

***Event: Ice event 2011***

---

**Your score is: 58**  
***Did Not Demonstrate***

**Part 1: Background Information**

**Preparer Information**

County: **Clay, IN**

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

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

Event Name: **Ice event 2011**

Event Date: **Wed, 2011-02-02**

Event Address: **Brazil, Indiana**

Event Address Line 2: **Clay County**

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:  
**N/A**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Large Ice Storm that shut down the county**

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

**Shared Channels**  
**Broadband**  
**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):*

***Working with Multiple agencies, moving to shared channels, using internet to send information to agency headquarters***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***Getting agencies to move to shared groups and limiting communications, making sure all responders understand the communications systems***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**More training and exercises for the volunteer fire agencies, making sure any responder can step into a communications role for their agency**

**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):*

*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):*

**Plain language was followed and helped with all communications**

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**More Training**

**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):*

**Communications was limited by needs**

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**More training**

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

**Slow to activate**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**getting everyone to follow along**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**more training**

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

**Not all responders have the information needed from their agencies**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

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

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

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

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

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

planned event, or exercise?

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

## Quality & Continuity

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

No

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Yes

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

No

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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:58**

**Did Not Demonstrate**

## ***Event: Blacktop Spill***

---

**Your score is: 50**  
***Did Not Demonstrate***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County: **Greene, IN**

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

Type of Event: **Exercise**

Event Name: **Blacktop Spill**

Event Date: **Wed, 2011-09-21**

Event Address: **IN St Rd 54 East,  
Bloomfield, IN**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal **No**

State **2**

Local **5**

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:

**IDHS HAZMAT Greene Co Sheriff Dept Greene Co EMA INDOT Richland Volunteer Fire Dept Environmental Management**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Semi-Truck ran off the highway at the bottom of Blue Barn Hill and turned over spilling fresh asphalt in ditch alongside the highway.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*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 most cases**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

## Quality & Continuity

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

**SEC 13.3** If so, was a back-up effectively provided? **0**

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

Success Factors & Challenges

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

## Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **NECP Goals: Successful Demonstration**

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

**Your Score:50**

**Did Not Demonstrate**

## ***Event: NLE 2011\_Parke exercise***

---

**Your score is: 91**

***Advanced Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Parke, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Exercise**

Event Name:

**NLE 2011\_Parke exercise**

Event Date:

**Tue, 2011-05-17**

Event Address:

**110 E High Street**

Event Address Line 2:

**Rockville, IN 47872**

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

Federal

**No**

State

**2**

Local

**9**

Non-governmental

**3**

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

Putnam, IN  
Clay, IN  
Vigo, IN  
Vermillion, IN

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

Parke EMA, EMS, Sheriff, Highway, Commissioners, Auditor, FIRE, Chamber of Commerce, Rockville PD, ARES, American Red Cross, State EOC, D7 Taskforce AHIMT

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

Earthquake on the New Madrid Seismic Zone near Marked Tree, Arkansas. Power and Communications on Day 1 are out statewide. Parke County's participation is day 2 with all Parke County power and communications restored but partner counties to the south still out.

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

Shared Channels  
Standards-Based Shared System  
Broadband  
Cellular  
Mobile Data  
Other

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

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

In most cases

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

In some cases

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*1. All local ESF's were available and reached within 20 minutes lists were up to date, and multiple communications means were listed for each ESF lead. 2. RACES/ARES operator could effectively receive and transmit calls via VHF HF. Contact was established with neighbor counties and State EOC via the district 7 NET. HAM operator very proficient.*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*1. Could not find manuals for HAM radio equipment. A less experienced operator would probably not have been able to operate equipment. 2. All call lists and checklists were on one persons computer in EOC. 3. Simplex antenna inoperable. 4. Ham operator came out of another county when called. 5. Checklists for activation need better defined.*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**1. Get user manuals for equipment. 2. Prepare Activation book with call lists, check lists, SOP's ect. for each office in the EOC. 3. Repair simplex antenna. 4. Recruit more RACES/ARES team members. 5. Re-write activation checklist and SOP's to address some needed specifics.**

**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]

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

**We have exercised annually since 1995.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**Some of our SOP and Policies are not on paper.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**Establish SOPs and Policies in writing and distribute as necessary.**

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

**Many of our responders have had NIMS.**

*Challenges (Optional):*

**Sheriff and many of our Elected Officials have not had NIMS.**

*Recommendations (Optional):*

**More folks to take NIMS.**

**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):*

**Interagency talk paths are set up for Standard Operating Procedures.**

*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):*

***We have been using common terminology for over a year now.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## **Responder Roles & Responsibilities**

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

**No**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

***We use a Unified command system, but our participation in this event did not warrant a large response.***

*Challenges (Optional):*

***We did have one large inject at the end of the exercise that came 10 minutes before the exercise was over, which did not leave us time for a complete response.***

*Recommendations (Optional):*

***Exercise Contractors work better with local planners for proper planning.***

**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):*

***Our role was a support role to other counties around us who were still without power and comms. And we did not go past one operational period.***

*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**

COML is the EMA/E911 director currently. COML was handled by EMA and the local EOC.

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

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

All were

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

All were

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

Yes

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

Yes

Success Factors & Challenges  
*Success Factors (Optional):*  
**local and district planning.**  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Quality & Continuity

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

No

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

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

3

Success Factors & Challenges  
*Success Factors (Optional):*  
**HAM radio station in EOC. RACES/ARES operators proficiency.**  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

All of the time

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

## Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Your Score:91**

**Advanced Demonstration**

# ***Event: ICE STORM***

---

**Your score is: 60**

***Early Demonstration***

## **Part 1: Background Information**

### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Putnam, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Real-world incident**

Event Name:

**ICE STORM**

Event Date:

**Tue, 2011-02-01**

Event Address:

**1600 W CO RD 225 S, GREENCASTLE IN  
46135**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

**0**

State

**0**

Local

**19**

Non-governmental

**0**

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

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

**Putnam Co 911, Putnam Co EMA, Putnam Co Sheriff, Greencastle PD, Greencastle FD, Russellville FD, Roachdale PD, Roachdale FD, Clinton Twn FD, Bainbridge FD, Bainbridge PD, Floyd Twn FD, Madison Twn FD, Fillmore FD, Fillmore PD, Reelsville FD, Cloverdale FD, Cloverdale PD, Jefferson Twn FD**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**Severe ice storm, created loss of power for several days**

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

**Shared Channels**

**Cellular**

**Mobile Data**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

**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):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

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

**N/A (none exist)**

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

**N/A**

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

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

**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?

**Some of the time**

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

**No**

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

**No**

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

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

**All of the time**

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

**All of the time**

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

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

**All of the time**

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

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

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

## **Responder Roles & Responsibilities**

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

**No**

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

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

**No**

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

**In no cases**

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

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

**No**

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

**None were**

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

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

**N/A**

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

**N/A**

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

**N/A**

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

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

## **Quality & Continuity**

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

**No**

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

**SEC 13.2** Did the primary mode fail during the incident, planned event, or exercise at any time? [Information only] **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:60**

**Early Demonstration**

# ***Event: Spring Storms & Flooding***

---

**Your score is: 74**

***Established Demonstration***

## **Part 1: Background Information**

### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Sullivan, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Real-world incident**

Event Name:

**Spring Storms & Flooding**

Event Date:

**Tue, 2011-04-19**

Event Address:

**35 West Wall Street**

Event Address Line 2:

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

Federal

**5**

State

**7**

Local

**7**

Non-governmental

**20**

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:  
**FEMA, STATE HOMELAND SECURITY, INDOT, IDOC, EMA, SHERIFF, CITY POLICE, LOCAL FIRE DEPT., RED CROSS, SAVATION ARMY, LOCAL VOLUNTEERS, RACES, EMS, PUBLIC WORKS.**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:  
**Flooding, Severe Wind Damage, Heavy Rain created severe damage in the County. Roads washed out, trees down, power lines down, levee damage.**

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

- Swap Radios
- Shared Channels
- Proprietary Shared System
- Standards-Based Shared System
- 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):*  
*Challenges (Optional):*  
*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

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

**In most cases**

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

**Most were**

Success Factors & Challenges

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SEC 6.2** Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational leadership due to a lack of common terminology? **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):*  
**BUSY SIGNALS ON 800Mhz**  
*Recommendations (Optional):*  
**More Freq. for County**

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

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

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

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

**Yes**

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

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

**No**

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

**In some cases**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Most were**

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

**Fire Chief**

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

**All were**

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

**Most were**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

## Quality & Continuity

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

**No**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**No**

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

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

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

**Most of the time**

Success Factors & Challenges

*Success Factors (Optional):*

*Challenges (Optional):*

*Recommendations (Optional):*

## Levels of Demonstration

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

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

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

### Advanced Demonstration (85-100)

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

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

### Established Demonstration (70-84)

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

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

### Early Demonstration (60-69)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Your Score:74**

**Established Demonstration**

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

---

**Your score is: 76**

***Established Demonstration***

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

#### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Vermillion, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Exercise**

Event Name:

**LEPC Functional Exercise**

Event Date:

**Sat, 2010-08-07**

Event Address:

**259 Vine Street**

Event Address Line 2:

**Clinton In. 47842**

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

Federal

**No**

State

**1**

Local

**14**

Non-governmental

**No**

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

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

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

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

**Shared Channels**  
**Cellular**

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

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

**In some cases**

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

**N/A (none exist)**

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

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

**Most of the time**

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

**In some cases**

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

**Some were**

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

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

**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?

**Yes**

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

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

**All of the time**

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

**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?

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

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

## **Responder Roles & Responsibilities**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SEC 11.4** Were necessary communications resources effectively ordered? **All 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] **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:76**

**Established Demonstration**

# ***Event: Schied Diesel Extravaganza***

---

**Your score is: 86**

***Advanced Demonstration***

## **Part 1: Background Information**

### **Preparer Information**

County:

**Vigo, IN**

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

Type of Event:

**Planned event**

Event Name:

**Schied Diesel Extravaganza**

Event Date:

**Thu, 2011-08-25**

Event Address:

**3901 U.S. Hwy 41**

Event Address Line 2:

**Terre Haute, IN 47802**

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

Federal

**No**

State

**2**

Local

**5**

Non-governmental

**3**

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

**Vermillion, IN**

**Putnam, IN**  
**Clay, IN**

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

**Indiana State Police, Indiana State Excise, Vigo Co. Sheriff, Vigo Co. EMA, Honey Creek Fire Dept., District 7 All Hazards Incident Management Team (AHIMT), Terre Haute Police Dept.,**

Briefly describe the incident, planned event, or exercise:

**A three day diesel truck rally that the above listed agencies provided security and traffic control. The District 7 AHIMT utilized the event to provide Indiana Dept. of Homeland Security with performance evaluation data for team members.**

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**  
**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?

**No**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

### **Common Policies & Procedures**

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

**In all needed cases**

**SEC 1.2** Were they written?

**In all needed cases**

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

<b><u>SEC 2.3</u></b> If so, were they followed? [Information Only]	<b>Most were</b>
Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b><u>SEC 3.1</u></b> Were interagency communications policies and procedures across responding agencies consistent with NIMS?	<b>All were</b>
Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b><u>SEC 4.1</u></b> Does a priority order exist for use of interagency communications resources (e.g., life safety before property protection)?	<b>Yes</b>
<b><u>SEC 4.2</u></b> Was this prioritization of communications resource use followed?	<b>All of the time</b>
Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b><u>SEC 5.1</u></b> Was a primary interagency communications talk path clearly established by procedures used during the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>Yes</b>
<b><u>SEC 5.2</u></b> If not, was such a talk path established ad hoc and communicated to responders early in the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>N/A</b>
Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b><u>SEC 6.1</u></b> Was plain language used throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>Most of the time</b>
<b><u>SEC 6.2</u></b> Did any communications problems arise amongst the primary operational leadership due to a lack of common terminology?	<b>No</b>
<b><u>SEC 6.3</u></b> Did any communications problems arise amongst other response-level emergency personnel during the incident, planned event, or exercise due to a lack of common terminology?	<b>No</b>
Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b><u>SEC 7.1</u></b> Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst the primary operational leadership?	<b>Most of the time</b>
<b><u>SEC 7.2</u></b> Were clear unit identification procedures used amongst other response-level emergency personnel throughout the incident, planned event, or exercise?	<b>Most of the time</b>
Success Factors & Challenges <i>Success Factors (Optional):</i> <i>Challenges (Optional):</i> <i>Recommendations (Optional):</i>	
<b><u>SEC 8.1</u></b> Were common names used by all responding agencies for interagency communications channels?	<b>Most of the time</b>

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

**Most of the time**

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

## Responder Roles & Responsibilities

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

**Yes**

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

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

**No**

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

**In some cases**

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

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

**No**

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

**Most were**

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

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

**N/A (none needed)**

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

**N/A (none needed)**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**

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

## Quality & Continuity

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

**No**

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

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

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:86**

**Advanced Demonstration**