

## ***Event: Thunder Over Louisville***

---

**Your score is: 69**  
***Early Demonstration***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County: **Clark, IN**

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **Thunder Over Louisville**

Event Date: **Sat, 2011-04-16**

Event Address: **Riverside area of  
Jeffersonville**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **3**

State **4**

Local **4**

Non-governmental **No**

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

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

**Fed-FBI, ATFE, Secret Service State-ISP,IPSC,IDHS, INDNR Local-Clark County Sheriff's Office, Jeffersonville City Police and Fire, Clarksville Police and Fire, Clark County EMS**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Begins the Kentucky Derby Festival. Vendors, Large Air Show and the second largest fireworks display in the country. Attended by nearly a million people with approx 250,000 + on the Indiana Shoreline**

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

**Proprietary 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 most cases**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

**SEC 8.2** Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels? **Some 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? **Most 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? **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:69**  
**Early Demonstration**

## ***Event: Lawrenceburg Fall Festival***

---

**Your score is: 87**  
***Advanced Demonstration***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County: Dearborn, IN

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event: Planned event

Event Name: Lawrenceburg Fall Festival

Event Date: Thu, 2011-09-22

Event Address: Lawrenceburg, Indiana

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal 0

State 1

Local 6

Non-governmental 0



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

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Dearborn County Sheriff, Lawrenceburg PD, Greendale PD, Hidden Valley, Lawrenceburg Fire Department and LEMS**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Annual festival with rides, food and entertainment**

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

**Swap Radios**  
**Shared Channels**  
**Proprietary Shared System**  
**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 all needed cases**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

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

**No**

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

**No**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**Most of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

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

**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 **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?

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**

## ***Event: Harvest Homecoming***

---

**Your score is: 46**  
***Did Not Demonstrate***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County: **Floyd, IN**

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **Harvest Homecoming**

Event Date: **Thu, 2011-10-20**

Event Address: **Downtown New Albany**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **5**

Local **6**

Non-governmental **2**

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:

**New Albany Police / Fire, Floyd County Sheriffs Dept. City of New Albany, State Fire Marshals Office, State Building inspector, ISP,**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Annual Fall Festival that takes place downtown New Albany. Booths, carnival rides and carnival type events.**

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

**Shared Channels**

**Cellular**

**Mobile Data**

## **Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance**

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

**Yes**

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

**No**

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 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? **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? **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? **Yes**

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?

**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?

**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? **Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

**SEC 11.3** Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities? **New Albany Police Dispatch**

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

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

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

**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? **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:46**

**Did Not Demonstrate**

## ***Event: Tornado Strikes Franklin County - Two Touchdowns***

---

**Your score is: 74**  
***Established Demonstration***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County: Franklin, IN

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event: Exercise

Event Name: Tornado Strikes Franklin County - Two Touchdowns

Event Date: Fri, 2010-11-19

Event Address: Brookville Firehouse

Event Address Line 2: 900 Mill Street, Brookville, IN 47012

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

Federal 0

State 2

Local 19

Non-governmental 2

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 Homeland Security, Indiana Dept. of Health, Franklin County EMA, Franklin County Sheriff, Franklin County Commissioners, Franklin County Highway, Franklin County Coroner, Franklin County Auditor, Franklin County Health Dept., Blooming Grove FD, Brookville VFD, Drewersburg VFD, Laurel VFD, Metamora VFD, Oldenburg VFD, Drewersburg EMS 1, Brookville EMS 2, Laurel EMS 3, Cedar Gove EMS 4, Rescue 24, Brookville PD, Franklin County Red Cross, Rush/Shelby REMC**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**An F4 tornado strikes the northwest corner of Franklin County destroying much of Laurel along with their firehouse. Continues southeast striking Brookville with severe damage. Damage in Brookville include the generator at the Security Center Housing Dispatch. Total loss of power. Severe damage to county infrastructure. Response by emergency responders tested. Mutual aid tested.**

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

#### 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, 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? **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? **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? **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? **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? **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? **N/A**

**SEC 11.4** Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered? **Some 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? **Yes**  
[Information only]

**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:74**

**Established Demonstration**

## ***Event: Special Event***

---

**Your score is: 77**  
***Established Demonstration***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County: **Harrison, IN**

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **Special Event**

Event Date: **Thu, 2011-09-08**

Event Address: **Lanesville Indiana**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **No**

Local **6**

Non-governmental **1**

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

**Harrison, IN**

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**EMA, Lanesville VFD, Lanesville PD, Sheriff Dept., EMA / E911, EMS**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Annual special event with about 80k people over the weekend**

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

**Swap Radios**  
**Gateways**  
**Shared Channels**  
**Broadband**  
**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 most 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 most cases**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

**SEC 6.1** Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise? **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? **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 (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels? **Some 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? **All were**

**SEC 11.3** Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities? **assigned by unit leader**

**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? **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:77**

**Established Demonstration**

## ***Event: LEPC Exercise***

---

**Your score is: 76**  
***Established Demonstration***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County: **Jefferson, IN**

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event: **Exercise**

Event Name: **LEPC Exercise**

Event Date: **Sat, 2011-10-08**

Event Address: **Hanover College**

Event Address Line 2: **484 Ball Drive, Hanover,  
Indiana**

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

Federal **No**

State **2**

Local **8**

Non-governmental **4**

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

**Jennings, IN**

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

**Hanover College Security Hanover Police Hanover Fire Department Madison Township HazMat Team Jefferson County Sheriff KDH EMS KDH Hospital Madison State Hospital Jefferson County Coroner Indiana State Police Red Cross Salvation Army Jefferson County ERT Jefferson County Health Department Air Methods Helicopter Jefferson County 911 Dispatch**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Kent water employee calls campus security about break-in at water treatment building. Call to campus security, smoke coming from Frat house. House dad who is hurt comes out of frat house tells officers unknown men had entered house and started fires on second floor landings, blocking escape. When security attempts to enter house smells odor like chlorine gas and has to leave. Security gets calls about gun fire at Science Center. Wounded Student at science center reports armed men enter science center grabbing hostages.**

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

**Shared Channels**

**Cellular**

**Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance**

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

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

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

**Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria**

**Common Policies & Procedures**

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

<b>SEC 9.1</b> Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period?	<b>Yes</b>
Success Factors & Challenges	
<i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b>SEC 10.1</b> Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	<b>No</b>
<b>SEC 10.2</b> Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	<b>In some cases</b>
Success Factors & Challenges	
<i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b>SEC 11.1</b> Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>No</b>
<b>SEC 11.2</b> Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee?	<b>Some were</b>
<b>SEC 11.3</b> Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities?	<b>Incident Command</b>
<b>SEC 11.4</b> Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?	<b>Most were</b>
<b>SEC 11.5</b> Were they ordered using documented procedures?	<b>Most were</b>
<b>SEC 11.6</b> Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>Yes</b>
<b>SEC 11.7</b> Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary operational leadership? [Information only]	<b>Yes</b>



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:76**

**Established Demonstration**

## ***Event: Ivan wind storm***

---

**Your score is: 91**  
***Advanced Demonstration***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County: Jennings, IN

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event: Real-world incident

Event Name: Ivan wind storm

Event Date: Sun, 2008-09-14

Event Address: City of North Vernon, Jennings Co.

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal No

State 2

Local 4

Non-governmental No

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

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Indiana Department of Homeland Security, IDEM**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Winds that were generated from Hurrigan Ivan did significant damage throughout the county in downed trees, power lines, power outages, structural damage**

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

**Shared Channels**  
**Cellular**

## **Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance**

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

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

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

## **Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria**

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

All of the time

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

In all needed cases

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

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

Yes

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

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

Yes

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

**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 **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:91**

**Advanced Demonstration**

## ***Event: ammonia farm trailer***

---

**Your score is: 65**

***Early Demonstration***

### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Ohio, IN**

#### **Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event:

**Exercise**

Event Name:

**ammonia farm trailer**

Event Date:

**Sun, 2011-09-18**

Event Address:

**woods ridge**

Event Address Line 2:

**Dillsboro, IN**

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

Federal

**No**

State

**No**

Local

**6**

Non-governmental

**0**

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

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

**Rising Sun Vol. Fire Dept., Ohio County Rescue, Ohio County EMA, Ohio County 911, Bear Branch Fire Dept., Ohio County Sheriff.**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**School bus into an ammonia trailer being pulled by a tractor. Bus hit a 3" valve and created a gas cloud. 10 students on bus overcome, fire dept. doing a scrub of area, deputies holding traffic.**

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

**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):*

***using both vhf for fire ground and 800 for IC made it where communications were a non issue back to dispatch***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***making sure to get people on the correct channels, and using plain english***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**N/A (none exist)**

**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?

**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?

**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?

**Yes**

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? **No**

**SEC 11.2** Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee? **None were**

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

**SEC 11.4** Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered? **N/A**

**SEC 11.5** Were they ordered using documented procedures? **N/A**

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

**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] **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:65**

**Early Demonstration**

**Event: HAZMAT spill at the intersetion of State Route 129 and State Route 350.**

---

**Your score is: 60**

***Early Demonstration***

**Part 1: Background Information**

**Preparer Information**

County:

**Ripley, IN**

**Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information**

Type of Event:

**Real-world incident**

Event Name:

**HAZMAT spill at the intersetion of State Route 129 and State Route 350.**

Event Date:

**Thu, 2011-10-20**

Event Address:

**State Route 129**

Event Address Line 2:

**State Route 350**

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

Federal

**No**

State

**3**

Local

**4**

Non-governmental

**1**

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: Delaware Vol. Fire Dept Osgood Police Dept Ripley County Sheriffs Ripley County EMA State: ISP DNR State Hwy Dept NGO: Davis Towing**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Tractor trailer truck lost control while heading north on State Route 129. The truck jackknifed at the intersection of 129 and State Route 350. The accident caused a tear in the drivers side gas tank resulting in the release of 50-75 gallons at a rate of 2 gallons a minute. The Ripley County 9-11 Center activated EMA by cell phone all other agencies were dispatched by radio. EMA contacted IDEM by cell phone and notified the state EOC by internet (WebEOC)**

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

**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):*

***It was routine***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Documenting procedures and transferring routine into SOP. I have only been the EMA Director since mid June.***

*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

**In most cases**

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

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

**N/A (none needed)**

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)?

**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?

**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?

**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?

**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):*  
***Basically once EMA is dispatched for an event the Fire Department asks for advise on containment and EMA notifies IDEM and the EOC. VFD and EMA remain on scene till the trucking company understands it repsonsibility and the clean up starts. They in turn leave and LEO remains if the vehicle is still blocking traffic. This is done routinely and unfortunately there is no written SOP as of yet.***  
*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?

**None were**

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

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

**N/A**

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

**N/A**

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

**N/A**

**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] **No**

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

Success Factors & Challenges  
*Success Factors (Optional):*  
*EMA deployed the ICV to the incident in the in the event that it became more complex. Once on scene it was not as severe as expected. The ICV would have managed all incident traffic in the event that it became more complex.*  
*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:60**

**Early Demonstration**