



## San Francisco Bay Subsistence Fisher Consumption Survey

### Workshop #2

February 15, 2024

San Francisco Estuary Institute

### Meeting Summary

Attendees	Affiliation	Representing
Keta Price	Hood Planning Group	Community Organizer
Janet Johnson	Richmond Shoreline Alliance	CBO
Skylar Sacoolas	Greenaction	CBO
Lauren Weston	Acterra: Action for a Healthy Planet	CBO
Hollis Pierce Jenkins	Literacy for Environmental Justice	CBO
Arrienn Harrison	SF Marie Harrison Community Foundation	CBO
Tonia Randall	SF Marie Harrison Community Foundation	CBO
Kelly Chen	Biomonitoring CA Department of Public Health	Agency
Duyen Kauffman	Biomonitoring CA Department of Public Health	Agency
Tran Pham	California EPA OEHHA	Agency
Wesley Smith	California EPA OEHHA	Agency
Carrie Pomeroy	University of Santa Cruz	Science Advisor
Camille Antinori	San Francisco State University	Science Advisor
Shelly Moore	Moore Institute for Plastic Pollution Research	Science Advisor
Anna Holder	SF Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Sami Harper	SF Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Gerardo Martinez	SF Regional Water Quality Control Board	
Kevin Lunde	SF 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 first workshop in November. SFEI shared a land acknowledgment recognizing the native peoples' ancestral territory, acknowledging the historical injustices and affirming respect for their sovereign rights.

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 goal of this meeting is to create another opportunity for CBOs to provide feedback to the revised questionnaire.

## 2. Revised Draft Questionnaire

After introductions, the discussion turned to the draft questionnaire. Gerardo Martinez from the SF Bay Water Board provided an overview on the timeline of the project. He delineated the current phase (Phase 1) as focusing on questionnaire development from 2023 through 2024. Phase 2 will involve pilot testing and ground-truthing the survey to refine its efficacy and practicality. Regional implementation of the consumption survey will occur in Phase 3. While specific dates for this phase were yet to be determined, it was envisioned to extend from 2025 onwards, potentially involving broader regional collaboration with entities such as the USEPA. Gerardo emphasized the importance of community feedback in shaping the survey and underscored the need for piloting and ground-truthing to validate its effectiveness before broader implementation. The goal of today's workshop was to finalize the questionnaire with input from both community members and technical advisors.

The draft questionnaire had undergone multiple iterations based on feedback from community organizations, agencies, and technical advisors. General comments from the Water Board highlighted the importance of practicality in the questions, aiming to gather data relevant for updating regulations. Technical advisors and agency representatives were integral in shaping revisions over the past three months. Technical advisors, represented by Carrie Pomeroy from UC Santa Cruz, expressed satisfaction with the progress made and stressed the importance of community input in refining the survey.

### 3. Section: Introduction

Martin initiated the discussion, noting the goal of receiving final feedback on the survey questions. He structured the session to discuss each section's questions and align them with community context and goals. Martin emphasized the importance of comparing the current survey results with past efforts (especially the 2000 SF Bay survey) and ensuring its timeliness and community accessibility. In the introduction section, feedback from the previous workshop highlighted the need for a more organic approach to engagement, prompting adjustments to the greeting process. Martin stressed assuring the participants of the survey's anonymity, flexibility in question skipping, and respect for respondents' time, aiming for a concise and efficient survey experience. Gerardo asked for feedback from CBOs. Tran Pham of OEHHA suggested mentioning participation incentives upfront, a point supported by other participants. Keta Price suggested incorporating a map specific to outreach areas. Subsequent discussions addressed logistical concerns, such as the survey's administration process and clarity of instructions, with community members sharing insights from their past experiences surveying. Tonia Randall from SFMHC expressed interest in contributing further and committed to involving her team in future discussions.

Shelly Moore from the Moore Institute raised questions about whether the survey should be conducted digitally or on paper, considering factors such as ease of use and data management. Gerardo Martinez from the SF Bay Water Board suggested that this decision would be made in phase 2 of the project, taking input from community-based organizations. Duyen Kauffman from CDPH emphasized the importance of softening the survey language for inclusivity and suggested considering language barriers and translation issues.

Tonia asked about reaching communities with different language preferences, and Gerardo explained the plan to have community-based organizations administer the survey, with translations provided. Skylar Sacoolas from Greenaction raised concerns about language barriers for organizations without multilingual staff, prompting discussion about finding language-speaking partners and budgeting for language support. Carrie Pomeroy from UC Santa Cruz suggested including a language preference indicator in the survey and pilot testing methods to assess language needs. Jay Davis from SFEI proposed budgeting for language support based on community needs.

#### 4. Section: Consumption

Martin then shifted the discussion to the section focused on consumption rates and patterns related to fishing in the Bay. He referenced questions from the 2000 survey, including inquiries about the frequency of fishing in the Bay over different time periods and the importance of seasonality in fishing practices, considering cultural and traditional reasons. Martin shared insights from previous surveys, indicating the use of multiple-choice questions regarding seasonal fishing preferences and cultural practices. Gerardo emphasized the significance of seasonality in assessing chemical risks and cultural practices related to fishing. Tonia raised a question about the timing of fishing trips, prompting consideration of tide cycles and potential inclusion in the questionnaire. Skylar sought clarification on how to complete a specific question involving marking boxes on the new seasonality chart, with Martin clarifying a method borrowed from the 1997 APEN survey. Discussion then shifted to the presentation of fish sizes in the questionnaire, with Shelly and others suggesting the inclusion of various fish fillet models or real photographs for clarity. Concerns were raised about the relevance of questions regarding fish consumption from stores or restaurants, with suggestions to remove them to shorten the survey accordingly. Anna noted that our brains find it easier/faster to answer questions that start with "which", and it takes a bit more energy/bandwidth for our brains to answer questions that start with "why". The item concluded with Janet Johnson from Sunflower Alliance advocating for considering smaller fish in the survey and further discussions on questionnaire logistics.

#### 5. Section: Species

Martin provided an overview of the next section of the survey, focusing on questions about fish species. Martin explained that the current picture used in the survey was sourced from OEHHA Fish Advisory but acknowledged the need for a new graphic based on feedback received. He emphasized the importance of avoiding hierarchy or delineation between types of fish in the image, stating that it should be comprehensive and without ranking. Martin outlined the questions in this section, including inquiries about frequency of fishing, approximate length of fish caught, parts of the fish consumed, and what respondents do with parts they do not eat. He also expressed enthusiasm about gathering information on various ways to prepare and cook different types of fish. Gerardo reiterated the need to avoid hierarchy in the image and clarified that it simply represents common fish in the Bay without indicating which to eat or avoid. The discussion then moved to address concerns and suggestions from community members. Skylar raised a question about the survey's logistics, specifically regarding

answering questions multiple times for different fish species. Martin explained a proposed approach using a Google form where respondents could complete sections multiple times if necessary. Janet suggested using "how long" instead of "approximate length" in the survey and proposed including rays as a species in the image. Jay supported the inclusion of rays and noted that the RMP has been collecting more data on rays. Camille Antinori from SF State suggested adding a space to record the species respondents are answering questions for. Carrie emphasized the importance of capturing information about how people prepare and consume different fish species for exposure to contaminants and nutritional value. Gerardo acknowledged the feedback and suggested reordering questions based on input received. Duyen provided suggestions for rearranging questions and adding options for stew and soup preparations.

## 6. Section: Location

Martin introduced the next section of the survey, focusing on location-related questions. He explained that the first question addressed the implementation of shoreline intercept surveys and aims to determine specific fishing locations and their significance. He emphasized the importance of understanding why certain locations are fished the most and proposed asking respondents to specify reasons for choosing particular locations. Martin noted that while the survey initially considered incorporating seasonality into location selection, it was deemed too time-consuming, choosing to focus instead on fish availability. Gerardo added that including a map in the survey would be beneficial for visualizing fishing locations and gathering additional data on where respondents fish. Camille suggested considering fluctuations in fish species at different locations over seasons and recommended incorporating this into the survey's ground-truthing phase. Sami agreed and suggested addressing this during the Bay-wide study planning phase. Gerardo addressed concerns about redundancy between questions, clarifying that each question serves a distinct purpose in gathering information about fish consumption and fishing locations. Jay proposed enhancing the survey's map information to allow respondents to indicate specific fishing spots or regions within the Bay depending if administered on paper or electronically. The discussion then shifted to suggestions for improving the survey's questioning about fishing locations, with Janet emphasizing the importance of understanding various factors influencing fishing location choices, such as tide levels and accessibility. Gerardo and others acknowledged the need to refine the survey's questions to better capture these factors. Carrie suggested adding options for accessibility and tide conditions in the survey.

## 7. Break

## 8. Sharing and Eating Catch

Martin initiated a discussion regarding the refinement of survey questions related to the sharing and consumption of catch. He highlighted adjustments made based on feedback from previous workshops, particularly regarding terminology and question clarity. Martin emphasized modifying questions about sharing catch to encompass those living with respondents rather than solely using the term "household." He proposed asking participants about the individuals they live with and their respective ages, sex, and fishing habits. He also mentioned considerations for specific demographic groups such as seniors and women of childbearing age. Gerardo sought input from community organizations, leading to Skylar suggesting the inclusion of options like "prefer not to say" or "intersex" for the sex category. Camille recommended providing context for questions to enhance response quality, with Carrie echoing the importance of structuring questions to allow for non-responses. Carrie suggested focusing on the interviewees' catch rather than extending inquiries to others. The group discussed the consolidation of certain questions and the need to differentiate between consumers living with the fisher and those who do not. Ultimately, they agreed to merge questions while still capturing relevant data..

## 9. Fisher Demographics

In this section, Martin noted that the questionnaire had been changed to refine its approach to categorizing racial backgrounds by aligning it with census categories, aiming for simplicity. He also highlighted considerations such as language spoken at home and zip code, emphasizing inclusivity and accuracy in demographic data collection.

In response, Gerardo offered clarifications and suggested enhancements to the survey questions. He proposed adding "choose all that apply" options for the question on racial background and refining the language in questions about gender and household composition to increase inclusivity and accuracy.

Carrie weighed in on the discussion by emphasizing the importance of clear communication about the voluntary nature of responses and the sensitivity of certain questions. Carrie advocated for ensuring that respondents feel empowered to decline to answer questions, highlighting the potential impact of overemphasizing voluntary responses on respondent comfort and data quality. Her insights underscored a commitment to ethical data collection practices and participant well-being.

Anna Holder and Camille Antinori offered nuanced perspectives on the placement of questions, potential alternatives, and considerations for data usage and privacy. Anna suggested changing the question about gender to asking about whether interviewees are included in OEHHA's sensitive population. Anna stressed the importance of explicitly stating how the data will be used and shared to empower respondents to make informed decisions about their information, reflecting a commitment to transparency and ethical data management practices. Camille provided technical insights into survey design considerations, advocating for efficient data collection methods and thoughtful placement of questions to maximize data utility and respondent comfort.

Throughout the discussion, participants expressed a consensus on the need for transparency, sensitivity, and flexibility in survey design to accommodate diverse respondents and research goals. They also highlighted the crucial role of community-based organizations in fostering trust and rapport with respondents, underscoring the collaborative and participatory nature of the survey process.

Martin emphasized the importance of compensating participants for their time, addressing concerns raised in previous discussions about inadequate compensation. He emphasized the need for participants to feel involved and informed throughout the process, including receiving updates on survey results. Martin also mentioned the suggestion by Shelly to include contact details on a card for participants, offering multiple options for providing survey information.

Gerardo suggested the inclusion of a QR code for accessing survey results, ensuring transparency and accessibility for participants. He acknowledged the importance of streamlining the survey process and providing adequate training for surveyors, reflecting a commitment to efficiency and participant engagement.

Skylar raised a point about providing explicit information on survey materials, such as pamphlets and maps, to facilitate survey conduct. She emphasizes the importance of community-based organizations and their prioritization in the survey process, underscoring the need for inclusivity and collaboration.

Carrie emphasized the significance of capturing survey reflections to address potential interruptions or discomfort experienced by participants during the survey. She advocated for a brief opportunity at the end of the survey to note any issues encountered, prioritizing participant well-being and data quality.



Martin further discussed considerations from previous surveys, including the inclusion of a risk communication section and interviewers' reflections on survey quality. Sami affirmed the importance of including metadata about survey conduct, such as language and gender, to ensure comprehensive data collection. Jay provided background on the risk communication section and highlighted the 2000 project's focus on understanding consumption habits. Gerardo acknowledged the potential inclusion of risk communication but stressed the need to keep the survey concise and manageable for participants.

## 10. Next Steps

Jay provided a reminder about the official deliverables for the project, emphasizing that the first workshop was included in the contract. Although the current workshop was not initially part of the agreement, it proved to be important and beneficial. Jay expressed satisfaction with the day's discussions, noting their value in refining the questionnaire. He outlined the plan to produce a draft report on the questionnaire by March 8, 2024, followed by a final version in May, with room for critical changes if needed. Jay noted that the questionnaire was not set in stone and will likely be refined after pilot testing. The next step will involve a public outreach meeting to present the final questionnaire and initiate discussions on implementation guidance for phase 2. This third meeting will happen in May, focusing on broader efforts and the project's regional scope. The meeting then shifted to immediate next steps, including prompt payment to attendees and the forthcoming distribution of a meeting summary and draft questionnaire report.

## 11. Feedback on Today's Workshop

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