

ODF SB 762 RAC Meeting 1 Evaluation Summary

Circle the Appropriate Response:

	1	2	3	4	5
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Okay	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1. Overall Meeting	1	2 (2)	3 (4)	4	5
2. Presentations	1 (1)	2 (1)	3 (3)	4 (1)	5
3. Materials	1	2 (3)	3 (2)	4 (1)	5
4. Discussions	1	2 (2)	3 (2)	4 (1)	5
4. Facilitator	1 (2)	2 (2)	3 (1)	4 (1)	5

6. What were the most useful parts of the meeting?

- Introductions, learning what everyone's priorities are, Getting some clarity on timeline
- Overall timeline, History, and staff material
- Q&A session
- The meeting moved quickly
- The staff presentations were very clear.
- Understanding who was participating and why

7. What things would you have changed about the meeting?

- I don't like having to use the chat function during meetings
- I realize the timeline makes this challenging, but get materials out further in advance of meetings.
- Nothing, understand its the first meeting.....
- Recommend that we use Zoom polls rather than having people respond in the comment box when we are asking for consensus opinions. Makes it easier to see the responses.
- The committee voting procedure is tricky to follow - looking in chat to see how many 1s 2s or 3s isn't very transparent. Can we please change the mechanism for that voting to something like a zoom poll so everyone can tabulate results?
- The introduction to the process was long and repeated what we read in the charter, the question about how to add missing voices to the conversation is important, but I wish we could have been given more clarity around how/when that will happen, -The introduction was helpful, but I was disappointed we didn't begin any work.

- This first meeting was all about process; I look forward to discussing more robust items

8. Do you have specific suggestions for improving the RAC meetings?

- Assume members have read the materials if they were asked to and provided at least a day to do that
- Continue to clarify and segment RAC participants/discussion from general observers. Continue to provide time at end of meeting for observers to comment/ask questions however
- I did not receive the materials prior to the meeting, and make sure all members are identified
- Please continue to adapt the RAC membership to ensure better balance. There are several stakeholder categories missing in the process, whose voices should be heard. The RAC membership doesn't meet the charter itself, missing environmental, DEI and public health voices at minimum. - The next meeting could further clarify what is in, and out of, scope for this RAC. Many comments were pertaining to other processes contained within SB 762, with RAC members bringing issues into the WUI definition RAC that legislation directed be handled elsewhere. Conflating the charge of this RAC could cause challenges for those other processes if we are too expansive in our response to our limited charge.
- Provide as much transparency as you can (I'm thinking specifically about the "new voices" discussion) about decision making and the related work that is beginning on this topic
- The dissemination of materials and response time required is very challenging. Sending information on Friday afternoons with mid-day Monday deadlines is providing very few business hours to respond, and is not sufficiently accessible to the public. Additionally I don't believe the charter was sent to interested parties in the public though it was promised at the meeting. If the public is to have a real chance to engage, this must change. I urge better outreach and advanced timing as much as possible to ensure appropriate collaboration and public support of this process.
- This might be part of the staff thinking for RAC meetings 2-4 anyway, but please keep the discussions focused on the matter at hand - definition of the WUI, not all the ways in which it might or might not be used. Too much tripping in the RAC #1 comments. I understand that needed to happen a bit at meeting #1, but now it is time to be disciplined. There are other, later steps provided in SB 762 where the politics & policies can and should come into play.

9. Do you have any additional comments that you would like the facilitation team to consider as they prepare for the next RAC meeting?

- Humor is always appreciated.
- Look forward to a draft proposal so we can begin the consensus/discussion process
- Thanks for doing this.
- There are perspectives missing from the RAC: BIPOC community, public health, environmental advocacy organization.
- Voting using the chat function will make it difficult to reach consensus

10. Your Name and Organization?

- Amelia Porterfield (The Nature Conservancy)
- Dylan Kruse (Sustainable Northwest)

- Holly Kerns (Association of County Planning Directors)
- Mark Long (OHBA)
- Mary Kyle McCurdy (1000 Friends of Oregon)
- Michele Bradley (Special Districts Association/Port of Tillamook Bay)
- Roger Beyer (Oregon Small Woodlands Association)

11. If you want a personal follow-up, please provide your best contact number.

Please contact RAC 1 Facilitator, Sam Imperati, (503.244.1174 or SamImperati@ICMresolutions.com) if you have further comments, concerns, or suggestions. Thanks!