

RMP Communication Plan

Definition

- Plan for RMP information and data products
- Distinct from “internal communication” (committee management and coordination) – that’s covered under Program Management

RMP Communication Plan

Goal

- Communicate information about water quality in San Francisco Bay in support of management decisions

RMP Communication Plan

Audiences

- **Primary**
 - **RMP stakeholders – groups that participate in and fund the Program**
- **Secondary**
 - Other regional managers
 - Regional law and policy makers
 - Regional scientists
 - Media, public outreach specialists, educators
 - Managers and scientists from other regions

RMP Communication Plan

Proposed General Strategy

- An area with potential for improvement
- Keep primary focus on primary audience
- Seek ways to improve communication to the primary audience
 - Conduct thoughtful and well-executed survey
- Support SFEP, SFEI, CWQMC, and others in reaching broader audience of decision-makers and the public

Pulse 2011: Lessons Learned

What Happened?

- Missed early goals on timeline (workload issue)
- Implemented new art director burnout prevention policy
- The move, vacation, and holidays then got in the way

Lessons

- Run a tighter ship from the beginning
- Workload reduction
- Start earlier
- Bring in reinforcements as needed

The Pulse: Pros and Cons of Annual Frequency

Pros

1. Report out *information* every year
2. Tangible, quality product for stakeholders
3. Annual improvement in design and content through repetition
4. Nice package with Annual Meeting for media
5. Consistency for staffing (but see Con #6)

Cons

1. Cost
2. Opportunity cost/workload for staff
3. Workload for stakeholders
4. Overlap with SOTB
5. Reduced frequency of Status and Trends
6. Burnout of staff – may be reaching that point
7. Burnout of audience?
8. Running out of themes?

RMP Communication Plan: 2012

- Conduct stakeholder needs survey
- Pulse: Theme CECs; delay until October 2013 – **need decision now**
- Status and Trends Update: October
- Annual Monitoring Results: December
- Fact Sheets: USGS fact sheet in Q1
- Estuary Insert: Q4; topic TBD
- Annual Meeting: October
- Workshops: Nutrient modeling?; Moderate toxicity?; Mercury?

Stakeholder Information Needs Survey

- Ensure high return rate
 - Aggressive cat-herding, help from Committee members, easy to complete and submit, other measures
 - Test on committee members before wider application
- The Pulse
 - How useful? how do you use it? Frequency? best elements? elements that aren't useful? suggestions for improvement? Topics?
- Pulse Lite
 - Would this be useful? Elements?
- Annual Monitoring Results
 - How useful? how do you use it? best elements? elements that aren't useful? suggestions for improvement
- Annual Meeting
 - How useful? best elements? elements that aren't useful? suggestions for improvement? Topics?
- Webinars
 - Worth pursuing? topics?
- Other suggestions for improvements?

Pulse Options: 2012

- Delay CEC Pulse one year (October 2013), S&T Update in 2012
 - Pro: will get target articles in Pulse, can pilot S&T update
 - Con: overlap with SOE
- Delay CEC Pulse 6 months
 - Pro: will get some target articles, no overlap with SOE
 - Con: overlap with SOE
- Keep Pulse annual
 - Pro: some stakeholders want this
 - Con: theme for 2012 not identified

“Pulse Lite”

- Latest Monitoring Results section
- Anything else?
- Would this be useful to stakeholders?
- Still a significant cost
- Needs further discussion if we decide to do this

RMP Communication Plan: 2012

- Conduct stakeholder needs survey
- Pulse: Theme CECs; delay until October 2013 – **need decision now**
- Status and Trends Update: October
- Annual Monitoring Results: December
- Fact Sheets: USGS fact sheet in Q1
- Estuary Insert: Q4; topic TBD
- Annual Meeting: October
- Workshops: Nutrient modeling?; Moderate toxicity?; Mercury?