

# ***Event: Calithumpian Parade***

---

**Your score is: 81**

***Established Demonstration***

## **Part 1: Background Information**

### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Adams, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Planned event**

Event Name:

**Calithumpian Parade**

Event Date:

**Mon, 2011-10-31**

Event Address:

**207 N 7th St**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

**No**

State

**No**

Local

**4**

Non-governmental

**No**

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

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

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Parade with large crowd**

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

**Shared Channels**

**Cellular**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

**In most cases**

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

**In most cases**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

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

**In some cases**

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most were**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**All of the time**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**N/A**

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

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

**Some of the time**

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

**No**

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

**No**

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

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

**N/A (no such channels used)**

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

## **Responder Roles & Responsibilities**

<b><u>SEC 9.1</u></b> Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period?	<b>Yes</b>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<b><u>SEC 10.1</u></b> Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	<b>No</b>
<b><u>SEC 10.2</u></b> Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	<b>In no cases</b>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<b><u>SEC 11.1</u></b> Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>No</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.2</u></b> Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee?	<b>Most were</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.3</u></b> Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities?	<b>Fire Chief (I.C)</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.4</u></b> Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?	<b>N/A (none needed)</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.5</u></b> Were they ordered using documented procedures?	<b>N/A (none needed)</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.6</u></b> Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>Yes</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.7</u></b> Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary operational leadership? [Information only]	<b>Yes</b>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	

## **Quality & Continuity**

<b><u>SEC 12.1</u></b> Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership?	<b>No</b>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<b><u>SEC 13.1</u></b> Was a back-up resource available for communications amongst the primary operational leadership in case of failure of the primary mode?	<b>Yes</b>
<b><u>SEC 13.2</u></b> Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only]	<b>No</b>
<b><u>SEC 13.3</u></b> If so, was a back-up effectively provided?	

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

## Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

### Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

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

### Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

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

### Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

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

### Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

## NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

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

**Your Score:81**

**Established Demonstration**

# ***Event: Three Rivers Festival***

---

**Your score is: 62**

***Early Demonstration***

## **Part 1: Background Information**

### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Allen, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Planned event**

Event Name:

**Three Rivers Festival**

Event Date:

**Thu, 2011-07-14**

Event Address:

**200 S. Clinton**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

**No**

State

**No**

Local

**5**

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:

**City of Fort Wayne police and fire County of Allen police Consolidated Communications TRAA Ambulance service**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Annual Festival**

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

**Swap Radios**

**Shared Channels**

**Proprietary Shared System**

**Standards-Based Shared System**

**Cellular**

**Mobile Data**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

**In all needed cases**

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

**In some cases**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

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

**In most cases**

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

**All were**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Most of the time**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**N/A**

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

**No**

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

**No**

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

**Most of the time**

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

**Most of the time**

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

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

**SEC 9.1** Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period? **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 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? **No**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Quality & Continuity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

### Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

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

### Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

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

### Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

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

### Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

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

### **NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration**

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

**Your Score:62**

**Early Demonstration**

## ***Event: DeKalb County Fair***

---

**Your score is: 79**  
***Established Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County: **De Kalb, IN**

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

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **DeKalb County Fair**

Event Date: **Fri, 2010-09-24**

Event Address: **100 South Main Street,  
Auburn**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **No**

Local **15**

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:  
**auburn, garrett, butler, waterloo, ashley police depts, sheriff, EMS, Health dept, Street Dept, fire ( butler, waterloo, garrett, auburn, jackson twp, s outheast, courunna**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**6 day county fair with rides and events**

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

**Shared Channels**  
**Cellular**

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

Did the response involve multiple agencies and emergency response disciplines within one hour of the incident, planned event, or exercise? **No**

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

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

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*  
**plan had all channels deadiated to agencies**  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
**operatoring thru 3 dispatch centers**  
*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):*

**using nims forms and sharing radio channels, and having a plan to work off of,**

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

Yes

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

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

Yes

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

**Responder Roles & Responsibilities**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

**SEC 11.1** Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise? **No**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

## Quality & Continuity

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Yes

**SEC 13.2** Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only]

No

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

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

## Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

### **Advanced Demonstration (85-100)**

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

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

### **Established Demonstration (70-84)**

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

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

### **Early Demonstration (60-69)**

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

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

### **Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)**

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

## **NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration**

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

**Your Score:79**

**Established Demonstration**

## ***Event: Sandbagging***

---

**Your score is: 76**

***Established Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County: **Huntington, IN**

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

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

Event Name: **Sandbagging**

Event Date: **Sat, 2011-02-19**

Event Address:

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **No**

Local **6**

Non-governmental **2**

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

**Whitley, IN**

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Huntington County Fire Departments, Whitley County Fire Departments, Huntington County Emergency Management.**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Sandbagging operations due to flooding.**

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

**Shared Channels  
Standards-Based Shared System**

## **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):*  
**Everyone was able to talk on the same channel when they came in on the scene with little difficulty.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**None**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**None**

**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 most cases**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*  
**Everyone knew what they needed to do.**  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
**None**  
*Recommendations (Optional):*  
**None**

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

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

**No**

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

**No**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**N/A (no such channels used)**

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

**N/A (no such channels used)**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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?

Most were

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

Incident Command

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

Most were

**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?

No

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

leadership? [Information only]

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Quality & Continuity

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

Yes

**SEC 13.2** Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only]

No

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Levels of Demonstration

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

jurisdictions.

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

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

### **Advanced Demonstration (85-100)**

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

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

### **Established Demonstration (70-84)**

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

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

### **Early Demonstration (60-69)**

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

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

### **Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)**

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

## **NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration**

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

**Your Score:76**

**Established Demonstration**

# ***Event: Horse Progress Days***

---

**Your score is: 97**  
***Advanced Demonstration***

## **Part 1: Background Information**

### **Preparer Information**

County: **Lagrange, IN**

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

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **Horse Progress Days**

Event Date: **Fri, 2010-07-02**

Event Address: **601 E Lake St Topeka IN 46571**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **0**

State **1**

Local **16**

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:

**IPSC, LaGrange County EMA, LaGrange County Dispatch, LaGrange County Sheriff Department, LaGrange County EMS, Topeka F.D; Topeka P.D, LaGrange F.D; Shipshewana F.D; Shipshewana P.D; Ligonier F.D; Rome City F.D; Rome City P.D; Howe F.D; Johnson Twp. F.D; Mongo F.D; Wolcottville P.D;**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Large multi-state farm show with multiple hands on exhibits and demonstrations. Involved thousands of people in the Town of Topeka with a population of 1100.**

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

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

**Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance**

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

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

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

## Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

### Common Policies & Procedures

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

**Setting up a command post and using the NIMS ICS 205 for communications was very successful.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**Multiple agencies working with a common communication.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Yes**

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

**All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Yes**

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

**N/A**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**No**

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

**No**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## **Responder Roles & Responsibilities**

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

**Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

***Using NIMS forms made everything flow and was easier to plan for event with them.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Having never set up for a large scale event was the main challenge.***

*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? **LaGrange County 911 Director**

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Quality & Continuity

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

**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:97**

**Advanced Demonstration**

## ***Event: 2011 LEPC/EMA Exercise***

---

**Your score is: 49**

***Did Not Demonstrate***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Miami, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Exercise**

Event Name:

**2011 LEPC/EMA Exercise**

Event Date:

**Fri, 2011-05-20**

Event Address:

**N. Miami Schools, 398 East 900  
North**

Event Address Line 2:

**Denver, IN 46926**

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

Federal

**0**

State

**2**

Local

**9**

Non-governmental

**8**

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:

North Miami School Officials & Staff; Peru FD; Mexico FD; Denver FD; Dukes Memorial Hospital EMS; Miami Co. Sheriff's Department; Miami County EMA; Grissom Air Force Base EMA; Grissom FD

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Car traveling at high rate of speed and pursued by Sheriff's Dept. enters school campus and hits a tank of Anhydrous Ammonia being delivered to school's agriculture department. Estimated 40 gallons leak, various students and staff are overcome. School is evacuated to off-site location while patients are transported to Dukes Memorial Hospital in Peru, Indiana. Triage and decon performed by Dukes EMS, Peru Fire EMS, and Grissom ARB Fire Department.

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

- Swap Radios
- Shared Channels
- Standards-Based Shared System
- Cellular
- Mobile Data

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

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

In 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]

Some were

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

**All were**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Most of the time**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**N/A**

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

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

**Some of the time**

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

**Yes**

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

**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?

**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

**Most of the time**

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

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

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

**SEC 9.1** Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period? **No**

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

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

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

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

**SEC 11.1** Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise? **No**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Quality & Continuity

**SEC 12.1** Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership? **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? [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:49**

**Did Not Demonstrate**

## **Event: 05 Jun 11 Avilla House Fire**

---

**Your score is: 76**

***Established Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Noble, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Real-world incident**

Event Name:

**05 Jun 11 Avilla House  
Fire**

Event Date:

**Sat, 2011-06-11**

Event Address:

**6851 E 100 N**

Event Address Line 2:

**Avilla, IN 46710**

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

Federal

**0**

State

**1**

Local

**9**

Non-governmental

**1**

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

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

Avilla, Albion, Kendallville, Laotto, Garrett, Corunna, Orange Twp Fire Depts. - EMS, Sheriff's Dept, Red Cross

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Fully engulfed house fire, other fire departments called either to assist or cover other areas during the fire. EMS and sheriffs deputy stood by at scene. Red Cross later called to assist homeowner. State fire marshal was called to the scene. In the midst of this house fire, a second garage fire was called in and Kendallville and some units had to leave work that fire.

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

Shared Channels

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

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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 all needed cases

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

In all needed cases

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

All were

NIMS?

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? **Some of the time**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SEC 11.1** Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise? **No**

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

**SEC 11.3** Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities? **IC & Ops 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):*  
*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?

**All of the time**

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

## Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

### Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

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

### Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

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

### Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

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

### Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

## **NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration**

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

**Your Score:76**

**Established Demonstration**

## **Event: 9/11 Beam 3000 Bikes**

---

**Your score is: 68**

***Early Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Steuben, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Planned event**

Event Name:

**9/11 Beam 3000 Bikes**

Event Date:

**Sat, 2011-07-02**

Event Address:

**North Wayne Street Angola IN**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

**No**

State

**1**

Local

**8**

Non-governmental

**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:

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

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

- Swap Radios
- Shared Channels
- Cellular

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

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

No

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

No

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

Yes

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

In most cases

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

***Moved Beam through the county with out incident. Traveled 10 miles without incident.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Providing enough staff to make sure there was no incident.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***More communications among agencies to know what was going on. Jurisdictional boundaries and who runs the show***

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

Some of the time

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

In some cases

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

Some were

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

<p><b>SEC 3.1</b> Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS?</p>	<p><b>Most were</b></p>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p><b>SEC 4.1</b> Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)?</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p><b>SEC 4.2</b> Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?</p>	<p><b>Most of the time</b></p>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p><b>SEC 5.1</b> Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise?</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p><b>SEC 5.2</b> If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?</p>	<p><b>N/A</b></p>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p><b>SEC 6.1</b> Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?</p>	<p><b>Most of the time</b></p>
<p><b>SEC 6.2</b> Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational leadership due to a lack of common terminology?</p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>SEC 6.3</b> 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><b>No</b></p>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p><b>SEC 7.1</b> Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership?</p>	<p><b>Most of the time</b></p>
<p><b>SEC 7.2</b> Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?</p>	<p><b>Most of the time</b></p>
<p>Success Factors &amp; Challenges  <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i>  <i>Challenges (Optional):</i>  <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i></p>	
<p><b>SEC 8.1</b> Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels?</p>	<p><b>Most of the time</b></p>
<p><b>SEC 8.2</b> Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels?</p>	<p><b>Most of the time</b></p>
<p>Success Factors &amp; 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? **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? **Incident Commander**

**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? **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?

**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:68**

**Early Demonstration**

## ***Event: North Manchester Fun Fest***

---

**Your score is: 79**

***Established Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Wabash, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Planned event**

Event Name:

**North Manchester Fun Fest**

Event Date:

**Sat, 2011-08-13**

Event Address:

**902 W MAin St**

Event Address Line 2:

**North MAnchester, In 46962**

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

Federal

**0**

State

**2**

Local

**9**

Non-governmental

**2**

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

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

**Indiana State Police, Indiana Dept of Natural Resources, Wabash County Sheriff, Wabash County EMA/HLS, North Manchester Police, North Manchester Fire, Pleasant Twp Vol Fire, Chester Twp Vol Fire, Urbana Fire Dept, Roann Fire Dept, Noble Twp Vol Fire, North Central Indiana Amer Red Cross, LifeMed Ambulance Svc.**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**The Fun Fest is an annual festival the has a car show, entertainment, 5K Run, Large Parade and other outdoor activities. Crowd control, traffic control first aid and fire suppression.**

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

**Shared Channels**

**Cellular**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

**In most cases**

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

**In some cases**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

**Wabash County EMA/HLS maintains a communication plan. Wabash County EMA/HLS is the Incident Command Agency for the Parade and 5K Run.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**North Manchester by its location presents radio reception problems due to the distance from the 800 MHz towers in Wabash County. VHF High is used as back up and a mobile command post is activated for the Parade and 5 K Run.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

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

**In some cases**

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

**Most were**

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

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

**Most were**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Most of the time**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**N/A**

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

**No**

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

**No**

Success Factors & Challenges  
*Success Factors (Optional):*  
***Wabash County EMA/HLS has sponsored training for NIMS courses for the past 5 years with instructors on board from EMA/HLS. While the program has been a success, volunteer firefighters need to be reminded that common terminology is required.***  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

**Most of the time**

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

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

**Yes**

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

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

**No**

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

**In no cases**

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

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

**No**

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

**Most were**

**Wabash County EMA/HLS director is the only trained COML in Wabash County and 1 of 5 within Indiana Homeland Security District 3 at this time. More COML classes are being offered in 2012.**

**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?

**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:79**

### **Established Demonstration**

## ***Event: Southern Wells Haz Mat***

---

**Your score is: 60**

***Early Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Wells, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Planned  
event**

Event Name:

**Southern  
Wells Haz  
Mat**

Event Date:

**Fri, 2010-08-  
06**

Event Address:

**9120 South  
300 West**

Event Address Line 2:

**Poneto, IN**

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

Federal

**0**

State

**1**

Local

**6**

Non-governmental

**2**

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

**Allen, IN**

**Wells, IN**

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

**Chester Township FD, Nottingham FD, Liberty Township FD, Wells County EMS, Wells County EMA, Fort Wayne FD Haz Mat Team, Wells County Sheriff, IDHS, Bluffton REgional Hospital, Bluffton Wells County 91 Dispatch Center, Souther Wells High School.**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Planned event was a school bus v.s. truck pulling an anhydrous nurse tank collision. Event included simulated injuries, fatality and Haz Mat release.**

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

**Swap Radios  
Shared Channels  
Proprietary Shared System**

**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):*

***Too many units on the same talks groups.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***Assignment of talk groups to areas of the incident.***

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

**Most of the time**

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

**In most cases**

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

***The purpose of this exercise was to find gaps, and from this perspective, the exercise was very successful.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**Address the number of talk groups needed and plan accordingly.**

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Yes**

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

**Most of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**No**

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

**Yes**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Some of the time**

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

**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?

**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):*

<b><u>SEC 8.1</u></b> Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels?	<b>Most of the time</b>
<b><u>SEC 8.2</u></b> Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels?	<b>All of the time</b>

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

## **Responder Roles & Responsibilities**

<b><u>SEC 9.1</u></b> Did a single individual carry out the Operations Section Chief responsibilities in each operational period?	<b>No</b>
<b><u>SEC 10.1</u></b> Did the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	<b>Yes</b>
<b><u>SEC 10.2</u></b> Did first-level subordinates to the Operations Section Chief directly manage more than seven subordinates at any time?	<b>In some cases</b>

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

<b><u>SEC 11.1</u></b> Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>No</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.2</u></b> Were COML roles and responsibilities carried out, either by the Incident Commander (or Unified Command), the COML, or another designee?	<b>All were</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.3</u></b> Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities?	<b>Incident Commander</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.4</u></b> Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?	<b>Most were</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.5</u></b> Were they ordered using documented procedures?	<b>Most were</b>

<b><u>SEC 11.6</u></b> Was a communications plan established by procedure or developed early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>Yes</b>
<b><u>SEC 11.7</u></b> Did the communications plan meet the communications needs of the primary operational leadership? [Information only]	<b>Yes</b>

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

## **Quality & Continuity**

<b><u>SEC 12.1</u></b> Were more than one out of every 10 transmissions repeated due to failure of initial communications attempts amongst the primary operational leadership?	<b>No</b>
--	-----------

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:60**

**Early Demonstration**

## ***Event: Old Settlers Days***

---

**Your score is: 92**

***Advanced Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Whitley, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Planned event**

Event Name:

**Old Settlers Days**

Event Date:

**Tue, 2012-06-19**

Event Address:

**Van Buren Streets**

Event Address Line 2:

**Columbia City, Indiana**

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

Federal

**No**

State

**No**

Local

**12**

Non-governmental

**4**

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

**Noble, IN  
Huntington, IN  
Whitley, IN**

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

**Whitley County Fire Departments (9) Whitley County EMA/DHS and HazMat and CERTs Columbia City Fire, Police Department, Whitley County Sheriff Department Whitley County EMS, Parkview Whitley hospital Whitley County Red Cross and Salvation Army, United Way Huntington County Fire Departments, Huntington County Sheriff Department Noble County Fire Departments, Noble County Sheriff Department Whitley County and Columbia City Communications**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Week of Fair rides, parades, concerts, Vendors with food and crafts.**

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

**Shared Channels  
Standards-Based Shared System  
Cellular  
Mobile Data**

## **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 most cases**

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

**In most cases**

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

***Interoperability on the 800 MHz system with all three counties able to interface.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***More radios for all responders are needed.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***Purchase more individual radios and computers***

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

**Most of the time**

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

**In most cases**

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

***Communications between all three counties with MOUs for sharing of individual talk group sharing exist.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Training the responders on the radio equipment and making sure that all responders have access to a handheld or mobile radio.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***Purchase more radios for the responders.***

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

***IMT is used for this event.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Communications for all responders.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***Purchase more radios for the responders.***

**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):*

***Life safety of responders and residents is always our first objective and priority.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Making sure that all responders are trained on the use and reading of the IAP.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***Create training sessions for the responders and have operational briefings so all responders are aware of objectives and the procedures for life safety,***

**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):*

**All communications will be run through one dispatch center at the EOC.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**Getting the responders to know where to call and what talk group or frequency to use.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**training of all responders before the incident is vital.**

**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):*

**Plain language was used by all responders during this event.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**responders from other counties need to be advised of correct talk group.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**More radios for all responders.**

**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):*

**IMT used a IAP for this event and all cominations are layed out for all responders and leadership positions.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**Training in IAP and IMT procedures.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**Training of all responders prior to event.**

**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):*

**IMT used an IAP for the entire event period. All NIMS compliant responding agencies responded.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**Making sure all responding agencies had a copy of the IAP and attended the operational briefing.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**Training of all responders.**

## **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):*

***An IMT was used with an IAP for each operational period.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Training of all responders.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***Training for all responders.***

**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):*

***IMT was used with an IAP for all operational periods.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***TRaining of all responders with the IMT use and the IAP.***

*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? **Columbia City PD dispatch personnel.**

**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):*

***IMT was used along with an IAP for all operational periods.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***IMT and IAP being created prior and operational briefings was a benefit.***

*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):*  
**All communications worked effortlessly.**  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
**None**  
*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):*  
**All communications were used and not back up was required.**  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
**None**  
*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):*  
**All communications worked. No back up was needed.**  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
**None**  
*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**