

ODF SB 762 RAC Meeting 2 Evaluation Summary

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

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

- Actually discussing possible WUI definition elements.
- Getting to know who the other participants are – Completing the charter, Humor is always nice to lighten the mood
- Hearing and learning about the SB 762 process.
- RAC discussion of what the scope of this rulemaking exercise includes
- Technical detail and goals of the agencies
- The facilitator’s willingness to set free on exercise that the RAC flagged as problematic
- The homework on coming up with our individual draft WUI definitions

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

- I think it could be more productive to spend more time on establishing a good definition of Wildland-Urban Interface and less time on items like Economic Impact Statements. I'm not sure impacts can be assessed before a product is established.
- I would like us to move a little more efficiently, so we make the most of our meeting time.
- Need more conversation about actual WUI definition, less conversation about individual RAC member concerns and downstream effects of WUI definition
- Skip the umbrella question and Mad Libs-like exercises. The RAC time would have been much better spent if ODF staff, and any other relevant agency staff, gave presentations on how the several WUI definitions have been used - by what levels of government, to what geographies and for what purposes, how they relate to other federal programs and funding etc... We have a short time to make recommendations and, to me, the best way to build consensus and understanding of where there are differences is to actually discuss these very practical issues about the task at hand - defining the WUI.
- The group was not well managed, there was too much discussion about items we have no control over (like the Oregon Administrative Procedures Act and its requirements) and too much focus on items that are not the direct task at hand.
- With only four meetings, I would have appreciated more time for substance. We were introduced to a variety of potential definitions, but I it would have been very helpful to hear some of the thoughts & concerns about why different people had such strong opinions about them.
- With such a short timeframe for this RAC, we've spent most of the first two meetings on 'team building' type exercises that detract from and unnecessarily complicate the topics before the committee. We could better spend our time focusing on the task before us in the next two discussions.
- Would prefer to hear from the agencies with respect to what they need to complete the tasks and what will be helpful. The meeting this week listened to RAC feedback first, then to agencies, would prefer a front end start with agencies for overview to perhaps reduce commentary and focus on the need.

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

- Be very clear with RAC members about the rulemaking scope, use of outcomes, and task at hand
- Clear agenda review early on. I felt that people were trying to build sideboards into the charter on topics that really belonged in the substantive part of the discussion. If it had been clear that opportunities for substantive input were forthcoming, we may not have gotten so bogged down.
- Have ODF staff give a presentation along the lines discussed above: how and by what entities and for what purposes are the several possible definitions of WUI used? What types of lands/geographies/structures do they cover? Is there

a more common definition used in the US? Does the federal government use any particular definition in its award of grants and other programs? Etc...

- I would like to encourage folks to think about protection of life, property and other important resources. Discussions about other points can follow.
- We need to work on the WUI- overall everyone in the group shares the same main goal, there are just 2 basic avenues of thought on how to achieve them- that is where the meat the of the discussion lies.

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

- Jon Jinings, who is our official RAC member, may have a different set of answers. As the DLCD alternate and staff representative who has attended both RAC meetings, I took on the task of filling out the electronic forms, using input from our team of staff experts.
- Try and guide the RAC towards the most productive conversation, which is, of course, what you are doing.
- Use of visuals of what interface looks like, intermix. Need to see visuals to better understand what a definition looks like.

10. Your Name and Organization?

- Amelia Porterfeild (The Nature Conservancy)
- Bob Horton (Jackson County Fire District 3)
- Jim McCauley (LOC)
- Jon Jinings (DLCD)
- Lauren Smith (AOC)
- Mary Anne Cooper (Oregon Farm Bureau)
- Mary Kyle McCurdy (1000 Friends of Oregon)
- Pam Hardy (Western Environmental Law Center)
- Sadie Carney (DLCD)