Appointment

From: Bacalan, Vince [Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/23/2019 9:51:28 PM
To: Yelensky, Erica [Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov]; Jennifer Hecker [JHecker@chnep.org]; DCRoomWest7324/DC-CCW-OWOW [DCRoomWest7324@epa.gov]

Subject: Santa Monica Review Team discussion of PE findings

Start: 4/24/2019 6:00:00 PM
End: 4/24/2019 8:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

AGENDA

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

I. **2014 challenges: Have they addressed…**
   a. Financial Management?
   b. Outreach and Public Involvement?
      i. SMBNEP roles and responsibilities
      ii. Effectiveness of the WAC
      iii. Communication to stakeholders and encourage public involvement
         1. Suggestion: webcasting as an option for greater public involvement/participation

II. **Perceived Strengths**
   a. Competent and well-managed staff to help implement CCMP
   b. Staff engages stakeholders and manages to keep information publicly available
   c. Governing Board is a diverse representation of the study area and amplifies the work throughout
   d. Diverse partnership allowing for stronger financial stability and sustainability
   e. Research projects have strong scientific basis. Data and results are disseminated via conferences and publications.
   f. Leader in trash reduction; stormwater projects; public trainings; and community involvement for habitat restoration (kelp forests)

III. **Perceived Challenges**
   a. WAC meetings may not be as productive and a friendly environment
      i. Suggestions: develop rules of engagement for meetings; hire meeting facilitator
   b. Autonomy as an independent entity
      i. Suggestions: one dedicated website; unified logo; clear roles of staff and responsibilities to support the NEP; governance structure diagram; develop by-laws, succession plans, operating procedures, code of ethics similar to other NEPs.
   c. Developing an economic/environmental valuation of its resources

IV. **Other opportunities, further documentation, questions to staff**
   a. Staff breakdown supported by 320 versus leveraged/in-kind support (p6, Narrative)
   b. Missing 2 items from Assessment and Monitoring piece (p26, Measures)
   c. Web-based GIS data display for more timely reporting of conditions (p28, Measures)
   d. Is the CMP vetted through the TAC first before approved by the GB? (p29, Measures)
   e. Existing Finance and Monitoring Plan utilized during the review period?
   f. Was monitoring after the Arroyo Sequit Fish Passage project determined that this was a successful effort? (p41, Narrative)
   g. Preliminary 'grade' for SMBNEP

V. **Site visit**

a. Which projects should we consider visiting?
b. How long the visit should be?
c. What HQ management can offer if attending?