

Event: Gas Main Rupture

Your score is: 83

Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Boone, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Real-world incident**

Event Name: **Gas Main Rupture**

Event Date: **Tue, 2011-10-04**

Event Address: **Elm Swamp Road/
Anderson Lane**

Event Address Line 2: **Lebanon IN 46052**

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

Federal **0**

State **1**

Local **7**

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:

Boone County EMA; Boone County Sheriff; Lebanon Police Department; Lebanon Fire Department; Boone county EMS; Witham Hospital; Center Township Fire Department; Vectran; Construction Company

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

A construction company hit and ruptured a gas main line. Homes were evacuated, a shelter was opened and Witham hospital activated exhaust fans due to odor.

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

Shared Channels

Proprietary Shared System

Cellular

Mobile Data

Other

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

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

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

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

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? **N/A (none exist)**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership? **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? **No**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

Quality & Continuity

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

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:83

Established Demonstration

Event: 2011 LEPC Haz Mat Exercise

Your score is: 92
Advanced Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Hamilton, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Exercise**

Event Name: **2011 LEPC Haz Mat Exercise**

Event Date: **Mon, 2011-09-26**

Event Address: **13400 Allisonville Rd, Fishers,
Indiana**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **3**

Local **7**

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:
IDHS, IDEM, State Board of Animal Health, Fishers Fire, Fishers Police, Hamilton County Sheriff, Hamilton County EMA, Westfield Fire, Noblesville Fire, Carmel Fire. Hamilton County RACES and Red Cross also on scene.

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Tornado touchdown causing damage to a Anhydrous Ammonia Tank. This caused a release of product into the air, thus causing an evacuation of 1500 people. Approximately 45 individuals transported to area hospitals.

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)? **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]

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?

Most of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Yes

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

SEC 11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities? **COML and the Incident Commander.**

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? **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:92

Advanced Demonstration

Event: School Bus Crash

Your score is: 45
Did Not Demonstrate

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Hancock, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Real-world incident**

Event Name: **School Bus Crash**

Event Date: **Tue, 2011-05-24**

Event Address: **6000 N. Rockingham Lane**

Event Address Line 2: **McCordsville, IN**

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

Federal **No**

State **1**

Local **10**

Non-governmental **No**

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

Hamilton, IN
Marion, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Ingalls Fire; Buck Creek Fire; Pendleton Fire; McCordsville Fire; Lawrence Fire; Hamilton Co. Fire; Sugar Creek Fire; Seals EMS; Hancock Co. Sheriff; Fortville PD; IEMS

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Two school buses crashed, one ran into the back of the other. 120 children on board. 24 ambulances were dispatched.

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)? **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? **N/A (none exist)**

SEC 1.2 Were they written? **N/A**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Cross County Communications - No Funding!

Recommendations (Optional):

Hancock County Upgrade to shared radio system.

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? **N/A (none exist)**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Developing Communication Policy across County lines
Recommendations (Optional):
Develop policies, purchase equipment, drill

SEC 3.1 Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS? **N/A (none exist)**

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):
Develop priority order and communication plan

SEC 5.1 Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise? **No**

SEC 5.2 If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise? **No**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

No funding!

Recommendations (Optional):

Develop Talk Path

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):

All agencies used plain language

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? **Some of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Same radio equipment county to county - no funding!

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 **None of the time**

channels?

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

No funding!

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):

Face to face communication

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Yes

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

In all cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Short staff

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Yes

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

All were

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

Fire Chief

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

N/A (none needed)

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

Quality & Continuity

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Marion County units all high band; Hancock County units all low band.
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? **None of the time**

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

- Jurisdictions demonstrated strong communications planning using established policies and procedures.
- Communications systems were effectively utilized and backup solutions were available if needed.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without communications impediments.

Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

- Jurisdictions demonstrated some communications planning using policies and procedures, whether documented or ad hoc.
- Communications systems were utilized with few difficulties and backup solutions were available if needed.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without significant communications impediments.

Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

A successful demonstration requires a "Yes" response to each primary evaluation criterion *and* a score greater than 59 on the

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

Your Score:45
Did Not Demonstrate

Event: I-70 PI Entrapment/Hazmat

Your score is: 90
Advanced Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Hendricks, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Real-world incident**

Event Name: **I-70 PI Entrapment/Hazmat**

Event Date: **Fri, 2010-11-12**

Event Address: **I-70 Eastbound 55 Mile Marker**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **0**

State **2**

Local **8**

Non-governmental **2**

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

Morgan, IN
Marion, IN

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

Indiana State Police, IDEM, Brownsburg Fire Territory, Brown Township Fire (Morgan), Hendricks Sheriff's Department, Morgan Sheriff's Department, Plainfield Fire, Liberty Township Fire (Hendricks), Danville Fire, Wayen Township Fire (Marion). Non-Governmental: Statflight, Duke's Earth Services, Inc.

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Serious accident involving a semi with entrapment leading to a Large Spill Hazmat Incident involving diesel fuel and products from the semi-trailer. Secondary accident with entrapment.

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

Shared Channels
Proprietary Shared System
Cellular
Mobile Data
Other

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

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

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

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

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?

N/A (none exist)

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):
Multi-County exercise.

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

Most were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
All Fire were on IPSC - Hendricks Fire OPS 1
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):
Fire al lhad common talkgroups to talk on.
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):
Multi county exercise.

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):
Getting away from 10 codes.
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)- **N/A (no such channels used)**

designated interoperability channels?

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Incident commander was the OSC.

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

No

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

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Yes

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

All were

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

Fire Chief

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] **Yes**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
MECA System / Talk around.
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

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

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

- Jurisdictions demonstrated strong communications planning using established policies and procedures.
- Communications systems were effectively utilized and backup solutions were available if needed.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without communications impediments.

Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

- Jurisdictions demonstrated some communications planning using policies and procedures, whether documented or ad hoc.
- Communications systems were utilized with few difficulties and backup solutions were available if needed.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without significant communications impediments.

Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

A successful demonstration requires a "Yes" response to each primary evaluation criterion *and* a score greater than 59 on the

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

Your Score:90
Advanced Demonstration

Event: Greenwood City Freedom Festival

Your score is: 90
Advanced Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Johnson, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Planned event

Event Name:

Greenwood City Freedom Festival

Event Date:

Sat, 2011-06-25

Event Address:

10 E Smith Valley Rd (Craig Park)

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

0

State

2

Local

5

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

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

State - ISP IPSC Local- Greenwood FD; Greenwood PD; Shf Johnson Co; White River FD; Rural Metro EMS

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

City wide parade in morning. Street Fair during the course of the day. In the evening live music, food vendors, fireworks. Average attendance was 35,000

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

**Swap Radios
Gateways
Shared Channels
Broadband
Cellular
Mobile Data
Other**

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

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

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?

All of the time

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

In most cases

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

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

All of the time

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

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?

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Quality & Continuity

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

The NECP establishes response-level emergency communications as the key performance indicator for communications interoperability.

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

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

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

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

- Jurisdictions demonstrated strong communications planning using established policies and procedures.
- Communications systems were effectively utilized and backup solutions were available if needed.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without communications impediments.

Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

- Jurisdictions demonstrated some communications planning using policies and procedures, whether documented or ad hoc.
- Communications systems were utilized with few difficulties and backup solutions were available if needed.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make timely decisions without significant communications impediments.

Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.
- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

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

showing "Established," "Advanced," or "Early" demonstration are considered to be successful demonstrations.

Your Score:90

Advanced Demonstration

Event: 2010 Indianapolis 500

Your score is: 63

Early Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Marion, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Planned event

Event Name:

2010 Indianapolis 500

Event Date:

Sun, 2010-05-30

Event Address:

**Indianapolis Motor Speedway,
Indianapolis IN**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

5

State

4

Local

12

Non-governmental

4

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

Pike, IN

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

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), National Weather Service, US Secret Service, Marion County Coroner’s Office, Marion County Division of Homeland Security, Indianapolis Fire Department, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department, Metropolitan Emergency Communications Agency (MECA), Indiana University Police Department, Marion County Emergency Management, Marion County Sheriff’s Department, Clarian Medical, Indianapolis Motor Speedway Safety Patrol, Rural Metro Ambulance Service, Wishard Health Services, Pike County Fire and EMS, Indiana Department of Transportation, Indiana National Guard, Indiana State Excise Police, Indiana State Police, Speedway Police Department, Speedway Fire Department

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

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

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?

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?

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?

No

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

No

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

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

Some of the time

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

No

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

No

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

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

None 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

All of the time

channels?

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

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

No

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

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

Yes

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

In 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?

Not designated

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:63

Early Demonstration

Event: CSX Train Derailment

Your score is: 71

Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Shelby, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

CSX Train Derailment

Event Date:

Mon, 2011-06-06

Event Address:

3732 W SR 52

Event Address Line 2:

Morristown, Indiana

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

Federal

0

State

2

Local

7

Non-governmental

4

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

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

Morristown Volunteer Fire Department, Fountaintown VFD, Shelby County Sheriff, Morristown Marshall, Shelby County Health Department, Shelby County EMA, IDEM, State Fire Marshall, CSX Summit Environmental, EOS Environmental (Divers), Buck Creek Fire Department

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

CSX Railroad trestle collapsed. Rail cars and ensires derailed. (6 tank car, 1 hopper car and 1 box car)

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

**Swap Radios
Shared Channels
Cellular
Mobile Data**

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

In most cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

System worked, no busies, mutual aid worked.

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 some cases

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

Most were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

All agencies trained to respond on assigned talkgroup.

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):
Mutual Aid talkgroups worked well.
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? **N/A (none needed)**

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):
IC established command and requested OPS channels.
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) **All of the time**

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

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

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
ICS worked well and was followed.
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):
Span of control was managed.
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):
Radio system best practice training.

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:71

Established Demonstration