

## Strategic Planning Meeting Summary

Thursday, September 30, 2010

9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

NOAA Office

### Attendees:

#### **BPSOS (Vietnamese**

#### **CBO):**

Tiffany Nguyen

#### **Cabrillo:**

Alfonso Montiel

Larry Fukuhara

#### **CDFG:**

Rebecca Hartman

#### **DTSC:**

Tim Chauvel

#### **EHIB:**

Marilyn Underwood

#### **FCEC CRC:**

Yolanda Lasmarias

Howard Wang

#### **Heal the Bay:**

James Alamillo

Frankie Orrala

#### **Herald**

#### **Community Center**

#### **(Chinese CBO):**

Connie Kwok

Rebecca Soong

#### **ITSI (EPA Contractor):**

Ed Gillera

#### **LA County Public**

#### **Health:**

Elva Silva

Kelly Ho

Joe McCullough

Marita Santos

#### **LB Environmental**

#### **Health:**

Jackie Hampton

#### **NOAA/MSRP:**

Jen Boyce

Gabrielle Dorr

Dave Witting

#### **OCHCA:**

Jessica Warren

Mozhgan Mofidi

#### **SEA Lab:**

Maria Madrigal

#### **SMBRC:**

Guangyu Wang

#### **SGA (EPA Contractor):**

Elizabeth Anderson

Stephen Groner

Tiffany Jonick

Nick Laurrell

#### **USC Sea Grant**

Linda Chilton

#### **St. Columban:**

Ana Manuel

#### **USEPA:**

Lori Lewis

Sharon Lin

Carmen White

### **I. Introduction and Agenda Review – United States Environmental PA**

Sharon Lin (EPA) opened the meeting by welcoming and thanking all partners for their attendance. The facilitator for the meeting was Lori Lewis (EPA) who then walked through the day's agenda. She underscored that the reason why such meetings are held is to keep partners apprised of the various aspects of the greater program and discuss any issues that need clarity. Attendees then introduced themselves, noting their affiliation with FCEC. Lin announced that FCEC was awarded with the PRSA Silver Anvil Award with SGA the official recipient of the award as the creative team.

### **II. ICs Program Overview – Sharon Lin (EPA)**

#### [Link to presentation](#)

- The ICs Program experience has been shared with various groups including:
  - At a workshop in EPA Pacific Northwest Region (Seattle) in April 2010;
  - The annual conference of Association of State & Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials in August 2010;
  - Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry Annual Convention in Portland in November 2010
  - Annual Safe-Secure-Sustainable (S3) Symposium in Monterey in May 2011
- Additionally, the White House AAPI initiative is taking a keen interest in FCEC.

### III. PV Shelf Remediation Update – Carmen White (EPA)

[Link to presentation](#)

- With the record of decision signed a year ago, EPA has been working on baseline monitoring, evaluating contaminants in sediment, water and fish.
  - Sediments: When the cap is put in place, one of EPA’s big concerns is re-suspending contaminants. So EPA, through Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD), is collecting sediment samples from the affected area’s clean edge. When analyzing the samples, EPA is taking a closer look at PCBs to see if they are breaking down, into what components and the effects of those potential components. Currently no data is available on those findings yet.
  - Water sampling: PCBs and DDTs do not “like” water; these contaminants would rather be in sediments. Analysis has begun on different levels of the water column to identify any potential link between water-born sediments and contamination.
  - Fish Monitoring: EPA has partnered a professor from California State University, Long Beach to tag a total of 75 white croaker and 25 barred sand bass. To date, there are 45 white croakers tagged and 6 barred sand bass tagged. It was spawning season on the shelf during the time of collection so not many barred sand bass were available for tagging. In the coming months, more barred sand bass should become available for tagging.
    - One of the goals is to figure out where fish are getting their body burden. EPA knows from past studies that levels of contaminants vary widely between white croakers. During fish monitoring, receivers will pick up signal from tagged fish to better understand where the fish are traveling.
  - Seafood Consumption Survey: This survey is modeled off the 1994 study. The need exists for a new risk assessment, so that any continued remediation is based on current fish consumption behavior. The survey will need to be approved by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) prior to implementation, which could protract any anticipated timeline.
- Questions/Comments:
  - Linda Chilton (USC Sea Grant) asked if any differences in contamination levels have been observed when coring. C. White explained that they did not go through cores.

### II. MSRP Update – Gabrielle Dorr (NOAA/MSRP)

[Link to presentation](#)

- MSRP has several arms to its program including: seabirds, fishing, outreach and education.
  - Seabirds: On Santa Barbara Island, removal of non-native vegetation is going on to restore Cassin’s auklets and Xantus’s murrelets. A self-watering nursery has been built on the island and 4.5 acres have been restored. Artificial nests were installed to jump start nesting communities.
    - Santa Cruz Island – Scorpion Rock: Efforts have included the removal non-native vegetation, the prevention of erosion, the re-introduction of 6,000 native plants and a monitoring survey of tagged seabirds in the area

- San Nicolas Island: The program is in the final stages of removing the feral cat population that has been preying on nesting seabirds. To date, 52 cats have been removed and housed in an off-site facility through the Humane Society. Additionally, native foxes have been captured, hospitalized, treated and released.
- Bald Eagle Restoration: 15 bald eagle chicks have hatched from 13 nests. In 2010, 200,000 people watched the eagle cam.
- Fishing Restoration: For the artificial reef project near Belmont Pier, physical and biological surveys are completed and design of the reef is 95% completed. The project will be going out for public comment early in 2011, with reef development beginning in Winter 2011.
- Public Outreach: MSRP developed an interactive kiosk made of sustainable materials. Users can pick up a brochure which the camera will recognize. The kiosk then interactively goes through the brochure with the user and presents a film on the selected topic. Two kiosks installed at Sea lab in Redondo Beach, with the goal of placing a total of 4 by end of 2010.
  - MSRP is also working on a establishing and maintaining a fish web cam.
- Questions/Comments:
  - S. Lin inquired about the kiosk prices. G. Dorr responded with the amount of \$200,000 for two.

### **III. Pier Signage – Marita Santos (LA County Public Health)**

#### [Link to presentation](#)

- In early 2010 visual surveys were taken at 24 fishing locations examining topics such as angler foot traffic, demographics, etc. Piers were contacted to ascertain the appropriate contacts and channels of approval to permanently post pier signage.
- A report was developed based on survey results which prioritized piers to receive signage based on different variables. This categorized piers into 4 groups ranging from high to low priority.
- In a subsequent conference call, Joe McCullough (LA County Public Health) informed the messaging workgroup that since most of the fishing locations were in LA County's jurisdiction, his department could oversee the posting for most of the locations. A potential timeframe for actual posting could occur simultaneously with the mussel quarantine posting. LA will post signage at 20 locations; Long Beach will post at 3 locations, and the City of Seal Beach will post one sign in Orange County.
- An official letter of assistance from EPA went out to LA County. Next up are letters for Long Beach and Seal Beach Developed.
- The projected timeline is to begin posting signs in April, when mussel quarantine signs are scheduled to go up.
- The evolution of the signage design was shared with partners.
- Questions:
  - S. Lin asked if the boards were true to size. M. Santos confirmed that they were.
  - L. Chilton asked about the maintenance of the signs. M. Santos stated that there will be discussion about that because last time signs were put up, they were not kept up.

- Jackie Hampton (Long Beach Environmental Health) volunteered that Long Beach can post and maintain signs. S. Lin explained how EPA will pay for production, but posting and maintaining the signs will be up to each jurisdiction. T. Jonick stated that FCEC is also working with Mark Sandoval from Long Beach. J. Hampton added that in the past, Parks and Recreation printed and posted. She also re-stated that her team can post and maintain the signs.
  - Yolanda Lasmarias (Community Resource Council) asked if there are other locations inland where the signs will be posted and if they will be posted on the web. T. Jonick explained that these signs are specific for fishing locations along the coastlines.
  - Howard Wang (Community Resource Council) commented that the signs are not finalized for translation. T. Jonick explained that the messaging workgroup wanted to make sure the English text is correct before diving into translations.
  - Marilyn Underwood (EHIB) asked why there would be 20 signs in Los Angeles. M. Santos said that this is due to the span of the advisory area.
  - Mozghan Mofidi (OCHCA) asked if the group is working with Orange County or the City of Seal beach? M. Santos answered they are working with the City of Seal Beach. M. Mofidi asked for the health officer's name that the group is corresponding with. T. Jonick explained they are working with Michael Ho from City of Seal Beach.
  - James Alamillo (Heal the Bay) commented that it would be beneficial to have Orange County's backing. J. Alamillo also noted that this was the second piece the messaging workgroup tackled (the first one being the angler outreach tip card).
  - L. Chilton questioned why boat ramps were no included. M. Santos suggested that this could be discussed in a messaging workgroup conference call.
  - J. McCullough suggested that the signs be posted everywhere mussel signs are posted.
  - S. Lin clarified that the fishing locations were prioritized before the project made contact with J. McCullough. Now that he's part of the project, signs can potentially be posted in a lot of locations, not just a selection of 24.
- Group Discussion on Pier Signage Concept  
*The following are the notes received from the group as a whole when they were asked to provide comments on the designs concept presented.*
- Possibly include a phone number for more information (some people might not have web access). Phone recordings should be in multiple languages. More details could potentially be included by allowing callers to press # for more info.
  - Add Korean translation of sign
  - Show picture of throwing fish back
  - Pictorially convey "don't eat"
  - Include common name of white croaker (kingfish/tomcod)
  - Enlarge pictures
  - Use yellow color? Attract attention
  - Size discrepancy (in fish sizes)

- Size discrepancy (in translations)
- OEHHA may not need to be credited / can be second person
- Consider changing color of signs every year so to make it new
- Discrepancy in locally caught vs. fish available in stores
- Check images of fish: Barred Sand Bass might be Kelp Bass (or might be confused as Kelp Bass because they look similar)
- Be more visual, use less words
- Take out “protect your health”
- Think about distinguishing what’s okay to eat outside of contamination area
- Possibility of including map
- Get rid of wording and just have pictures

#### IV. **Sport Angler Organization Outreach – Gabrielle Dorr (NOAA/MSRP)**

[Link to presentation](#)

- Sport related fish (barracuda and barred sand bass) have come onto the new advisory list, which potentially puts sport anglers at risk. FCEC and NOAA/MSRP are working on partnering with sport angler groups to educate this new audience.
- The goal is to present FCEC and MSRP information at angler organization meetings. Tip cards are distributed and anglers are given a commitment letter to avoid eating Do Not Consume fish and pass on the information to one more person. Angler organizations are also asked to participate in a link exchange, and also asked if information can be published in their newsletter (if they have one).
- In preparation for this outreach, a run-through presentation was held with Heal the Bay and United Anglers of Southern California. The presentation was revised based on feedback.
- The first presentation was held with the Redondo Rod and Gun Club.
- Questions/Comments:
  - M. Underwood asked how many groups have been identified. T. Jonick answered approximately 40-50 groups. However, T. Jonick solicited the help of the group to find more angler organizations because groups dissolve and it has been challenging reaching the groups.
  - Group discussion opened up to address the issue of identifying new angler organizations. Allcoastsportfishing.com, bloodydeck.com and the Long Beach Casting Club were all identified as potential organization or conduits to other organizations.
  - Additionally, the group identified several tactics to grow the Sport Angler Organizations roster:
    - At the landings where party boats launch
    - Local bait/tackle shops
    - What about PTA’s
    - Derby Days
    - Fishing swap meets
    - Fishing shows/expo – Fred Hall
    - Go to any MLPA workshops

**V. Angler Outreach – Frankie Orrala (Heal the Bay)**

[Link to presentation](#)

- The number of total anglers reached from June-August was 1,813.
- Two major aspects of Angler Outreach are the Intervention and Monitoring outreach. Intervention outreach directly addresses anglers through the administration of tip cards and the general FCEC messaging. Monitoring outreach assesses behavior of anglers through surveys and observation.
- Some highlights from Monitoring data collected between May and June (looking at a little over 120 data sets):
  - In those reporting outreach, 41 total fish were observed in anglers' buckets: 11 were white croaker, 6 were topsmelt and 24 were other fish. It should be noted that all 6 topsmelt were in the possession of a single angler with 1-2 years experience who did not report awareness of topsmelt contamination. Likewise 8 of the white croaker were in the possession of a single angler who reported intentions to use the white croaker as bait for shark fishing.
  - In those not reporting outreach, 173 total fish were observed in anglers' buckets: 19 were white croaker, 16 were topsmelt and 138 were other fish.
- As for awareness, 60% of respondents who reported not having received outreach also reported having heard that white croaker was contaminated (compared with 90% who received outreach.) This is the only one of the DNC fish where a majority of respondents without outreach reported having heard of contamination.
- There is a steady incline in the possession of “other fish” in more experienced presumably more skilled, fishermen. About a third of anglers fish to catch anything, while another 40% aim for bonito, halibut or shark. Only one person set out to catch a DNC fish (barred sand bass.)
- The vast majority of anglers were Latino/a.
- Questions/Comments:
  - S. Lin asked what the sample size numbers were for the “without outreach” segment. F. Orrala answered that with outreach was 45-46 and without outreach was 173.

**VI. Fisherman's Appreciation Day – Larry Fukuhara (Cabrillo)**

[Link to presentation](#)

- Fisherman's Appreciation Day (FAD) was a free event held on the Venice Pier on July 31 designed to influence the behavior of participating fishermen through fishing expertise and social norms.
- By establishing partnerships with various restaurants and agencies, FAD was able to provide a family friendly atmosphere complete with food, real fishing advice, games and prizes – all at no expense to participants.
- Overall, 120 – 130 people visited the event, with about 70 anglers participating in L. Fukuhara's rigging demo. While the event featured regular FCEC messaging addressing DNC fish, FAD took a new approach in directing anglers on advanced fishing tactics for catching non-DNC fish such as halibut, mackerel and shark.

**VII. Strategic Thinking and Conversation Sessions**

*After completing the morning session, the group was broken into 5 small groups to separately evaluate 19 tactical items identified in the Institutional Controls Road Map (collaboratively developed by all partners as a guiding document for the program). The purpose of these small group discussions is to gather and tabulate the partners' different thoughts on the many individual tactics which combine to create the Institutional Controls program. In preparation for these tactical items, S. Lin and T. Jonick provided updates to further inform partners as they began their small group discussions. Each of these items is laid in detail in the following tables.*

o **Focus Area 1: Public Outreach and Education**

- The majority of work is underway with the new tip card in use, community outreach continuing and the pier outreach program being fully implemented.
- Questions/Comments:
  - S. Lin suggested that tactic #9 (Directly outreach to fish consumers to educate at-risk families and communities about the health risks related to white croaker consumption, providing them with best practices for preparing and eating locally caught fish) be opened up to small group discussion. Consequently, it was re-classified as an “in progress” tactic.
  - G. Wang (SMBRC) suggested that question #2 (Create new educational materials based on OEHHA or EPA risk assessment and risk management recommendations) be opened up for small group work because while the tip card is done, there are still other types of messaging pieces in progress. T. Jonick responded that at the time the Road Map was developed tactic #2 was primarily geared towards the tip card.
  - Referencing tactic #7 (Utilize community organizations to educate at-risk families and communities about the health risks related to white croaker consumption, providing them with best practices for preparing and eating locally caught fish) & #9 (Directly outreach to fish consumers to educate at-risk families and communities about the health risks related to white croaker consumption, providing them with best practices for preparing and eating locally caught fish) H. Wang (CRC) asked about the categorization of groups such as the PTA, school districts, teenage organizations – where would they go? Are they community groups or are they consumers? S. Lin responded that they should be categorized in #7.

Public Outreach & Education				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
1. Reinforce health inspectors' efforts to educate markets on "Best Practices" in purchasing white croaker (and possibly other fish), resulting in markets signing commitments to voluntarily implement "Best Practices"	Not Addressed	Groups 1, 2 and 5 said yes. Groups 3 and 4 said no.	G1: 5 G2: 3 G3: N/A G4: N/A G5: 4-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Depending on monitoring/enforcement, but must be followed up by enforcement efforts, Should be driven by data—are contaminated fish ending up at markets? If fish aren't there, let's not do it</li> <li>▪ G2: LB Found white croaker, anglers try to sell white croaker to markets, Haven't been signing commitments, Not effective in educating public because going through middle man – but effective in enforcement, Markets are already aware,</li> <li>▪ G4: RH: If there is a lot of contaminated fish pursue               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ JM: Are there best practices?</li> <li>○ KH: most Asian store fish are imported</li> <li>○ JM: no locally caught fish in markets</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Continue education in "best practices"</li> </ul>
2. Create new educational materials based on OEHHA or EPA risk assessment and risk management recommendations (e.g. advisory update)	Completed/ In Progress	Groups 3 and 5 said yes while the other groups did not address this issue	G1: N/A G2: N/A G3: No Rank G4: N/A G5: 1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G3: Need something in markets to replace tri-fold</li> <li>▪ G5: Educational Materials need to continue focus on vulnerable populations, new materials should be developed to keep current (e.g. Keep design/look),</li> <li>▪ Note: At the time the ICs Road Map was developed, this tactic referred to updating the outreach materials based on more recent data. A milestone of 2010 was doing just that through developing the new angler outreach tip card; hence some groups did not address this tactic. Partners felt that potential new materials could be created (in addition to the tip card, resulting in further discussion)</li> </ul>



Public Outreach & Education				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
3. Update fish advisory signage based on the updated assessment	In Progress	CONSENSUS: All groups said Yes	G1: 1 G2: 1 G3: 1 G4: 1 G5: 1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: This is what we've been striving for, for years, to tell people about advisory</li> <li>▪ G3: Priority</li> <li>▪ G4: JM: This is the audience we're trying to reach               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ KH: Suggested bigger pictures on the signs</li> <li>○ RH: Sport fishing implications should be addressed</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Educational Materials need to continue focus on vulnerable populations, new materials to keep current (eg. Keep design/look)</li> <li>▪ Note: skipped lengthy group discussion due to earlier meeting discussion</li> </ul>
4. Utilize the pier outreach program to educate pier and shore-based anglers in Los Angeles and Orange County on the risks of consuming contaminated white croaker and other locally-caught fish	Ongoing	CONSENSUS: All groups said Yes	G1: 1 G2: 1 G3: 1-2 G4: 1 G5: 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Because of the new advisory we have a new message for outreach</li> <li>▪ G2: A lot of new anglers are being reached with the message.</li> <li>▪ G3: If we stopped people would assume there is no longer a problem. New anglers need to get the information</li> <li>▪ G4: JM: maybe good way focus is on boat fishermen               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ GD: This is very important</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Consider if this needs to be refocused</li> <li>▪ Note: A concern was brought up to taper down pier outreach due to repeat interactions. The angler outreach team countered that they are constantly meeting new anglers on the piers. Group agreed this tactic was still very important because this is our target, at-risk audience.</li> </ul>

Public Outreach & Education				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
5. Ensure all local anglers receive fish advisory information when obtaining a fishing license by distributing local advisory information in a simple tip card at time of license purchase	Not Addressed	Groups 2, 3 and 5 said Yes. Group 4 said no and Group 1 was not sure	G1: N/A G2: 4-5 G3: 5 G4: N/A G5: 1-2 (eventually lowered ranking to be in line with other groups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Not sure, logistically may be difficult, consider working with CDFG to include tip card in regulation booklet. A potential problem: there are so many license distributors, Consider stratifying list on license store, Need to determine if its logistically feasible, Could take a lot/all of resources, We need more information</li> <li>▪ G2 Shop attendees won't remember, Only applicable for shoreline, How can it be effective?</li> <li>▪ G3: Need more info, needs to be fleshed out more to understand potential priority</li> <li>▪ G4: JM: how can we ensure people get it?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RH: no license needed to fish on pier</li> <li>○ KH: 24/7 effort needed</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Ensure fish advisory info with fish license. What outlets exist? Bait shop, CDFG</li> <li>▪ Note: There was some confusion on where fishing licenses were needed. As licenses are not required on piers, this influenced groups to give this a lower priority.</li> </ul>

Public Outreach & Education				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
6. Outreach to angler organizations to educate pier and shore-based anglers in Los Angeles and Orange County on the risks of consuming contaminated white croaker and other locally-caught fish	In Progress	CONSENSUS: All groups said yes	G1: 2 G2: 4-5 G3: 2 G4: 3 G5: 4-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: It's been a priority, and it represents a data gap. Angling organizations have been asking for the info. Questions to ask during outreach: What fish are anglers targeting?</li> <li>▪ G2: Aren't we already reaching out to pier, shore, sport anglers?</li> <li>▪ G3: Potentially untapped audience, Questions how many anglers belong to clubs</li> <li>▪ G4: RH: If there's not many groups – should be easy               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ GD: They are disorganized</li> <li>○ RH: 1 contact reach many people</li> <li>○ On pier people are highest risks – clubs are more elite</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: No Comments</li> <li>▪ Note: For groups ranking this lower, discussion surrounded the fact that just because fish are caught, they are not necessarily eaten. Also, fishermen with boats may not necessarily be fishing in contaminated area.</li> </ul>

Public Outreach & Education				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
7. Utilize community organizations to educate at-risk families and communities about the health risks related to white croaker consumption, providing them with best practices for preparing and eating locally caught fish	In Progress	CONSENSUS: All Groups Said Yes	G1: 1 G2: 1 G3: 1 G4: 2 G5: 1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: So many tons of white croaker landed; unsure where it's going; Mechanism to reinforce their work</li> <li>▪ G2: It's timely; it's effective; Already an established link using trusted sources to reach out to in community; These people are educated so more access to information; People may not spread the word</li> <li>▪ G3: We get larger health message into communities</li> <li>▪ G4: GD: like it               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RH: reach at-risk groups</li> <li>○ JM: people already linked up</li> <li>○ More feasible bang for buck</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Continue Education via CBOs; Media effort to ensure ethnic accuracy of info.</li> </ul>
8. Utilize health professionals and community clinics to educate at-risk families and communities about the health risks related to white croaker consumption, providing them with best practices for preparing and eating locally caught fish	Complete	This issue was only addressed by Groups 3 and 5 who both said Yes.	G1: N/A G2: N/A G3: 1 G4: N/A G5: 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Not Answered</li> <li>▪ G2: Not Answered</li> <li>▪ G3: Should continue and expand into other school districts priority</li> <li>▪ G4: Not Answered</li> <li>▪ G5: Utilize health professionals; LADPH clinic outreach; target pregnant women and new moms.</li> <li>▪ Note: This issue was marked as complete to indicate that this tactic was carried out by the CBOs when they did health clinic outreach. On a different scale, LAPH continues to reach out to health professionals, and Yolanda to school nurses.</li> </ul>

Public Outreach & Education				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
9. Directly outreach to fish consumers to educate at-risk families and communities about the health risks related to white croaker consumption, providing them with best practices for preparing and eating locally caught fish	In Progress	Groups 1, 2, 4 and 5 said Yes, while Group 3 said No.	G1: 4-5 G2: 2-3 G3: N/A G4: 5 G5: 4-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Consider combining items 9 &amp; 7 into a single tactic               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Really should focus on #7; 9 is supplemental/complimentary</li> <li>○ Additional considerations: Are there other groups we should partner with (i.e. sustainable seafood, meshing message with contamination)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G2: How do we define consumer?</li> <li>▪ G3: No – Should not outreach directly at markets</li> <li>▪ G4: JM: how are you going to find them?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ KH: send survey out to everyone</li> <li>○ GD: “can we contact you” added to survey and add insert</li> <li>○ Could work but a lot of potential obstacles</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: In light of fish preparation videos, could conduct demonstrations</li> <li>▪ Note: Due to its overlap with Tactic #7, Tactic #9 was de-emphasized</li> </ul>

o **Focus Area 2: Enforcement and Monitoring**

[Link to presentation](#) by S. Lin

- Following the Enforcement Meeting on May 27, 2010, 4 joint inspections efforts between CDFG and City of Long Beach have been executed.
- Individually: CDFG inspected 4 commercial vessels, CDFG conducted 30 recreational fisherman inspections; City of Long Beach inspected 12 markets, and Orange County conducted 36 market inspections.
- Efforts to align the catch-ban area with catch blocks are being looked into, along with tracking landed white croaker.
- Questions/Comments:
  - C. White commented that EPA will start looking at contaminant levels of lobster. T. Jonick noted that there was an inquiry into [info@pvsfish.org](mailto:info@pvsfish.org) about lobster contamination levels. R. Hartman (CDFG) said that a group at CDFG is doing research on lobsters, so there may be collaboration opportunities. S. Lin commented that EPA needs to figure out what parts of the lobster are going to be analyzed.

Enforcement				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
10. Develop creative ways to layout regulations to commercial fishermen (i.e. "A Pocket Guide to CA Commercial Fishing") to increase access to and understanding of regulations	Complete	This question was only answered by Group 3 who said Yes	G1: N/A G2: N/A G3: 3 G4: N/A G5: N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Not Answered</li> <li>▪ G2: Not Answered</li> <li>▪ G3: Consider making community aware as well– at churches, festivals, events</li> <li>▪ G4: Not Answered</li> <li>▪ G5: Not Answered</li> </ul>
11. Make catch-ban regulation easily accessible for commercial operations to increase access to and understanding of regulations	Complete	N/A	N/A	N/A
12. Randomly sample white croaker landed at the two identified major landing areas: Huntington Beach and Terminal Island	Not Addressed	CONSENSUS: All groups said Yes	G1: 1-2 G2: 1-2 G3: 2-3 G4: 2 G5: 1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: This is part of missing data set; Tactic should be top of mind: where are these fish going? Figure out where landed fish are going;</li> <li>▪ G2: What are the logistical elements? (Up to CDFG); landing is the 1<sup>st</sup> line of defense; it may be difficult because of resources (expensive); Completes water to table pathway</li> <li>▪ G3: How clean are the fish just outside the ban area? Suggest conducting statistically valid random sample,</li> <li>▪ G4: RH: Depends on the goal of the program: is it to get contamination levels of white croaker? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ GD: Are they fish which are coming from PV?</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Random Sample at landing areas (critical step in the risk exposure pathways)</li> <li>▪ Note: Discussion surrounded making the "water to table" link. If the program figures out where fish are going once they're landed, that could allay enforcement/monitoring efforts on other fronts.</li> </ul>

Enforcement				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
13. Reestablish catch-ban area to correspond with commercial catch-blocks in order to increase understanding of regulations and enforce adherence to regulations	In Progress	CONSENSUS: All Groups said Yes	G1: 1 G2: 2 G3: 5 (eventually agreed with group) G4: 1-2 G5: 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Confusion/alignment discrepancy puts public health at risk</li> <li>▪ G2: Need more data /too many data gaps; Maybe just for a few catch blocks (just 72c); But drive people to fish in other areas; Affecting livelihood of fisherman; But expanding catch ban is more health protective; Fish travel – so why bother</li> <li>▪ G3: If they are going to lie they will lie,</li> <li>▪ G4: Eases future research (so no back and forth on if fish came from catch ban area or not); will ease confusion if fish is caught in actual catch ban;</li> <li>▪ G5: foundation of legal enforcement framework</li> <li>▪ Note: RH explained the value of the catch-ban alignment, and was able to persuade partners of its importance.</li> </ul>



Enforcement				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
14. County health departments conduct targeted inspection, outreach and market surveillance of white croakers using a variety of tools (e.g. prop 65, existing program mandates and information kits developed by FCEC)	Ongoing	CONSENSUS: All Groups said Yes	G1: 2 G2: 1-2 G3: 1 G4: 2-3 G5: 1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: If inspectors pull out, markets may go back to bad habits; program must deal with market employee turnover; This is our line of defense since we can't make water to table connection</li> <li>▪ G2: Should keep going until problem solved; Amend by rotating markets, keep moving; if program disappear, bad behavior may pop up pretty quick</li> <li>▪ G3: No comments</li> <li>▪ G4: GD: not a lot of white croaker               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RH: can scale back on efforts – can go to same person 1-2 times (as opposed to 7 or 8)</li> <li>○ 2 visits per year</li> <li>○ Data driven</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Inspectors develop relationships, serve community, sustain the message</li> </ul>
15. Increase enforcement of existing bag limit for white croaker	In progress	Groups 1, 2, 4 and 5 said Yes. Group 3 said No	G1: 3 G2: 2-3 G3: N/A G4: 1 G5: 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Need to have teeth in regulation</li> <li>▪ G2: Bag limit sends a mixed message but only legal resource; this really is protecting against illegal sales</li> <li>▪ G3: We're sending mixed message—saying ok to catch 10 white croaker</li> <li>▪ G4: RH maintain the current levels; change/increase of enforcement might not be worth it</li> <li>▪ G5: No comments</li> <li>▪ Note: Group discussion centered around sending mixed messages as to permitting 10 white croaker to be caught, although white croaker is a DNC fish</li> </ul>

Monitoring				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
16. Assess the geographic extent and frequency with which contaminated white croaker are reaching fish markets.	Ongoing	CONSENSUS: All groups said yes	G1: 2 G2: 5 G3: 2 G4: 1-2 G5: 1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Tactics 14, 16 and 17 should all be linked in execution</li> <li>▪ G2: Though it gets at the heart of a major issue, this is a vast problem which could be very complicated and expensive to approach</li> <li>▪ G3: Important</li> <li>▪ G4: Execution methodology seems flawed – this is a very important tactic to get right however the discrepancy between landed white croaker and sold white croaker seems extraordinarily high and pointing to a more major problem</li> <li>▪ G5: No comments</li> </ul> <p>Note: Groups seemed to be in consensus in both suggesting that this tactic could be of the utmost importance and that it is an extremely large, potentially insoluble issue to address.</p>
17. Evaluate market availability of other contaminated fish caught locally, in addition to white croaker	Not addressed	CONSENSUS: All groups said Yes	G1: 2-3 G2: 3-4 G3: 3-4 G4: 2-3 G5: 2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: This is a data gap; Should we determine market availability at markets or go back to landing data? What's there? We need to know; Should monitor other DNC fish to see if there's a paper trail</li> <li>▪ G2: Barracuda and topsmelt might be a concern; It would be an easy add on for market inspection group</li> <li>▪ G3: Inspectors "unofficially" not seeing it</li> <li>▪ G4: RH: do all DNC fish not just white croaker</li> <li>▪ G5: Evaluate market availability of other fish (Barracuda)</li> </ul>

Monitoring				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
18. Maintain/develop effective means of communicating with the regulatory agencies to ensure that all ICs components are effectively inter-coordinated and integrate new data/information as it's received	Ongoing	CONSENSUS: All groups which discussed this item said Yes	G1: N/A G2: 2 G3: 3 G4: 1 G5: 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: N/A</li> <li>▪ G2: Information-sharing, leveraging resources</li> <li>▪ G3: No comments</li> <li>▪ G4: RH: makes sense               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ KH: so we won't redo efforts</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Effective communication with agencies (data analysis and IC's components coordinated)</li> <li>▪ Note: Group discussion focused on the fact that this was an important tactic in its capacity to avoid duplicating work; and to make sure our program is well integrated.</li> </ul>

Monitoring				
Tactic [These are the priorities developed by the partnership at previous Strategic Planning Meetings]	Status	Does it make sense to focus resources on this over the next 3 years?	If yes, rank on a scale of 1-5 (1high; 5 low)	Reason for ranking (Notes Recorded by Facilitators)
19. Identify restaurants that regularly sell white croaker. Educate them on alternatives or ways to get clean fish	Not Addressed	Groups 2, 4 and 5 said Yes; Group 3 said no and Group 1 could not decide	G1: N/A G2: 1 G3: N/A G4: 2 G5: 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ G1: Start with the landing info – can you trace to restaurants; They’re only part of the picture if landing info points that way; No: because altruistically could be difficult; This should be driven by landing data</li> <li>▪ G2: This has been a neglected area; might consider adding “restaurant associations” to language; Already doing enforcement and monitoring around there, because already addressed by other programs; Sometimes fishermen sell directly to restaurant; Chefs will sometimes go directly to docks; Markets have live fish</li> <li>▪ G3: Not enough resources; go to distributors before restaurants</li> <li>▪ G4: RH: Important because potentially invisible               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Challenge is finding if the fish are actually contaminated, which could be hard to do</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ G5: Not served / not found</li> <li>▪ Notes: Discussion focused on feasibility and practicality of carrying this out. It could be finding a needle in a haystack; there are far more restaurants than markets.</li> </ul>

**VIII. Closing**

- S. Lin closed the meeting by announcing that the line of strategy developed in these sorts of meetings will form the basis of the next 3–5 year work plan, and as a whole that she really appreciates all the feedback everyone put in. In the next few months EPA will try to put together a skeletal document of all work plans. T. Jonick noted that the summary of the meeting will be available online along with any available Power Point presentation. S. Lin reminded the group that there may be another meeting before the end of the year in addition to the upcoming newsletters. T. Jonick also mentioned that more frequent discussions and conference calls will be held in between the Strategic Planning and Partners meetings so as to continue the work which has already yielded positive results. No specific time frame was set but another large meeting was suggested to be on the table for some time early in 2011.

**IX. Miscellaneous Items**

<b>Meeting Assessment</b>	
Positive (What worked)	Things to Change (What did not work)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lori – Facilitator</li> <li>• Gill Formation (set up of tables and chairs)</li> <li>• Small group facilitators</li> <li>• Good flow to presentations</li> <li>• Good presenters</li> <li>• On-time</li> <li>• Lunch</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Security</li> <li>• Partners should receive worksheets and important documents ahead of time to allow time for review</li> </ul>

**Action Items**

- What: contact Jackie for assistance for signs in Long Beach
- Who: SGA
- By When: Oct. 8, 2010

**Upcoming Meetings/Events**

- BPSOS 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary 10/10
- Health Fair at St. Columban church on Sunday 11/21/2010 9am-3pm
  - 125 S. Loma Drive, CA 90026. Contact: Y. Lasmarias – [ylasmarias@aol.com](mailto:ylasmarias@aol.com)
- Autumn Sea Fair 10/17/2010
  - Cabrillo Marine Aquarium
- SCE AAPI Health Walk / Green Environment Fair CSUF May 7, 2011