



Task 11 Consumption Survey Workshop #3

May 13, 2024

San Francisco Estuary Institute

Meeting Summary

Attendees	Affiliation	Representing
Skylar Sacoolas	Greenaction	CBO
Tonia Randall	SF Marie Harrison Community Foundation	CBO
Rosa Nelson	Nuestra Casa	CBO
Yasmine El Hage	Surfrider	CBO
Francis Ranstead	Sogorea Te Land Trust	CBO
Andria Ventura	Clean Water Action	Environmental Group
Duyen Kauffman	Biomonitoring CA - Department of Public Health	Agency
Tran Pham	California EPA - OEHHA	Agency
Anna Holder	California State Water Board	Agency
Mary Cousins	Bay Area Clean Water Agencies	Permittees
Carrie Pomeroy	University of California Santa Cruz	Science Advisor
Camille Antinori	San Francisco State University	Science Advisor
Shelly Moore	Moore Institute for Plastic Pollution Research	Science Advisor
Sami Harper	SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Gerardo Martinez	SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Kevin Lunde	SF Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Jay Davis	San Francisco Estuary Institute	
Martin Trinh	San Francisco Estuary Institute	

1. Introductions and Review Goals for the Meeting

To open the meeting, Martin Trinh from SFEI expressed gratitude for the attendees' participation and feedback received since the second workshop in February. Sami Harper from the SF Water Board emphasized inclusive conversation guidelines, such as releasing judgment, active listening, and making space for diverse voices. The overarching goals of this meeting are to present the final questionnaire report and to provide an opportunity for community members and community based organizations (CBOs) to provide implementation guidance for the consumption survey.

2. Draft Report on the Questionnaire

After introductions, Martin provided an update on the draft questionnaire report. He explained that the development of the questionnaire involved thorough reviews of past efforts in California and similar regions, such as San Diego and Santa Cruz, with guidance from Shelly Moore and Carrie Pomeroy. The process incorporated feedback from community-based organizations, agencies, and technical advisors. This collaborative and thoughtful approach resulted in a robust questionnaire.

The project aimed to produce both a questionnaire and a final report. After refining the draft questionnaire following the second workshop, the team detailed the rationale behind the survey tool, incorporating input from community-based organizations and technical advisors. The report was sent out for comments on March 8, and Martin thanked those who provided feedback.

Since March, additional meetings with technical advisors focused on their implementation experiences and potential strategies for future deployment, including different survey modes and methods for gathering and analyzing data. The report was nearly complete, with a final section on implementation guidance pending feedback from the current workshop.

Martin summarized the input from community-based organizations. There was an increased emphasis on seasonality of subsistence fishing activity, a debated but ultimately included question on income, and a decision to allow more open-ended responses to enhance understanding and the reliability and validity of data and interpretation. The team also planned to explore various survey modes to enhance data collection.

During the discussion, Jay reiterated that while the report had been sent out for review and some comments received, the report is still open to additional feedback

before finalizing it. Sami Harper emphasized the importance of input from CBOs and opened the floor for further comments and questions. The deadline for finalizing the report, along with the implementation section, is set for the end of May due to the contract for the project ending.

The meeting then transitioned to a discussion on implementation guidance, with plans to revisit the survey comments and questions later as necessary.

3. Guidance on Implementing the Consumption Survey

Martin began his presentation by outlining the implementation guidance and sharing experiences from technical advisors based on previous surveys conducted in San Diego, Berkeley, and Santa Cruz. He expressed enthusiasm for engaging with community-based organizations (CBOs) to gather their input on what strategies might be effective in their respective communities before pilot testing the survey in Phase 2 of the broader project.

Martin provided a brief timeline of the broader project, with this Phase 1 focusing on drafting a survey. This phase included three workshops aimed to gather feedback from CBOs on the survey questions and discuss information needs identified by the Water Board. The feedback from these workshops was synthesized, and now they are seeking advice on implementation. The next step (Phase 2) would pilot the questionnaire with selected community groups. This pilot would ideally be conducted under the guidance of a coordinator, with communities administering the survey themselves.

Martin then presented the implementation guidance compiled by SFEI and with input from Water Board staff and technical advisors. He introduced the recommendation to hire an experienced contractor coordinator to lead the effort. This coordinator would play multiple roles, including training community surveyors, compiling data, and ensuring data quality and consistency. As the SFEI and the Water Board do not have the technical expertise and experience of conducting a large-scale survey, an experienced coordinator to handle multiple groups would be beneficial. Sami Harper opened the floor for feedback on the idea of hiring a coordinator. Skylar Sacoolas inquired whether the coordinator would be part of a community-based organization or a third party hired by SFEI. The role would involve coordinating multiple organizations and liaising with the Water Board. SFEI is willing to help if needed, but will not necessarily be involved in the project after Phase 1.

Mary Cousins inquired about the contracting process, asking if it would require a competitive solicitation or if they could select someone directly. Sami and Kevin Lunde

explained that the process would depend on funding sources, particularly for Phase 3, for which they will work to secure the necessary (more substantial) funds.

Andria Ventura expressed concerns about the allocation of funds, suggesting that the money should be directed toward community groups and the people participating in the survey rather than external professionals. She emphasized the need for broad and inclusive community engagement, considering diverse cultural dynamics. Sami and Martin acknowledged these concerns, reiterating the importance of involving community experts and ensuring fair compensation and distribution of funds.

Rosa Nelson highlighted the need for the coordinator to address cross-cultural and language barriers, ensuring inclusivity in the survey process. Sami confirmed that these considerations were integral to the plan.

Gerardo Martinez emphasized the importance of having a standardized training process for CBOs to ensure the comparability and usability of data collected from different communities. He explained that while CBOs are experts in their communities, they might need support in conducting surveys. Therefore, an external coordinator would help bridge this gap by providing necessary training and ensuring data consistency across different sites.

Carrie Pomeroy joined the meeting expressing appreciation for the ongoing discussions. She highlighted the importance of community engagement, particularly emphasizing the need for communities to take the lead in identifying priorities and being involved from start to finish. Carrie suggested incorporating community-engaged methods and face-to-face discussions to better understand priorities and enhance technical advisory perspectives. She also stressed the significance of financial resources to support community engagement efforts and proposed assistance with proposal writing to secure funding.

Andria Ventura echoed Carrie's points, emphasizing the importance of documenting subsistence fishing to drive greater protections for communities. She urged the Water Board to fund the project, highlighting its significance in addressing long-standing issues. Sami Harper responded to questions regarding the pilot testing results and the possibility of online survey availability, indicating that decisions would depend on ongoing discussions and the results of the pilot testing phase (Phase 2).

Carrie added to this, explaining the potential utilization of pilot test results and the importance of ongoing documentation in informing survey development and interpreting

results. Camille shared insights on the sampling design and highlighted the critical role of CBOs in gathering information about fishing locations and cultural approaches.

Skylar raised concerns about the feasibility of surveying 100 to 200 individuals within a specific timeframe, to which Sami clarified that the goal was for the entire Bay-wide survey, not just the pilot. Martin elaborated on the importance of capturing metadata and sample sizes to ensure effective data collection.

Andria expanded on the information needed regarding subsistence fishing in the Bay. Andria highlighted the need for robust data to support the designation of the Bay as supporting various beneficial uses, including subsistence fishing. She emphasized the importance of not just proving the existence of subsistence fishing but also gathering more data to better understand the scope of the activity. These data would inform pollution cleanup efforts and exposure reduction strategies. Acknowledging the role of her organization, Clean Water Action, as advocates, she stressed the necessity of engaging with specific communities directly affected by subsistence fishing rather than taking a broader approach.

The discussion then shifted to the challenges of identifying subsistence fishers, as many may not self-identify due to economic concerns or cultural reasons. Andria suggested that identification could be based on consumption patterns rather than self-identification. Sami confirmed the need for more outreach, particularly in the South Bay, where subsistence fishing might be underrepresented. Sami highlighted ongoing efforts to engage community groups in surveys and assessments such as the SWAMP realignment effort. Kevin mentioned the LA Water Board's work on identifying subsistence fishing in reservoirs and the associated costs, which were several hundred thousand dollars.

Martin outlined the feedback received about how the survey would be conducted, emphasizing the need for voluntary participation and anonymity of responses. He discussed the use of tablets for data collection and the importance of incorporating both closed-ended and open-ended questions. He also addressed safety practices with the suggestion that survey administrators wear identifiable attire but refrain from checking fishing licenses to avoid intimidating respondents. Rosa emphasized the significance of maintaining a non-threatening appearance to ensure the comfort and cooperation of survey participants. She suggested that surveyors wear casual attire, such as loose-fitting t-shirts, that clearly are not associated with any agency or enforcement entities. This approach would reduce the likelihood of participants feeling intimidated or reluctant to engage with surveyors, particularly if they fear repercussions related to fishing licenses. Skylar echoed Rosa's sentiment and emphasized the importance of

attire in establishing a relaxed and approachable atmosphere. She suggested that surveyors could wear t-shirts or vests with minimal branding or official insignia, maintaining a balance between casual and professional attire. Skylar also proposed making attire options, such as badges or vests, optional for surveyors to accommodate individual preferences.

Carrie reinforced the idea of adopting a lighthearted and unassuming approach through surveyor attire. Sami suggested incorporating elements of humor, such as t-shirts with playful slogans like "fish nerd," to create a friendly and welcoming interaction environment. Carrie also highlighted the need for surveyors to carry identification or contact information for further engagement, ensuring transparency and trust-building with participants. Shelly shared her experience from the San Diego Bay study, where surveyors wore non-authoritative attire, such as baby blue t-shirts with subtle designs. She emphasized the importance of attire in signaling a non-threatening presence to participants, promoting openness and cooperation during the survey process. Shelly's comments underscored the effectiveness of adopting a casual and unobtrusive appearance to facilitate meaningful engagement with survey participants.

The meeting continued with discussions on translation services for the survey, the involvement of community-based organizations in outreach, and the potential for incentives to encourage participation.

The discussion then delved into the potential benefits of survey participation, including the dissemination of public health information and updates on project outcomes. Tonia Randell raised questions about incentivizing survey participation, prompting discussions on offering information exchange and project updates as incentives.

4. Next Steps

Sami then outlined the next steps and updated deadlines. The draft survey for the pilot test was scheduled for completion by the end of the month, with discussions on final guidance concluded. Phase 2 involves piloting and ground-truthing the survey at specific sites and refining the sampling strategy. Collaborations with CBOs are planned for late 2024, with a slightly larger survey effort potentially in 2025.

The draft report on the questionnaire is scheduled for completion by the end of the month, with recommendations on implementation guidance. Phase 2 involves piloting and ground-truthing the survey at specific sites and refining the sampling strategy. Collaborations with CBOs are planned for late 2024, with the survey slated for 2025. The regional-wide effort, contingent on funding, would see advocacy from the Water Board and community organizations, beginning in 2026 or 2027. Sami detailed the phases, focusing on supporting the pilot survey with funding, identifying capable groups, and testing the survey with community members. Feedback from the pilot test will inform revisions to the survey and subsequent larger-scale testing. Phase 3 entails securing funding for a larger region-wide survey, training groups, managing data, and utilizing collected data for regulatory purposes or signage updates.

5. Feedback on Today's Workshop

Finally, Sami asked for feedback on the day's workshop. Attendees expressed appreciation for the thorough discussion and community input prioritization. CBOs advocated for the inclusion of more CBOs in future steps. The meeting concluded with thanks from the survey team to all participants, especially to community representatives, for their valuable contributions, encouraging continued engagement in the project.

Skylar from Greenaction appreciated the workshops but reserved judgment on impact until the pilot study's results. Tonia from SFMHCF emphasized the importance of water resources and suggested bio-testing for survey participants. Rosa noted positive experiences and praised the focus on environmental justice.

Andria Ventura underscored the urgency of funding, emphasizing the need to initiate fundraising to avoid delays. The meeting concluded with Jay expressing gratitude to participants for their input and commitment, highlighting the groundwork laid for future phases. Sami echoed appreciation for the collaboration and commitment, ending the meeting.