and understanding of what's happening in the program
  - e. Possible solution: collect updates and share with rest of the group before meetings
2. Keeping up with changing info
  3. Workload issue
    - a. Partners have additional responsibilities/play multiple roles
    - b. Coordination of schedules is a challenge
  4. Despite program longevity, there are still data gaps
  5. Lack of follow-up from strategic planning meetings
    - a. What are we doing with strategic planning meeting info?
  6. For enforcement:
    - a. Markets already knowledgeable about problem
    - b. Broken record to market
    - c. Getting timely results from lab
  7. Getting consensus from big group (especially with messaging is a challenge) and it's time consuming
  8. Being a government agency can sometimes be a barrier
  9. Lack of commercial fishing insider
  10. Small sample size when collecting samples (i.e. some fish that are on advisory list)
  11. Lack of transparency with public might cause problems
  12. Lack of outreach material for enforcement
  13. Contamination is a complex issue, so ensuring understanding is difficult (internal weakness/communication)
  14. We have finite language capabilities to explain complex issues (communication)
  15. Simplifying complex/nuanced information (communication)
  16. Funding program activities is finite
  17. Internal government restrictions on travel prevents partner engagement

*Internal Weaknesses Themes:*

- Communication
- Anti-government perception

➤ **Third Station: External Opportunities**

Facilitator: Paula Combs (SGA)

*Questions posed by the facilitator:*

- What are external opportunities that can help us achieve or exceed our goals?
- What are opportunities you're aware of that our group might be able to use to our advantage?
- Is there anything else you're working on that we might be able to tap into for the Palos Verdes Shelf project?
- What opportunities within your organization exist that could potentially help achieve the overall goal of the program?

**Notes from group:**

1. Approach association (i.e. United Anglers) to reach party boats.
  - a. It's a benefit to the captains
2. Outreach to inland residents
  - a. Opportunity to contact county fairs or other inland organizations - --  
- (What is the % of inland anglers?)
3. Outside organizations
  - a. Coordinate outside schedules, along with internal schedules, so everyone doesn't end up on the pier at the same time
  - b. Have external orgs/clubs/schools/etc. contact information and schedules and develop a database for who is on the piers
    - i. Use database for what outside organization are working on (not just for schedules)
4. Contact fishing show (cable TV) to get message out to anglers
  - a. Focus pitch on non DNC fish (good/safe fish to eat)
  - b. Focus pitch on good/safe locations
  - c. 10 year anniversary (sale to TV, Radio)
    - i. Korean & Spanish TV channel
5. Fred Hall Fishing Show - at LB convention every year
  - a. Provide incentives at FCEC booth
6. Creating Peer (Pier/Beach/Ocean) Network (Increase communication among all groups)
  - a. For example, if someone has a boat going out- this could be taken advantage of by multiple groups
7. A wider variety for market inventory (differ types of markets)
  - a. Wholesale (contact and inform)
8. A way to use social media tools (from residents) to inspect fish in markets
  - a. Conflict: residents have no scientific background or in-depth knowledge regarding DNC fish
  - b. Residents act as an "alert" to inspectors
  - c. Fish (computer) identification tool
  - d. Resident takes picture - GPS on photo location - location could be turned into inspector along with the photo
9. Boat Shows
  - a. Might create relationship with captains
10. Fish and Bait/Tackle Shop
  - a. Anglers receive tip card with purchase
    - i. Reach out to product wholesalers and partner with them
11. Educating employees at Seafood Markets (not just managers)
  - a. Wholesalers and retailers
12. Online cross-linking with fishing, diving, kayaking, (ocean enthusiasts), surfing, boating, etc. for blogs + websites and link to pvsfish website
13. Hand-out mail-in surveys when anglers get off party boats
  - a. Mail in or not: automatically entered in raffle
  - b. Partner with tackle manufactures for incentives
14. Attend Long Beach Scuba Show
15. Hold a fish BBQ outside party boat area and survey anglers while they hangout and eat (when they get off boat)
  - a. Provide Incentive -hold raffle



*External Opportunities Themes:*

- Party Boats
- Media
- Events
- Communication

➤ **Fourth Station: External Threats**

Facilitator: Nicole Sintov (SGA)

*Questions posed by the facilitator:*

- What are external threats that can prevent us from achieving our goals?
- What's going on in your work sphere that might negatively impact reaching our goals?
- Is there anything else you're working on that might have negative impacts on the PV Shelf project?

*Notes from group:*

1. Government
  - a. Funding
  - b. Policy/flexibility (e.g. travel)
  - c. Restructuring
  - d. Institutional memory loss
  - e. Inherent complexity
2. Public Perception
  - a. Believability of data/results
  - b. Trust/credibility
    - i. In FCEC
    - ii. In fish-related info in general - conflicting results
  - c. Accountability (FCEC)
  - d. Lack of data sharing
3. Communication of accurate message
  - a. Media
  - b. Generalizing beyond data/force-multiply
4. Lack of receptiveness
5. Prioritization
  - a. Hospital setting
6. Information overload
  - a. Overconfidence
  - b. Messaging kept fresh
  - c. Programming incentives → behind change
7. Limits to alternative behaviors → Risks
8. Risks of DNC consumption not immediately evident
  - i. Lack of specific info
9. Anti-business
10. Anti-Gov. Sentiment
11. Role confusion

*External Threats Themes:*

- Info overload

- Public perception
- Message complexity
- Government - policy (travel restriction)
- Communication - accuracy

➤ **Fifth Station: External World Threats**

Facilitator: Jackie Lane (EPA)

*Questions posed by the facilitator:*

- How might the overall external environment affect our goals and projects?  
(Positive or negative)
- What's going on in the world that may have an impact on our project?  
(Positive or negative)

**Notes from group:**

II. Positive

1. Fishermen are not catching fish (including DNC)
2. +/- Still have a program/successor
3. Election and believe in work
4. Advance technology to improve our work (expertise)
5. Environment is healing itself based on new data and MSRP conducting restoration
6. Awareness & green world (economy causing trend)
  - a. Site due to meeting goals - clean up
  - b. Development marine protective area
7. People are more aware of protecting ocean and the clean water guidelines
8. +/- Climate change results in fish stock
9. +/- Marine Special Plan
  - a. Big picture planning of ocean
10. +/- Tech. advances leading to cheap protein source
  - a. GMO food source

III. Negative

1. Not many fisherman fishing
  - a. Over regulated
  - b. Cost
  - c. Awareness of contamination
  - d. Fishery
2. Importing fish/other sources
3. Difference recreational/subsistence fishing
4. Elections/budget cuts/policy change lobbyist
5. Climate change could drive fish out
  - a. Big oil spills or any environmental disaster
  - b. Long term biological cycle and how it influences our ability to evaluate risk in future
6. High public turn over (awareness/behavior)

- a. Ability to track fishermen and survey them
- 7. Technical advancement has affected recreation fishing
- 8. Anti-green world
- 9. Possible offshore drilling for fossil fuels
- 10. +/- Possible removal of Long Beach break
- 11. Over fishing/fishing down the food chain
- 12. Pacific health threat/terrorism - may affect our message and how it's heard
- 13. Economic trending down - will cause them to buy fish from any source

*External World Themes:*

- Election result may impact fed, state, and local participation + how our program is viewed
- Change in/events in technology can impact fish consumption habits

**II. Summary Discussion**

After the SWOTE afternoon session, all the partners came together to review the notes from each group. L. Lewis asked everyone to pair up with someone and discuss which notes stood out to them. Below is a list of “what stood out” to the group:

**Notes from summary discussion:**

*What Stands Out*

- 1. Complexity (what do we have control over?)  
Productive (smart, passionate, hard-working)
- 2. Communication
  - a. Internal: absence of knowledge among groups - increase information among group.
- 3. Breaking into fishing community
- 4. New opportunities - we’ve done so much, but there are still more opportunities, ideas, contracts, etc.
- 5. Looking forward- move into positive messaging
  - a. Go fishing
- 6. Strong stakeholder process has had longevity
  - a. Iterative process
  - b. Give and get/ responsiveness
- 7. Goals evaluation needed
  - a. Are they realistic? Achievable? Still meaningful?

Conclusion:

Lewis thanked all the partners for their participation and asked everyone to call out what they thought “worked” and “didn’t work” with the meeting:

| What worked:  | What you would change:  |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation</li> <li>• New ideas</li> <li>• Location/facility</li> <li>• Food</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candy (mixed reviews)</li> <li>• Lunch—working?</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agenda</li><li>• Attractive, funny people</li><li>• Updates in morning (were good, right level)</li><li>• SWOTE</li></ul> |  |
|---|--|

Lewis asked each person to address the group for parting thoughts- something they would like to leave the group with until next year's meeting. After everyone was finished, T. Jonick thanked partners and noted that the meeting summary would be available shortly on [www.pvsfish.org](http://www.pvsfish.org). J. Huang also thanked everyone and said she's learned a lot from the day's interactions and activities. Huang also said she looks forward to this year and asked for patience while she continues to get adjusted to the project. Huang closed with a big thank you to Long Beach for providing the meeting's location. The meeting was then adjourned.