

Event: 10-50 PI with Hazmat

Your score is: 48
Did Not Demonstrate

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Benton, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

10-50 PI with Hazmat

Event Date:

Fri, 2010-09-03

Event Address:

SR 352 and US 41

Event Address Line 2:

Boswell, IN Fairgrounds

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

Federal

0

State

0

Local

4

Non-governmental

1

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

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Benton Co EMA, Benton Co EMS, Fowler Fire, Boswell Fire, Oxford Fire, Earl park Fire, Benton Co Sheriff, Benton County Newspaper

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
5 vehicle accident, including a large truck and a truck pulling an anhydrous tank. The county had to dispatch both EMS units and 4 fire departments and Sheriff and Benton County EMA for hazmat. There was a total of 2 fatalities and 7 injured people. Those people were transported by EMS. Incident Command was used at scene.

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

**Cellular
Other**

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

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

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

the adequacy of response-level emergency communications?

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

N/A (none exist)

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

N/A

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?

N/A (none exist)

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

N/A (none exist)

and radio caches?

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

N/A (none exist)

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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?

No

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Most of the time

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

Most of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Some of the time

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

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):

Yes

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

any time?

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

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Yes

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

Some were

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

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

Most were

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?

None were

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

No

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

Quality & Continuity

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

No

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

No

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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:48
Did Not Demonstrate**

Your score is: 60
Early Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Carroll, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

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

Event Name: **Missing Man**

Event Date: **Sun, 2011-07-03**

Event Address: **Monticello, IN**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **2**

Local **8**

Non-governmental **No**

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

White, IN
Tippecanoe, IN
Hamilton, IN

List all Federal, State, local, or tribal agencies involved in the incident, planned event, or exercise:
Indiana State Police; IN Dept. of Natural Resources; Carroll County Sheriff; Carroll Co. EMS; Monticello Fire/EMS; White Co. Sheriff; Tippecanoe Co. EMA; Hamilton Co. Sheriff (K-9); Carroll Co. Coroner

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
9-1-1 received a call at 11:10 p.m. on July 3 regarding a missing man from a party. Location was a rural subdivision, Lakeside, with shoreline access. Search was conducted over two days on land and in water.

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

Swap Radios
Gateways
Shared Channels
Standards-Based Shared System
Cellular

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

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

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

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
IPSC backbone allowed interoperability
Challenges (Optional):

Terrain limited ability to use some communication

Recommendations (Optional):

Have a communication rep. on site

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):

Educate users on use of the system

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

Some were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Need to develop policies

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):
Use of the statewide system with mutual aid frequency
Challenges (Optional):
Out of district coming in, without mutual aid frequency
Recommendations (Optional):
Establish policy for using a common talkgroup

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? **Some of the time**

SEC 8.2 Were standard names as identified in the National Interoperability Field Operations Guide (NIFOG) used for Federal Communications Commission (FCC)-designated interoperability channels? **None of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

No

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

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

No

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

Most were

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

Incident Commander

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

Some were

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?

None were

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

Quality & Continuity

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

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

Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

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

Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

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

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

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

Your Score:60
Early Demonstration

Event: LEPC/EMA Countywide exercise

Your score is: 56
Did Not Demonstrate

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Cass, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Exercise**

Event Name: **LEPC/EMA Countywide exercise**

Event Date: **Mon, 2011-11-28**

Event Address: **US 24 & County Road 600 East**

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 **2**

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

Cass, IN

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

Indiana State Police

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Traffic accident involving charter bus and farm truck pulling chemical trailer. Multiple injuries, fatality, and a hazardous material leak.

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

Swap Radios

Shared Channels

Cellular

Mobile Data

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

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

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

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Some of the time

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

In some cases

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

Some were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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?

Yes

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

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

All of the time

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

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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 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? **E9-1-1 Coordinator**

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

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

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

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

operational leadership? [Information only]

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Quality & Continuity

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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:56

Did Not Demonstrate

Event: Hot Dog Festival

Your score is: 89
Advanced Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County: **Clinton, IN**

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event: **Planned event**

Event Name: **Hot Dog Festival**

Event Date: **Fri, 2011-07-29**

Event Address: **Downtown, Frankfort, IN**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **0**

State **1**

Local **4**

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:
Frankfort Police Department, Clinton County Sheriff's Office, Clinton County Emergency Management, Clinton County EMS, Frankfort Fire Department, Red Cross and Key event staff members

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
The Hot Dog Festival is a planned event every year with an estimated 10,000 visitors. We utilized one interoperability channel for all agencies involved. We coordinated all events on the operations channel including traffic control, medical responses and law responses. One dispatch console was designated to the event.

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

**Swap Radios
Shared Channels
Proprietary Shared System
Cellular**

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

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

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

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Most of the time

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

In all needed cases

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

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Most were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Unified command was established.

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Yes

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?

All of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Yes

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Most of the time

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

No

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

All of the time

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

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?

None of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

SEC 11.3 Who by position or function carried out the responsibilities? **On duty communications center supervisor.**

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 **Yes**

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:89

Advanced Demonstration

Event: Montgomery County Strawberry Festival

Your score is: 56

Did Not Demonstrate

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Montgomery, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Planned event

Event Name:

Montgomery County Strawberry Festival

Event Date:

Fri, 2011-06-10

Event Address:

200 S. Water St

Event Address Line 2:

Lane Place

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

Federal

No

State

No

Local

5

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:
Crawfordsville Police Dept Crawfordsville Fire Dept Montgomery County Emergency Management Montgomery County Sheriff's Office Darlington Fire Department

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:
American Red Cross STAR Ambulance Service (Private Service)

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?

Yes

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

No

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

No

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

In most cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In most cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

The City of Crawfordsville's Police, Fire, and Communications personnel were the primary agencies for this event which helped to steer the interoperable communications in a direction that streamlined the event.

Challenges (Optional):

Having agencies assisting from the private sector as well as Emergency Management who utilize their own forms of communications as well as their own way of communicating (codes/signals, lack of standardization).

Recommendations (Optional):

A recommendation for improving this event in the future would be to conduct training with all agencies within the county/area from public and private sectors to help bring all agencies more inline and better prepare these agencies to work with one-another in planned and emergency events.

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?

N/A (none exist)

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

N/A

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Having communications policies in place helped to streamline some of the communications amongst public safety agencies

Challenges (Optional):

Communications between private and public safety agencies.

Recommendations (Optional):

Develop policies and procedures that encompass private sector agencies.

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):

Life safety is always the utmost priority.

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?

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Train all private/public agencies to the same level and standards so the responders all understand each agencies "plain language". Even though each agency tried to use plain language, there are still hurdles with what each agency means by specific terms and statements.

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

Most of the time

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

Most of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Most of the time

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

N/A (no such channels used)

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

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Challenges (Optional):
Due to the small size of the incident, each agency's O.I.C. acted as I.C. for their section.

Recommendations (Optional):

In the future, the use of the NIMS command structure would significantly improve not only the incident, but also communications and emergency response within the planned event.

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?

SEC 11.4 Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered?

Some were

SEC 11.5 Were they ordered using documented procedures?

Some were

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

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):

Utilization of a COML is still a new concept in our area. Within our county, we only have 1 person trained as a COML. Emergency

responders within our county still feel that most of the COML responsibilities are things that "should" be carried out by the dispatch personnel.

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):

Our county still utilizes both 800Mhz as well as VHF making redundancy from both sides.

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:56

Did Not Demonstrate

Event: Purdue vs IU Football Game

Your score is: 70

Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Tippecanoe, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Planned event

Event Name:

Purdue vs IU Football Game

Event Date:

Sat, 2010-11-27

Event Address:

Ross Ade Stadium

Event Address Line 2:

Purdue University, West Lafayette IN 47906

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

Federal

1

State

1

Local

8

Non-governmental

3

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

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

FBI, ISP, Purdue PD, W. Lafayette PD, Lafayette PD, Tippecanoe CO SO, Purdue FD, Tippecanoe Emergency Ambulance Service, Tippecanoe Co. EMA, Dayton PD, Battle Ground PD, Tippecanoe Co EOD, Andy Frain, Purdue Athletics

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

To search the venue before the game, provide security for the fans, Teams and officials before, during and after the game, to provide traffic and crowd control before during and after the game. To provide Fire and EMS for the entire event.

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

- Swap Radios**
- Gateways**
- Shared Channels**
- Proprietary 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 most cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

We use the same basic plan for all home Purdue Football games. Over the years we have tweaked the plan and it works very well.

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,

In some cases

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 4.1 Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)? **No**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 7.1 Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership? **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):
All responders are briefed before the game and most have worked the details before.
Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

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

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

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

SEC 11.1 Was the ICS COML position specifically filled during the incident, planned event, or exercise? **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? **During the briefings the specific talkgroup assignment were made and they are largely the same for each game. Which was carried out by unified command**

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

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

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

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

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

Quality & Continuity

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

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):
Our local 800 system is very robust and we have excellent coverage, especially in and around campus.
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):
While we have a back up resource available, we have no written plan to switch in the event of a coms failure...
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:70

Established Demonstration

Event: mva/mci

Your score is: 71

Established Demonstration

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

Warren, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Real-world incident

Event Name:

mva/mci

Event Date:

Sat, 2008-07-12

Event Address:

**SR 136 one mile west of SR
63**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

No

State

2

Local

8

Non-governmental

1

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

Vermillion, IN

Fountain, IN

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

Warren County EMS, Warren County Rescue, West Lebanon Fire, Covington Fire, Fountain County EMS, Vermillion County EMS, Warren County Sherriff, Warren County Coroner, Indiana State Police, PHI Air Transport, Covington Police Dept.

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Vehicle Accident involving a minivan and a passenger car. Total of twelve patients, including six children, 4 teens, and two adults. One person entrapped, all transported alive from the scene with one fatality after ariving at hospital. Total of six persons were airlifted to trauma center, the rest tranported via ground ambulance.

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?

No

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

In some cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In most cases

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

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

Most of the time

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

In some cases

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

Some were

Success Factors & Challenges
Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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? **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?

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:71

Established Demonstration

Event: Hydro EAP Functional Exercise

Your score is: 59

Did Not Demonstrate

Part 1: Background Information

Preparer Information

County:

White, IN

Incident, Planned Event, or Exercise Information

Type of Event:

Exercise

Event Name:

Hydro EAP Functional Exercise

Event Date:

Thu, 2011-09-15

Event Address:

315 North Illinois St.

Event Address Line 2:

Monticello, IN 47960

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

Federal

0

State

0

Local

9

Non-governmental

2

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

Carroll, IN

Tippecanoe, IN

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

White County Sheriff, Monticello Police, EMA, Commissioner, Environmental Officer, LEPC, Monticello Fire, White Co Health Dept., White Co Communications

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Flooding from Tippecanoe River

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

Shared Channels

Broadband

Cellular

Mobile Data

Part 2: Incident Selection Guidance

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

Part 3: Secondary Evaluation Criteria

Common Policies & Procedures

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

In some cases

SEC 1.2 Were they written?

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

All of the time

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

In all needed cases

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

All were

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):
Recommendations (Optional):

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

All were

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

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

Yes

SEC 4.2 Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?

Most of the time

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

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

No

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

No

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

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

All of the time

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

All of the time

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

All of the time

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

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

All of the time

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

Some of the time

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

Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quality & Continuity

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

leadership in case of failure of the primary mode?

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

Yes

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

3

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

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

Most of the time

Success Factors & Challenges

Success Factors (Optional):

Challenges (Optional):

Recommendations (Optional):

Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

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

Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

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

Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

- Communications systems faced technical difficulties and little consideration was given to reliable backup methods.

- Operational leadership was able to manage resources and make decisions despite communications impediments.

Did Not Demonstrate (0-59)

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

NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration

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

Your Score:59

Did Not Demonstrate