

ODF SB 762 RAC 1 Meeting 3 Evaluation Summary

Responses:	1	2	3	4	5
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Okay	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1. Overall Meeting	1	2 (2)	3 (5)	4 (1)	5 (2)
2. Presentations	1 (1)	2 (3)	3 (4)	4 (1)	5 (1)
3. Materials	1	2 (5)	3 (4)	4 (1)	5
4. Discussions	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (1)	5 (3)
5. Facilitator	1 (2)	2 (3)	3 (5)	4	5
6. Pace	<i>Too Slow</i>		<i>Just Right</i>		<i>Too Fast</i>
	1 (2)	2 (1)	3 (6)	4 (1)	5

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

- Actual discussion of the WUI definition and fiscal impact statement
- Discussion about the WUI Definition
- Discussion among members
- Group discussion with various perspectives
- Hearing everyone else's perspectives on the WUI definition
- Hearing from most RAC members
- Hearing the ODF proposal
- I thought things went pretty well
- The discussion for the most part. Our charge is to advise the ODF staff on a WUI definition that meets the direction given in SB 762. The RAC should hear from experts in the field on their professional perspectives (like the Fire Chiefs, ODF staff, etc...) and then discuss how what that means for the definitions and fiscal impact, given our own expertise and experiences - and the actual words IN SB 762.
- The WUI definitions from the survey responses

ODF SB 762 RAC 1 Meeting 3 Evaluation Summary

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

- A more robust discussion of both – this feels like a check the box exercise where the RAC.
- An activity of a definition of a simple term that we approve and then define. Just to practice/simulate with a less-intense topic.
- I would have went around the room to have everyone explain their final definition in order to better understand why they chose the words they did, allowing each to simply say ditto referring to someone who might have already explained their point. Without an option like this, the homework seemed pointless, especially because the definition proposed by ODF literally stalled all work by the senate due to the refusal of the senate to adopt the definition, in favor of something more focused. The whole exercise and RAC process for the first part to come up with the definition seems disingenuous now.
- In several instances the discussion diverted from the task at hand, and staff should bring us back to it.
- It felt like we were not actually working on the WUI definition. ODF decided what it would be and they wanted a rubber stamp from the RAC. I would have liked to see the RAC play a bigger role in the definition's development.
- Meeting was fine, but I struggle with not having the definitions of the words within the WUI definition. The definition of structures will be key.
- More activities that need us to make choices so we can move forward with recommendations
- ODF has already determined their staff report, the meetings are just for show.
- The polling tool is getting overused, and at the end was confusing, because for at least two questions all we saw on our screens were blank questions - there was no content. I know for at least one I was confused and now see I voted differently than I would have had the question actually been on the screen.
- The RAC still lacks perspectives from public health professionals & advocates and under-represented populations that live and work in areas that have in the past and are likely in the future to experience wildfire and wildfire smoke. Many of these populations are not landowners and do not have a voice here.
- These meetings should be held in-person
- Would have appreciated more professional context for the ODF suggestion
- Would have encouraged the facilitator to ask people who provide only very short statements to elaborate. Some people elaborate naturally, but others merely state a position. Why matters.
- Would have encouraged the facilitator to call on quiet people.

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

- As we move into other tasks, it will be critical to add other perspectives (public health, represented populations who live & work in wildfire impacted areas), and for staff to spend time orienting them to the RAC's purpose and work to date.
- Hold them in-person
- More focused use of polling tool, and no blank questions.

ODF SB 762 RAC 1 Meeting 3 Evaluation Summary

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

- It is hard for me to move forward without definitions because WUI is new to me and I'm not sure which words include places like farmworker housing, etc.
- Keep working to explain the process, why the Fiscal Impact Statement isn't something to get hung up on, and that there will be plenty of opportunity to work through how and where the WUI definition is implemented. It might also be productive to explain how any regulations that could be part of the overall SB 762 effort would occur.
- These meetings should be in-person

11. Your Name and Organization?

- Amanda Astor (AOL)
- Bob Horton (Jackson County Fire District 3)
- Jon Jinings (DLCD)
- Lauren Smith (AOC)
- Leti Moretti (HR County Planning Commission)
- Mary Anne Cooper (Oregon Farm Bureau)
- Mary Kyle McCurdy (1000 Friends of Oregon)
- Michele Bradley (Special Districts)
- Pam Hardy (Western Environmental Law Center)
- Roger Beyer (OSWA)