

San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes from the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Annual Report
4/17/2019

Attendees: Luisa Valiela, Bruce Wolfe, David Lewis, Erika Castillo, Arthur Deicke (phone), Chris Gurney (phone)

QUESTIONS that came out of the group discussion:

- Who is main audience for the Annual Report? The Governing Board or are there other intended audiences?
- How blunt can/should the Annual Report be in documenting challenges?
- Is the schedule (and intended audience) of the Annual Report mandated?
- When is the revamped SFBRA website scheduled to be done?

MAIN MESSAGES from group discussion:

- Annual Report is an opportunity to communicate SFBRA successes to a broader audience.
- Current Annual Report format misses the opportunity to appeal to a broader audience.
- Introductory/overview material on the SFBRA is missing.
- Thanking (and turning the spotlight on) the voters for passing Measure AA and funding the projects is missing.
- Better graphics needed in summarizing the performance measures, as well as providing benchmarks so progress over time is easier to understand (20 year path).
- Simplify messages, such as “..highlight 2 great things that are going well and 2 things we are being challenged with..”* as a way of providing transparency and honest accounting.
- Missing “next steps/next round” information and communication of the potential of other funding sources to be added to SFBRA grants. Show that the process is working well and underscore that more funding will be needed.
- Some visuals in the report are good but improvements could be made in transferring more of the narrative information into digestible graphics.
- Reporting on the BRITT needs better description of “why” it is being tried: “We are doing something daring and innovative to fix something that’s not working.”* And its performance measures should be included.

EDITS suggested for the current Annual Report

- Weblinks embedded in the text wherever possible in the online version.
- Appendices should be separated from main report.
- Page numbers should be added.
- Better labeling on “unit” column in performance measures table in Appendix A.
- The number that asserts that 67% of projects are “benefitting” disadvantaged communities should be edited to say they are “located/near” DACs and there should be an associated table that lists those projects so that they can be checked by interested parties.
- Photos should have labels.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS for next round of Annual Report

- Design and content should have input from a communications expert.
- Future Annual Reports should focus on being robust on-line versions, including videos.
- Decide whether the intended audience is just the Governing Board and leave format as is, or if also trying to be an outward facing communications piece, work on improving content delivery with better graphics.
- If the Annual Report is intended to serve as a public outreach document, the Advisory Committee would like to be included as a reviewer of an early outline version in order to provide comments.
- Important to gage level of effort in producing this Annual Report with the number of people expected to read it.

*Quotes attributed to David Lewis and with which the subcommittee generally agreed.