



McKenzie Rebuilds Kick-off Meeting Meeting Summary

Oct 28, 2021 9:00 a.m.- 12:00p.m.

(held via Zoom)

Participating Team Members: Val Rapp, Joe Moll, Cliff Richardson, Melanie Stanley, Devin Thomsson, Patrick Wingard, Merrick Firestone, Lane Tompkins, Mary Camarata, Matt McRae, Kathi Jaworski, Karl Morgenstern, Jared Pruch, Sarah Means, Jae Pudewell, Alice Bonasio, Darren Cross, Christiana Rainbow

Guests: Lisa Mattes, Stephanie Jennings, Lynn Burditt, Priti Shah (FEMA CPCB), John Carlile (Upper McKenzie Community Center)

Co-Conveners: Lane County Commissioner Heather Buch, Mandy Jones

Oregon Solutions Staff Team: Karmen Fore, Margaret Van Vliet, Kristen Wright, Wendy Willis, Mika Sakai

Welcome/Opening Comments

Comm. Heather Buch opened the meeting by thanking the team members for their continued participation. She acknowledged that the work is hard and sometimes overwhelming, but is hopeful that we will have a fruitful discussion as the team keeps working on our narrowing scope. Mandy Jones also thanked the team, noting that today we'll talk more about inclusion and representation, picking up on discussions from the first meeting. She mentioned that the conveners and project managers understood that the 3-hour meetings were challenging for some, and pointed out that future meetings will be 90-minutes in length, which will mean we may need more frequent meeting.

Kristen Wright (Oregon Solutions) then introduced new project member, Devin Thompson, who leads the long-term recovery group (LTRG). She described today's agenda and went over logistics, including for team members and guests.

Mapping Exercise

Wright shared a visual representation of how Oregon Solutions operates, and the general sequence of activities which start with project scoping and lead to a Declaration of Cooperation. She underscored the idea that team members bring a variety of assets, lived experience, and authorities to the table, and that our charge is to decide on which projects, among the many possibilities, would not get done, or done as well or as quickly, without the collective effort of this group. The visual drew the connection of the five thematic areas discussed at the prior meeting (housing, infrastructure, communications, watershed protection and the economy) to each other, and to the achievement of future vibrant communities.



Wright then led the team through a discussion on the topic of housing, asking members to reflect on what’s already happening, and what is needed, and to consider what areas and communities along the river these activities and needs are happening. The project managers captured comments, questions, and other insights within the visual as a virtual “sticky note” exercise, the results of which are contained here in the list below, and in the image on Attachment A. Yellow notes conveyed what’s being done, orange conveyed what’s needed, and green captured things the group wants to know about.

After a robust discussion, Wright paused and asked team members to step back and consider what concepts got the most energy, and where needs are concentrated. Members noted how land use, zoning, and wastewater management are inter-dependent and, in some ways, have to be dealt with before housing. They discussed how housing is needed quickly, and that communities and families can’t wait for several years until all these pieces are in place. They also underscored the need for lots of different kinds of housing, and some pointed out that not all of it can or should be regulated affordable.

The following table is a recap of the issues surfaced through the exercise:

Project/Issue	What’s being done	What is needed	What do we need to know
Housing (generally)	*Statewide \$15million	*Early visioning and creativity might be lost; no time. *Accountability *Role clarity, stop duplicating, decide who is on point	*Is infrastructure in critical path to housing? [What comes first? (septic, zoning, other infrastructure, financing, builders)] *What’s needed at macro-level? Do tools of planning help us think more broadly? *Are we clear about root causes? * What’s in the way? *What do we mean by “vibrant” (community?)
Zoning & Land Use	*Transportation Growth Management – Blue River process will inform the rest of the corridor. Have TGM grant and process * \$15 million in statewide funding	*Urgency *[Addressing] State restrictions * Consider nexus between zoning & affordability *Small lot development; ADUs – Not generally possible in rural residential zone – need solution. *[Community] Education *[Addressing] Zoning issues (Flooding and zoning type) *Flexibility to address local	*[Need to understand] Lane County Comp Plan



		priorities.	
Permitting	*DLCD Emergency rules – for temporary housing	*Infrastructure [More septic upgrades]	
Building	<p>*Master contract for modular buildings. *LTRG Needs Assessment. * Baseline data about homes destroyed, new permits</p> <p>*DEQ \$1.5 million for septic upgrades in recovery zone</p>	<p>*Creativity and new building tech for all *Housing for area workers *Rental housing *Funding *Contractors. For contractor shortage, could we have master contracts?</p> <p>*Septic upgrades [wastewater management]: *Coordination on septic contractors *Pure Water Partners and EWEB helping with revegetation that paves the way, including financing</p> <p>*Affordable housing: - Planned approach smart about locations. - Plan for affordable housing – consider mix of low/middle income. - Small footprint homes consistent with overall preferences. - Culturally appropriate language / discussion about housing - Move at the time frame of the community – action/outcomes are needed.</p>	<p>Affordable housing: -What do we mean by affordable housing? -What do the community members want or need? -What is wanted/needed for housing, services, etc.? -What are the housing options in burn zones/non-burn zones? -Need to understand the tension between what people like/prefer and strategies that might enable affordability, etc.</p>
Financing	State has new money	*Access, affordability for all	
Wastewater management	<p>*Blue River Water/wastewater district on a path *Legislative funding for</p>		<p>*Water/sanitation district/septic – what do we know is needed? *What can be done short-</p>



	water district *Possible EPA grant for waste-water solutions		term? Long term?
Lazy Days	*HFG has purchase option; rebuild possible; received \$1M special appropriation *Geotech study completed. Says hillside mostly stable. *Due diligence		
Seneca Property	Holding organization identified		
5-Acre Parcel Near School	*Under contract		

Making Our Process More Inclusive

Margaret Van Vliet (Oregon Solutions) noted that at the first meeting the group had substantive discussions about making sure the OS process is inclusive and accessible to the whole community. She introduced Wendy Willis, Executive Director from Oregon’s Kitchen Table (OKT), and asked her to share about OKT’s approach to public engagement and ways it might be a helpful resource for this process. Willis described the different types of representativeness, levels of engagement, and potential elements of community engagement (See Attachment B).

Van Vliet then asked participants to consider what inclusion, belonging and connectedness bring to mind and invited them to offer images or thoughts in the chat. The following phrases were shared by project team members:

In-person, Native American land, trust, information and access, welcome, accepted, we meet the people where they are at, local priorities, listening, acceptance, we all live downstream, stewards for future generations, understanding the needs, acknowledging limiters and addressing them directly, equality between community building and not only building for tourism, in person safely, beer, the river connects us, balancing now and future, teamwork and shared resources, right fit based on geology, geography, affordability, and communities desires, coffee and snacks, gratitude for all the support that has come and will come in the future.

Van Vliet continued, noting that there are two levels at which we should consider these themes of inclusivity and representativeness: within the project team itself, and engagement with the broader community that was impacted by the fires. Because of the specific roles project team members are expected to play in order for the process to be successful, she asked members to consider whether there were any obvious gaps within the team itself. For engagement of the broader community, Van Vliet highlighted it is about more than just “transparency,” although that is an important component.



The group discussed ideas and offered suggestions which were captured in the list below and in the image in Attachment A. A key theme that emerged was the need to connect with indigenous communities, as tribal members and cultural heritage issues have not yet been engaged. It was noted that there are government-to-government protocols that need to be respected, but that also sometimes it's also helpful to approach people in a more neighborly fashion.

Ideas for Building Inclusion, Belonging, Connectedness Within the Project Team

- Tribal representation
- Make space for project team members to get to know each other
- Can OS provide updates, press releases?

Ideas for Building Inclusion, Belonging, Connectedness With the Broader Community

- McKenzie River Reflection
- Do an analysis: where do people get their information
- Bring folks into the valley for visits/meetings
- How can we draw back attention from County folks not in M Valley?
- Produce videos – share on social media
- EWEB and Lane Electric have communication channels
- Ensure we're connecting with those displaced
- 1:1 meeting
- Connect via work projects (helping neighbors with projects like firewood, gutters)
- How to connect with people at various income levels and capacities?
- LTRG Assessment
- Locals Helping Local
- Engage with property owners outside of burn area that can help who offered living spaces for RV's
- How to connect with new owners in the valley
- Provide resources to build capacity
- Draw on community leadership for governance
- Siletz tribe has connection to Camp Creek land
- How can we include aspects related to the land and Native American community ownership of that land?
- Fund a tribal liaison to work with multiple tribes
- Pay for tribal expertise in cultural resources, etc/
- How did indigenous people live in/use resources in this valley? How can these inform how we proceed?
- Understand which tribes have historical and other connections to this place



Public Comments and Next Steps

There was no public comment.

Wrap Up

The co-conveners thanked the project team members for their participation and efforts, and noted the next meeting will take place November 18, from 1:00 – 2:30.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.