Event: District 1 Hospital Exercise

Your score is: 84
Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Jasper, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **District 1 Hospital Exercise**

Event Date: **Sat, 2011-09-24**

Event Address: **1104 Grace Street**

Event Address Line 2:   **Rensselaer, IN 47978**

List total number of agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Federal   **0**

State   **1**

Local   **7**

Non-governmental   **1**

Which other counties, if any, had significant participation in the event?

Newton, IN
La Porte, IN
Porter, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Indiana State Police, Lake County, Porter County, Laporte County, Newton County

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
District 1 hospital full scale exercise. Used police departments on 800 and 155 radios. Set up with EOC - Comm with hospital and police. Requested nutual Aid from counties within district using cell phonoe, VHF and some 800. Health Department, EMA and Fire Departments, Police, amublance responded. Drill lasted 4 hours and all went well.

Indicate all communications technologies used in the incident, planned event, or exercise covered by this evaluation:

Shared Channels
Cellular

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

Did the response involve multiple agencies and emergency response disciplines within one hour of the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **Yes**

Was the incident, planned event, or exercise managed under a National Incident Management System (NIMS)-compliant Incident Command System (ICS)?   **Yes**

Does sufficient documentation exist to provide for independent validation and verification of the adequacy of response-level emergency communications?   **Yes**

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

SEC 1.1 Did policies and procedures exist for interagency communications between the involved jurisdictions, agencies, and disciplines?   **In most cases**

SEC 1.2 Were they written?   **In most cases**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 2.1 Were established interagency communications policies and procedures followed throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Most of the time

SEC 2.2 Did established policies and procedures exist between responding agencies for request, activation, accountability, deactivation, and problem resolution of deployable interagency communications resources, such as mobile communications centers, gateways, and radio caches?

In most cases

SEC 2.3 If so, were they followed? [Information Only]

Most were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 3.1 Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS?

Most were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 4.1 Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)?

Yes

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?

Most of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 5.1 Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

SEC 5.2 If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 6.1 Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise? **All of the time**

SEC 6.2 Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational leadership due to a lack of common terminology? **No**

SEC 6.3 Did any communications problems arise amongst other response-level emergency personnel during the incident, planned event, or exercise due to a lack of common terminology? **No**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership? **All of the time**

SEC 7.2 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise? **Most of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 8.1 Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels? **Most of the time**

SEC 8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels? **Most of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

SEC 9.1 Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period?

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 10.1 Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?

No

SEC 10.2 Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 11.1 Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

SEC 11.2 Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee?

Most were

SEC 11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities?

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

Most were

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?

Most were

SEC 11.6 Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

SEC 11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary

Yes

operational leadership? [Information only]

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Quality & Continuity

SEC 12.1 Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership?   **No**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 13.1 Was a back-up resource available for communications amongst the primary operational leadership in case of failure of the primary mode?   **Yes**

SEC 13.2 Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only]   **No**

SEC 13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 14.1 Overall, was the primary operational leadership able to communicate adequately to manage resources during the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

The NECP establishes response-level emergency communications as the key performance indicator for communications interoperability. Stakeholders involved in its development stressed that the key outcome of improved governance structures, common operational protocols, technology standards, and all other NECP objectives was improved emergency response. Consequently, a summary score based on these criteria can be considered to represent broadly the state of communications interoperability across the evaluated

jurisdictions.

Based on the range of scores possible in using the evaluation criteria presented here, the following levels of demonstration in providing and supporting response-level emergency communications are offered below.

While individual scores, themselves, provide more information, these levels of demonstration may be useful for representing a baseline, current status, or trend more generally to executive audiences or others less familiar with the complexities of communications interoperability. Four levels limit the degree of granularity possible, so recognize that the difference between, say, a score of 83 and 85 is marginal even if here it represents crossing the threshold between "Established" and "Advanced" demonstration. The quartile division between levels results largely from many criteria having four possible responses.

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies and effectively address a significant incident were it to occur. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated strong communications planning using established policies and procedures.

- Communications systems were effectively utilized and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without communications impediments.

Established Demonstration (70-84)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated some communications planning using policies and procedures, whether documented or ad hoc.

- Communications systems were utilized with few difficulties and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without significant communications impediments.

Early Demonstration (60-69)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications for incidents, planned events, or exercises but communications and coordination were largely ad hoc, with few documented plans or procedures. Other indicators may include:

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

The jurisdictions involved did not demonstrate response-level emergency communications during the incident, planned event, or exercise observed due to communications impediments arising from a lack of planning, established policies and procedures, technical solutions, or a combination thereof.

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

A successful demonstration requires a "Yes" response to each primary evaluation criterion *and* a score greater than 59 on the secondary evaluation criteria. Answers consistently indicating that criteria elements were met "Most of the time" during the evaluated incident, planned event, or exercise will result in a score over 59. This is considered the threshold for successful demonstration of response-level emergency communications for NECP Goal 2. In other words, incidents, planned events, or exercises evaluated as showing "Established," "Advanced," or "Early" demonstration are considered to be successful demonstrations.

Your Score:84
Established Demonstration

Event: 3rd Annual Great Lakes Boat Race

Your score is: 90
Advanced Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **La Porte, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **3rd Annual Great Lakes Boat Race**

Event Date: **Sun, 2011-08-07**

Event Address: **Washington Park, Michigan City IN**

Event Address Line 2:

List total number of agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Federal   **1**

State   **2**

Local   **9**

Non-governmental

Which other counties, if any, had significant participation in the event?

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Federal/ US Coast Guard State/ District 1 Coordination, Department of Natural Resources Local/ Michigan City Police Dept, Michigan City Fire Dept, LaPorte County Emergency Medical Services, LaPorte County Emergency Management, LaPorte County Hazmat, Michigan City Parks Dept, Michigan City Bridge Tender, LaPorte County Tourism, Michigan City Summer Festival Committee. Non-government/ Red Cross, Amateur Radio, Great Lakes Grand Prix Boat Race officials.

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Michigan City plans yearly for the Great Lakes Grand Prix Boat Race which located in Washington Park along Lake Michigan. It is a week long event which includes parade, Festival Booths, Time Trials, and the actual Super Boat Race. Incident Command is set up within the District 1 Mobile Command Center including all local emergency personel.

Indicate all communications technologies used in the incident, planned event, or exercise covered by this evaluation:

Swap Radios
Gateways
Shared Channels
Proprietary Shared System
Standards-Based Shared System
Broadband
Cellular
Mobile Data

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

Did the response involve multiple agencies and emergency response disciplines within one hour of the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **Yes**

Yes

Was the incident, planned event, or exercise managed under a National Incident

Management System (NIMS)-compliant Incident Command System (ICS)?

Does sufficient documentation exist to provide for independent validation and verification of the adequacy of response-level emergency communications?   **Yes**

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

SEC 1.1 Did policies and procedures exist for interagency communications between the involved jurisdictions, agencies, and disciplines?   **In all needed cases**

SEC 1.2 Were they written?   **In all needed cases**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Followed ICS form 201,202,203,204,205,205A,206,207,208,209,211,214
Challenges (Optional):

Needed more personel by where the boats launched.
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 2.1 Were established interagency communications policies and procedures followed throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **All of the time**

SEC 2.2 Did established policies and procedures exist between responding agencies for request, activation, accountability, deactivation, and problem resolution of deployable interagency communications resources, such as mobile communications centers, gateways, and radio caches?   **In all needed cases**

SEC 2.3 If so, were they followed? [Information Only]   **All were**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
All agencies were interoperable through incident command as well as shared channels.
Challenges (Optional):

Making sure communication has been established with all departments involved.
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 3.1 Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS?   **All were**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Using NIMS all agencies were able to understand and communicate with one another.
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 4.1 Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)?   **Yes**

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?   **All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 5.1 Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **Yes**

SEC 5.2 If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **N/A**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 6.1 Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **All of the time**

No

SEC 6.2 Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational

leadership due to a lack of common terminology?

SEC 6.3 Did any communications problems arise amongst other response-level emergency personnel during the incident, planned event, or exercise due to a lack of common terminology?

No

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership?

All of the time

SEC 7.2 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 8.1 Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels?

All of the time

SEC 8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels?

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

SEC 9.1 Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period?   **Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 10.1 Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?   **Yes**

SEC 10.2 Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?   **In all cases**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 11.1 Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **Yes**

SEC 11.2 Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee?   **All were**

SEC 11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities?   **Michigan City Chief of Police Swistek**

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?   **All were**

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?   **All were**

SEC 11.6 Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in   **Yes**

the incident, planned event, or exercise?

SEC 11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary operational leadership? [Information only]   **Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Quality & Continuity

SEC 12.1 Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership?   **No**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 13.1 Was a back-up resource available for communications amongst the primary operational leadership in case of failure of the primary mode?   **Yes**

SEC 13.2 Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only]   **No**

SEC 13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

All of the time

SEC 14.1 Overall, was the primary operational leadership able to communicate

adequately to manage resources during the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

The NECP establishes response-level emergency communications as the key performance indicator for communications interoperability. Stakeholders involved in its development stressed that the key outcome of improved governance structures, common operational protocols, technology standards, and all other NECP objectives was improved emergency response. Consequently, a summary score based on these criteria can be considered to represent broadly the state of communications interoperability across the evaluated jurisdictions.

Based on the range of scores possible in using the evaluation criteria presented here, the following levels of demonstration in providing and supporting response-level emergency communications are offered below.

While individual scores, themselves, provide more information, these levels of demonstration may be useful for representing a baseline, current status, or trend more generally to executive audiences or others less familiar with the complexities of communications interoperability. Four levels limit the degree of granularity possible, so recognize that the difference between, say, a score of 83 and 85 is marginal even if here it represents crossing the threshold between "Established" and "Advanced" demonstration. The quartile division between levels results largely from many criteria having four possible responses.

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies and effectively address a significant incident were it to occur. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated strong communications planning using established policies and procedures.

- Communications systems were effectively utilized and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without communications impediments.

Established Demonstration (70-84)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated some communications planning using policies and procedures, whether documented or ad hoc.

- Communications systems were utilized with few difficulties and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without significant communications impediments.

Early Demonstration (60-69)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications for incidents, planned events, or exercises but communications and coordination were largely ad hoc, with few documented plans or procedures. Other indicators may include:

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

The jurisdictions involved did not demonstrate response-level emergency communications during the incident, planned event, or exercise observed due to communications impediments arising from a lack of planning, established policies and procedures, technical solutions, or a combination thereof.

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

A successful demonstration requires a "Yes" response to each primary evaluation criterion *and* a score greater than 59 on the secondary evaluation criteria. Answers consistently indicating that criteria elements were met "Most of the time" during the evaluated incident, planned event, or exercise will result in a score over 59. This is considered the threshold for successful demonstration of response-level emergency communications for NECP Goal 2. In other words, incidents, planned events, or exercises evaluated as showing "Established," "Advanced," or "Early" demonstration are considered to be successful demonstrations.

Your Score:90
Advanced Demonstration

Your score is: 82
Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Newton, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

Blizzard

Event Date:

Tue, 2011-02-22

Event Address:

3218 W. 100 N. Morocco, IN Newton County

Event Address Line 2:

List total number of agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Federal

No

State

2

Local

8

Non-governmental

No

Which other counties, if any, had significant participation in the event?

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
State INDOT, IDHS, local Fire Department, law enforcement, EMS, Public Utilities (Highway and Street Dept)

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
record level Blizzard affecting several counties.

Indicate all communications technologies used in the incident, planned event, or exercise covered by this evaluation:

Gateways
Shared Channels
Cellular
Mobile Data

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

Did the response involve multiple agencies and emergency response disciplines within one hour of the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

Was the incident, planned event, or exercise managed under a National Incident Management System (NIMS)-compliant Incident Command System (ICS)?

Yes

Does sufficient documentation exist to provide for independent validation and verification of the adequacy of response-level emergency communications?

Yes

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

SEC 1.1 Did policies and procedures exist for interagency communications between the involved jurisdictions, agencies, and disciplines? **In most cases**

SEC 1.2 Were they written? **In most cases**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 2.1 Were established interagency communications policies and procedures followed throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise? **All of the time**

SEC 2.2 Did established policies and procedures exist between responding agencies for request, activation, accountability, deactivation, and problem resolution of deployable interagency communications resources, such as mobile communications centers, gateways, and radio caches? **In most cases**

SEC 2.3 If so, were they followed? [Information Only] **Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 3.1 Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS?

All were

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 4.1 Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)?

Yes

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 5.1 Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

SEC 5.2 If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 6.1 Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Most of the time

SEC 6.2 Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational leadership due to a lack of common terminology?

No

SEC 6.3 Did any communications problems arise amongst other response-level emergency personnel during the incident, planned event, or exercise due to a lack of common terminology?

No

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership?

All of the time

SEC 7.2 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 8.1 Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels?

All of the time

SEC 8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels?

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

SEC 9.1 Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period?

No

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 10.1 Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?

Yes

SEC 10.2 Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?

In all cases

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 11.1 Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

SEC 11.2 Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee?

All were

SEC 11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities?

IC was COML

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

All were

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?

All were

SEC 11.6 Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

SEC 11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary operational leadership? [Information only]

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Quality & Continuity

SEC 12.1 Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership?

No

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 13.1 Was a back-up resource available for communications amongst the primary operational

Yes

leadership in case of failure of the primary mode?

SEC 13.2 Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time?
[Information only]   **No**

SEC 13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 14.1 Overall, was the primary operational leadership able to communicate adequately to
manage resources during the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

The NECP establishes response-level emergency communications as the key performance indicator for communications interoperability. Stakeholders involved in its development stressed that the key outcome of improved governance structures, common operational protocols, technology standards, and all other NECP objectives was improved emergency response. Consequently, a summary score based on these criteria can be considered to represent broadly the state of communications interoperability across the evaluated jurisdictions.

Based on the range of scores possible in using the evaluation criteria presented here, the following levels of demonstration in providing and supporting response-level emergency communications are offered below.

While individual scores, themselves, provide more information, these levels of demonstration may be useful for representing a baseline, current status, or trend more generally to executive audiences or others less familiar with the complexities of communications interoperability. Four levels limit the degree of granularity possible, so recognize that the difference between, say, a score of 83 and 85 is marginal even if here it represents crossing the threshold between "Established" and "Advanced" demonstration. The quartile division between levels results largely from many criteria having four possible responses.

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies and effectively address a significant incident were it to occur. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated strong communications planning using established policies and procedures.

- Communications systems were effectively utilized and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without communications impediments.

Established Demonstration (70-84)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated some communications planning using policies and procedures, whether documented or ad hoc.

- Communications systems were utilized with few difficulties and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without significant communications impediments.

Early Demonstration (60-69)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications for incidents, planned events, or exercises but communications and coordination were largely ad hoc, with few documented plans or procedures. Other indicators may include:

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

The jurisdictions involved did not demonstrate response-level emergency communications during the incident, planned event, or exercise observed due to communications impediments arising from a lack of planning, established policies and procedures, technical solutions, or a combination thereof.

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

A successful demonstration requires a "Yes" response to each primary evaluation criterion *and* a score greater than 59 on the secondary evaluation criteria. Answers consistently indicating that criteria elements were met "Most of the time" during the evaluated incident, planned event, or exercise will result in a score over 59. This is considered the threshold for successful demonstration of response-level emergency communications for NECP Goal 2. In other words, incidents, planned events, or exercises evaluated as showing "Established," "Advanced," or "Early" demonstration are considered to be successful demonstrations.

Your Score:82
Established Demonstration

Event: Popcorn Fest

Your score is: 87
Advanced Demonstration
Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Porter, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Planned event

Event Name:

Popcorn Fest

Event Date:

Sat, 2011-09-10

Event Address:

Valparaiso

Event Address Line 2:

Downtown

List total number of agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Federal

0

State

0

Local

3

Non-governmental

0

Which other counties, if any, had significant participation in the event?

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Annual Valparaiso Popcorn Fest

Indicate all communications technologies used in the incident, planned event, or exercise covered by this evaluation:

Swap Radios
Shared Channels
Broadband

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

Did the response involve multiple agencies and emergency response disciplines within one hour of the incident, planned event, or exercise?

Yes

Was the incident, planned event, or exercise managed under a National Incident Management System (NIMS)-compliant Incident Command System (ICS)?

Yes

Does sufficient documentation exist to provide for independent validation and verification of the adequacy of response-level emergency communications?

Yes

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

SEC 1.1 Did policies and procedures exist for interagency communications between the involved jurisdictions, agencies, and disciplines?

In all needed cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

N/A (none exist)

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Executed communications without interference to existing emergency service communications.
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 2.1 Were established interagency communications policies and procedures followed throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?

All of the time

SEC 2.2 Did established policies and procedures exist between responding agencies for request, activation, accountability, deactivation, and problem resolution of deployable interagency communications resources, such as mobile communications centers, gateways, and radio caches?

In most cases

SEC 2.3 If so, were they followed? [Information Only]

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 3.1 Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS? — **All were**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 4.1 Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)? — **Yes**

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed? — **All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 5.1 Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise? — **Yes**

SEC 5.2 If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise? — **N/A**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 6.1 Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise? — **All of the time**

SEC 6.2 Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational leadership due to a lack of common terminology? — **No**

SEC 6.3 Did any communications problems arise amongst other response-level emergency personnel during the incident, planned event, or exercise due to a lack of common terminology? — **No**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership? — **All of the time**

SEC 7.2 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise? — **All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 8.1 Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels? — **All of the time**

SEC 8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels? — **N/A (no such channels used)**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

SEC 9.1 Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period? **Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 10.1 Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time? **No**

SEC 10.2 Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time? **In no cases**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 11.1 Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise? **Yes**

SEC 11.2 Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee? **Some were**

SEC 11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities?

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered? **All were**

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures? **None were**

SEC 11.6 Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise? **Yes**

SEC 11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary operational leadership? [Information only] **Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Quality & Continuity

SEC 12.1 Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership? **No**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 13.1 Was a back-up resource available for communications amongst the primary operational leadership in case of failure of the primary mode? **Yes**

SEC 13.2 Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only]   **No**

SEC 13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 14.1 Overall, was the primary operational leadership able to communicate adequately to manage resources during the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

The NECP establishes response-level emergency communications as the key performance indicator for communications interoperability. Stakeholders involved in its development stressed that the key outcome of improved governance structures, common operational protocols, technology standards, and all other NECP objectives was improved emergency response. Consequently, a summary score based on these criteria can be considered to represent broadly the state of communications interoperability across the evaluated jurisdictions.

Based on the range of scores possible in using the evaluation criteria presented here, the following levels of demonstration in providing and supporting response-level emergency communications are offered below.

While individual scores, themselves, provide more information, these levels of demonstration may be useful for representing a baseline, current status, or trend more generally to executive audiences or others less familiar with the complexities of communications interoperability. Four levels limit the degree of granularity possible, so recognize that the difference between, say, a score of 83 and 85 is marginal even if here it represents crossing the threshold between "Established" and "Advanced" demonstration. The quartile division between levels results largely from many criteria having four possible responses.

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies and effectively address a significant incident were it to occur. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated strong communications planning using established policies and procedures.

- Communications systems were effectively utilized and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without communications impediments.

Established Demonstration (70-84)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications during routine incidents, planned events, or exercises involving multiple jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies. Indicators may include:

- Jurisdictions demonstrated some communications planning using policies and procedures, whether documented or ad hoc.

- Communications systems were utilized with few difficulties and backup solutions were available if needed.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without significant communications impediments.

Early Demonstration (60-69)

Response indicative of county's capability to consistently provide response-level communications for incidents, planned events, or exercises but communications and coordination were largely ad hoc, with few documented plans or procedures. Other indicators may include:

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

The jurisdictions involved did not demonstrate response-level emergency communications during the incident, planned event, or exercise observed due to communications impediments arising from a lack of planning, established policies and procedures, technical solutions, or a combination thereof.

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

A successful demonstration requires a "Yes" response to each primary evaluation criterion *and* a score greater than 59 on the secondary evaluation criteria. Answers consistently indicating that criteria elements were met "Most of the time" during the evaluated incident, planned event, or exercise will result in a score over 59. This is considered the threshold for successful demonstration of response-level emergency communications for NECP Goal 2. In other words, incidents, planned events, or exercises evaluated as showing "Established," "Advanced," or "Early" demonstration are considered to be successful demonstrations.

Your Score:87
Advanced Demonstration