

Table 1. Summary of Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) Meetings

	Meeting Date	No. of Attendees*	Primary SAG Meeting Topics
1	Dec. 7 th , 2010	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SFBFP Introduction• SAG Expectations• SAG Process• Discussion on funding for grant program
2	Feb 14 th , 2011	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAG Hopes/Expectations and Project Framework• Presentation on fishing populations in San Francisco Bay• Evolution of fish educational materials and signs• Discussion on upcoming RFP for San Francisco Bay Fish Project grants
3	May 24 th , 2011	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduce funded projects• Presentation on new advisory for San Francisco Bay• Discussion of key messages for the San Francisco Bay advisory• Discuss educational materials and language needs• Explore future media activities
4	Sep. 8 th , 2011	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Social Marketing Workshop: Lessons Learned• Presentation on outreach and signage under the Palos Verdes Shelf project (Los Angeles and Orange County)• Report back from signage subcommittee and discussion on new San Francisco Bay sign• Discussion: What have we learned from the SAG? How do we want to shape the SAG for the coming year?• SAG year-end evaluation
5	Dec. 6 th , 2011	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation and discussion on fish monitoring for San Francisco Bay• Updates from the funded group• San Francisco Bay sign update
6	March 12 th , 2012	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updates from the funded groups• Presentation on the mercury and PCB TMDLs for San Francisco Bay• Discussion about possible future activities for the SFBFP• Update on SFB signs and discussion of media activities
7	June 14 th 2012	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation on Biomonitoring California• Final presentations by funded groups• Update on SFB sign posting and media activities• Review accomplishments to date, report back on possible future activities, discuss next steps for the project• SAG year-end evaluation

*excluding CDPH staff

Table 2. Brochure Languages and Copies Produced

Languages	Number of copies (Shark Cover)	Number of copies (Clinic Cover)	Available digitally (Shark and Clinic Covers)
English	2000	9000	X
Spanish	1000	3000	X
Chinese	2000	3000	X
Vietnamese	0	2000	X
Cambodian	0	1000	X
Samoan	0	1000	X
Tagalog	0	1000	X
Korean	0	1000	X
Tongan	0	0	X
Laotian	0	0	X
Japanese	0	0	X
TOTAL	5,000	21,000	

Table 3. Funding for the Four Groups

Funded Groups	Original award	Supplemental funding	Total award
APA Family Support Services (APA)	\$25,000	\$1,250	\$26,250
California Indian Environmental Alliance (CIEA)	\$25,000	\$1,250	\$26,250
Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice	\$25,000	\$1,250	\$26,250
Kids for the Bay (KftB)	\$20,000	\$1,250	\$21,250
Total	\$95,000	\$5,000	\$100,000

Table 4. Funded Group Activities, Population Served, Project Collaborators

Funded Group	Primary Activities	Primary Population Served by Project	Project Collaborators
APA	--Interviews and education with anglers and at community events --Interviews and education with youth and families at Family Resource Centers --Educational workshops	Asian/pacific Islanders immigrants with limited or no English skills. API groups included Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Samoan, Filipino, Laotian, Cambodian, and Japanese.	APA partner organizations including Nihonmachi Little Friends, Lao Seri Association, Vietnamese Family Services, Pilipino Senior Resource Center, WestBay Multi Services Center, Korean Center, Richmond Area Multi-Services, Soul'd Out Productions, Resource Center for Children, Youth and Families, Samoan Community Development Center
CIEA	--Surveys and education in WIC waiting room; --"Making Healthy Fish Choices" classes --Training WIC clinic staff and increasing their capacity to provide fish information to their clients	Low-income women at WIC clinic in Fruitvale (Oakland). WIC serves women who are pregnant or breastfeeding, and families with children ages 0-5. Participants were primarily Latino, Vietnamese, Native American, and African American.	Native American Health Center WIC clinic
Greenaction	--Angler interviews and education --Education at community meetings/events and with women at clinics	Anglers, community members, and women at health clinics who reside in Bayview Hunters Point and southeast San Francisco, a community that is primarily low-income people of color who are disproportionately impacted by pollution exposure from many sources.	Several churches, soup kitchens/shelters, community centers, hospitals/clinics in the BVHP and southeast SF community
KftB	--Lessons for 6 elementary school classes --Student presentations and interviews of parents --Teacher training --Angler interviews and education	Students in 3rd-6th grade classes and their families within low-income elementary schools in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Anglers at piers in Berkeley and Richmond.	Garfield Elementary, Franklin Elementary, Montalvin Manor Elementary, Cox Academy, King Elementary

Table 5. Funded Group Project Participants

Activity	Major Activities	Participants	SFB Fish Consumers ^a	At Risk ^b SFB Consumers	Completed Outcome Evaluation	Outcome Evaluation Method	Other Household Members Who Eat SFB Fish
APA Family Support Services							
1	Survey of API community and workshops	4,380	3,927	3,810	2137	Pre/post test (6 questions)	15,098
2	Long Term Assessment	57 ^c	57 ^c	57 ^c	57 ^c	Retrospective post test + 4 additional questions	N/A
	APA Total	4,380	3,927	3,810	2,137		15,098
California Indian Environmental Alliance							
1	Waiting room survey and educational session	769	49	38	47	Retrospective post test	130
2	"Making Healthy Fish Choices" Classes	1,350 ^d	170 ^e 13 ^e	N/A ^f	170 11	Pledge Retrospective post test	N/A 91 ^g
	CIEA Total	2,119^h	232^h	38	228^h		221^h
Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice							
1	Angler survey/education	374	315	182	259	Retrospective post test	398 ⁱ
2	Community presentations (in-depth)	469	431 ^j	425	469 ^j	Retrospective post test	1,242 ^k
3	Workshops for at risk (women of childbearing age)	107	106	106	106	Retrospective post test	487
4	Tongan/Samoan community presentation	25	20	12	24	Retrospective post test	189
5	Community presentations (general) ^l	575	471 ^l	N/A	512 ^m	Show of hands	N/A
	Greenaction Total	1,550	1,343	725	1,370		2,316

Kids for the Bay							
1	Students attending "Safe Bay Food Consumption" lessons (6 classes)	183	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
2	Parents/guardians of students attending "Safe Bay Food Consumption" lessons	183 ⁿ	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
3	Population screening	121 ^o	203	168	N/A		N/A
4	Parent/guardian interviews	92 ^p	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
5	Student presentations to parents	65 ^q	N/A	N/A	65	Retrospective post test	N/A
6	Angler interviews/education	21	21	N/A	19	Retrospective post test	N/A
7	Teacher training	7	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
	Kids for the Bay Total	211	224	168	84		N/A
	Grand Total (all groups)	8,260	5,726	4,741	3,819		17,635

SFB = San Francisco Bay

N/A = not applicable. This information was not collected or an accurate number could not be estimated.

PST = Population Screening Tool (a tool for tracking the total number of participants, SFB fish consumers, at risk consumers, and other household members who consume SFB fish).

RPT = Retrospective Post Test (tools for tracking outcome evaluation measures such as changes in knowledge, awareness, and intent to change behavior; CDPH developed a short (simplified) and long version of the RPT).

Notes:

- Participants were identified as consumers of SFB fish based on the PST, unless otherwise indicated.
- Consumers of SFB fish were identified as "at risk" if they met at least one of the following criteria: (1) they ate ≥ 2 meals/week of SFB fish; (2) they ate surfperch or white croaker, or (3) they were a member of a high risk population (women 18-45 or children 1-17).
- The 57 participants in the long term assessment are a subset of the survey and workshop participants (listed in the row above) so they are not included in the total for APA.
- The WIC clinic implemented the class for a 5 month period (April-August 2012). There were 810 class attendees for the first three months (April-June 2012). While CIEA's project officially ended in June, the clinic continued to conduct the class during July and August, and CIEA estimated that an additional 540 people attended the class during these two months. The total number of class participants (1350) includes all attendees during the entire five month period.
- These numbers underestimate the actual number of SFB fish consumers because CIEA was only able to collect evaluation information from a subset of class participants. Of the 810 class participants during the first three months of implementation (see footnote (d), above), only 387 provided a copy of the pledge and of these, 170 indicated that they were SFB fish consumers on the pledge (they did not fill out the PST). Also, 101 of the 810 class participants filled out the PST, which identified 13 SFB fish consumers.
- The number of class participants who were at risk could not be estimated. While the vast majority of class participants were women of childbearing age (and thus met the criteria for "at risk"), information about gender and age was not recorded for most participants.

- g. This number underestimates the actual number and is only based on information from the subset of 101 of the 810 class participants who filled out the PST.
- h. There may be overlap between the waiting room survey participants and the class participants, and between the class participants who filled out the pledge and the class participants who filled out the retrospective post test. The potential overlap among participants was not tracked and could not be estimated.
- i. Due to likely double counting this figure was adjusted downward 50% based on an estimate from Greenaction staff. The double counting occurred when members of the same household were interviewed and those members each provided an estimate the number of people in their household who eat Bay fish.
- j. The number of SFB consumers is smaller than the number with outcome evaluation because some participants answered the evaluation questions but did not fill out the PST.
- k. Due to likely double counting this figure was adjusted downward by 33% based on an estimate from Greenaction staff (see footnote (i) above).
- l. These participants did not fill out the Population Screening Tool or the Retrospective Post Test. Instead they answered three questions that were tallied by counting the number of people who raised their hands. One of the questions asked whether the participants were consumers of SFB fish.
- m. These participants were asked only a single outcome evaluation question: "After talking with me today, your knowledge of the Bay fish advisory has improved and did you find the information useful?" Participant responses were determined by a show of hands. More participants answered affirmatively to this question than the number who indicated they were SFB fish consumers (512 vs. 471), thus this number (512) is likely to include some participant who were not consumer of SFB fish.
- n. This number is likely to underestimate the actual number. KftB assumed that one parent/guardian received materials from their student or participated in a project activity (interviews or presentations by students), but if there were more than one parent/guardian per student, the actual number would be higher.
- o. This number represents 121 households (not individuals) that returned the population screening survey (KftB revised the PST so it could capture household, rather than individual, information). The 121 households are also a subset of the 183 students/parents so they are not included in the total.
- p. This number represents a subset of the 183 students/parents so it is not included in the total; 46 students returned the interview forms to KftB (from interviews of 46 parents) but it is likely that the actual number of students/parents participating in the interviews was higher.
- q. This number underestimates the actual number of parents who attended the student presentations; only 65 parents turned in their post test survey forms to KftB. Also, the 65 parents represent a subset of the 183 student/parent participants and thus are not included in the total.

.

Table 6. Summary of Pre/Post Test Scores from APA Workshops

	Attendees who completed both pre and post test	Ave pre test score*	Ave post test score*	Ave change in score
Workshops	2137	2.6	4.9	+2.3

*Based on a six-question test. The same six questions were asked before and after the workshops.

Table 7. APA Long Term Assessment

	No. of participants	1. I have an understanding of the fish consumption advisory for San Francisco Bay.				2. I have the information I need to reduce my exposure to chemicals from eating San Francisco Bay Fish.				A. I will continue to eat fish because some fish are good for me and my health.				B. Mercury, PCB and other contaminants is not something you can see, smell or taste. That's why it's important to know which fish are safer than others to eat.				C. I will continue to eat fish regardless of the advisory because of cultural, economic (financial) or personal reasons.				D. I am interested in finding out which chemicals, if any, is in my body and how much.			
		+change	no change	-change	%+change	+change	no change	-change	%+change	+change	no change	-change	%+change	+change	no change	-change	%+change	+change	no change	-change	%+change	+change	no change	-change	%+change
Vietnamese	7	2	5	0	29%	7	0	0	100%	0	6	1	0%	7	0	0	100%	0	7	0	0%	6	0	1	86%
Chinese	7	7	0	0	100%	7	0	0	100%	6	1	0	86%	6	1	0	86%	2	5	0	29%	6	1	0	86%
Laotian	7	7	0	0	100%	7	0	0	100%	6	1	0	86%	7	0	0	100%	0	7	0	0%	7	0	0	100%
Cambodian	7	7	0	0	100%	7	0	0	100%	6	1	0	86%	0	7	0	0%	0	7	0	0%	6	1	0	86%
Filipino	7	5	2	0	71%	5	2	0	71%	7	0	0	100%	7	0	0	100%	0	7	0	0%	7	0	0	100%
API1	8	7	0	0	88%	8	0	0	100%	7	1	0	88%	7	1	0	88%	1	7	0	13%	6	2	0	75%
API2	7	5	2	0	71%	7	0	0	100%	5	2	0	71%	5	1	1	71%	2	5	0	29%	7	0	0	100%
Samoan	7	7	0	0	100%	7	0	0	100%	6	1	0	86%	7	0	0	100%	0	7	0	0%	7	0	0	100%
Total	57	48	9	0	82%	55	2	0	96%	43	13	1	75%	46	10	1	81%	5	52	0	9%	52	4	1	92%

Note: We compared the participant's rating before the first activity (survey) to the respondent's rating after the final follow up that occurred 2 months later. The "+change" column shows the number of participant's whose rating went from "highly disagree", "disagree", or "don't know" to "agree" or "highly agree" over the 2 month period. The "no change" column shows the number of participants whose level of agreement with the statement did not change. The "-change" column shows the number of participant's whose rating went from "highly agree" or "agree" to "DK" or "disagree" or "highly disagree". No distinctions was made between "highly agree" and "agree" responses, nor were distinctions made between "highly disagree" and "disagree" responses.

Table 8. CIEA Outcome Evaluation Summary of Waiting Room Survey^a

	1. Has talking with me today increased your knowledge of the consumption advisory for San Francisco Bay?				2. Do you have the information you need to reduce your exposure to chemicals from eating San Francisco Bay fish?				3. Do you think you are likely to avoid eating surfperches from the San Francisco Bay?					4. Do you think you will share the advisory information with other family members or friends?				5. Do you think you will follow the advisory recommendations for eating fish from the San Francisco Bay?					7. [men 18+ & women 46+] Do you think you will limit the amount of white croaker, sharks, and sturgeon that you eat from the San Francisco Bay to no more than one serving per week?					9. [women 18-45 & children 1-17] Do you think you will stop eating striped bass, sharks, and sturgeon from the San Francisco Bay?				
	Yes	No	Don't Know	% Yes ^b	Yes	No	Don't Know	% Yes ^b	Yes	No	Don't Know	N/A (don't eat surfperches now)	% Yes ^c	Yes	No	Don't Know	% Yes ^b	Yes	No	Don't Know	N/A (already follow advisory)	% Yes ^c	Yes	No	Don't Know	N/A (don't eat these fish now)	% Yes ^c	Yes	No	Don't Know	N/A (don't eat these fish now)	% Yes ^c
Client Interviews	43	0	3	93%	42	2	3	89%	17	2	4	24	74%	43	0	2	96%	35	1	9	2	78%	16	1	7	11	67%	16	2	8	9	62%

n=47

a. There was no question 6 (it was inadvertently omitted); Questions 8 and 10 were open-ended questions that asked for other steps the respondent planned to take.

b. These percentages include "don't know" in the denominator; missing response are excluded.

c. These percentages include "don't know" in the denominator but missing and N/A responses are excluded.

Table 9. Greenaction Outcome Evaluation Summary

	no. of participants	1. After talking with me today, your knowledge of the Bay fish advisory has improved.				2. The information I provided you with today is useful to you.				3. I plan to stop eating surfperches from San Francisco Bay.				4. I plan to remove the skin before cooking & eating fish from San Francisco Bay.				5. I plan to share this information with family & friends.				6. I plan to follow the advisory recommendations & eat less toxic kinds of fish from SFB.				7a. [men 18+ & women 46+] I plan to limit the amount of white croaker, sharks, and sturgeon I eat from SFB to no more than one serving per				7b. [women 18-45 & children 1-17] I plan to stop eating striped bass, sharks, and sturgeon from San Francisco Bay.			
		agree	disagree	Don't Know	% agree*	agree	disagree	Don't Know	% agree*	will change	will not change	N/A	% will change**	will change	will not change	N/A	% will change**	will change	will not change	N/A	% will change**	will change	will not change	N/A	% will change**	will change	will not change	N/A	% will change**	will change	will not change	N/A	% will change**
Angler interviews	260	165	60	35	63%	187	34	39	72%	16	95	149	14%	75	118	67	39%	237	9	14	96%	199	10	51	95%	121	34	83	78%	6	8	8	43%
Community presentations	469	467	0	2	100%	462	1	6	99%	333	133	3	71%	301	161	7	65%	464	3	2	99%	338	117	14	74%	204	65	7	76%	155	35	3	82%
At-Risk women in clinics	106	103	1	2	97%	102	0	4	96%	86	7	13	92%	81	9	16	90%	105	0	1	100%	91	0	15	100%	0	0	0	0%	79	1	26	99%
Total	835	735	61	39	88%	751	35	49	90%	435	235	436	65%	457	288	90	61%	806	12	17	99%	628	127	80	83%	325	99	90	77%	240	44	37	85%

*These percentages include "don't know" in the denominator; missing response are excluded.

**These percentages exclude missing and N/A responses from the denominator ("don't know" was not a response choice).

Note: In Questions 1 and 2, participants were asked their level of agreement with the statement. Participants who said "agree" or "highly agree" are summed under "agree". Participants who said "disagree" or "highly disagree" are summed under "disagree". For the remaining questions, participants were asked how likely they were to take the steps listed. Participants who reported "definitely will change" or "probably will change" are summed under "will change". Participants who reported "definitely will not change" or "probably will not change" are summed under "will not change".

Table 10. Kids for the Bay Outcome Evaluation of Student Presentations

	Total Participants	1. (I had/I now have) an understanding of the fish consumption advisory (the "Guide") for the San Francisco Bay.*				2.(I had/I now have) the information I need to reduce my exposure to chemical from eating San Francisco Bay Fish.*				3. I plan to stop eating surfperches from San Francisco Bay.				4. I plan to remove the skin before cooking & eating fish from San Francisco Bay.				5. I plan to share this information with other family members and friends.				6. I plan to follow the advisory recommendations (the "Guide") for eating fish from the San Francisco Bay.				7. [men 18+ & women 46+] I plan to limit the amount of white croaker, sharks, and sturgeon I eat from the San Francisco Bay to no more than one serving per wk.				9. [women 18-45] I plan to stop eating striped bass, sharks, and sturgeon from the San Francisco Bay.			
		# +change	# same	# -change	% +change	# +change	# same	# -change	% +change	# agree	# neutral	# disagree	% agree	# agree	# neutral	# disagree	% agree	# agree	# neutral	# disagree	% agree	# agree	# neutral	# disagree	% agree	# agree	# neutral	# disagree	% agree	# agree	# neutral	# disagree	% agree
Student presentations to parents	65	44	18	2	69%	39	20	4	62%	45	9	6	75%	53	3	5	87%	57	2	3	92%	48	3	2	91%	31	3	3	84%	39	8	3	78%

Note: For Questions 1 and 2, the parents/guardians were asked to think about what they knew before the student presentation and what they now know after the student presentation. The responses show the number of parents/guardians who reported a positive change (" +change"), stayed the same, or reported a negative change ("-change") when comparing their responses before and after the presentations. For the remaining questions, the parents/guardians were asked to indicate the response that best reflects their feeling about the each statement. Participants who indicated "strongly agree" or "agree" are summed under "agree". Participants who indicated "strongly disagree" and "disagree" are summed under "disagree".

Table 11. Training for Funded Groups and Their Partners

Date	Training Topics	Attendees
6/13/11	Fish contamination topics and evaluation	All funded groups+one APA partner organization
8/2/11	Fish contamination topics and evaluation	Greenaction (new staff person)
2/6/12	Fish contamination topics	APA partner organizations
2/29/12	Fish contamination topics and implementation of the WIC fish curriculum [training conducted collaboratively with CIEA staff]	Native American Health Center WIC clinic staff