

Event: Flood 2008

Your score is: 63

Early Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Bartholomew, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

Flood 2008

Event Date:

Sun, 2008-06-08

Event Address:

Bartholomew County

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

2

State

4

Local

22

Non-governmental

10

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

Marion, IN

Shelby, IN
Jackson, IN
Monroe, IN
Johnson, IN
Jennings, IN

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

FEMA, US DEPT of Agriculture, Indiana State Police, Dept of Natural Resources, Indiana Department of Homeland Security, Excise, Columbus Police, Bartholomew County Sheriff's Department, Hope Police Department, Columbus Fire Department, 10 Volunteer Fire Departments-German Twp, Harrison Twp, Columbus Twp, Hope Fire, Elizabeth Twp, Jonesville Fire, Southwest Fire, Clay Township, Clifford Fire, Columbus Regional Hospital, STAT Ambulance, Other Supporting ambulances from the region. Additional police support from the above counties.

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

On June 7, 2008, Bartholomew County received heavy rains the week prior to the flooding event near the Edinburgh area. On the day prior Edinburgh received over 9 inches of rain, Hope Indiana received 5.5 inches and Columbus received approximately 2.5 inches on the already saturated ground. As the waters traveled from the Johnson/Shelby County areas into Bartholomew County flooding occurred throughout the city and county. Over 2900 homes and business were damaged and 900 individuals were evacuated to shelters. The initial flooding began to affect the county around 1100 am and by 6pm the Columbus Regional Hospital was forced to evacuate 157 patients to hospitals south of Columbus. Travel was restricted on I-65 and US 31 near Edinburgh due to the flood waters. The Bartholomew County Emergency Operations 911 Center received 4,546 telephone calls during the 24 hour period. Over 10,000 calls were received in a seven day period.

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

Shared Channels
Standards-Based Shared System
Cellular

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

In some cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Due to the number of buses initially the law enforcement local departments utilized 800 analog system.

Challenges (Optional):

Due to the extreme volume of telephone calls, Our local CAD program could not hold the number of calls for service coming in and the

dispatchers were forced to document information on paper. The center received 4,546 telephone calls in a 24 hour period and the dispatchers were unable to make calls outside due to all of the incoming lines were being used. Supporting agencies from outside the county were unfamiliar with Mutual Aid Channels and were trained on site on how to use their radio systems.

Recommendations (Optional):

After action report identified major areas of improvement: 1. Additional Channels were added to the Columbus Tower, Edinburgh Tower 2. Replaced CISCO CAD program with OSSSI CAD-more capable of holding up to 999 calls in the system. 3. Upgraded telephone phone system and added each dispatch console private lines to have the capability of call out at all times. 4. Added stream gauges in the county to monitor rivers and streams.

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

Some of the time

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

In some cases

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

Some were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Initial briefings were held with all levels of government and public safety agencies. Briefings were conducted every three hours for the first 24 hours then two times a day for a two week period. High level of cooperation among agencies. Politics and egos were left out and solid decision making was made at briefings.

Challenges (Optional):

Local EMA office was overwhelmed with request, called in support from other county EMA offices. Manpower was overwhelmed. Initially, the Operations Center had lost email capabilities of communications with outside the center. EMA officials were unable to provide written documentation request to the State EOC. Only communications available was telephone.

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):

Daily briefings enhanced the communications among all agencies. After the 1 hour briefings side bar meetings among the various departments local, state were able to work through issues.

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):

Along with public safety agencies local volunteers assisted in removing individuals from their homes.

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Yes

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Some of the time

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

Law Enforcement used basic 10 codes, Fire plain language

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? **None of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Unsure about Sec 8.2

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):

Briefings facilitated by E911 Director and EMA Director

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 most 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? **EMA Director**

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered? **Some 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):
Sometimes dispatchers were unable to receive confirmations from first responders due to the high volume of radio traffic.
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):
Heavy number of busies signals law enforcement used 800 analog system
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):
Again our daily briefings provided a clear direction of what the public and private sectors were responsible for.
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: For Bare Feet Sock Factory Fire

Your score is: 17
Did Not Demonstrate

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Brown, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

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

Event Name: **For Bare Feet Sock
Factory Fire**

Event Date: **Sat, 2011-09-10**

Event Address: **2082 SR 45**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **0**

State **0**

Local **5**

Non-governmental **0**

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

**Morgan, IN
Johnson, IN**

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

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Fire in Factory

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

**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? **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? **None 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] **None 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? **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):

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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? **Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges

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

SEC 13.1 Was a back-up resource available for communications amongst the primary operational leadership in case of failure of the primary mode? **No**

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? **0**

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:17

Did Not Demonstrate

Event: Red White Blue

Your score is: 70
Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Jackson, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **Red White Blue**

Event Date: **Fri, 2011-06-10**

Event Address: **200 N. Preston Crothersville IN**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **No**

Local **3**

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:
Jackson County EMA Crotherville Fire Crothersville PD

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Annual Event

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

Gateways
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? **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? **In some cases**

Success Factors & Challenges

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

SEC 2.1 Were established interagency communications policies and procedures followed **Most of the time**

throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?

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]

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?

Most were

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

No

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Yes

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership? **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? **Some 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? **None 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? **Most were**

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

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

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

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

SEC 11.7 Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary 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:70

Established Demonstration

Event: 2011 LEPC Full Scale Exercise

Your score is: 72

Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Monroe, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Exercise

Event Name:

2011 LEPC Full Scale Exercise

Event Date:

Sat, 2011-08-20

Event Address:

1965 S Henderson

Event Address Line 2:

Bloomington, IN 47404

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

Federal

No

State

No

Local

8

Non-governmental

2

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

Hendricks, IN

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

Bloomington PD, Bloomington Fire, Bloomington Township Fire Hazmat, Monroe County EMA, Monroe County Health Dept, IU Health EMTs, Monroe County Central Emergency Dispatch, Bloomington Township Hazmat Team

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Release of ammonia refrigerant in the city parks ice rink facility. Event involved leak, injuries to visitors and staff at the ice rink. Event required rescue, decontamination on site, leak mitigation, decon for walk ins at hospital.

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

**Shared Channels
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 some cases

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

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

Most of the time

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

In most cases

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

Some were

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

<p>SEC 3.1 Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS?</p>	<p>Most were</p>
<p>Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p>SEC 4.1 Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?</p>	<p>All of the time</p>
<p>Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p>SEC 5.1 Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p>SEC 6.1 Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?</p>	<p>All of the time</p>
<p>SEC 6.2 Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational leadership due to a lack of common terminology?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p>SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership?</p>	<p>All of the time</p>
<p>SEC 7.2 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?</p>	<p>All of the time</p>
<p>Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p>SEC 8.1 Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels?</p>	<p>All of the time</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>All of the time</p>
<p>Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i></p>	

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? **No**

[Information only]

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

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

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

All of the time

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

Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

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

Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

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

Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

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

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

The jurisdictions involved did not demonstrate response-level emergency communications during the incident, planned event, or exercise

observed due to communications impediments arising from a lack of planning, established policies and procedures, technical solutions, or a combination thereof.

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

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

Your Score:72

Established Demonstration

Event: School Bomb threat

Your score is: 44

Did Not Demonstrate

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Washington, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

School Bomb threat

Event Date:

Thu, 2010-04-01

Event Address:

: 1100 N Eastern School Rd, Pekin, IN
47165

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

0

State

2

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:

Washington County Sheriff Dept, Washington County EMA, Salem City Police Dept., Pekin Town Marshal, Salem Fire Dept., Pekin Vol. Fire Dept., Washington County Ambulance Service, IN State Police, Indiana Department of Homeland Security, East Washington School Corp., Salvation Army

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

On April 1, 2010, a local school corporation staff member contacted the Washington County Sheriff's Department to report finding a letter purporting that a bomb would explode on school grounds on the above date. Fortunately, the letter was determined to be a hoax, but the incident called for a tactical, multi-agency response.

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

Shared Channels

Standards-Based Shared System

Mobile Data

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

Yes

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

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):

Recommendations (Optional):

Future Plans and development of a standardized interagency comm plan.

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):
Recommendations (Optional):
Future plans and development of a standardized interagency communications plan.

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):
Future plans and development of standardized interagency comm plann

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):
TICP was completed and put into place afterwards

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):
It allowed clear and precise comm throughout the event and designated only one comm freq.
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

SEC 6.1 Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise? **None of the time**

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Assisted agencies that uses several codes and procedures
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):
unit identification must be named at beginning of event

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

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

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

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quality & Continuity

SEC 12.1 Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial **Yes**

communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership?

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:44

Did Not Demonstrate