

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Barbara Craig, Bill Hutchison, Clark Seely, Dan Postrel**  
**July 17, 2008**

Key decisions, agreements and principles arising from this meeting:

- The current work plans accurately identify the broad, major issues facing the Board. However, they should be reformulated according to a consensus model, articulating major decisions, and identifying sub-issues or incremental decisions that, as they are addressed, lay the groundwork for the overarching decisions.
- The Board has a need to document its decisions and to keep track of issue history, helping to provide adequate context for agenda items. It is the Board's responsibility to agree on specific statements and agreements in principle, so that these can be recorded.
- Changes in staff report format may also be useful. These could include stronger statements of the issue; recommendations that provide a range of alternatives, possibly with a preferred alternative; and sufficient context and chronology to explain the progress and current status of the issue.
- The Board and Department need to work better as partners, strengthening each other's work. Work plans need to be synchronized with Department work cycles (budget and legislative concept development, etc.), to provide prioritization and guidance to the agency. Conversely, work plans should help the Board understand how their decisions look on the ground, and how Board action or direction fits with existing workloads.
- Clark and Dan can provide a report on this meeting to the Board on July 24.
- The Board should use its August meeting to test these concepts and apply Elaine Hallmark's consensus model to the state forests issue, as a means of exploring more deliberate, decisive approaches to issues.

## Oregon Board of Forestry Work Plan Review

Notes from meeting with Bill Hutchison, Barbara Craig, Clark Seely, Dan Postrel  
July 17, 2008

### The purpose of the work plan review

-- Long Term, to prepare for the revision of the FPFO; Short Term, to prepare for the remainder of the 2008 Board meetings and the 2009 meetings.

-- Increasing the effectiveness of the Board in reaching decisions.

**The current work plans accurately identify the broad, major forest issues, but should be re-formulated according to a consensus model, identifying major decisions and the sub-issues or sub-decisions leading up to them.**

-- An example from state forests: The overriding question might be, "Are state forests meeting GPV?" Sub-issues might be, "What *is* GPV?" "How will we know when we have achieved it?" "What performance measures and targets are helpful?"

-- The work plans now identify a variety of objectives, tasks and timelines, but these aren't necessarily the right rocks, defining and supporting a sequence of actions and decisions that lead to a major decision or outcome.

-- A desire to "free up the Department from slogging through work plans."

-- Work plan structure should change to describe the overarching decisions that are to be arrived at through the consensus process (up front in the document). The remainder of each work plan should be re-cast to identify sub-issue statements (or questions) instead of the current objective statements (that too often read as work tasks). This would correct the current problem of lack of statement (and original Board discussion and agreement) of the core issue and sub-issues, and provide that "place to come back to..." as work plans progress. Articulation of the issue and sub-issues should also help foster prioritization (which is lacking now).

-- It's possible that work plans could be divided among Board members, who would then recast or remap them according to the consensus model Elaine Hallmark has set out. Staff could also work on this.

-- It's also possible that the staff report structure needs to be revised to include better connection with the issue statements and articulation of alternatives and to show linkage with previous Board decisions via meeting summary statements.

**There is a serious need to document Board decisions, and to keep track of issue history so that Board members have adequate context for agenda items.**

-- The Board should discipline itself to agree on specific statements and capture the agreements in principle as it makes decisions, so that these can be recorded. This is really a Board responsibility. This can produce something like legislative history, explaining Board intent and showing the building blocks (incremental decisions) that lead to major decisions. Will help merge the Board meetings with the work plan documents. Will also help align and better connect Board work with Department work.

--Re-articulation of need for meeting summaries that document decisions, with substantial input from Board as to how decisions / agreements / principles are described.

-- Board members need a stronger context and understanding of chronology when items come before them. Perhaps a Gantt chart or a running summary or running commentary alongside the work plan would help illustrate where the issue is, and what events have come before.

-- Board members need a better sense of linkage and time criticality. e.g.: If we delay our work or that of an advisory group, will that have serious ramifications elsewhere?

**The Board and Department need to work better as partners, operating in ways that complement and strengthen each other's work.**

-- Work plans need to be synchronized with Department work cycles (budget, legislative concepts, FPFO revision?), so the Department has policy guidance when it needs it. (These cycles and relationships have already been described).

-- Conversely, work plans could help the Department provide the right information at the right times. Examples: Board members need to know how their decisions, such as on state forest performance measures, play out on the ground (i.e., "what's it look like?"). Board members also need to know how their decisions or direction fit with existing workload.

-- Staff is excellent; Marvin's input is always valuable, even if different from a Board member's viewpoint -- may reflect insights or events not otherwise available to the Board. The State Forester is the interface between the Board's work and the Department's work

-- Staff reports with recommendations that provide a range of alternatives and potentially a preferred alternative would be helpful (i.e. applying the best professional judgment). Board may see ways to combine parts of alternatives, or introduce new elements. Concern: appearing to undermine the Department, which is highly regarded, by going in another direction.

### Other comments

- The Board feels stretched and overworked, but without a sense of making a difference.
- The Board could understandably be viewed as lacking credibility. e.g.: How can it act or speak with authority on federal lands without having made decisions on state forests?
- Some work plans lack an issue statement at a high level.

### Next steps

- Prepare summary of the July 17 meeting.
- Use August meeting as an opportunity to revisit the state forests issue, applying Elaine's model, testing some of the comments described here, and taking a more deliberate and decisive approach.
- Clark and Dan may report at July Board meeting on the conversation, and pass on suggestions about how to proceed with the August meeting.