

August 27-28, 2010 Jackson Advisory Group Supplemental Draft Minutes

Discussion on Agenda Item 6.c. Saturday August 28, 2010: Next Steps, Report writing, Landscape Committee Report

(Transcript of recording)

John: ask staff, which means Russ, to get the diverse materials packaged in a consistent format. Not to change the language, but to get it prepared in a format that is appropriate for the report.

To assist in that or respond to that, we would like to suggest that Linwood assist, respond to that.

Linwood: I honestly cannot commit to that, I am going 6-7 days per week.

Vince: Kathy is the chair person.

John: true, but the thought was to have Linwood and Mike Jani help get this material in a format that is easy to read. The thought was that Russ would help initiate that and then we will work with the committee, particularly the role that you and Mike Jani can play.

Vince: why is that in terms of organization? They are both busy people.

John: sure.

Vince: I would think that Kathy and I who have worked on this a lot, can structure this stuff, in a consistent fashion.

Linwood: on that note, it is important that the format of the landscape committee and research committee reports be similar.

Steve: that was the thinking, to get it into that format.

John: you certainly do not want it to read as two separate committee reports. It has to be formatted as a response to the charter. That was some of the thought we had last [night?]

Mike A: are you asking Linwood to review and comment on what Russ writes?

John: Yes.

Steve: what we are trying to do, this may be inaccurate, but the request has been ongoing to review it and get it into this format up to this point, and the work has been good but it is not getting it into that consistent format. Linwood worked with Russ on the integration process, and I think Linwood and Mike, I think, well to be quite honest, have a lot of support by the whole committee, and I am just putting it right on the table, and I think Kathy does as well and Vince does as well. But we wanted to run into as minimum possible people reading it saying "gee, this is somebody's agenda" versus not an agenda. Even though there would not be an agenda, we did not want to have that be an issue, of people reading it thinking there was an agenda going into it.

I am just being 100 percent honest. Whether you agree with that or not, that was why the recommendation. Right or wrong, that was the logic.

We did not want it to be [coming?...]]

Vince: I thought we were talking about organization.

Steve: It is getting the exact recommendations that we talked about. It has got to be what we agreed upon. We do not want to reword, you know. It is about getting it in that format. Russ would take all that, put what we all agreed to in that language, and then it would just be critiqued by Linwood and perhaps Mike.

Linwood discussed his time constraints.

John: this is giving you the opportunity to contribute as best you can.

Steve: we did not mean to put you in a place like this. The question was what was the rationale, and I am trying to give you an honest shot at what the rationale was.

Linda: Hm.

John: Obviously we will need help from Kathy and Vince.

Steve: Absolutely, it was a first cut that will then go to the committee to make sure it is ... [?].

Linwood: time constraints.

John: both you and Mike Jani, this is an opportunity to comment.

[Other discussion]

Vince: there are two parts to it, 1) getting organized, getting all the disparate things into clear format, 2) there is no introductory part, we dropped all that verbiage it was hitting people's emotional hot buttons. But there still has to be context created for that.

John: Vince is talking about the rationale for supporting the recommendations.

Russ: I understand I am being asked to do that, to draft the rationale as well.

Vince: I think you have to have Kathy and other members of the landscape committee kind of buy into that concept before you go forward with that.

Helge: clarify, please.

Vince: I want the concept of his writing to be first reviewed by the landscape committee to see if they want since he has not been a member of the landscape committee. He is not there a lot.

John: I do not want to leave it till September there needs to be forward movement. Can there be a conversation on this next week?

Steve: get a conference call of the landscape committee to check in on the exact parameters, in order to get it to be accurate, reflect all the work and move it forward.

R: this is just a procedural issue so we do not need Bagley-Keene notice.

Mike L: it took us almost 6 months to get the research committee report to a point where the JAG could finally buy off on it, so we are trying to shorten the process here since we do not have 6 months left.

John: the intent is Russ initiating this discussion and get input to end up with a document that can just slide into the report.