

Strategic Planning Meeting Summary

Thursday, September 25, 2008

9:30 am – 4:30 pm

NOAA Office, Long Beach

Attendees:

Boat People SOS:

Tiffany Nguyen

Cabrillo:

Alfonso Montiel

CDFG Marine Region:

John Fallan

Marty Maytorena

Patty Velez

FCEC Community

Resource Council:

Leeann Serizawa

Elenore Sobrevega

DTSC:

Tim Chauvel

Greg Holmes

EHIB:

Marilyn Underwood

Heal the Bay:

James Alamillo

Mark Gold

Frankie Orrala

ISTI (EPA contractor):

Tawny Tran

LA County Public Health:

Janet Scully

Marita Santos

LA Sanitation District:

Joe Gully

LB Environmental Health:

Monica Cardenas

LA Environmental Health:

Maria Dalusong

Janice Lewis

Obi Ogamba

NOAA/MSRP:

Jennifer Boyce

Gabrielle Dorr

Dave Witting

OEHHA:

Bob Brodberg

OC Environmental Health:

Tom Wong

Robert Curtis

St. Anselm's Cultural Center:

Anh Nguyen

SGA (EPA contractor):

Stephen Groner

Tiffany Jonick

Khanh Nguyen

SMBRC:

Guangyu Wang

Lia Protopapadakis

USEPA:

Roberta Blank

Jackie Lane

Lori Lewis

Sharon Lin

Carmen White

I. Welcome, Introductions & Agenda Review

Lori Lewis (USEPA) facilitated meeting, walked through the agenda and had attendees introduce themselves. Roberta Blank (USEPA) welcomed the group and thanked partners for their continuing commitment to the Institutional Controls Program.

II. PV Shelf Feasibility Study Update—*Presentation by Carmen White (USEPA): [Link to presentation](#)*

C. White presented the status of the Feasibility Study and explained the Superfund Non-Time Critical Removal and Remedial processes. The Feasibility Study assesses what can be done to reduce risks the contaminated sediments pose to human health and the environment. The EPA national remedy review boards come into the process to share information on what has been done at other similar Superfund sites and advise on technical and policy issues related to site cleanup. The process also ensures a good level of experience sharing and program consistency at the national level.

- Feasibility Study (FS):
 - The EPA National Remedy Review Board recommended evaluating dredging as an option to address the sediment contamination. The last time dredging was evaluated as an option was in 1999, and technology has improved considerably since then. The next draft of the FS will include analysis on the dredging alternative.
 - The PV Shelf Technical Information Exchange Group (PVSTIEG) is expected to review the FS this winter.
- Remedy Review Board:
 - R. Blank explained that the Remedy Review Board reviews and makes recommendations for any superfund site remedy that costs \$25 million or more. The board provides recommendations and does not necessarily override the input from stakeholders.

Questions/Comments:

- C. White was asked to explain capping, which is placing clean sand over the contaminated sediment. Capping will be difficult due to the likelihood of re-suspending the contaminated sediment.
- In the original pilot exploring capping, how many acres were in the pilot? C. White explained there were three 45-acre plots. The contaminated sediment spans approximately 320 acres.
- Has EPA looked at sediment movement in the area? C. White said EPA has looked at sediment movement extensively via studies done by the U.S. Geological Services.
- C. White explained that EPA will also be assessing re-suspension resulting from dredging.

III. ICs Program Update

A. Monitoring/Enforcement—*Presentation by Sharon Lin (USEPA): [Link to presentation](#)*

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

- Monitoring:
 - Collected 10 white croaker samples (fish fillets) at Belmont Pier and 9 samples at Rainbow Harbor as a part of the Take Home Fish Assessment.
 - Belmont Pier:
 - Average DDT = 102.4, ppb, 95% Upper Confidence Level (UCL) = 141.7 ppb
 - Average PCBs = 95.04, ppb, 95%UCL = 127.2 ppb
 - Rainbow Harbor: :
 - Average DDT = 117.3, ppb, 95% UCL = 166.4 ppb
 - Average PCBs = 136.9, ppb, 95%UCL = 170.8 ppb
 - These samples are consistent with the levels found in the 2002 EPA/MSRP sampling and analysis. S. Lin can provide anyone interested in a detailed summary of the analysis with the technical memo.
- Enforcement Program:
 - Three trainings for inspectors in August with LA County Environmental Health, Orange County, and City of Long Beach.

- County contracts:
 - LA County contract is currently being processed.
 - City of Long Beach contract was awarded in August.
 - The Orange County contract was awarded in April.

Questions/Comments:

- Questions were asked as to what the lab result numbers mean. Robert Brodberg (OEHHA) explained that the numbers are in an area where someone could consume one meal per week (Belmont numbers) to no consumption at all (Rainbow Harbor numbers)
- Janet Scully (LA County Public Health, Toxics Epidemiology) asked what the chemical levels for white croaker are at a non-contaminated site. Dave Witting (NOAA/MSRP) suggested that looking at samples from Ventura (a cleaner area) may be good for comparison purposes.
- Questions were raised about the meaning of “background levels,” which refer to the levels that are not affected by the contamination.
- Dave Witting (NOAA/MSRP) provided the following information on the fish concentration “background levels” after the meeting as a follow-up:
 - Ventura white croaker (skin-off fillet): DDT – 84 ppb, PCB – 22 ppb from the 2002 MSRP/EPA fish contaminant survey.
- D. Witting said that the Port of Los Angeles is a known source of PCBs when the question was raised.

B. FCEC—*Presentation by Tiffany Jonick (S. Groner Associates, Inc.): [Link to presentation](#)*

T. Jonick provided a summary of goals for FCEC’s upcoming year.

- Partner’s Coordination
 - Provide monthly opportunities to update partners through meetings, agency calls and the eNewsletter (new initiative)
- Angler Outreach Program:
 - Goals for the 2008-2009 year include:
 - Maintain/increase angler knowledge at 80% (with outreach)
 - Maintain/increase behavior change at 90% (with outreach)
 - Take Home Fish Assessment: Reduce the number of white croaker anglers are taking into the community
- Community Outreach:
 - Goals for the 2008-2009 year for the Vietnamese community include:
 - Maintain/increase knowledge of white croaker contamination at 90% (with outreach)
 - Maintain/decrease 0-5% white croaker consumption rate
 - Maintain/increase healthy fish eating habits by 5-10%
 - Maintain/decrease unhealthy fish eating habits by 5-10%
 - Goals for the 2008-2009 year for the Chinese community include:
 - Implement small scale outreach in Chinese community in Spring 2009
 - Show behavior change from efforts
 - Goals for the 2008-2009 year large scale outreach events include:

- Host booths at 6 large scale community outreach events to increase awareness
- Reach 900 community members through these events.

Questions/Comments:

- Patty Velez (CDFG) asked why the Vietnamese and Chinese communities were selected for community outreach, and where the Latino community fit in. T. Jonick explained that in 2006 to 2007, FCEC conducted a Consumption, Attitudes and Beliefs survey among eight different ethnic communities. Based on those results, several communities, including the Vietnamese, Chinese and Filipino were identified as being more “at risk” due to the frequency of consuming fish, parts of the fish they ate and preparation methods. The Latino community members heavily comprise the angling community, and are reached through the angler outreach program.
- Obi Ogamba (LA County Environmental Health) asked how the behaviors are being measured. T. Jonick explained that the community outreach program measures behaviors in two ways through surveys. For the angler outreach program, the behaviors of anglers who have received outreach are compared to the behaviors of anglers who have not received outreach. For the community outreach program, FCEC asks community members who have received outreach for their phone numbers. After a month FCEC follows up with them to see how they’ve changed their fish consumption behaviors.
- Tawny Tran (ITSI) asked if media outreach has been done for the program. S. Lin explained that media consultants were hired earlier in the FCEC program and a lot of awareness was raised. Additionally, media was engaged after EPA and MSRP released the results of the Fish in Ocean monitoring. T. Jonick explained that targeted media outreach has been done for the Vietnamese community, mirroring the outreach efforts for that community.
- Marilyn Underwood (CDPH-EHIB) shared with the group insight on public service announcements (PSAs) done in San Luis Obispo, and provided the following follow-up information after the meeting. The PSAs were done in English and Spanish for a fish contamination problem in San Luis Obispo County. They were distributed in a media packet to about 45 English and three Spanish radio stations in the San Luis Obispo and Monterey counties. The English PSA can be found as a link on the following web page: http://www.ehib.org/topic.jsp?topic_key=173. The Spanish PSA can be found as a link on the following web page: http://www.ehib.org/topic.jsp?topic_key=175&mode=Internet. Based on focus group feedback, the Spanish involves two speakers in more of a conversation style while the English is one speaker.

C. MSRP—*Presentation by Dave Witting (NOAA)*

- MSRP is working on increasing opportunities for the fishing community, with one of the focuses being an artificial reef project:
 - After testing, MSRP found that Cabrillo’s sediments were too soft and began assessing Belmont Pier for the artificial reef project.
 - Belmont Pier: MSRP concluded that the sediment can support the target habitat aimed to be created by the artificial reef.

- MSRP has met with the City of Long Beach and found out that the City is committed to Belmont Pier, and will continue to encourage fishing in one area of the pier.
- MSRP has also met with academics who have worked with artificial reefs, and also met with United Pier and Shore Anglers of California, along with United Anglers of Southern California to obtain their input.
- MSRP is also working on a wetland restoration project in the Bolsa Chica area in Huntington Beach. If assessment goes smoothly, NOAA will turn the wetland into a fish habitat.
- MSRP also funded some of the studies related to the Marine Protective Area (MPA) in the Northern Channel Islands area.
- Outreach grants have been awarded to two organizations for the 2008 year and MSRP will release another RFP in January 2009.
 - MSRP will also participate in Cabrillo's Sea Fair.

D. OEHHA—*Presentation by Robert (Bob) Brodberg*

- OEHHA is still working on updating the advisory. R. Brodberg projected having a version of the advisory sometime in the 1st quarter of 2009, but does not have a specific date.
 - The Sacramento River Delta Brochure is a good reference document due to extensive message testing.

Questions/Comments:

- A question was raised on whether the data covers the same sites as the Water Board data, and if white croaker is on that list. R. Brodberg explained that although there is overlap, the data does not repeat very well. White croaker was not on the Water Board list due to EPA and MSRP's extensive sampling.

IV. PV Shelf Implementation Plan —*Presentation by Sharon Lin (USEPA)*

[Link to presentation](#), [Link to Implementation Plan](#)

S. Lin provided an overview of the PV Shelf Implementation Plan, reviewing the development and progression of the plan, as well as the accomplishments made in the past and what will be carried out from 2008 to 2013 for the program.

Questions/Comments:

- Guangyu Wang (SMBRC) questioned the heading "2008 and Beyond," wanting to get a better sense of the timing. S. Lin explained that "2008 and Beyond" referred to the next five years.
- G. Wang also questioned if FCEC should reconsider the messages for the community outreach program regarding parts of the fish to consume and preparation methods, as it is not a remedy for different types of contamination.
- O. Ogamba asked if FCEC was conducting outreach to schools, and suggested advertising on MTA buses. T. Jonick responded that FCEC does not have a targeted program addressing school-aged children; however LA County Public Health does sometimes host informational booths at schools.

- C. White commented that the efforts laid out in the Institutional Controls Implementation Plan would be folded into the remedy for the site.

Following S. Lin's presentation, the group broke into smaller groups to have more in-depth conversations. Structure of small group sessions:

- Smaller working groups (6-10 per group)
- Discuss elements on worksheets: evaluating what agency/group is responsible for the ICs Implementation Plan tactics, assessing the time frame needed for carrying out the tactics, identifying any possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying the tactics and the possible strategies needed to address these barriers.
- 60-75 minutes
- Present small group outcomes to larger group

Group 1: Angler

Members: Frankie Orrala (Heal the Bay), Alfonso Montiel (Cabrillo Marine Aquarium), Marita Santos (LA Public Health), Tim Chauvel (DTSC), Gabrielle Dorr (MSRP/NOAA), and Tiffany Jonick (SGA, serving as facilitator/scribe.)

Public Outreach & Education—Angler Group

Tactic #1: Create new educational materials based on OEHHA or EPA risk assessment and risk management recommendations (e.g. advisory update)

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 - 1. OEHHA
 - 2. EPA
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
 - 1. Completion of advisory
 - 2. Start gathering concepts and collect ideas by January
 - 3. Bring together advisory samples by Nov. 19th and get comments on samples
 - 4. Possible mock-ups by March Strategic Planning meeting
 - 5. Test format
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
 - 1. No advisory yet
- d. Additional comments:
 - 1. Group likes portions depicted in Sacramento River Delta Advisory (using hands)
 - 2. The group wanted to know what is involved in advisory process.
 - 3. Group also wanted to know what is maximum range of consumption.
 - 4. Can we obtain interim information on generalizations to guide materials?

Tactic #2: Update fish advisory signage based on the updated assessment

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 - 1. MSRP
 - 2. EPA
 - 3. County(ies)/City(ies)
 - 4. Piers/Concessionaires
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
 - 1. Identify locations for signage
 - i. Identify stakeholders
 - ii. Reach decision on marker
 - 2. Survey of Signage
 - 3. Identify who will address future maintenance needs of signage
 - * All of the above can be carried out prior to advisory being developed, so once the advisory is complete, it becomes a matter of execution.
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic

out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?

d. Additional comments:

1. **Need clarification on message.**
-

Tactic #3: 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

a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?

1. **Heal the Bay**
 2. **Cabrillo Marine Aquarium**
 3. **S. Groner Associates**
-

b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?

1. **Ongoing**
-

c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?

1. **People's attitude (some people just do not want to hear from the angler outreach workers)**
-

d. Additional comments:

1. **Gauge partners interest in evaluating angler outreach program**
-

Tactic #4: 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

a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?

1. **CA Department of Fish and Game**
 2. **EPA/SGA**
-

b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?

1. **Create a protocol for distribution**
 2. **Create materials**
- * This could be carried out Summer/Fall 2009**
-

c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?

d. Additional comments:

1. **Time release with 1st of the year (license expires at the end of the year, so people may get fishing licenses at the beginning of the year to get the most usability from the licenses-need to verify this assumption)**
-

Tactic #5: 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

a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?

1. **MSRP**
 2. **EPA/SGA**
-

-
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
1. Develop strategy
 2. Identify organizations and venues
- * Spring 2009
-
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
1. MLPA process makes organization wary
 2. Should this wait for the advisory to be developed?
-
- d. Additional comments:
- Some organizations to target include: UPSAC/UASC
-

Group 2: Community

Members: Jackie Lane (USEPA), Janet Scully (LA County Public Health), Anh Nguyen (St. Anselm's), Tiffany Nguyen (BPSOS), Roberta Blank (EPA), Elenore Sobrevega (FCEC CRC), and Khanh Nguyen (SGA, serving as facilitator/scribe)

Public Outreach & Education—Community Group

Tactic #1: Create new educational materials based on OEHHA or EPA risk assessment and risk management recommendations (e.g. advisory update)

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
1. FCEC taskforce
 2. Technical Review Committee to look at the messages (must re-establish)
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
1. Dependent on advisory development (OEHHA and EPA); however, design work on materials can start.
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
1. Timing of the advisory
 2. Contracts need to be modified if additional work is expected
 3. Balance message with mercury and other contaminants
- d. Additional comments:
1. New materials need to have similar branding.
 2. Must consider developing materials for the community at large.

Tactic #2: 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

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
1. SGA
 2. Community-based organizations
 3. Public Health agencies
 4. FCEC
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
1. Ongoing
 2. Chinese community (March 09)
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
1. Access at-risk families.
 2. Cultural norms and behaviors
 3. Resistance from health clinic
- d. Additional comments:

Tactic #3: 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

a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?

1. Public Health Professional
 2. Community-based originations
-

b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?

1. Ongoing
-

c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?

1. Fish contamination consider low priority compared to more immediate health threats
-

d. Additional comments:

Tactic #4: 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

a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?

1. County health inspectors
 2. Heal the Bay
-

b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?

1. Not sure if this is possible
-

c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?

1. Resistance from market.
-

d. Additional comments:

1. To be considered, but not sure.
-

Tactic #5: 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"

a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?

1. Toxic Epidemiology
 2. Community-based organizations
-

b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?

1. Target pilot – March June 2009
-

c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?

1. Manpower
 2. Lack of resources
 3. Limited authority to get access to marker owners
-

d. Additional comments:

- Fabulous idea!
-

Group 3: Enforcement

Members: Marty Maytorena (CDFG), James Alamillo (Heal the Bay), Marilyn Underwood (EHIB), Jennifer Boyce (MSRP/NOAA), Sharon Lin (EPA), Monica Cardenas (Long Beach Environmental Health), Robert Curtis (OC Health Care Agency), John Fallen (CDFG), Obi Ogamba (LA Environmental Health) and Tawny Tran (ITSI, serving as facilitator/scribe)

Enforcement Group

Tactic #1: 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)

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 1. County health department (OC, LB, LA)
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
 1. Monthly – OC 12x
 2. Trimester – LB 3x
 3. Semi-annually – LA* 3-5 year contracts
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
 1. Storage of contaminated fish from undocumented sources.
 2. Align with inspectors and wardens to contraband the fish. There is a missing link between all the white croaker landed and white croaker found in the markets. The group suggested better communications between inspectors and wardens may help the situation.* To address the barriers, effective communications will be necessary, such as translated letters to markets.
- d. Additional comments:
 1. Inspectors found questionable invoices that had a point of contact listed. However, when the contact was called, there was no one there.
 2. Establish point of contact to track invoices. The group suggested that a point person be designated to track all the invoices who have questionable points of contact listed.

Tactic #2: Increase enforcement of existing bag limit for white croaker/ commercial catch ban patrol

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 1. Department of Fish & Game
 - b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
 - 3 to 5 years
 - No incremental steps
 - c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
 1. Man power
 2. More funding to pay overtime staff.
 3. Another potential barrier: timely reporting
 - d. Additional comments:
-

Tactic #3: 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

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
1. EPA
 2. Department of Fish and Game
-
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
- Timeframe: Now to six months
 - The team needs to layout steps, which should take place now to 5 years
-
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
1. Processing time
 2. Frequent follow ups
-
- d. Additional comments:
-

Tactic #4: Make catch-ban regulation easily accessible for commercial operations to increase access to and understanding of regulations

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
1. EPA
 2. Department of Fish and Game
-
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
- Timeframe: Now to six months
 - The team needs to layout steps, which should take place now to 5 years
-
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
1. Processing time
 2. Frequent follow ups
-
- d. Additional comments:
-

Tactic #5: Reestablish catch-ban area to correspond with commercial catch-blocks in order to increase understanding of regulations and enforce adherence to regulations

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
1. Department of Fish and Game
 2. OEHHA
-
- b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
1. 3-5 years
 2. Patrol/dockside sampling, which should take 3-5 years
-
- c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
1. Legislative/regulatory barriers
 2. Compilation of collected data is also a barrier. The data is collected, but EPA does not receive the forms in a timeline manner
-
- d. Additional comments:
-

Group 4: Monitoring

Members: Robert Brodberg (OEHHA), Carmen White (EPA), Greg Holmes (DTSC), Mark Gold (Heal the Bay), Dave Witting (MSRP/NOAA), Patty Velez (CDFG), Joe Gully (LACSD), Guangyu Wang (SMBRC), Tom Wong (OC Health Care Agency), and Stephen Groner (SGA, serving as facilitator/scribe)

Monitoring Group

Tactic #1:	Assess the geographic extent and frequency with which contaminated white croaker are reaching fish markets
-------------------	---

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 1. Local Health Inspectors
 - b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
 1. To analyze extent white croaker are reaching markets, the group thought it would take 1 year for Orange County
 2. The group suggested wider survey area (perhaps looking at a more comprehensive group of markets). This would have to be done every 5 years, as opposed to the current frequency, and a new agreement for wider surveys would be needed.
 - c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
 1. Creating new agreement
 2. Conducting analysis
 3. Training of inspectors
 - d. Additional comments:
-

Tactic #2:	Randomly sample white croaker landed at the two identified major landing areas: Huntington Beach and Terminal Island
-------------------	---

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 1. Fish and Game
 2. EPA/EPA Contractor
 - b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
 1. The group estimated this taking 2 years: to accomplish the coordination and fish analysis
 2. Consider timing efforts with white croaker season
 - c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
 1. Non cooperation from commercial anglers/distributors
 2. Questions on what blocks fish come from. The commercial fishing operations are not always accurate when reporting what blocks catch came from. Even though they are fishing all day across different blocks, they do not necessarily report each block. There is no way to verify the actual blocks where the fish are caught.
 - d. Additional comments:
 1. Consider having sit-down meeting with distributors
-

Tactic #3:	Evaluate market availability of other contaminated fish caught locally, in addition to white croaker
-------------------	---

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?

 - b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
Should re-examine tactic after tactic #1 is done

 - c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?

 - d. Additional Comments:
This tactic is a low priority – focus should be on white croaker.
-

Tactic #4:	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
-------------------	---

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 - 1. US EPA – Lead
 - 2. Partners
 - 3. SMBRC volunteered to head up the data portion

 - b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?
 - 1. ID data sources
 - 2. Collecting data
 - 3. Compiling/managing data
 - 4. Analyze/interpret data
 - 5. Messages/ICs application
 - * Group was unsure about the time line

 - c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
 - 1. Bureaucratic structure
 - 2. Data incompatibility
 - 3. Funding/personnel
 - 4. Data management system
 - 5. Communication/interagency
 - 6. Effective communication to audience (the fish contamination message is a complex one, and needs to be communicated effectively to the audience).

 - d. Additional comments:
-

Tactic #5:	Identify restaurants that regularly sell white croaker. Educate them on alternatives or ways to get clean fish/ or alternative fish.
-------------------	---

- a. What agency/group is responsible for carrying out this tactic?
 - 1. Local health inspectors

 - b. What is the time frame for carrying this tactic out? Are there incremental steps that need to be accomplished first? What is the time frame for these incremental steps?

 - c. What are possible barriers that the implementing agency may encounter in carrying this tactic out? What are possible strategies to address these barriers?
-

1. Lots of restaurants
2. Lots of types of “croaker”

- d. Additional comments:
 One suggestion is to focus on one concept of this tactic:
 - Just do education
 - Skip ID of white croaker at restaurants

V. Action Items

Items	Who	By
Check levels of white croaker “background levels” (Ventura)	D. Whiting	Today
Send angler data analysis to angler work group	Tiffany Jonick	September 26, 2008
Share the Public Service on basic fish consumption	Marilyn Underwood	October 3, 2008
Send comments to S. Lin on Implementation Plan.	ALL	October 7, 2008
Notes from today	Tiffany Jonick	October 25, 2008
Compile work group charts and incorporate into the Implementation Plan and distribute to partners.	Sharon Lin	November 11, 2008

VI. Misc. Items

Meeting Assessment	
Positive (what worked)	Things to Change (what did not work)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workshop groups - Food - Updates first before work group - Good attendance – “right folks” attended - Meeting dates set in advance - Location of meeting - No camera issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People should bring their own bottles - Bring map of area - More stretch breaks especially during update presentations.

Bike-rack:

- LA River – source of contamination