



## **Graphics Joint Caucus Session February 2, 2012**

---

### **MEETING SUMMARY California Water Plan Update 2013 Graphics Joint Caucus Session February 2, 2012 11:45 am – 2:00pm CalEMA Headquarters, Sacramento**

#### **Overview of Graphic Elements**

Department of Water Resources (DWR) introduced their Water Plan Graphics Staff in attendance; staff explained their roles and mentioned how they are looking forward to hearing feedback on this topic.

Megan Fidell, DWR, provided an overview of the use of graphics in the Water Plan. She explained the importance of graphics is to display complicated concepts, summarize data, and emphasize messages. She mentioned another important point with the graphics is that they will be reused in many ways, including by advocates, the legislature and newspapers. She mentioned that the reuse can be dangerous as once it is out of the Water Plan's hands the context may not be provided to audiences. Facilitator Lisa Beutler underlined this concern as it has happened in the past.

Ms. Fidell continued and explained that for Update 2013 the Public Advisory Committee will be able to preview the graphics before the Public Review Draft. She reviewed the graphic input schedule (posted online). The topics for input are as follows:

- Inventory, critique, ideas
- Groundwater, environmental water
- Regional Reports
- RMS, Finance
- Highlights

#### **Evaluating the Highlights Document**

Ms. Fidell posed questions to the group requesting both feedback on the 2009 Update graphics and suggestions for Update 2013 graphics. The graphic staff added that graphics refers to things like pull out quotes, headers and other entry points for readers.

- How did you respond to the graphics in Update 2009?
- Were any key concepts missed that should have been displayed graphically?
- Should there be more or less photos and graphics?
- What other graphics should be considered for 2013 that were not in the 2009?

Ms. Fidell noted that the content will be updated for 2013 – she is asking that participants talk about what type of graphics were effective rather than the content of the graphics themselves.

## **Group Report Backs**

### **Overarching Principles**

- Less words, more pictures.
- Graphics should have directive messages.
- Have a graphical annotated Table of Contents with hyperlinks to the data and more information.
- Font should get smaller with more and more details.
- The graphics should speak for themselves.

### **Comments on Graphics in Highlights**

#### **General Comment**

- Many stakeholders suggested that the Highlights document no longer come with a disk, many people did not feel the disk is necessary.
- Identifying the audience if for the Highlights; for the Legislature and their staff it needs to tell a story. The Highlights should be reviewed by someone outside of the Water Plan to provide comments on whether it makes sense to them.
- Include a big picture of California to show how important water is to the State rather than only using technical graphs and charts.
- The vision is important and should be in the front of the document.
- Current messages might have to do with uncertainty as supply fluctuates between wet and dry years.
- Graphs should be simple so that it is clear what they are trying to convey. (For example the RMS Dot Chart it is not clear in what it is conveying and could send the wrong message that a strategy with more dots is better).

#### **Specific Feedback on 2009 Graphics**

- The conclusion and recommendations at the end should have graphics - highlight the recommendations to give them some pop.
- California vision and implementation pages could be improved.
- Sharpen the message on Page 15.
- The Secretary's message was too much in 2009, it should convey three or four main points.
- Pages 10 and 11 in the Highlights -one interpretation is that this is a great graphics to break down water for those who do not know a lot about California water; the other interpretation is that climate change (which is the header) does not come across in the graphic.
- Bottom of Page 4 – the graphic does not accurately represent agriculture.
- Page 5 should define “acre/foot” by a practical definition of how much that would provide water to households. Similar comment on Page 9 that “cubic feet per second” should be explained in terms of why that is important.
- Page 12 the blue on black does not show up well.

- Page 14 and 15 the legend should be on the same page as the figure.

### **Water Balance Graphic**

- One comment made was to keep the water balance chart depicting 8 years, rather than adding the new years to the previous graphic. Others supported adding more years to the graph especially to compare wet and dry years.
- This graphic should yield a ready comparison between supply vs. use.

### **New Ideas on Graphics**

- Graphics depicting year to year changes in consumptions and in supply. Maybe by region and add it to Page 6.
- Add a groundwater graphic.
- Try to convey new issues like climate change to readers graphically.
- Water trades is an important missing topic.
- Need graphics on the water system and the on infrastructure to get across the idea that water is moved across the State in response to the demand.
- Add a graphic to depict the Water Plan stakeholder input process.
- Suggestion to add in the effects of long term droughts and couple that with the snow pack and effects of climate change.
- Add a State map depicting the different storage, conveyance and tributary facilities, since a lot of people do not know of the Delta. Highlight the Sierra Nevada watershed.
- Graphics should display the effects of water use efficiency programs.

### **General Water Plan Graphics Comments**

#### **Photos**

- One suggestion was to build a photo library so that stakeholders or members of the public could upload photos to share.

#### **Other notes**

- The document should be printer friendly – possibly have a “just text” version of the document for people with limited internet connections/printing capabilities. And make it so that audiences can download certain pieces rather than the full document.
- Possible organize by regions.
- Make a tab for the regions section so people can go straight to that.

## **Overview of the 2013 Table of Contents**

Ms. Beutler mentioned that from this point forward the Water Plan process is creating a document; at this point everything is launched. She explained that now the group should focus on the full Water Plan document (rather than the Highlights).

Ms. Fidell asked participants to consider the following questions:

- Who are the audiences for the full Water Plan?
- What are the key graphics for these chapters?
- Which ones should we bring forward from 2009? Is continuity important?
- Which other important concepts should be displayed visually?

## Audiences

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, explained the intended audiences for Update 2009:

- Highlights Document: is the Executive Summary, containing the key messages from the full plan.
- Volume 1: is the strategic plan for policy makers, key resources managers, etc.
- Volume 2: is the management strategies which are a reference for water managers across the State.
- Volume 3: is the regional reports which should tell the story of each region. This section previously did not have recommendations, but for Update 2013 the intent is to have regional report recommendations.
- Volume 4: is the encyclopedia – it was related to content that is somewhere else in the Water Plan.

Ms. Beutler mentioned that Volume 1 is used as background information on California water issues for students and other audiences. She also mentioned that the companion plans has been copied a lot as the Water Plan is the only place that lists out the different Agencies/Departments and their roles with water.

Lewis Moller, DWR, mentioned that the intent is to add a summary of the regional reports to the Update 2013 Highlights document so that a broader audience can understand the different regional concerns.

### Comments and Suggested Audiences:

- Consider teachers. The information should be promoted to teachers to educate students on where water comes from in California.
- Media should weigh in on the contents of the Highlights document.
- The Highlights document is an opportunity to reach out to many audiences including the general public to educate them on the value of water and groundwater.
- Tribes outside of California look to the Water Plan for ideas on improving coordination and collaboration.
- DWR should track who is downloading information from their website to gather information on other users.
- Students in college and university use State plans.
- There should be a Water Plan user/reader guide.