Circle the Appropriate Response: 1 2 3 4 5

Very Satisfied

Very Dissatisfied

1. Overall Meeting 1 2 3 4 5
   (1) (1) (1)

2. Presentations 1 2 3 4 5
   (1) (1) (1)

3. Materials 1 2 3 4 5
   (1) (1) (1)

4. Discussions 1 2 3 4 5
   (1) (2)

4. Facilitator 1 2 3 4 5
   (2) (1)

5. Pace Too Slow Just Right Too Fast
   1 2 3 4 5

6. What were the most useful parts of the meeting?
   • RAC 1 is moving at way too slow of a pace. I like that RAC2 is off to a quicker start.
   • Hearing a little from each participant, discussing the scope of the work
   • The group helped improve clarity around how this RAC intersects with others, and the timeline ahead.

7. What would you have changed about the meeting?
   • None for this one.
   • Seemed on track for a first meeting
   • The poll process/voting on the charter was somewhat confusing, and different from the other RAC. It seemed to be heading for appropriate correction, but the process was unclear.

8. Do you have any specific suggestions for improving the RAC meetings?
   • Nothing right now, you are doing a great job. I really appreciate you giving a “next up” warning on who will speak next.
   • Getting out materials further in advance, though hopefully that is more possible as we get up and running.

9. Do you have any additional comments that you would like the facilitation team to consider as they prepare for the next RAC meeting?
   • I recognize that this is a challenging facilitation job, and appreciate the cat-herding aspect of it. I think Annie did a great job overall, and am looking forward to working with her.
I think the group could use additional grounding about what the legislation requires and how the pieces work together. There seemed to be some lack of understanding about how the Fire Risk Maps interact with the landscape resilience projects.

10. Please provide your name and Organization

Bob Horton, Jackson County Fire Dist 3

Pam Hardy, Western Env. Law Center

Amelia Porterfield, The Nature Conservancy (responding as alternate for Kerry Metlen)