

# COMPARISONS WITH SFEI

- **SFEI is one of our primary benchmarks**
  - Same size organization
  - Same mission
- **We judge our successes in part by comparison to you**
  - It is not a competition, as we want us to both succeed
  - However, it is metric for judging our success
- **One area we pale in comparison is communication**
  - RMP Annual Meeting
  - Pulse of the Estuary
  - Historical ecology book signing
  - Museum exhibit
  - Billboards on the highway

# AUDIENCE

- **Part of the difference is attributable to target audience**
  - We focus on our Commission as the primary audience
  - Secondary focus on fellow scientists, working toward consensus
  - Less interested in reaching the general public
- **Still, there are others we need to reach better**
  - The bosses of our bosses
  - The people who need to implement the methods/approaches we develop
- **We have three initiatives I want to share with you**
  - Fact sheets
  - Videos
  - Effectiveness of the Clean Water Act document

# CWA DOCUMENT STATUS

- **We now have drafts of all chapters**
  - Executive Summary and outside Perspectives sections won't begin until these have been refined/reviewed
- **There is a need for integration**
  - Chapters differ in writing style and level of detail
  - Burden is on SCCWRP to do that
  - Karen is working on it as we speak (pray her baby is not early!)
- **The integrated document will focus on three refinements**
  - Shorten it to meet our goal of no more than 50 pages
  - Make it less about process and more about message
  - Edit it to meet our audience of high level managers

# SCHEDULE

- **Send it out for CTAG review in April**
  - Look for draft by April 16
- **Use part of our April 23 meeting to summarize input and revisions**
- **Refine further and send draft to commentators and Executive Summary Committee no later than June 15**
  - Get those sections back by July 15
- **Compile and lay out the whole document by end of July**
- **CTAG makes this a focal point of their August 9 meeting**
- **Commission review/approval at their September 7 meeting**
- **Release: October 18**

# REPORT CHAPTERS

- **Have Contaminant Inputs to the Ocean Changed?**
- **Is it Safe to Swim?**
- **Are the Fish Safe to Eat?**
- **Has the Ecosystem been Protected?**
- **Have the benefits of the CWA outweighed the costs?**
- **Each chapter will also include a section on future challenges**

# MAIN MESSAGES

- **Have Contaminant Inputs to the Ocean Changed?**
  - Pollution inputs to the ocean have decreased dramatically despite population increases
  - Nonpoint source pollution is now a relatively greater contributor of many contaminants
- **Is it Safe to Swim?**
  - Beach water quality has improved dramatically
  - Most improvements are due to changes in sewage treatment
    - Relocation of outfalls further offshore
    - Better (secondary) treatment
    - Disinfection
  - Most remaining problems result from land-based runoff, though these are also improving

# MAIN MESSAGES (CONT.)

- **Are the Fish Safe to Eat?**

- Fish tissue contamination has declined considerably
- Large sections of the coast still have fish advisories
- Current concerns stem mostly from moderate widespread mercury contamination

- **Has the Ecosystem been Protected?**

- In some cases, biological communities have improved substantially
  - Invertebrates
  - Fish disease/community integrity
  - Birds
- In other cases, ecosystem health depends on factors besides water quality
  - Kelp
  - Fish populations

# MAIN MESSAGES (CONT.)

- **Are the Fish Safe to Eat?**

- Fish tissue contamination has declined considerably
- Large sections of the coast still have fish advisories
- Current concerns stem mostly from moderate widespread mercury contamination

- **Has the Ecosystem been Protected?**

- In some cases, biological communities have improved substantially
  - Invertebrates
  - Fish disease/community integrity
  - Birds
- In other cases, ecosystem health depends more on other factors besides water quality
  - Kelp
  - Fish population



# HAVE THE BENEFITS OF THE CWA OUTWEIGHED THE COSTS?

- **Costs were substantial**
- **So were the benefits**
- **A complete analysis to assess relative costs and benefits is needed**
- **Future improvements are likely to come at a higher cost**
  - The low-hanging fruit have been harvested
  - Infrastructure is aging and needs further investment
  - The cost burden is shifting to state and local entities
  - Need new approaches to achieve further reductions