

Mid-Valley LEPC  
Hazards Material Tabletop  
September 8, 2010  
Evaluation Summary (1)  
Raw Data

Please assist us in improving future activities we provide for you by taking a few minutes and filling out this evaluation. Thank you for your input!

- A. Tabletop material: excellent\_\_**10**\_\_, good\_**9**\_\_, satisfactory\_**3**\_\_,  
unsatisfactory\_\_\_\_\_
- B. Classroom: excellent:\_**15**\_\_, good\_**7**\_\_, satisfactory\_\_\_\_, unsatisfactory\_\_\_\_\_
- C. Information and guidance about the Tabletop: excellent\_\_**16**\_\_, good\_**6**\_\_,  
satisfactory\_\_, Unsatisfactory\_\_\_\_\_
- D. What did you like the most about the Tabletop?
- Low Key
  - Interaction among participants
  - Interaction between agencies
  - Networking that takes place
  - Great opportunity to discuss with different organizations about their perspectives of an emergency
  - Well organized
  - Interaction forced involvement, not a lecture
  - Learning about what we need to work on “next steps” and sharing with other community members
  - Different looks at a scenario add how important it is to work with others
  - Information on shelter in place
  - Hearing from private industry and their perspectives
  - Variety of participants
  - Information sharing
  - Having other from industry to discuss the scenario with
  - Interaction with in group
  - Lessons learned
  - Great moderation
  - Facilitator
  - Info sharing
  - Hearing from Businesses
  - Hearing from all the different groups
  - It’s good to meet and discuss these situation with the actual players
  - Building relationships
  - Just talking with people and learning about things I was unaware of!
  - Get everyone at table good networking opportunity

E. What did you like the least about the Tabletop and why?

- No Coffee
- Coordination of objectives – didn't immediately see how topics all came together
- Would be nice to have a copy of the handout(or sent out on-line)
- I think you should integrate the different views
- Not having interaction from mixing groups
- Time was rushed
- Uncertainty about how and when industry would be notified
- Preliminary slide on ICS and HSEEP
- Time was too short
- Confusion in notification of incident, but this will always be reality for real life

F. Recommendations to improve future activities:

- Name Tags/Table signs
- Too separate – mix next time
- Mimic real world action
- Hand outs
- Would be nice to have more agencies/businesses involved
- Continue to add partner and move towards developing actual exercises
- Sign attendance sheet with phone and email and add to database
- I like the idea of putting responders at different tables
- Better info from the response group on what they would do specifically
- Have more action on issues that come up, I would like feedback on what was done
- Maybe longer sessions – go more in depth on what is going on and add new situations/issues as we progress

G. Tabletop: exceeded **8**, fulfilled **14**, failed \_\_\_ to meet my expectations.

H. Time: appropriate **19**, too much **1**, not enough **2**

I. Presentations: excellent **15**, good **7**, satisfactory \_\_\_\_, unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_

J. Other comments:

- Thank you for your time
- Thanks for your hard work
- Appreciate the professional presentation
- Thank you!
- Good job with keeping things moving