Event: Daviess Co Flood March 12, 2011

Your score is: 81
Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:	**Daviess, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:	**Real-world incident**
Event Name:	**Daviess Co Flood March 12, 2011**
Event Date:	**Sat, 2011-03-12**
Event Address:	**White River Levee CR 650 N**
Event Address Line 2:	**CR 650n/450W**

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

Federal	**2**
State	**3**
Local	**15**
Non-governmental	**2**

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

Warrick, IN
Vanderburgh, IN
Posey, IN
Pike, IN
Martin, IN
Gibson, IN
Knox, IN
Daviess, IN
Crawford, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
USACE, ASCS, Indiana State Police, Indiana Dept of Natural Resourses, Counties EMAs of Crawford, Daviess, Knox, Gibson, Martin, Pike, Posey, Vanderburgh, Warrick, Daviess Co Red Cross, Southwest Medical Ambulance Service, Daviess County Highway Dept, Daviess Co Sheriff Dept, Daviess Co Amateur Radio Club, Sugar Creek Vol FD, Vinceness Twp VFD, Harrison Twp VFD,

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Levee broke flooding 8,000 acres and threating 49 homes.

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

Shared Channels
Standards-Based Shared System
Cellular
Mobile Data
Other

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):
Good commo with arriving units using 800 Mhz
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 some cases**

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

Most 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?

All of the time

SEC 8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide

All of the time

(NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels?

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?

All were

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

IC

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?　　**No**

SEC 11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary 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?　　**Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
800 Mhz radio could not reach a tower. We moved antenna radio reached tower.
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 (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:81
Established Demonstration

Event: Tornado Outbreak

Your score is: 86
Advanced Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:	**Dubois, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:	**Real-world incident**
Event Name:	**Tornado Outbreak**
Event Date:	**Tue, 2011-04-19**
Event Address:	**County-wide**
Event Address Line 2:	

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

Federal	**0**
State	**4**
Local	**25**
Non-governmental	**4**

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:
Local: 12 fire departments, 4 EMS stations, Dubois County Sheriff, Dubois County EMA, Dubois County communications Ferdinand PD, Jasper PD, Huntingburg PD, Holland Town Marshall, Birdseye Town Marshall State: Indiana State Police, Dept. of Natural Resources, Dept. of Transportation, IDHS Non-governmental: Jasper, Huntingburg & Ferdinand Utilities, Dubois Rural Electric

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
In a very short period of time, five tornados touched down in different areas of Dubois County. We did not have any communications problems.

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

Standards-Based Shared System
Cellular
Other

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? **In all needed 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 all needed 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?

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?   **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?   **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?   **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?

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?

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?

Most were

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

Incident Commander Communications Director

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

All 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:86
Advanced Demonstration

Event: Emge Fire

Your score is: 83
Established Demonstration

<u>Part 1: Background Information</u>

Preparer Information

County:	**Gibson, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:	**Real-world incident**
Event Name:	**Emge Fire**
Event Date:	**Mon, 2010-06-21**
Event Address:	**Emge Plant, Ft. Branch Indiana**
Event Address Line 2:	

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

Federal	**1**
State	**3**
Local	**18**
Non-governmental	**5**

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

Vanderburgh, IN
Warrick, IN
Spencer, IN
Knox, IN
Posey, IN
Crawford, IN
Daviess, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
US Environmental Protection Agency, ISDH, IDEM, ISDH, Evansville Fire Dept., Princeton Fire Territory, Gibson Co. EMA, Gibson Co. EMS., Haubstadt VFD, Ft. Branch VFD, Hazleton VFD, Owensville VFD, Toyora Fire Dept., Gibson ARC, Columbia VFD, Somerville VFD, Buckskin VFD, Oakland City VFD, Warrick Co. ARC, Warrick Co. EMA, Vanderburgh Co. EMA, Crawford Co. EMA, Spencer Co. EMA, Daviess Co. EMA, Knox Co. EMA, Posey Co EMA, Black Beauty Coal Co., Duke Energy, Indiana State Police, Gibson Co. Sheriff, Ft. Branch Town Marshall, Haubstadt Town Marshall, Owensville Town Marshall

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Fire erupted within debris of a demolished meat packing plant. Fire contained after long period of time to inside walls of brick and cork

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

Swap Radios
Gateways
Shared Channels
Standards-Based Shared System
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 some cases**

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

during the incident, planned event, or exercise?

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?　　**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?   **All were**

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

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?   **All 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,   **Yes**

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?   **Yes**

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:83

Established Demonstration

Event: NLE 2011

Your score is: 81
Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Knox, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Exercise**

Event Name: **NLE 2011**

Event Date: **Mon, 2011-05-16**

Event Address: **5700 N Camp Arthur Road, Bruceville, IN 47516**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal   **1**

State   **2**

Local   **6**

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:
FEMA, IDHS, ISP, Knox County EMA, Knox County Central Dispatch, Vincennes Township Fire, Vincennes City Fire, Knox County EMS, Knox County Health Department, Good Samaritan Hospital, American Red Cross, Old Post Amateur Radio Society

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Earthquake event involving the New Madrid and Wabash Valley Faults.

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

Gateways
Shared Channels
Standards-Based Shared System
Broadband
Cellular
Mobile Data
Other

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**

Yes

Does sufficient documentation exist to provide for independent validation and verification of the

adequacy of response-level emergency communications?

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 all needed 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?   **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)? **No**

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed? **N/A**

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?

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?

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? **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? **All were**

SEC 11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities? **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 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? **Most 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:81
Established Demonstration

Event: Hazardous Material Response

Your score is: 76
Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Perry, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

Hazardous Material Response

Event Date:

Mon, 2011-09-19

Event Address:

State Road 37

Event Address Line 2:

St. Croix

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

Federal

1

State

2

Local

20

Non-governmental

4

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:
USFS Federal Law Enforcement ISP- Hazardous Material Response Team Local Law Enforcement, Fire/Haz. Mat, EMS, EMA Haz. Mat Team (AES)

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Unknown chemical/gas, inside vehicle with deceased person.

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

Shared Channels
Standards-Based Shared System
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 some cases**

SEC 1.2 Were they written?   **N/A (none exist)**

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?   **Some 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 some cases**

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

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Due to location, no VHF communications. 800 service was in and out.
Recommendations (Optional):

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

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?   **Most 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:76
Established Demonstration

Event: Miller Search

Your score is: 72
Established Demonstration
Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Pike, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

Miller Search

Event Date:

Fri, 2011-06-24

Event Address:

Oatsville, Indiana (Pike county)

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

0

State

2

Local

12

Non-governmental

4

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

Gibson, IN
Vanderburgh, IN
Warrick, IN
Daviess, IN
Crawford, IN
Spencer, IN
Knox, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Indiana Helicopter, Center for Missing & Exploited Children; District 10 Taskforce; IMT Team (Logistics, Law Enforcement Element); local law enforcement; Dog Team; CERT; Area churches; PIO; EMA; Red Cross; Eight (8) local Fire Departments; EMS; Ohio Valley Search & Rescue; Volunteers

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Missing boy. Searched nine days in dangerous heat.

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

Swap Radios
Shared Channels
Standards-Based Shared System
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)?

No

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 some 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?   **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?   **Some of the time**

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

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? **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? **No**

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? **Planning and Operation Chiefs**

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

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures? **Some 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:72
Established Demonstration

Your score is: 81
Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Posey, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

Flood 2011

Event Date:

Sun, 2011-05-15

Event Address:

Posey County

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

No

State

4

Local

8

Non-governmental

3

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:

Indiana Dept of Transportation, Indiana National Guard, Dept of Natural Recources, Indiana Dept of Corrections, Posey County Highway, Posey County Sheriff, New Harmony Street Dept, New Harmony Town Marshall, New Harmony Fire Dept, Point Township FIre Dept, Black Township FIre & Rescue, Posey County EMA

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Major river flooding that required sandbaging operations and evauaction of some hownowners

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?

No

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?

No

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?   **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?   **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?   **Most 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?

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?

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?

No

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?

Incident Commander

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

N/A (none needed)

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?

N/A (none needed)

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?

No

[Information only]

<u>**SEC 13.3**</u> If so, was a back-up effectively provided?

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

<u>**SEC 14.1**</u> 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:81
Established Demonstration

Your score is: 63
Early Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Spencer, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Exercise

Event Name:

NLE 2011

Event Date:

Fri, 2011-06-17

Event Address:

Statewide

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

5

State

10

Local

30+

Non-governmental

15

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

Vanderburgh, IN

Dubois, IN
Pike, IN
Warrick, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
State IDHS, all 10 Ditrict counties, all local agencies

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Earthquake that took out all communications except sat phone and amateur radio (no repeaters). Allowed to use WebEOC only after day two. We could use direct communications provided they did not connect with a repeater. Mobile radios were used, utilizing battery back-up and generators to relay communications between fire stations and EOC. day two.

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

Shared Channels
Mobile Data
Other

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 some cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In some 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?

Some 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 some cases

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

Some 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?   **Some 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)?   **No**

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?   **N/A**

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?   **No**

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?   **No**

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

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

used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels?

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?   **No**

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?   **All were**

SEC 11.6 Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?   **No**

SEC 11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary 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]　　**Yes**

SEC 13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?　　**3**

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?　　**Some 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:63
Early Demonstration

Your score is: 87

Advanced Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Vanderburgh, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Planned event

Event Name:

NLE '11

Event Date:

Mon, 2011-05-16

Event Address:

708 Stanley Ave

Event Address Line 2:

Evansville, IN 47711

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

Federal

No

State

4

Local

7

Non-governmental

2

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

Posey, IN

Warrick, IN
Daviess, IN
Gibson, IN
Pike, IN
Dubois, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Indiana State DHS, Indiana State Health, IPSC, INDOT

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Earthquake Exercise, Functional

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

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

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 some cases**

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

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Redundancy
Challenges (Optional):
Loss of tech
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,   **In most cases**

accountability, deactivation, and problem resolution of deployable interagency communications resources, such as mobile communications centers, gateways, and radio caches?

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?   **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?   **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? **All 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? **Some 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]   **Yes**

SEC 13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?   **3**

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?   **Most 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

Your score is: 64

Early Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Warrick, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Exercise

Event Name:

NLE2011

Event Date:

Mon, 2011-05-16

Event Address:

107 W. Locust St., Room 308

Event Address Line 2:

Boonville, IN 47601

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

Federal

1

State

6

Local

10

Non-governmental

3

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

Crawford, IN

Daviess, IN
Dubois, IN
Gibson, IN
Knox, IN
Martin, IN
Perry, IN
Pike, IN
Posey, IN
Spencer, IN
Vanderburgh, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
FEMA ISHS, IPSC, ISDH, INDOt, National Guard, IDEM EMA, NPD, WCSD, BFD, RACES, Red Cross, Purdue Extension Agent, Deaconess Hospital, Commissioners

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
FEMA NAtional Level Exercise, based on a earthquake in D10. Several states involved.

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

Gateways
Shared Channels

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 some cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In some 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,

In most cases

such as mobile communications centers, gateways, and radio caches?

SEC 2.3 If so, were they followed? [Information Only]   **Some 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?   **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?   **No**

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?   **No**

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

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

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

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?   **Yes**

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? **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? **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? **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? **No**

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? **COML**

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered? **N/A (none needed)**

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures? **N/A (none needed)**

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]   **Yes**

SEC 13.3 If so, was a back-up effectively provided?   **3**

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?   **Most 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:64
Early Demonstration