

Strategic Planning Meeting Summary

Thursday, September 13, 2007

9:30 am – 4:00 pm

US EPA Regional Office, Downtown Los Angeles

Facilitator: Lori Lewis (USEPA)

Attendees:

USEPA:

Roberta Blank
Jackie Lane
Sharon Lin
Carmen White

CH2M HILL:

Olivia Edwards
Kellie Freeman

SGA:

Stephen Groner
Tiffany Jonick
Khanh Nguyen

Action Research:

Coral Bruni

NOAA/MSRP:

Jennifer Boyce
Gabrielle Dorr
Dave Witting

California DTSC:

Loni Adams

CDPH-EHIB:

Diana Lee
Marilyn Underwood

CDFG:

Patty Velez

CalEPA OEHHA:

Bob Brodberg

LA Dept. of Public Health:

Marita Santos
Janet Scully

LA County Sanitation

District:

Joe Gully

OC Environmental Health:

Tom Wong

LB Environmental Health:

Monica Cardenas

SMBRC:

Guangyu Wang

Heal the Bay:

James Alamillo
Mark Gold

Frankie Orrala

Cabrillo:

Linda Chilton

Korean Resource Center:

Heejoo Yoon

I. Introductions & Announcements

Lori Lewis facilitated meeting, walked through the agenda and had attendees introduce themselves. Roberta Blank welcomed the group, recognized Gina Margillo's past efforts with the group and commented on the recent efforts to integrate the various Institutional Controls and remedial investigation in addressing the Palos Verdes Shelf (PVS) Superfund Site. Roberta also encouraged the group to continue to work together on this important program.

II. P.V. Shelf Site Review & Update —*Presentation by Carmen White (US EPA)*

<http://www.pvsfish.org/library/pdf/CarmenWhite9-13-07.pdf>

Carmen White presented a Site Review and Update for the PVS remediation program:

- Remedial Investigation (RI) Report:
 - Concentrations of DDT and PCBs in the surface sediments have overall, decreased. There are signs of degradation in DDT (DDE and DDMU), however, there is no data for the daughter products, and the associated health risks and effects are currently unknown.

- RI Report is currently being reviewed and is anticipated to be completed in October.
- Feasibility Study (FS) Preview:
 - Will look at standard remedies for sediment sites: dredging, capping, monitoring natural recovery, or a combination of the remedies.
 - Feasibility Study is in progress.
- Although remedies are being analyzed in the FS, any remedy will require continuation of ICs program.

III. ICs Program Update—*Presentation by Sharon Lin (US EPA)*

<http://www.pvsfish.org/library/pdf/SharonLin9-13-07.pdf>

Sharon Lin presented a progress report and update on the components of the ICs Program:

- Discuss a brief summary of the PVS ICs Program Strategic Planning Meetings:
 - 2005 – Three Strategic Planning Sessions
 - EPA started working on the ICs Action Plan, and EPA and SMBRC started working on transition.
 - 2006 – One Strategic Planning Follow-up Session
 - EPA committed to continuing to work on ICs action plan the update the existing ICs Implementation Plan.
 - Follow-up on various action items.
 - 2006-2007 – Key Activities
 - EPA continues the course on the FCEC program
 - Development of Road Map (a strategic planning document).
- Review of 2006-2007 ICs Program:
 - Monitoring Program:
 - Completed the marine fish contaminant survey report.
 - Media outreach on the survey results.
 - Enforcement Program
 - Market inspection program with Orange County, LA County and Long Beach.
 - Held 1st enforcement committee meeting.
 - FCEC: Focus on measurable success (behavior modifications) and measuring incremental risk reduction.
- Continue to work on a fully integrated ICs/Cleanup program to manage risk exposure.

Questions/Comments:

- Carmen discussed the possibility of having a Record of Decision (ROD) for PVS by Fall 2008, however, the ROD will not be detailed. It will incorporate IC issues and components.
- Continued communications between all stakeholders is required to make sure the ICs Implementation Plan is successful
- Further details and discussion needed [*in order to flesh out the components*]

IV. Program Road Map—Presentation by Stephen Groner (S. Groner Associates, Inc.)
<http://www.pvsfish.org/library/pdf/StephenGroner9-13-07.pdf>

Stephen Groner presented the ICs Program Road Map, which details the program's goals, objectives and an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT).
http://www.pvsfish.org/library/pdf/IC_Road_Map_083107.pdf

Group agreed/approved the Road Map with refinements based on comments below. Additionally, EPA will move forward with developing the second part of the Road Map (Strategies and Tactics) which will build on the existing Road Map.

Questions/Comments

- Add “target” to market: correct baseline (commercially available white croaker slide)
- Concerns expressed over the 1996 baseline number of markets found with white croaker
- Concern regarding the numeric objective of zero markets by 2014
- Concerns regarding the difference between different standards (i.e. FDA vs. EPA)
- What you can sell vs. safe to eat vs. Superfund standard [*this underscores the differences in EPA vs. FDA standards*]
- Concerns/hesitance about a state ban on white croaker (FDA standards were used for ban of white croaker)
- It is difficult for state to make policy changes, etc.
- Fish move—they will “swim outside” the target areas [*Difficult to be 100% sure if a white croaker caught is contaminated or not; contaminated fish can still be caught even if fishermen are not fishing in the catch ban area*]
- Critical gap: There is a gap in consumption on the commercial side i.e. possible sale of contaminated fish (white croaker). [*How do we address fish such as Sand Bass that are contaminated and pose a health risk, but are at lower contaminant levels than white croaker and still being sold?*]
- Need to look at strategies to address gap (e.g., EPA risk baseline, state, and hybrid etc.)
- Does EPA have influence on commercial fish?
- Could create a “Clean Croaker Certification Program” (i.e.90% of fish caught in the area are clean) giving white croaker a positive spin. However, to implement this program would cost money.
- Concern that we are not looking at other species of commercially caught fish in addition to white croaker
- Important to continue to emphasize and expand education/outreach for anglers
- Clarify short-term and long-term objectives with clear time frames (as part of ICs)
- Need to continue to use recent data (for advisories, bans, etc.)
- Need to have baseline numbers solid, understandable and accurate
- A Draft advisory was issued in 1986, so the 0% baseline regarding awareness of the advisory is difficult to estimate.
- Look at updating numbers from 1994 surveys
- Incorporate other data
- Find out what anglers intend to do with fish they catch

- Need to have more information on frequency (explain the unit used) [*number of trips anglers are making to catch fish and frequency of fishing*]
- Clarify numbers/information on baseline (i.e. there was an earlier 1997 advisory)
- Catch block versus catch ban (exact latitude/longitude not given when catch ban area was established)

V. Focused Group Discussion

To help set the stage for next year’s work, focused group discussions were held in the afternoon. The purpose of the small group discussions was to harness the collective expertise of the all the meeting participants and brainstorm ideas for inclusion in the Strategies & Tactics version of the Road Map.

Structure:

- Smaller working groups (8-10 per group)
- Discuss/brainstorm questions on handout and issues raised in morning session
- 30-45 minutes
- Present summary to larger group

Group 1: Enforcement

| Members | | |
|---------|---------|------------------------------|
| Loni | Olivia | Sharon |
| James | Guangyu | Jennifer |
| Roberta | Tom | Tiffany (facilitator/scribe) |

Questions that framed discussion: What can be done in terms of regulatory enforcement? What are the behaviors that can be enforced? What behaviors are people engaging in that we want to change? What behaviors do we want people to engage in? How can these behaviors be evaluated?

- Shift angler advisory to regulation
- Enforce existing bag limit (10)/ lower amount of fish anglers catch
- Size limit for any species can be a tool
- Enforce and set bag limit for other species in addition to white croaker
 - location-specific bag limit
 - Increase bag limit for other species with low levels of contaminants
- Marine Protective Area designation for PVS (close area off to all forms of fishing)
- Re-evaluate catch ban areas
- Take into consideration enforce-ability of catch ban area
- Coordinate catch ban area with catch blocks
- Make fishing regulations readily available/accessible for both recreational anglers and commercial fishing operations
- Increase enforcement resources
- Develop creative ways to layout regulations for commercial fishermen
- Modify CA retail food code/existing codes
- Research technological methods to monitor area/to increase presence

- Increase presence of inspectors at markets
- State-funded market sampling
- Increase inter-agency coordination
- Implement a “Clean Certification Program” at markets (Certification comes from Heal the Bay?)
- Require fishing license at piers, informational material would accompany license

How do we know that we’re moving toward success?

- Number of markets found with contaminated fish
- Number of incidents reported in catch ban area
- Surveying markets, fish distributors on regulations (measures awareness)
- Number of anglers exceeding bag limits

Group 2: Monitoring

| Members | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Bob Monica Joe G | Diana Janet Patty | Carmen Dave Stephen (facilitator/scribe) |

Questions that framed discussion: How can we structure/layer the monitoring program to measure risk reduction? This includes monitoring of fish contaminant levels and monitoring of behaviors. What are components of the program that can be monitored? How can these components be evaluated? How do we know that we’re moving toward success?

Ocean Monitoring:

- Fish Monitoring (LA Co Sanitation Districts – Every two years)
 - o White Croaker
 - o Perch (Black)
 - o Sand Bass
 - o Kelp Bass
 - o Scorpion Fish
 - o [Seafood safety monitoring]
- Fish Monitoring – Outfall (LACSD – Annual)
 - o White Croaker
 - o Horny Head – Turbot

In general, broad agreement that we need consistent protocol:

- o Fish Preparation
- o Body components
- o QA/QC
- o Analytical methods
- o Using reference materials
- o NIST (White Croaker – PV Reference Material)

Agency Monitoring:

- EPA – Remedy Monitoring
- Trustee – Restoration Project Monitoring
- LACSD
- LA-City-EMD
- Ports:
 - Physical Fish Monitoring
 - Start Fall '07
 - Quarterly
- SCCWRP-Bight '08 Monitoring
- TMDL/MSY/NPOES – Permitted
 - Water board

Market Monitoring:

- Seafood Market Monitoring
 - LA County Environmental Health
 - LB Environmental Health
- Gaps – Monitoring restaurants

Questions:

- Monitoring of records vs. fish chemistry
- Mechanism to verify approved sources
- What % of fish go to restaurant vs. market?
- Training of inspectors regarding fish ID
- Should we monitor for other species and containments?

Anglers:

- Pier Monitoring
- SMBRC – Seafood Consumption Study (needs updating)
- Message Evaluation
- Bio-monitoring – Human Blood (CDPH Statewide) Monitoring
- Behaviors
 - Type of Fish
 - Where
 - How many fish
 - Fish Preparation
 - Stop Eating Fish
- Do the fish reach the most vulnerable (pregnant women, children)
- MSRP/EPA – Pier intercept survey (2002)

Measurements of success:

- Monitoring parts
- Risk Assessment for Total
 - CR by species (Superfund Level)
- Develop narrative :
 - Focus on positive behaviors:
 - Increase in “good” fish caught
 - Markets – “knowing where fish is bought”, fish have invoices

- Proxy Method
 - Looking at key parameters

Group 3: Education and Outreach Group:

| Members | | |
|-----------|---------|----------------------------|
| Coral | Kellie | Frankie |
| Linda | Jackie | Marita |
| Gabrielle | Hee Joo | Marilyn |
| | | Khanh (facilitator/scribe) |

Question: Focusing on the consumption of contaminated white croaker, what behaviors are people engaging in that we want to change?

- Reduce consumption of contaminated fish

Question: What are the smaller components or processes (if any) that contribute to these behaviors? (Here, we want to break down behaviors to the smallest manageable piece in order to affect incremental changes)

- Identify fish
- Change cooking behavior
- Change of fishing location
- Knowledge of fish cleaning methods
- Change amount of consumption
- Eat “safe” fish
- Catch and release

Question: How can these behaviors be evaluated?

- More diverse target audience (e.g., pregnant women, ethnic groups, children)
- More updated educational materials
- Safe fish guidelines (include other fish)
- Repeat messaging
- Conduct targeted types of follow-up with incentives
 - Same day & long term (using pre and post surveys)
- Santa Monica Seafood Consumption Study (Closer look at study for future reference and other studies)
- Concerns about comparable data (“apples” to “oranges”)
- Track reason for angler fishing (why is he/she fishing)
- Greater integration among education, monitoring and enforcement
- Take into account whole advisory
- Greater integration of the overall MSRP Projects
- Difficult to quantify and prove behavioral changes based on current information
- Target more outreach to children
- Establish “bench mark” before outreach activities
- Look at past survey data
- What to do with white croakers if released (contaminate food chain)
- Reduce confusing/misleading materials and fish guidelines

- Include media outlet with outreach
- More depth and breadth with target audience (more partners—CBOs and others)
- Integration between media/info dissemination and outreach activities
- Include community outreach in Road Map
- Work with angler supply stores/shops
 - Develop new or use existing posters for stores/shops
 - Pre and post surveys
 - Follow-up for long-term behavior modification
- Certification process for “safe fish”
- ID “safer” fishing locations
 - Greater/more standardize signage for piers throughout CA and OC coastal waters
- Additive risks for consuming various fish, not just white croakers

Question: How do we know that we’re moving toward success?

- Base success on survey and monitoring data
- Decrease in fish consumption activities
- More evaluation of collaboration with other social services/local programs (i.e. WIC)
- How far reaching is our message?
- Proof in behavior changes
- Meet objectives in Road Map

VI. State Update

- Fish Forum:
 - Raised issues about other contaminants
 - Link to the Port of Los Angeles fish survey
 - Emphasis on benefits (omega 3 etc.) balance of benefits and risks
 - See EPA website “fish forum”
- OEHHA fish guidance
 - Progress of revised advisory has been delayed, uncertain when advisory will be released
 - Holding up other work (i.e. advisories)
- TMDL/MS4/NPDES Permitting:
 - A draft work plan to outline monitoring work and needs will be prepared by the LA Sanitation District and submitted to interested stakeholders for review and comment.

VII. Action Items

| Items | Who | By |
|--|-----|--------------------|
| Additional questions and comments regarding Road Map | ALL | September 21, 2007 |
| Meeting summary | SGA | End of September |
| OEHA Guidance (provide update) | Bob | End of September |

| | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------|
| Refine Roadmap and outline (incorporate today's ideas in next draft) | SGA | November (partner's meeting) |
| TMDL/MS4/NPDES Permitting | Joe | November (partner's meeting) |

VIII. Misc. Items

| Meeting Assessment | |
|---|---|
| Positive (what worked) | Things to Change (what did not work) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different groups represented - Road Map improvement and work in progress - Appreciated SGA's efforts in between meeting to keep partners on track; specifically their efforts coordinating conference calls on issues - Facilitator was on track with schedule - Small group work - Lunch - Key stakeholders/players present - Working hard - Meeting was productive - Setting stage - Big picture discussion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Few CBOs present - More space required - Meet in Long Beach |

Next Strategic Planning Meeting

- Group expressed interest in having a Strategic Planning meeting every six months

Bike-rack *[The items listed below will be discussed at the November partners' meeting]:*

- Timeframe for next Implementation Plan
- Incorporate key messages to audience (Next Draft)