Effective Emergency Operations Preparedness for Recurring Planned Public Events

Stuart E. Mills

Larkspur Fire Protection District, Larkspur, Colorado

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I hereby certify that this paper constitutes my own product, that where the language of others is set forth, quotation marks so indicate, and that appropriate credit is given where I have used the language, idea, expression, or writings of another.

Signed: _____

Abstract

The problem was the Larkspur Fire Protection District (LFPD) did not effectively prepare to manage emergency operations during recurring planned public events which placed participants, the community, and emergency service providers at increased risk. The purpose of this evaluative applied research project was to determine how the LPFD could effectively prepare to manage emergency operations during recurring planned public events. The three research questions were, (a) What are the planned public event internal policy component similarities utilized by given groups of agencies, (b) How extensively do given groups of agencies utilize the incident command system during planned public events, and (c) How extensively do given groups of agencies utilize incident action plans for recurring planned public events. The first procedure used to answer the research questions consisted of a questionnaire which was distributed to emergency service representatives in various regions within the United States. The second procedure was to conduct personal interviews with local emergency service workers, municipal representatives, and a recurring planned public event owner and manager. Results from the research indicated that the LFPD did not effectively prepare for emergency operations during recurring planned public events. The first recommendation was that LFPD should strive to initiate effective communications among primary stakeholders impacted by public events. The second recommendation was that multidisciplinary planning teams should be formed for the emergency operations planning of public events. The third recommendation was that LFPD, in conjunction with multidisciplinary planning teams, should draft a policy and associated procedures based on standardized national guidelines which outline the appropriate methods of effectively preparing for emergency operations during planned public events.

Table of Contents

Appendices

Introduction

Many communities experience fluctuations in population volume as the result of recurring planned public events such as annual fireworks displays, festivals, holiday parades, music concerts, and sporting events. As a result of the sporadic influx of population volume in communities when such events take place, the likelihood of communities inherent risk factors affecting a greater than normal number of people is naturally increased. Throughout the nation it is not an uncommon occurrence for local authorities to be called upon to participate in emergency operations preparedness and management of recurring planned public events to minimize potential negative effects when an emergency incident occurs during such an event.

Within the jurisdiction of the Larkspur Fire Protection District (LFPD), notable recurring planned public events which occur annually consist of a one day long distance running race, a 24 hour mountain bike race, a one day cycling festival, and a 16 day renaissance festival. With the exception of The Colorado Renaissance Festival, the other events have proven to have low participation volume and are perceived to have a low impact on the community. The Colorado Renaissance Festival is the largest and most significant recurring public event. The Festival occurs annually and runs during the weekend days from 10:00 a.m. through 6:30 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays for eight consecutive weekends beginning the second weekend of June. The Festival, which has been held on the same site for the past 36 years, is provided onsite Emergency Medical and Fire services by the LFPD on a contractual basis. Onsite law enforcement services are provided by the Douglas County Sheriff's Department.

The problem was that the LFPD does not effectively prepare to manage emergency operations during recurring planned public events, which places participants, the community, and

emergency service providers at increased risk. The purpose of this research project was to determine how the LFPD can effectively prepare to manage emergency operations during recurring planned public events. Three research questions were developed to determine how the LFPD can effectively prepare to manage emergency operations during recurring planned public events. The research questions were: (a) What are the planned public event internal policy component similarities utilized by given groups of agencies; (b) How extensively do given groups of agencies utilize the incident command system during recurring planned public events; and (c) How extensively do given groups of agencies utilize incident action plans for recurring planned public events. The descriptive method was the primary method used in this project.

Background and Significance

LFPD Description

The LFPD is a combination career/volunteer special fire protection district whose boundaries encompass 110 square miles of rural Southwest Douglas County, Colorado. The District boundaries contain the Town of Larkspur, numerous privately owned ranches, and several subdivisions inside the wildland/urban interface in close proximity of the Pike National Forest. The resident population served by LFPD is approximately 5,828 (Douglas County Assessor's Office, personal communication, 2011). According to the most recent United States Census data, approximately 183 of the District's residents reside within the Town of Larkspur and the remaining 5,645 residents reside within municipally unincorporated areas of the District (United States Census Bureau, 2010). Additionally, a personal conversation with a Park Ranger for the Douglas County Parks and Recreation Department revealed that within the District boundaries

there are over 32,000 acres of undevelopable Colorado Open Space and conservation land (T.

Welle, personal communication, 2012).

The primary high volume commuter artery through the District between the metropolitan

areas of Denver and Colorado Springs is a north and southbound 13.5 mile stretch of Interstate

25. The secondary commuter artery through the District between the metropolitan areas of

Denver and Colorado Springs is a north and southbound 15 mile stretch of State Highway 105.

Between the primary and secondary commuter arteries are Burlington Northern Santa Fe

Railway Company (BNSF) north and southbound railways on which an average of one

commercial carrier train passes through the District each hour.

District personnel operate out of 3 stations; Station 161 is centrally located in the Town of

Larkspur and centrally within the District; Station 162 is located in a municipally unincorporated

area in the northwest corner of the District; and Station 164 is located in a municipally

unincorporated area in the southeast corner of the District. Station 161 apparatus consists of two

command vehicles, two Type 1 engines, two Type 6 engines, one Type 1 water tender, and two

Type 1 ambulances. Station 162 apparatus consists of one Type 1 engine, one Type 6 engine,

one Type 1 water tender, and one Type 1 ambulance. Station 164 apparatus consists of one Type

1 engine, one Type 3 water tender, and one Type 6 engine.

The Career staff consists of 21 members and is comprised of three shift Lieutenants, six shift

firefighter/EMT-Paramedics (FF/EMT-P's), seven shift Firefighter/Emergency Medical

Technician - Basics (EMT-B's), one Fire Chief, one EMS Division Chief, one Fire Marshal, one

Training Lieutenant, and one Administrative Assistant. Career shift personnel work on a rotating

48 hour shift schedule followed by 96 hours off-duty. LFPD career staff is based primarily at

Station 161. Station 162 is staffed with one career FF/EMT-B and one career FF/EMT-P per

shift. Command/Administrative staff personnel consist of the Fire Chief, EMS Division Chief,

Fire Marshal, Training Lieutenant, and the Administrative Assistant. Command/Administrative

staff personnel work a standard 45 hour work week 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through

Friday. The volunteer staff consists of 44 FF/EMT-B's and four FF/EMT-P's who augment

staffing at various stations on an as-needed basis. In conjunction with the career staff, the

volunteer staff is led by a Volunteer Division Chief and a Volunteer Lieutenant. When

necessary, staffing is augmented with four part-time FF/EMT-B's.

Recurring Planned Public Events within LFPD

   Due to the rural nature and small population of LFPD, the occurrence of recurring planned

public events is low. Four recurring planned public events of relative significance take place

within the boundaries of the LFPD on an annual basis. On the first Saturday of May each year a

privately sponsored combined 50 kilometer, 25 kilometer, and eight mile running race occurs on

Douglas County Parks and Recreation property. During the first Friday and Saturday of June a

24 hour mountain bike race, which is also privately sponsored, takes place in the same location

as the 50 kilometer, 25 kilometer, and eight mile running race. The Sunday following the 24

hour mountain bike race, a privately sponsored cycling festival occurs which utilizes multiple

municipal, county, and state roadways and crosses multiple jurisdictional boundaries. The

largest and most significant privately sponsored recurring planned public event within the

District is the Colorado Renaissance Festival which takes place on privately owned commercial

property in the town limits of Larkspur. The festival begins on the second weekend in June and

continues for seven consecutive weekends.

Description and Impact of Small Recurring Planned Public Events within LFPD

Historically, the running race, the 24 hour mountain bike race, and the cycling festival have not been perceived to pose potentially excessive community impact or emergency management or operational issues within the District. Due to this perception, emergency operations preparation activities for these events have been limited to ensuring onsite medical standby agreements are executed and adhered to. The viewpoint of the District is that if an incident occurs during one of these events that is beyond the management scope of the on-site personnel, on-duty crews will bolster the incident command system to the degree necessary.

The running race has a maximum participation capacity of 1,000 people and the 24 hour mountain bike race has a maximum participation capacity of 800, but according to the Douglas County Parks and Recreation Department, "They haven't reached that capacity yet" (T. Welle, personal communications, 2012). Each of these events have occurred annually since the 2006 and have resulted in a total of five event related medical emergencies which were easily mitigated by on-site contracted LFPD medical standby units (Highplains Firemanager Response Query, 2012).

The cycling festival, which utilizes multiple municipal, county, and state roadways and crosses multiple jurisdictional boundaries, has an approximate 27 mile leg of the course traversing through LFPD. According to the events technical manager, a potential maximum of 4,500 bicycle riders may pass through this leg of the course throughout the duration of the event (M. Heaston, personal communication, 2012). Obviously, traffic flow is a notable community impact due to the number of cyclists and the length of the course on public roadways. Despite the larger number of participants of the cycling festival in comparison to the running race and the

24 hour mountain bike race, only three event related medical emergencies have occurred since 2006, each of which were easily mitigated by on-duty personnel (Highplains Firemanager Response Query, 2012).

Description and Impact of Large Recurring Planned Public Events within LFPD

Unlike the running race, 24 hour mountain bike race, and cycling festival, the Colorado Renaissance Festival for years has been perceived by some members of the LFPD to pose potentially excessive community, emergency management, and operational impacting issues to the District due to the temporary and sporadic large population fluctuation. The Festival occurs annually and runs during the weekend days from 10:00 a.m. through 6:30 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays for eight consecutive weekends beginning the second weekend in June. According to the event promoter's estimate, an average of 7,000 customers attend the event each weekend day of the event (J. Paradise Jr., personal communications, 2012).

The Colorado Renaissance Festival is located within the town limits of Larkspur on 87 acres of privately owned commercial property in the wildland/urban interface. According to the LFPD Fire Marshal, the Festival covers a total of 87 acres broken down as follows; actual Festival grounds consist of 19 acres for vendors, event activities, and attractions, 26 acres are dedicated to service and campground areas, and 42 acres are dedicated to customer parking (R. Johnson, personal communication, 2012). On the Festival grounds are numerous combined and free-standing wood framed thematic commercial structures which are leased to approximately 200 Festival vendors. Vendor specialties consist of glassblowing, metal works, food preparation and sales, non-alcoholic and alcoholic beverage sales, theatrical presentations, exotic animal displays, and arts and crafts sales.

LFPD provides onsite Basic Life Support (BLS) and Advanced Life Support (ALS) medical personnel standby for the festival on a contractual basis. The medical personnel team, which generally consists of one EMT-B and one EMT-P, utilizes an easily identifiable on-site structure for patient assessment and treatment. The Festival promoter also hires four volunteer LFPD personnel for potential onsite fire suppression activities. The fire suppression personnel team utilizes one of the District's Type 6 engines and one of the District's Type 1 engines in the event rapid response suppression activities are required. Contracted law enforcement activities are provided by eight off-duty Douglas County Sheriff's Office (DCSO) deputies with varying time schedules and duties. Additionally, the DCSO provides an emergency dispatcher with the appropriate communications equipment to facilitate potential emergency law enforcement, as well as fire operations radio communications.

The incident command structure utilized by the LFPD at the Renaissance Festival is minimal in scope. It consists of one Incident Commander who supervises all other on-site LFPD personnel and facilitates communication with event and law enforcement personnel. Although both the DCSO and event personnel each have a single person in charge, there has never been a true unified command established. For six years, the LFPD has utilized and Incident Action Plan (IAP) for each day of the festival which consists of an Incident Briefing Incident Command System (ICS) Form 201, an Incident Radio Communications Plan ICS 205 Form, and a Communications List ICS 205A Form. Neither the incident command structure nor the IAP has been inclusive of the other organizational entities involved in the event. Additionally, special law enforcement procedures, hazard assessments, and evacuation guidelines have never been clearly communicated among the entities involved in the event.

Throughout the history of the Festival neither the community nor the event has been impacted by large scale low frequency, high risk incidents such as structure fires, wildland fires, extreme weather, or civil disturbances which have necessitated large scale emergency mitigation efforts or event evacuation. According to the Town Manager, "The only impact we've ever noticed is the increased traffic on the weekends" (M. Krimmer, personal communication, 2012). All incidents encountered by the LFPD at the event have been medical incidents that were easily mitigated by on-site and on-duty LFPD personnel. During the Festival seasons from 2008 through 2011, 481 patients were treated for various medical issues by on-site medical personnel but only 56 of those patients required ambulance transport by on-duty LFPD personnel (LFPD Special Event Patient Logs, 2008 through 2011).

Because no recorded major incidents have occurred during the Festival's 36 year history which have negatively affected its participants, the community, and emergency service providers does not mean such an event will not occur in the future. Due to the event's rural wildland/urban interface location, composition and usage of its commercial structures, it's large predictable temporary influx of population and related traffic issues, a major incident within the festival would prove to be difficult to manage. Given past emergency preparedness practices by the LFPD and other agencies associated with the Festival, the mitigation difficulties of such an incident may be magnified due to the lack of pre-planning and enhanced communications provided by a well-organized unified command.

Research Relationship to the National Fire Academy Course Executive Analysis of Fire

Service Operations in Emergency Management

This applied research project (ARP) relates to material presented in Unit 1 of the Executive Analysis of Fire Service Operations in Emergency Management (EAFSOM) Student Manual. (United States Department of Homeland Security [USDHS], 2011) In an article by William Shouldis reprinted from Fire Engineering in the EAFSOM Student Manual it is stated, "The roots of a community's 'all-hazard' preparedness program involve intergovernmental relations and a detailed planning process that includes mutual-aid assessment of risk" (Shouldis, 2010, para. 1). This implication is further supported by the statement within Unit 5 of the EAFSOM Student Manual, " The roots of a community's 'all-hazard' preparedness program hinge on the departmental leadership, intergovernmental relations, and a detailed planning process which includes external assistance agreements" (USDHS, 2011, p. 5-3). These statements clearly and concisely imply that cooperative preparedness efforts among multi-disciplinary stakeholders are a necessity if major emergencies are to be effectively mitigated. These concepts are applicable to large recurring planned public events. Although, such events obviously are not in themselves emergency situations, the probability of emergency situations occurring at the site of such an event is amplified due to the mass gathering and activity of people in a relatively small area. All such events may have a combination of intrinsic potential hazards which require preplanned and well communicated operational procedures if management of emergencies occurring as a result of those hazards is to be effectively managed.

Research Relationship to the United States Fire Administration Operational Objectives

This research relates to the United States Fire Administration (USFA) operational objectives in that its intention is to "Improve local planning and preparedness" and "Improve the fire and emergency services performance in response to and recovery from all hazards" (United States Fire Administration [USFA], 2010, pp. 19-20). Although the LFPD has historically participated in planning for and managing emergency operations at recurring planned public events within its jurisdiction, the planning processes have not been appropriately inclusive of the major stakeholders involved. If the planning processes were to be revised to include the major stakeholders, response to and mitigation of emergencies during such events will be more effective. The revision of processes will provide well-communicated knowledge of various stakeholders' roles during emergency and non-emergency situations, identification of necessary Incident Command functions for specific levels of emergency and non-emergency situations, identification of administrative documentation for specific levels of emergency and non-emergency situations, identification and mitigation of hazards associated with specific events, and well-established evacuation planning.

Literature Review

The literature search began at the National Fire Academy (NFA) Learning Resource Center (LRC) in December of 2010 while attending the Executive Fire Officer Program course, Executive Analysis of Fire Service Operations in Emergency Management. Numerous publications on emergency operations preparedness were discovered on file at the LRC, however, few specifically addressed emergency operations preparedness for recurring planned public events from a fire service perspective. The literature search continued at the researcher's

home agency library, the Pikes Peak Regional Library system, as well as, Google™ internet

search engine. The applicable research material discovered in the course of the literature search

consisted of publications covering the topics of governmental recommendations for public safety

agencies within whose jurisdictions special events occur, governmental recommendations for

preparedness planning, and Incident Command System practices. Other applicable research

material discovered were articles specific to special events which explored the importance of the

Incident Command System and need for emergency planning and special event security

concerns.

   One relevant publication discovered via Internet search was a Federal Emergency

Management Agency (FEMA) publication which provides detailed recommendations for pre-

planning of special events. The stated purpose of the Special Events Contingency Planning Job

Aids Manual was, "…the prevention of injury, suffering or death that may occur as a result of

poor planning or preventable incidents at public events," and to identify, "…the elements that

should be considered by those responsible for planning and conducting events that attract large

numbers of people" (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], 2010, p. 1). The

document also described hazard assessment and mitigation, ingress and egress routes, and

evacuation procedures as crucial planning components. Without knowing the hazards inherent to

an event, the potential emergencies and the magnitude of those emergencies that may arise from

the hazards remain unknown. Similarly, without established ingress and egress routes and

evacuation procedures, the impact of an emergency incident during a public event may be

magnified. FEMA (2010) suggests that multidisciplinary planning teams should consist of key

stakeholder agency personnel, utilize ICS during the planning phase and use the system's

expansion capabilities as necessary, dependent upon the scope of the special event. Logically, it

is also recommended that ICS be utilized during emergencies that occur at planned public events

(FEMA, 2010, p. 3). Within the document it is also stated that, "An Incident Action Plan

provides a concise, coherent means of capturing and communicating the overall incident

priorities, objectives, and strategies of both operational and support activities" (p. 3-5). In the

setting of a recurring planned public event, priorities, objectives, and strategies should have

already been identified to some extent during the planning phase prior to the event, thus making

it possible to create an IAP prior to the event. A pre-drafted IAP would assist ICS personnel in

making more timely and efficient decisions if an emergency situation were to occur during a

planned public event. This document relates to all three research questions in that it suggests

potential planned public event internal policy components, ICS utilization during planned public

events, and the utilization of IAP's during planned public events.

Unfortunately, no literature describing how individual agencies construct and utilize IAP's

during planned public events was discovered during the literature search. The National Incident

Management System (NIMS)/ICS forms booklet (2010) did however, provide samples of

standardized ICS forms which could be utilized in the formulation of a recurring planned public

event IAP. For the purpose of this research, the forms booklet was related to the third research

question which asks how extensively given groups of agencies utilize IAP's during planned

public events. It provided a source of information which was used to formulate a research

questionnaire item to determine what standardized ICS forms are used by a number of agencies

during recurring planned public events.

According to the United States Department of Homeland Security (USDHS, 2008),

preparedness planning should be, "…realistic, scalable, and applicable to all types of incidents,

from daily occurrences to incidents requiring the activation of interstate mutual aid to those

requiring a coordinated Federal response" (p. 16). This concept can easily be applicable to planning for recurring public events which often pose elevated risk to event participants, the community in which the events occur, and emergency service providers responsible for management of emergency incidents that may occur during the event. Additionally, preparedness planning is a core concept of all three research questions. Appropriate preparedness planning should result in identification of necessary internal policy components, how ICS should be utilized, and to what extent the IAP's should be used.

Regarding the management of emergency situations, it is stated, "ICS is used to organize on-scene operations for a broad spectrum of emergencies from small to complex incidents, both natural and manmade" (USDHS, 2008, p. 46). Although, not technically classified as emergency situations, planned public events may be a stimulus for the occurrence of emergency situations due to inherent natural or manmade hazards. In the event an emergency situation occurs during a planned public event, the mitigation of the emergency may be expedited by ensuring an appropriately scaled ICS is in place prior to its occurrence. In an article concerning organizational management during public events at large fixed facilities such as stadiums and arenas, this concept is supported by the statement, "The security staff should use an Incident Command System with a security director/incident commander to coordinate local resources in response to a critical incident at the facility" (Marciani, 2009, para. 10). ICS, as discussed in these documents, relate to the second research question which was developed to determine how other agencies utilize ICS during recurring planned public events.

Ahmed (2009) describes ICS as a basic business management system which can be used not only by emergency service agencies, but by a variety of organizations with differing inherent disciplines. He effectively points out the similarities between ICS components used by

emergency service agencies and departmental structures utilized in academic institutions. Ahmed equates the ICS Operations Section functions with the functions of a university's "academic affairs department", the ICS Logistics Section is equated with a university's "facilities/support services department", the ICS Finance/Administration Section with the functions of a university's "business/administration department", and the Planning Section with a university's department of "an academic affairs" (para. 4). Ahmed further points out that ICS should not be considered solely a system reserved for use during emergency situations but should be used for a variety to events from, "…a student fair or a concert to a sports event or even a wedding…" (Ahmed, 2009, para. 10).

In another article by Ahmed (2009, November 1) titled, "With NIMS and ICS, Practice Makes Perfect", it is reiterated that ICS should be implemented during routine situations such as special public events. In the article it was stressed that communications, personnel support, interagency coordination, ICS structure flexibility, and continual training were the key components necessary for maximum functionality of the system. Utilization of ICS during public events, Ahmed claims, provides training opportunities for personnel and will enable them to function more efficiently within the system during true emergency situations (2009, November 1, para. 10). The articles by Ahmed were related to the overall purpose of this research project, the second research question, and in that it provided key viewpoints on how to effectively prepare to manage emergency operations during recurring planned public events and ICS utilization during planned public events.

Harkey (2011) describes the required planning and National Incident Management System (NIMS) and ICS utilization during a large international equestrian event. Since the event was expected to draw in excess of 500,000 participants, planners "…strongly advocated the National

Incident Management System and a Modified version of the Incident Command System" (para. 1). Due to the scope of the event, the organizers utilized a robust mixture of personnel from different emergency service disciplines to fill ICS positions. Medical Center healthcare providers were assigned on-site positions, as were Fire Service, EMS, local and federal law enforcement personnel, and various volunteer personnel. A Special Operations Center was established on-site specifically to coordinate the activities of emergency service workers within the on-site ICS. Although ICS structure components were not specifically described in the article, emergency service workers were divided into specific functional divisions which were further divided into specific functional groups in order to maintain manageable spans of control. In addition to the Special Operations Center, planners found it necessary to establish a "Venue Operations Center" to deal with the daily operational issues of the event and "…link event organizers to emergency responders" (para. 10). The Special Operations Center was manned by the "Event Control" team whose personnel were assigned the positions of Event Control Commander, Planning Section Chief, Communications Leader, and Liaison Officer (para. 13). While the information contained in this article was primarily descriptive of organizational structure without offering positive or negative operational criticism, it revealed that ICS can be, and is utilized in large non-emergent situations such as public events. The article provided information pertinent to research question two, which was developed to determine the extent to which given groups of agencies utilize ICS during planned public events.

According to Bickel (2007), emergency management of planned public events from a law enforcement and security perspective consists of three phases: (a) planning prior to the event, (b) "managing security during the event," and (c) "post-event activities" (para. 9). In the article, the importance of involving all stakeholders in the planning process is shown to be vital in order to

ensure the effective development of specific plan components. Bickel discusses the importance

of forming "…[an] executive team…headed by the overall event security director representing

the lead law enforcement agency" and the "…top command level personnel from all partners in

securing the event" during the planning phase (para. 10). "Threat and risk assessment", which

could be construed as being synonymous with hazard assessment/analyses, is according to

Bickel, the primary foundation of the planning process (para. 16). Managing security during the

event requires effective communications among personnel, adequate personnel deployment in

key event areas, ensuring EMS crews are available, "and more" (para. 9). Although ICS is not

specifically mentioned in the context of managing security during a public event,

communications and adequate personnel deployment are both integral components of ICS.

Finally, after completion of the event, the use of an after action review is stressed to determine

what went well, where improvements need to be made, what were the "lessons learned" (para.

9). The article by Bickel provided information pertinent to the first research question by

providing information on stakeholder cooperation and coordination in emergency preparedness

which could be included in an agency's internal policy, which outlines emergency preparedness

measures necessary for effective emergency operations during a public event.

    The article by Bickel (2007), was a synopsis of a more detailed report written by Edward

Connors for the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, which is a special office

within the United States Department of Justice. The report was meant to provide an outline for

law enforcement agencies which take the lead role in planning for high participant level special

public events (Connors, 2007). Within the report the differentiation of roles of ICS positions for

a special public event managed under a single jurisdictional ICS and an event managed under a

unified multi-jurisdictional ICS structure are discussed. Within a single jurisdictional ICS

structure, says Connors, the IC is obviously responsible for the management of the event and any emergency incidents which may occur in the event. Conversely, in a multi-jurisdictional, or unified ICS structure, representatives are assigned a command position and "…jointly determine objectives, plans and priorities and work together to execute them" (p. 30). Additionally, from the viewpoint of a security and law enforcement specialist, the report makes it evident that other agencies, such as fire protection and EMS agencies need to be incorporated in the event's emergency operations management plan (Connors, 2007). This report provided information loosely related to research question one, in that requirements for single jurisdictional command and unified command could be potential components of an internal planned public event policy. The information provided in the report also related to the second research question which was developed to discover how extensively agencies utilize ICS during planned public events.

In its document, Fairgrounds Emergency Plans, the Michigan Department of Agriculture (MDA) offers an emergency planning outline for fairgrounds within the State that host a variety of special events. MDA contends that a fairgrounds emergency plan should, "Integrate with local plans," be "Collaborative - written with input from many disciplines", and be "known and used" (MDA, 2008, p.1). The concepts presented by MDA (2008) are further supported in an article concerning planning for outdoor events by Sutuza (2011) who says, "Plans must be implemented through communication, processes and exercise" (para. 4). Integration with local plans, multidisciplinary planning efforts, and training to ensure plans are known and used are concepts consistent with UDSHS NIMS guidelines (USDHS, 2008, p. 13). The MDA document outlines vital plan and policy specific items such as purpose, scope, responsibilities, planning assumptions, hazard assessment, and operational concepts (MDA, 2008). This document is

relative to the first research question in that it provides a comprehensive framework from which

planned public event policies and procedures could be developed.

Procedures

Questionnaire Development

The first procedure consisted of the creation of a questionnaire constructed to provide

informational solutions that may help to amend the past and current practices of the LFPD which

result in perceived ineffective preparation to manage emergency operations during recurring

planned public events. The majority of the questions were tailored to seek answers to the three

research questions; (a) What are the planned public event internal policy component similarities

utilized by given groups of agencies, (b) How extensively do given groups of agencies utilize the

ICS during planned public events, and (c) How extensively do given groups of agencies utilize

IAP's for recurring planned public events. Information discovered through the literature search

was systematically utilized in the formulation of questions related to policy, ICS, and IAP

utilization.

The first questionnaire item was a multiple choice question which solicited general

information regarding the type of organization with which the respondent was associated. The

available choices were Fire/EMS, Law Enforcement, Emergency Management, and other. These

choices were included to identify potential operational variations concerning policy composition,

ICS structure, and IAP utilization between varying types of agencies and for potential grouping

for comparative analysis.

The second questionnaire item was a multiple choice question which was developed to seek general information about average participation levels of the largest recurring planned public events within the respondents' jurisdictions. The available choices were; (a) 0 to 15,000 participants, (b) 15,000 to 30,000 participants, (c) 30,000 to 45,000 participants, (d) 45,000 or more participants, and (e) there are no recurring planned public events within my organization's jurisdiction. The first four choices were included to provide a volume based method for potential grouping of results, dependent on event size and level of participation. The last choice was included as an exclusionary response. Selection of the last item by a respondent definitively indicated the absence of recurring planned public events within his or her jurisdiction, therefore, he or she would be unable to accurately answer the remaining questionnaire items related to emergency management of such events.

The third, fourth and fifth questionnaire items each related to research question one which sought internal policy component similarities utilized by given groups of agencies. Questionnaire item three, which asked if the respondent's organization usually took the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events within their jurisdiction, required a yes or no response. This researcher believed that, dependent upon the respondent's answer, internal policy characteristics may vary. The fourth questionnaire item, which also required a yes or no response, was designed to establish if the respondents' agencies utilized an internal policy which specifically governed emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events. Due to the policy specific nature of the research, a "no" answer of item four was an exclusionary response. Since the first research question was designed to discover internal

component similarities between such policies, the inclusion of respondent's agencies without such a policy would distort the final results.

Questionnaire item five was meant to discover if the respondents planned public event policy contained a component which required the use of a multidisciplinary planning team. The answers available for this item were, (a) yes, (b) no, and (c) not applicable, my organization does not have a planned public event policy. The use of multidisciplinary planning teams, according to information documented in the literature review, is a vital component of preparedness planning and thus was viewed by this researcher to be a critical policy component.

Questionnaire item six was included to determine if the respondents planned public event policy required a hazard assessment and analysis to be completed for recurring planned public events. Like item number five, the answers available were, (a) yes, (b) no, and (c) not applicable, my organization does not have a planned public event policy. Hazard assessment and analysis again, according to information documented in the literature review, is a vital component of preparedness planning and should be addressed to some extent in an organization's planned public event policy.

Questionnaire item seven was constructed to determine if the respondents' organizations addressed evacuation procedures for recurring planned public events. The available answers were identical to those available in items five and six. Evacuation procedures, again according to the literature reviewed, is a vital component of preparedness planning. A valid assumption can therefore be made that evacuation procedures should in some way be addressed in a planned public event policy.

The subsequent three questionnaire items, items eight, nine, and ten, concerned ICS structures used by organizations during recurring planned public events. Item eight asked respondents what incident command positions are normally assigned during recurring planned public events within their jurisdictions. The available answers were; (a) Incident Commander, (b) Public Information Officer, (c) Safety Officer, (d) Liaison Officer, and (d) other.

Questionnaire item nine inquired of the respondents to what extent general staff management functions were necessary during planned public events. The available answers were; (a) Operations Section, (b) Planning Section, (c) Logistics Section, (d) Finance Section, and (e) none of the above general staff management functions are ever necessary.

Questionnaire item ten was designed to determine the extent to which organizations utilized unified command during recurring planned public events by including various public safety agency, municipal, and private personnel in the command structure. The available answers were; (a) Fire/EMS personnel, (b) Law Enforcement personnel, (c) Office of Emergency Management personnel, (d) Event Promoter personnel, (e) Public Works/Utilities personnel, and (f) other. Similar to item eight, if "other" was selected, the respondent was able to specify the additional position or positions in a text field.

Questionnaire items 11 and 12 inquired about IAP usage by organizations during recurring planned public events. Item 11 was developed to determine how often organizations utilize IAP's during recurring planned public events. The answers available to respondents were; (a) always, (b) occasionally, and (c) never. A respondent's answer of "never" to item 11 was not considered an exclusionary response since information provided in earlier items may have been accurately completed and potentially could yield valuable research information. Item 12

solicited the extent to which organizations utilize standardized ICS forms. Examples of the ICS

forms are not included in the appendices of this applied research project due to length restrictions

however; clarifying examples of NIMS ICS forms included in the response choices for item 12

can be found at http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/ics_forms_2010.pdf. The response

choices available were as follows:

- A. Our organization does not use ICS forms

- B. ICS 201 (Incident Briefing)

- C. ICS 202 (Incident Objectives)

- D. ICS 203 (Organization Assignment List)

- E. ICS 204 (Assignment List)

- F. ICS 205 (Incident Radio Communications Plan)

- G. ICS 205A (Communications List)

- H. ICS 206 (Medical Plan)

- I. ICS 207 (Incident Organization Chart)

- J. ICS 208 (Safety Message/Plan

- K. ICS 209 (Incident Status Summary)

- L. ICS 210 (Resource Status Change)

- M. ICS 211 (Incident Check-In List)

- O. ICS 213 (General Message)

- P. ICS 214 (Activity Log)

- Q. ICS 215 (Operational Planning Worksheet)

- R. ICS 215A (Incident Action Plan Safety Analysis)

- S. ICS 219 (Resource Status Cards)

- T. ICS 220 (Air Operations Summary Worksheet)

- U. ICS 221 (Demobilization Check out)

- V. ICS 225 (Incident Personnel Performance Rating)

Questionnaire distribution, data collection, and analysis

The questionnaire distribution and data collection was accomplished by using an internet based company called SurveyMonkey^{TM} which specializes in online subscription survey services. The first step to utilizing the service was to establish a personal subscription to utilize the services of the company. Following successful subscription application, the previously described questionnaire items were manually entered by the researcher into the company's web based application. In addition to the questionnaire items, the following heading message was entered to inform respondents of the purpose of the questionnaire:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information for an Executive Fire Officer Program Applied Research Project. The completed Applied Research Project will give the Larkspur Fire Protection District greater insight on how to more effectively prepare for and manage emergency operations during local recurring planned public events.

A closing message was entered in such a manner that when a respondent completed the questionnaire, it would be visible. The purpose of the message was dual; (a) to thank the respondent for completing the questionnaire and, (b) to solicit copies of other agencies existing internal policies and procedures related to emergency operations preparedness and management of public events utilized by other agencies. The closing message was as follows:

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. If your organization has a policy in place related to emergency operations preparedness and management of public events would you

mind sharing it with me? It would greatly assist me in my research for my Applied Research

Project. Please e-mail it to me at smills@larkspurfire.org. If you have questions or advice

concerning my research you can contact me at (303) 681-3284. Stuart Mills, Larkspur Fire

EMS Division Chief.

Distribution of the questionnaire was accomplished by e-mailing a link automatically created

by the online subscription service. Included in the questionnaire distribution e-mail was a brief

description of the purpose of the questionnaire, the questionnaire link, and a statement requesting

that the recipient forward the e-mail to other qualified personnel who may be able to provide

additional data. Upon receipt of the e-mail, the recipient was expected to click the questionnaire

link which would open the recipient's web browser and automatically direct the browser to the

service's online survey application. Once the online survey application was activated, the

recipient was able to complete and submit the previously described questionnaire. When a

respondent completed a questionnaire, the data was recorded in the SurveyMonkey^{TM} database

which was accessible via this researcher's personal subscription login.

On March 8, 2012 the questionnaire distribution e-mail message was sent to individuals

within this researcher's personal mailing list. The personal mailing list contained 104 e-mail

addresses comprised of Fire, EMS, Emergency Management, and Law Enforcement service

recipients located in various regions within the United States. Additionally, at the request of this

researcher, the questionnaire distribution e-mail was forwarded to an unknown number of

National Society of Executive Fire Officers (NSEFO) members by the Secretary of the NSEFO.

Data collection efforts via questionnaire distribution were concluded on April 8, 2012.

Upon conclusion of the questionnaire collection efforts some of the respondents were excluded from the study because their response to questionnaire item two indicated there were no recurring planned public events within their jurisdictions. If no such events occurred within their jurisdictions the respondents had no way of accurately responding to the remaining questionnaire items. Other respondents who submitted incomplete questionnaire responses were excluded because incomplete data sets may distort the results of the research. An additional group of the respondents was excluded from the study because they indicated that their agency did not have an internal policy in place for recurring planned public events which addresses emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations. Since the first research question was designed to discover internal component similarities between such policies, the inclusion of respondent's agencies without a policy would distort the final results. The remaining respondents who appropriately completed the questionnaire and indicated that recurring planned public events did occur within their jurisdictions were deemed as a whole, to be the primary study group.

Through the use of the filter function provided by SurveyMonkey^{TM} , the primary study population was divided into 4 groups; (a) 0 to 15,000 participants (0k -15k group), (b) 15,000 to 30,000 participants (15k-30k group), (c) 30,000 to 45,000 participants (30k-45k group, and (d) 45,000 or more participants (45k plus group). The groups were created for the purpose of comparative analysis to identify potential internal policy components, ICS utilization, and IAP utilization variations based on event size. Following grouping of the primary study population, the questionnaire results were downloaded from the online survey subscription service website in Microsoft Excel 2007^{TM} spreadsheet format. The questionnaire items and results for the individual groups can be found in Appendices A, B, C, and D.

The there are several potential benefits of conducting research by distributing electronic questionnaires and collecting the resultant data electronically. The most obvious advantages of using e-mail to distribute questionnaires is that it is less costly and less time consuming than standard mail. In most cases, the ability to transmit large numbers of e-mail messages is included in the standard service fees of internet service providers. In today's technological business environment, group e-mails can be sent simultaneously to a large group of people who are able to receive e-mail and e-mail notifications in seconds over large geographical distances.

The distribution of electronic questionnaires and collection of the resultant data electronically does, however, present certain disadvantages. Many recipients may view e-mailed questionnaires as junk e-mail and delete the messages immediately upon their receipt. Others may configure their e-mail client software to automatically delete messages that come from unrecognized sources. Still other recipients may routinely receive an overwhelming number of e-mails which may result in the recipient placing a low priority on a randomly received message containing a request that they complete a questionnaire. Another disadvantage of utilizing digital technologies to distribute and collect data is that recipients who receive and attempt to complete the questionnaires may not fully understand the purpose of the data they are asked to submit, or they may misinterpret specific questions which could result in skewing of data.

Interview Procedures

The second procedure was comprised of five separate interviews with local stakeholders to augment the data obtained from the questionnaire procedure. The individual interviews consisted one with a Larkspur Fire Protection District employee, one with a Douglas County Sheriff's Office employee who currently is assigned as a law enforcement liaison with the Douglas County Office of Emergency Management, and one with an Elbert County Office of Emergency Management employee. These local emergency services employees were selected as interviewees due to their presumed knowledge of the subject matter of this research project. Two additional interviews were conducted with employees of the Town of Larkspur and with Colorado Renaissance Festival managerial personnel. The employees of the Town of Larkspur and the event managerial personnel were selected because of their mutual obligation to effectively communicate with each other and adhere to local ordinances and governmental procedures related to the event. The interviewee's as a whole were preemptively presumed to have varying levels of knowledge pertaining to the event's real and perceived potential impacts to the community and its inherent emergency operational preparedness implications.

The interview questions developed for the three local emergency services personnel were similar to those of the questionnaire procedure however, the interviewee was not provided with a list of potential answers. Five of the questions were open-ended which gave the interviewee the opportunity to provide a detailed response. The remaining two questions were closed-ended, however after the interviewee provided a response, he or she was asked to provide additional comments supporting the answer. The first question asked of the local emergency services personnel was intended to discover the interviewee's opinion of who should take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned

public events. The question relates to the purpose of this research in that responses may identify

valid agency or agencies leadership roles which may improve the LFPD's abilities to effectively

prepare to manage emergency operations during such events. The second and third interview

questions were associated with the first research question in that they sought interviewee

opinions of the importance of planned public event policies and the necessary components of

policies for such events. The fourth interview question related to the second research question

by soliciting the interviewee's viewpoints of appropriate ICS implementation and structure

during planned public events. The fifth and sixth interview questions were associated with the

third research question and were developed to solicit interviewee opinions of IAP usage and

specific ICS form usage during planned public events. The last interview question did not

exclusively relate to any of the research questions but did request final interviewee comments

pertaining to contents of the interview in hopes additional pertinent information would be

discovered.

   The interview questions developed for the Colorado Renaissance Festival manager were

intended to discover specific information related to the event from his perspective. The first

three questions were open-ended and designed to solicit general knowledge of the event related

to the participation level, the number of event employees, and number of event vendors. Such

information could provide a better understanding of the nature of the event and thus enable the

District to better prepare for emergency operations during the event. The fourth question, a

closed-ended question, inquired if the recurring event had an established internal emergency

action plan (EAP) which provides guidelines to event personnel if an emergency situation were

to occur. The presence or lack of presence of an EAP loosely relates to research question two in

that an appropriately structured EAP should include guidance to employees on emergency

services involvement in the event of emergency situations. The fifth question was an open-ended question which asked the interviewee to share final comments related to the event.

The interview questions developed for the Town of Larkspur were intended to discover specific information related to the event from the perspective of municipal employees. Questions one, two, and five were identical to those asked of the Colorado Renaissance Festival manager. Question three was developed to determine the level of preplanning interactions between the Town of Larkspur and the Colorado Renaissance Festival. Information about preplanning efforts applies to the purpose of this research because such information could provide insight on how the LFPD may need to participate in future planning efforts for the event. Question four was designed to learn from the Town's perspective what the greatest impacts of the festival were on the community. Such information could be vital in effectively preparing for emergency operations during the event.

The process for each interview was standard. Initially, the potential interviewees were contacted either in person or via telephone, appropriate introductions were made and the purpose of the interview and research was explained. After the potential interviewee agreed to participate in an interview, a meeting time, date, and place was established. Prior to the beginning of each interview, the purpose of the interview and research was reiterated. When the interviewee conveyed his or her understanding of the interview, and indicated they were prepared to begin, the interview, questions were individually read aloud by the researcher followed by an unrestricted amount of time for the interviewee to answer the questions to their satisfaction. The interviews were conducted on April 4, April 5, April 13, April 17, and May 8 of 2012. The times required to complete individual interviews ranged from 5-15 minutes. Upon completion of the interview process, responses of emergency services personnel were analyzed to determine trends

among individual responses. Additionally, Town employee and event manager personnel responses were analyzed to determine potential information which may possibly aid the LFPD in determining how to effectively prepare to manage emergency operations during recurring planned public events.

The benefit of performing personal interviews with these stakeholders was that they had a greatly enhanced opportunity to elaborate on their viewpoints as opposed to completing a questionnaire which severely limits a respondent's ability to express his or her viewpoints. Interviews however, tend to consume much larger amounts of time due to scheduling, travel time, conducting the actual interviews, and compiling the resultant data.

Results

Questionnaire Results

The questionnaire collection efforts concluded with 223 responses. Eight (4%) of the respondents were excluded because their response to questionnaire item two indicated there were no recurring planned public events within their jurisdictions. Naturally, with no such events occurring within their jurisdictions the respondents had no means of accurately responding to the remaining questionnaire items. An additional 32 (14%) of the respondents submitted incomplete questionnaire responses. These respondents were excluded from the study on the basis that incomplete data sets may distort the results of the research. An additional 84 (38%) of the respondents were excluded from the study because they indicated that their agency did not have an internal policy in place which addresses emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations for recurring planned public events. The combined total questionnaire responses, excluding incomplete responses, can be found in Appendix A.

Since the first research question was designed to discover internal component similarities between such policies, the inclusion of respondent's agencies without a policy would distort the final results. Ninety-nine (44%) of the respondents provided usable answers to the questionnaire and indicated that recurring planned public events did occur within their jurisdictions. These 99 responses were used as the primary study population.

The primary study population of the 99 responses was divided into 4 groups based on the average number of participants attending the largest recurring planned public event within the respondents' jurisdictions. Complete questionnaire responses for each group can be found in Appendices B through E. The following results are based on responses from questionnaire items one through four respectively. The 0k-15k group contained 40 (40%) responses and the 15k-30k group consisted of 18 (18%) responses. In the 30k-45k group there were 10 (10%) responses and in the 45k plus group there were 31 (31%) responses. Results can be found in Table 1.

Table 1		
Average number of participants attending the largest recurring planned public event within respondents' jurisdictions.		
Participant Group	Number	Percentage
a. 0k-15k group	40	40%
b. 15k-30k group	18	18%
c. 30k-45k group	10	10%
d. 45k plus group	31	31%
Totals	99	100%

The 40 agencies represented in the 0k-15k group were 32 (80%) Fire/EMS agencies, one (2%) Law Enforcement agency, and four (10%) Emergency Management agencies. Additionally, three (8%) of the respondents identified their agency types as "other." These "other" agency

types consisted of one wildland fire agency, one public safety agency, and one "fire only"

agency. Results can be found in Table 2.

Table 2		
Agency types represented in the 0k-15k group.		
Agency Type	Number	Percentage
a. Fire/EMS	32	80%
b. Law Enforcement	1	2%
c. Emergency Management	4	10%
d. Other	3	8%
Totals	40	100%

The 18 agencies represented in the 15k-30k group were comprised of 16 (90%) Fire/EMS

agencies, one (5%) Law Enforcement agency, and one (5%) Emergency Management agency.

None of the respondents indicated their agency was an "other" agency type. Results can be

found in Table 3.

Table 3		
Agency types represented in the 15k-30k group.		
Agency Type	Number	Percentage
a. Fire/EMS	16	90%
b. Law Enforcement	1	5%
c. Emergency Management	1	5%
d. Other	0	0%
Totals	18	100%

Of the 10 agencies represented in the 30k- 45k group there were nine Fire/EMS agencies and

one Emergency Management agency. None of the respondents within this group indicated they

belonged to either a law enforcement agency or an "other" type of agency. Results can be found

in Table 3.

Table 4

Agency types represented in the 30k-45k group.

Agency Type	Number	Percentage
a. Fire/EMS	9	90%
b. Law Enforcement	0	0%
c. Emergency Management	1	10%
d. Other	0	0%
Totals	10	100%

The 31 agencies represented in the 45k plus group were comprised of 29 (94%) Fire/EMS

agency, one (3%) Law Enforcement agency, and one (3%) Emergency Management agency.

Within this group there were no respondents that indicated their agency as an "other" type of

agency. Results can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

Agency types represented in the 45k plus group.

Agency Type	Number	Percentage
a. Fire/EMS	29	94%
b. Law Enforcement	1	3%
c. Emergency Management	1	3%
d. Other	0	0%
Totals	31	100%

The number of organizations within the study population that usually takes the lead role in

emergency preparedness and emergency operations during recurring planned public events

varied between event participation group sizes. In the 0k-15k group, 30 (30%) of the agencies

took the lead role while 15 (15%) of the 15k-30k group usually took the lead role. Within the

30k-45k group, 8 (8%) usually took the lead role in emergency preparedness and emergency

operations of such events while in the 45k plus group 23 (23%) usually took the lead role. The

ratios of agency types that take the lead role in emergency preparedness and emergency

operations of such events were not readily available from the data collected. Since 86 (87%) of

the agencies within the primary study population were Fire/EMS agencies and the remaining 13

(13%) were comprised of Law Enforcement, Emergency Management, and "other," it is

mathematically obvious that the majority of the lead agencies in the study population were

Fire/EMS agencies. Results can be found in Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 6

Number of organizations that usually take the lead role in emergency preparedness and emergency operations of recurring planned public events

Participant Range Group	Number	Percentage
a. 0 to 15,000 participant group	30	30%
b. 15,000 to 30,000 participant group	15	15%
c. 30,000 to 45,000 participant group	8	8%
d. 45,000 or more participant group	23	23%
Totals	76	76%

Table 7

Organizations that usually do not take the lead role in emergency preparedness and emergency operations of recurring planned public events

Participant Range Group	Number	Percentage
a. 0 to 15,000 participant group	10	10%
b. 15,000 to 30,000 participant group	3	3%
c. 30,000 to 45,000 participant group	2	2%
d. 45,000 or more participant group	8	8%
Totals	23	23%

The descriptions of the agency types in the preceding groups were included merely to

illustrate the various types of organizations respondents of the study population were associated

with. Relative to emergency operations preparedness and emergency management for recurring

planned public events, varying policy component similarities, ICS utilization, and IAP utilization

were assumed to be present in each of the preceding groups regardless of agency type. For this

reason, subsequent questionnaire analysis focused on group comparison.

Questionnaire research question 1 results

The first research question was developed to discover planned public event internal policy

component similarities utilized by given groups of agencies. Answers to this question were

provided via the combined respondent answers of questionnaire items five, six, and seven.

Questionnaire item five inquired of respondents if their recurring planned public event policies

required the use of a multidisciplinary planning team. Questionnaire item six asked the

respondents if their policy required a hazard assessment/analysis to be completed for recurring

planned public events. Finally, questionnaire item seven asked respondents if their policy

addressed evacuation procedures for planned public events.

Eighty-eight of the 99 agencies which comprised the primary study population had policy

components which required the use of a multidisciplinary planning team for recurring planned

public events while 11 did not have such a policy component. The 0k-15k group was the largest

group and consisted of 40 of the primary study population agencies. Within that group, 34

(85%) agencies required the use of a multidisciplinary planning team. The next largest group

which required the use of a multidisciplinary planning team was the 45k plus group in which 29

(94%) of the groups 31 agencies had such a requirement. Following the 45k plus group in size

was the 15k-30k group. This group was comprised of 15 agencies, 15 (83%) of which were

required by policy to utilize a multidisciplinary planning team. The 30k to 45k group only

consisted of 10 agencies however all 10 (100%) were required by policy to utilize a

multidisciplinary planning team for planned public events. It is apparent from the data presented

that, regardless of the quantity of participants attending planned public events, the majority of the

agencies in the study population have an internal policy component which requires the use of

multidisciplinary planning teams. Results can be found in Table 8.

Table 8			
Recurring planned public event policies multidisciplinary planning team requirements.			
Participation Group	Required	Not Required	% Required
0k-15k group	34	6	85
15k-30k group	15	3	83
30k-45k group	10	0	100
45k plus group	29	2	94
Totals (N=99)	88	11	

Surprisingly, the number of agencies which were required by policy to complete hazard

assessment/analyses prior to planned public events was overall comparatively less than those

required to utilize multidisciplinary planning teams. The 0k-15k group consisted of 23 (58%)

agencies and the 15k-30k group consisted of 12 (66%) agencies which were required by policy

to complete hazard assessment/analyses in preparation of upcoming planned public events.

Similarly, the 30k-45k and the 45k plus groups had respectively 8 (80%) and 24 (77%) agencies

which were required to complete hazard assessment/analyses prior to planned public events.

Although the number of agencies required to complete hazard assessment/analyses was less than

expected, the number of agencies having policies dictating such requirements was greater than

50% within each group. Results can be found in Table 9.

Table 9			
Recurring planned public event policies hazard assessment/analysis requirements.			
Participation Group	Required	Not Required	% Required
0k-15k group	23	17	58
15k-30k group	12	6	66

Table 9 (continued)			
Recurring planned public event policies hazard assessment/analysis requirements.			
Participation Group	Required	Not Required	% Required
30k-45k group	8	2	80
45k plus group	24	7	77
Totals (N=99)	67	32	

Evacuation procedure requirements were a common component in the recurring planned

public event policies of the majority of agencies within the primary study population. In the 0k-

15k group there were 26 (65%) agencies that required evacuation procedures to be addressed in

their recurring planned public event policies. In the 15k-30k and the 30k-45k groups

respectively, 14 (65%) agencies and nine (90%) agencies had internal policy components that

addressed evacuation procedures. Similarly, the 45k plus group contained 26 (84%) agencies

whose internal planned public event policies addressed evacuation procedures. Results can be

found in Table 10.

Table 10			
Recurring planned public event policies evacuation procedures requirements.			
Participation Group	Required	Not Required	% Required
0k-15k group	26	14	65
15k-30k group	14	4	78
30k-45k group	9	1	90
45k plus group	26	5	84
Totals (N=99)	75	24	

The use of multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard assessment/analyses, and evacuation

procedures were identified in the literature reviewed as being logical and vital components of a

planned public event internal policy. Analysis of the results of questionnaire item five revealed

the majority of agencies within each group had a planned public event internal policy component

which required the use of multidisciplinary teams. Questionnaire item six showed that the

majority of agencies within each group had a policy component requiring the completion of a

hazard assessment/analysis for recurring planned public events. Similarly, questionnaire item

seven indicated that most agencies in each group had a public event policy which addressed

evacuation procedures. This information answers the first research question which was

developed to discover planned public event internal policy component similarities utilized by

given groups of agencies.

Questionnaire research question 2 results

The second research question was developed to determine the extent to which given groups of

agencies utilizes ICS during planned public events. Answers to this question were provided

through the combined respondent answers of questionnaire items eight, nine, and ten.

Questionnaire item eight inquired of respondents what ICS positions are commonly filled during

recurring planned public events. Questionnaire item nine asked respondents what general staff

management functions were ever necessary during recurring planned public events. Lastly,

questionnaire item nine asked respondents what other organization's personnel are routinely

assigned ICS positions during recurring planned public events.

The questionnaire results revealed that within the 0k to 15k group, 38 (95%) agencies

normally filled the Incident Commander (IC) position, 25 (63%) normally filled the Public

Information Officer (PIO) position, 26 (65%) normally filled the Safety Officer position,

17(43%) normally filled the Liaison Officer position, and 9 (23%) normally filled "other" ICS

positions. Results can be found in Table 11.

Table 11

ICS positions normally filled by the 40 organizations in the 0k-15k group during recurring planned public events.

Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Incident Commander	38	95%
b. Public Information Officer	25	63%
c. Safety Officer	26	65%
d. Liaison Officer	17	43%
e. Other	9	23%

Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.

During planned public events, all 18 (100%) agencies in the 15k-30k group normally assigned an IC. Within that group, ten (56%) agencies normally assigned a PIO, ten (56%) agencies normally filled the Safety Officer position, and ten (56%) normally filled the Liaison Officer position. Additionally, four (22%) of the agencies within this group utilized "other" positions within their ICS structure. Results can be found in Table 12.

Table 12

ICS positions normally filled by the 18 organizations in the 15k-30k group during recurring planned public events.

Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Incident Commander	18	100%
b. Public Information Officer	10	56%
c. Safety Officer	10	56%
d. Liaison Officer	10	56%
e. Other	4	22%

Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.

All ten (100%) of the agencies in the 30k-45k group normally filled the IC position during planned public events. Nine (90%) of the agencies normally assigned a PIO, and 10 (100%) normally assigned a Safety Officer. Additionally, seven (70%) normally assigned a Liaison Officer, while one (10%) normally assigned "other" ICS positions.

Table 13

ICS positions normally filled by the 10 organizations in the 30k to 45k group during recurring planned public events.

Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Incident Commander	10	100%
b. Public Information Officer	9	90%
c. Safety Officer	10	100%
d. Liaison Officer	7	70%
e. Other	1	10%

Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.

` Identical to the 15k-30k group and the 30k-45k group, all 31 agencies within the 45k plus group normally assigned an IC during planned public events. Within the 45k plus group additional normally assigned ICS positions were, PIO by 25 (81%) of the agencies, Safety Officer by 22 (71%) of the agencies, Liaison Officer by 21 (68%) of the agencies, and "other" by seven (22%) of the agencies. Results can be found in Table 14.

Table 14

ICS positions normally filled by the 31 organizations in the 45k plus group during recurring planned public events.

Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Incident Commander	31	100%
b. Public Information Officer	25	81%
c. Safety Officer	22	71%
d. Liaison Officer	21	68%
e. Other	7	22%

Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.

In addition to the fundamental ICS positions, agencies within each group employed general staff positions in varying degrees during recurring planned public events. Within the 0k-15k group 31 (78%) of the agencies assigned an operations section and 23 (58%) utilized a planning section. Furthermore, 21 (53%) assigned personnel to a logistics section and eight (20%)

normally find the need to establish a finance/administration section. Six (15%) of the agencies

within this group never find the need to establish any of the aforementioned general staff

components during recurring planned public events. Results can be found in Table 15.

Table 15		
General staff positions normally filled by the 40 organizations in the 0k-15k group during recurring planned public events.		
Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Operations Section	31	78%
b. Planning Section	23	58%
c. Logistics Section	21	53%
d. Finance/Administration Section	8	20%
e. None of the above are ever necessary	6	15%
Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.		

Unlike the agencies in the 0k-15k group, all agencies within the 15k-30k group normally set

up an operations section during recurring planned public events. Planning and Logistics Sections

however appear to be slightly less common in this group than in the 0k-15k group. Planning

Sections are normally set up by 10 (56%) of the agencies while Logistics Sections are normally

utilized by 6 (33%) of the agencies. Additionally, only one (6%) of the agencies normally

utilized a Finance/Administration Section. Finally, none of the agencies in this group indicated

there is never a need for general staff positions. These differences however, should not be

considered significant due to the smaller group size. Results can be found in Table 16.

Table 16		
General staff positions normally filled by the 18 organizations in the 15,000 to 30,000 participation group during recurring planned public events.		
Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Operations Section	18	100%
b. Planning Section	10	56 %

Table 16 (continued)		
General staff positions normally filled by the 18 organizations in the 15,000 to 30,000 participation group during recurring planned public events.		
c. Logistics Section	6	33%
d. Finance/Administration Section	1	6%
e. None of the above are ever necessary	0	0%
Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.		

Similar to the 15k-30k group, all ten agencies in the 30k-45k group normally establish an

Operations Section during every recurring planned public event within their jurisdictions. Seven

(70%) agencies within this group usually establish Planning Sections and eight (80%) of the

agencies usually establish a Logistics Section. Four (40%) of the agencies in this group normally

find the need for a Finance/Administration Section during planned public events. Comparable

with the 15k-30k group, none of the agencies in this group indicated general staff positions are

never needed during planned public events. It should be noted that since there are only ten

agencies within this group, the data presented may not represent the potential results of a larger

population group. Results can be found in Table 17.

Table 17		
General staff positions normally filled by the 10 organizations in the 30,000 to 45,000 participation group during recurring planned public events.		
Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Operations Section	10	100%
b. Planning Section	7	70%
c. Logistics Section	8	80%
d. Finance/Administration Section	4	40%
e. None of the above are ever necessary	0	0%
Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.		

As seen with the 15k-30k and 30k-45k groups, all agencies within the 45k plus group

establish an operations section during recurring planned public events. 25 (81%) of the agencies

within this group normally utilize a Planning Section and 22 (71%) normally establish a

Logistics Section. Twenty-one (68%) of the agencies in the 45k plus group normally find the

need to establish a Finance/Administration Section. Ironically, 7 (23%) of the respondents

indicated their agencies never find the necessity for establishing any of the listed general staff

sections. These responses were apparently aberrant since all 31 agencies within the group

normally assign personnel to an Operations Section. Results can be found in Table 18.

Table 18		
General staff positions normally filled by the 31 organizations in the 45,000 or more participation group during recurring planned public events.		
Answers	Number	Percentage
a. Operations Section	31	100%
b. Planning Section	25	81%
c. Logistics Section	22	71%
d. Finance/Administration Section	21	68%
e. None of the above are ever necessary	7	23%
Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.		

Table 19 was included to illustrate the degree of Unified Command incorporated in each

group's emergency operations management during recurring planned public events. Each group

utilized other organization's personnel to varying degrees during recurring planned public

events. While the data presented does not provide definitive indications of what positions other

organization personnel were assigned within the ICS structure, it does provide a strong indication

that unified command during planned public events is not uncommon. Notably, among all

groups, law enforcement personnel are the most often other organization personnel assigned to

ICS positions. Law Enforcement personnel inclusion in the command structure of planned

public events ranged from 90% to 100% within all groups. This is most likely reasonably

accurate data due to the inherent Law Enforcement requirements of mass gatherings. Results can

be found in Table 19.

Table 19			
Other organization's personnel assigned ICS positions during recurring planned public events.			
Organization type	0k-15k	15k-30k	30k-45k	45k Plus
Fire/EMS	20 (50%)	12 (67%)	2 (20%)	22 (71%)
Law enforcement	36 (90%)	17 (94%)	10 (100%)	29 (94%)
OEM	12 (30%)	11 (61%)	4 (40%)	14 (45%)
Event promoter	23 (58%)	10 (56%)	4 (40%)	20 (65%)
Public works/utilities	24 (60%)	7 (39%)	5 (50%)	23 (74%)
0k-15k group = 40 agencies			
15k-30k group = 18 agencies			
30k-45k group = 10 agencies			
45k plus group = 31 agencies			
Totals not applicable due to respondent ability to select multiple answers.			

Questionnaire research question 3 results

Research question three was developed to determine how extensively given groups of

agencies utilize IAP's for recurring planned public events. Answers to this question were

provided by responses from questionnaire items 11 and 12. Questionnaire item 11asked

respondents if their agencies utilized IAP's for recurring planned public events. Questionnaire

item 12 asked respondents what ICS forms were commonly used by their agencies during such

events. Questionnaire item 12 is relevant to IAP utilization since ICS forms are common

components of IAP's.

All respondents within the study groups indicated their agencies utilize IAP's for recurring

public events either always or occasionally. Seventy-one of the agencies always utilized IAP's

while 28 utilized IAP's occasionally. Such widespread use of IAP's is an indication that

agencies find value in operational documentation of planned public events, however, from the

data provided, that value is not precisely expressed. Results can be found in Table 20.

Table 20

Organizations which always or occasionally use IAP's for recurring planned public events.

Participation Group	Always	Occasionally	Total Agencies
0k-15k group	24	16	40
15k-30k group	16	2	18
30k-45k group	9	1	10
45k plus group	22	9	31
Totals (N = 99)	71	28	99

Literature suggests that effective documentation of events included in an IAP can be achieved

by using standardized ICS forms. Eighty-three of questionnaire respondents within all four

research groups indicated their agencies use a variety of ICS forms during recurring planned

public events. The remaining 16 agencies that did not use ICS forms consisted of four from the

0k-15k group, five from the 15k to 30k group, one from the 30k to 45k group, and six from the

45k plus group. This data indicates the use of ICS forms during such events is common practice

by many agencies. Due to the large amount of data generated from responses in reference to ICS

form utilization by agencies during recurring planned public events, a systematic breakdown of

the data was not provided in the results section to avoid excessive distraction.

As described in the procedures section of this project, after the respondent completed the last

question, the following closing message was programmed to appear:

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. If your organization has a policy in place

related to emergency operations preparedness and management of public events would you

mind sharing it with me? It would greatly assist me in my research for my Applied Research

Project. Please e-mail it to me at smills@larkspurfire.org. If you have questions or advice

concerning my research you can contact me at (303) 681-3284. Stuart Mills, Larkspur Fire

EMS Division Chief.

Unfortunately, none of the respondents who completed the questionnaire returned their

agency's policies via electronic mail. Therefore, in-depth research of a sizeable collection of

authentic planned public event policies was not possible.

Interview Results

Five personal interviews were conducted between April 4, 2012 and May 8, 2012. Three of

the interviews were conducted with emergency service workers from local agencies in Colorado;

one was an LFPD employee, one was employed by the Douglas County Sheriff's Office, and one

was employed by the Elbert County Office of Emergency Management. Additional interviews

were conducted with municipal employees of the Town of Larkspur and with the manager of the

Colorado Renaissance Festival. This group of interviewees was selected based on their potential

stakeholder status and presumed knowledge of the largest recurring planned public event within

the District, or similar events at other locations. Complete transcriptions of the interviews can be

found in Appendices F through J.

A personal interview was conducted with Randal Johnson, the LFPD Fire Marshal, on April 4,

2012. During the interview, Johnson indicated that emergency operations preparedness and

emergency operations management for planned public events, in particular the Colorado

Renaissance Festival requires the involvement of all stakeholder organizations impacted. He

stated, "So I believe that Douglas County Emergency Management, Douglas County Sheriff's

Office, and the LFPD should be involved with that." He also indicated that the Town of

Larkspur and personnel from the event should also be involved in planning efforts because,

"…there's impacts to the town directly." Johnson also indicated that having a functional internal

policy which provides emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations

management of recurring planned public events is imperative. He stated, "Each event is going to

have particulars that will be unique to that event but, if you're all over the board for different

events, that's not good." Johnson stressed that such an internal policy should contain

components addressing multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard assessment/analysis pertaining

to specific event sites, and evacuation procedures. Additionally, he stressed the importance of

defining responsibilities of event stakeholders from varying disciplines. Johnson stated, "…you

could have a large sweeping fire, you could have an active shooter event, you could have a

tornado…Each one of those events is probably going to require a different lead as far as agencies

are concerned" (R. Johnson, personal communications, April 4, 2012).

   Johnson opined that ICS is a necessity for all public events and the command structure for any

such event should be unified among all organizations involved. He emphasized again that the

nature of an emergency situation occurring within a public event will require a lead role from a

specific discipline within the unified command structure. "…if fire is on scene and it's a fire

event, somebody from fire should be designated as the incident commander." Alternately he

stated, "…if it's a cop event then the lead cop on scene should be designated as the IC."

Regarding additional necessary IC positions during recurring planned public events, Johnson

recommended Planning and Logistics divisions. While he did not expand upon the role of a

planning division, he pointed out that, relative to public events within LFPD, logistics may not

be utilized immediately but pre-assignment of that division may be useful in the event an

extended emergency situation occurs. In conjunction with establishing unified command during public events, Johnson averred, "IAP's should be done for every planned event and for every day of the event because there are specifics that change from day to day." In response to the ICS forms which should be utilized in a public event IAP, Johnson indicated that all forms that would be utilized on a large scale emergency incident should be included in the IAP (R. Johnson, personal communications, April 4, 2012).

On April 5, 2012 an interview was conducted with Keith Mathena, a Deputy with the Douglas County Sheriff's Office who was recently assigned as the Departmental Liaison with the Douglas County Office of Emergency Management. When asked who should take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events, Mathena indicated that all emergency service agencies impacted by such events "…should have a role in making those decisions and, in a unified manner, all take the lead role." He believes there should be an internal policy which provides guidelines to personnel of various disciplines responsible for the emergency management of public events however, "…it's going to get sticky…" in the development and implementation of a policy which addresses emergency service agencies with differing primary missions. He did stress that a generalized document which provides basic direction to the various stakeholders is important. According to Mathena, the specific components of such a document should address hazard assessment/analysis, communications procedures, and evacuation procedures (K. Mathena, personal communications, April 5, 2012).

When questioned in regards to how extensively ICS should be utilized during recurring planned public events, Mathena indicated that it should utilized regardless of the magnitude of the event. He did not offer his opinion of most of the command staff positions or any of the

general staff position, however, he did stress the vital importance of the Incident Commander position during all types of incidents. He also emphasized that Unified Command between fire and law enforcement agencies could be problematic because of the mission differences between the disciplines. (K. Mathena, personal communications, April 5, 2012)

Similar to the opinion of the LFPD Fire Marshal, Randal Johnson, Mathena indicated that he believes IAP utilization is a necessary tool for effective emergency operations during recurring planned pubic events. Unlike the opinion of the LFPD Fire Marshal however, Mathena indicated that the extent of ICS form usage is dependent upon the type of event. If during a public event, an emergency situation occurs, it may be "…a major wildfire or huge event where you're bringing in overhead teams you'll use basically every form under the sun to accomplish what you need for accountability, resource ordering, and all that stuff that goes along with it" (K. Mathena, personal communications, April 5, 2012).

On April 13, 2012, Cory Stark of the Elbert County Office of Emergency Management was interviewed. When asked who should take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events, Stark echoed the viewpoints of Johnson and Mathena. In reference to emergency preparedness and operations as it relates to a recurring large public event within Elbert County Stark said, "…it's unified but it starts in jurisdiction and I think by having everybody come to the table to begin building a process and a plan it becomes a shared process." Stark also expressed his opinion that an internal policy governing emergency operations preparedness and management would be beneficial. By having such a policy in place, according to Stark, "some of the questions and some of the gaps that could be created when new folks are entered into the mix…" are alleviated Similar to Johnson and Mathena, he alluded that important components of such a policy should

be hazards and vulnerabilities, evacuation procedures, and effective communication procedures"

(C. Stark, personal communications, April 13, 2012).

According to Stark, ICS should be used in emergency situations and during recurring planned

public events. Although he did not describe all necessary individual ICS positions during public

events other than the incident commander role, he did stress that for ICS to work effectively the

presence of a functional communication framework necessary. Stark also indicated that the use

of IAP's is an integral component for successful ICS implementation during planned public

events. He stated in reference to utilizing IAP's during public events, they are "…not only

critical for the event and understanding what you're dealing with in that (event), they're a great

training tool. They provide hands-on process for when you actually have to create them in the

field." Stark also believes that all standardized ICS forms should be readily available to the ICS

team managing emergency operations of a planned public event so that when an unexpected

large emergency situation occurs, all necessary administrative components are accessible. In

closing, he stressed that for effective preparation for management of emergency operations

during recurring planned public events to be present, effective collaboration and communications

among all stakeholders is required. The catalyst, according to Stark, needed to initiate effective

collaboration and communications among the stakeholders is a leader, "…who can connect

everybody and make awareness, make the point, and make the cooperation that everybody wants

to buy into" (C. Stark, personal communications, April 13, 2012).

The interview results of the three Emergency Service workers revealed that each believed

effective emergency preparedness and emergency operations for recurring planned public events

hinges upon cooperative planning and operational strategies among the primary stakeholders

associated with a particular event. They also expressed their opinions that an internal policy

which provides guidelines for emergency preparedness and operations during such events would be beneficial. Each interviewee indicated that hazard assessment/analyses and evacuation procedures would be important components of such a policy. These interviewee responses contributed to answering the first research question which was developed to discover the planned public event internal policy component similarities utilized by given groups of agencies. Each of the interviewees in the emergency service worker group expressed their beliefs ICS should be implemented in a unified manner and that IAP's should be utilized and comprised of various readily available standardized ICS forms. The interviewee's responses in reference to ICS and IAP utilization both contributed to answering the second and third research questions which were developed to determine the extent to which given group of agencies utilize ICS and IAP's.

On April 17, 2012, two employees of the Town of Larkspur were interviewed simultaneously. One of the employees was Matt Krimmer, who was the Town Clerk and Manager. The other employee was Sharon Roman, who was the Deputy Town Clerk. When asked the average number of customers that attend the Colorado Renaissance Festival, Roman estimated there were 10,000 to 15,000 participants attending the event each business day. (S. Roman, personal communications, April 17, 2012) Neither Roman nor Krimmer were aware of the number of employees at the Festival. When asked about planning meetings between the Town of Larkspur and the Colorado Renaissance Festival, Krimmer indicated there are no such efforts. He stated, "They submit a plan every year which describes traffic control and traffic management. That's pretty much the extent to which we coordinate anything with them" (M. Krimmer, personal communications, April 17, 2012). In response to the inquiry of how the community is impacted by the event, Roman indicated the most positive impact was the tax revenue the Town received as the result of the Festival conducting business within the town limits. Both Krimmer and

Roman agreed the only negative impact was that of increased traffic volume. Neither provided additional pertinent information as closing statements.

On May 8, 2012 a personal interview was conducted with Jim Paradise, the owner and manager of the Colorado Renaissance Festival. Mr. Paradise claimed an average of 7,000 customers attend the event each Saturday and Sunday during the Festival season. According to Paradise, during the weekend days that the Festival conducts business there are approximately 200 employees on the site. During event operating hours there are also approximately 300 private vendors, 60 (20%) of whom reside in recreational vehicles or tents throughout the Festival season in a specially designated campground adjacent to the main fairground. When asked if the event had an Emergency Action Plan (EAP) in place, Paradise stated the event had one, however, he also indicated it was developed independently of collaboration with local emergency service providers by stating, "…we would like to get involved with the Sheriff's Department and the Fire Department to make it more specific…" (J. Paradise, personal communications, May 8, 2012).

The interviewee responses from the Town of Larkspur employees and the owner/manager of the Colorado Renaissance Festival did not provide specific answers to the research questions. They did however, provide insight upon the degree of emergency preparation within their own organizations, as well as the degree of collaborative preparation with other stakeholders impacted by the event. It appeared the Town's primary concern of negative impact to the community is related to increased traffic during the event, which was solely addressed by the event via the annual submission of a traffic control and management plan. In contrast, the event management staff appeared to desire collaborative planning with Emergency Services stakeholders in an effort to develop a more effective EAP.

Discussion

Throughout the nation there are many communities in which recurring planned public events occur. These events range from small community events drawing participant crowds of less than 100 up to large scale events which may have a participant draw in excess of 45,000. Each event, regardless of its size, requires a certain degree of emergency operational preparedness to increase the effectiveness of emergency operations if a true emergency incident occurs during the event. The lack of an adequate level of emergency operational preparedness for public events places the events participants, the communities in which the events take place, and the emergency service workers responsible for mitigating emergency incidents during such events at unnecessary risk. Additionally, lack of emergency operations preparedness resulting in poorly managed emergency incidents during public events could have devastating social and legal ramifications to the responsible stakeholder organizations and communities at large.

Emergency operations preparedness for public events obviously requires planning and the amount of planning required is partly dependent upon the nature and size of the event. The extent to which emergency operations planning for public events is also dependent on the number of jurisdictional agencies, organizations, and municipalities are impacted, or potentially impacted by emergency situations during the event. USDHS (2008) points out that care should be taken to ensure the results of the planning process are, "…realistic, scalable, and applicable…" so that during an actual emergency situation at a planned event, the plans are of use to onsite emergency service personnel regardless of the nature of the emergency (p. 16).

According to FEMA (2010) planning for public events should be conducted by multidisciplinary teams consisting of key stakeholder agency or organization personnel. The key stakeholder agencies or organizational personnel of such a team may consist of Fire Service

representatives, Law Enforcement representatives, Office of Emergency Management

representatives, municipality representatives, event representatives, and possibly various county,

state, or federal representatives. Bickel (2007) also stressed the importance of establishing a

multidisciplinary planning team comprised of key stakeholders. Similarly, MDA (2008)

appeared to echo the concept of multidisciplinary planning teams via the statement referring to

fairgrounds emergency plans, "…written with input from many disciplines…" (MDA, 2008, p.

1). During the planning process, the team should strive to identify and develop mitigation

strategies of hazards specific to the event and develop functional evacuation plans (FEMA,

2010). Primarily due to the literature reviewed, this applied research project author concluded

that a planned public event policy should contain the three critical components of; (a)

multidisciplinary planning team guidelines, (b) hazard assessment guidelines, and (c) evacuation

plan guidelines.

While the necessity of such a policy was not stressed in the literature reviewed, it is common

knowledge that one of the primary purposes of policies is to guide organizational direction.

Therefore, agencies without a policy outlining the requirements for emergency operations

preparedness relating to recurring planned public events may experience difficulties managing

emergency situations at such events. Although public events occur with a fair amount of

frequency within the District, the LFPD has never had a formal policy for recurring planned

public events. Additionally, formal multidisciplinary teams have never been established for

planning purposes of any of the recurring public events within the District. The questionnaire

results indicated that 84 (38%) of the 223 agencies that responded also did not have such a policy

in place. Ninety-nine (44%) of the respondents agencies did however, have such a formal policy

in place. The majority of the agencies' policies contained components which required the use of

a multidisciplinary planning team, requirements for hazard assessment/analysis, and

requirements for the development of evacuation procedures. The components contained in the

agencies policies coincided with a combination of some of the concepts presented by USDHS

(2008), FEMA (2010), Bickel (2007), and MDA (2008).

   The interviews with local emergency service workers made their opinions evident that LFPD,

or any other agency in whose jurisdiction recurring planned public events occur, should have a

policy governing unified emergency operations planning. Each addressed the need for such a

policy to contain requirements for multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard assessment and

analysis, and evacuation procedures. It was apparent that each found the value of planning for

public events in a unified manner as being highly beneficial not only to emergency service

providers but to the communities they serve. The combination of the interviewee's responses

and the questionnaire respondent agencies that have recurring planned public event policies in

place which list guidelines for multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard assessment and

mitigation, and evacuation procedures, justifies the need for the LFPD to develop such a policy.

   The interview with municipal employees made it evident that little planning was conducted

for the town's largest recurring planned public event which included officials from the Town of

Larkspur. Their observation of the only negative impact to the community consisted merely of

the increase in motor vehicle traffic. The Town Clerk and Manager stated, "They (Douglas

County Sheriff's Department) submit a plan every year which describes traffic control and traffic

management. That's pretty much the extent to which we coordinate anything with them" (M.

Krimmer, personal communications, April 17, 2012). The only other impact discussed was the

positive impact of tax revenue generated for the town which, "…allows the town to still be a

town; the biggest part of our revenue is from the Renaissance Festival" (S. Roman, personal

communications, April 17, 2012). The owner and manager of the Town of Larkspur's largest

recurring planned public event, the Colorado Renaissance Festival, also indicated a lack of

inclusion in emergency operations preparedness. When questioned if the event had an EAP in

place, the owner and manager indicated there was one however, indicated its development was

independent of other stakeholder input by stating, "…we would like to get involved with the

Sheriff's Department and the Fire Department to make it more specific…" (J. Paradise, personal

communications, May 8, 2012).

   The lack of inclusion of municipal and event representatives in emergency operations

preparedness planning could result in the unavailability of needed existing resources and

personnel if a large-scale incident were to occur at a public event within a municipality's

boundaries. Additionally, large scale emergencies at such events which lack stakeholder

preparedness collaboration could result in unnecessary negative impacts to its employees,

participants, the community, emergency service workers, and surrounding jurisdictions which

may be called upon to render aid. Every community which hosts planned public events should

be included in a multidisciplinary planning team to ensure community impacts are fully

understood and contingency plans for potential large scale emergency incidents can be developed

with input from all stakeholder disciplines involved.

   The use of ICS should not be considered a system reserved only for emergency situations. It

is a flexible system which is applicable during routine situations such as recurring planned public

events. Ahmed (2009) describes ICS as a basic management system which can be tailored to fit

any discipline in any situation which requires a functional and systematic management structure.

Marcini (2009) infers that organization and effectiveness of security staff personnel assigned to

planned public events is dependent upon ICS structure.

The questionnaire results indicated that the vast majority of respondent's agencies utilized

ICS in varying degrees during planned public events. In the 0k-15k group, 38 (95%) of the

respondents' agencies appointed an IC, and all agencies within the other groups assigned an IC

100% of the time. The PIO position was assigned between 56% and 90% of the time. It is not

surprising that the agencies within the 30k-45k group and the 45k plus group required a PIO

between 90% and 80% respectively due to possible media involvement resultant to the events

impact, or potential impact upon the community. This contrasts with the slightly lower

frequency PIO assignment by the agencies in the 0k-15k group, of which 63% normally filled the

position, and the 15k-30k group, of which 56% normally filled the position. The questionnaire

results for the remaining ICS/general staff positions varied similarly between each group.

It should be noted that the questionnaire results do not reflect the exact nature of the events

occurring within each group's jurisdictions. It is obvious that a high risk, high participation

event such as an automobile race with spectators numbering in the tens of thousands would

require a more expanded ICS structure than a low risk, low participation event such as a small art

festival in a small municipal park. According to the United States Department of Homeland

Security, "ICS is used to organize on-scene operations for a broad spectrum of emergencies from

small to complex incidents, both natural and manmade" (USDHS, 2009, p. 46). A recurring

planned public event should be considered to be inclusive of that spectrum of emergencies

because each event's specific and inherent hazards may easily be the catalyst for small or large

emergencies.

When questioned about the extent to which ICS should be used during recurring planned

public events, each of the emergency service workers interviewed expressed their opinion that it

should be used for both planned public events and emergency situations. Each however, had

varying descriptions of how extensive ICS structure at planned events should be. All three

interviewees stressed that unified command during such events is critical. The LFPD Fire

Marshal stressed the importance of utilizing unified command during public events because not

all emergency situations that could occur during an event would be within the mitigation

capabilities of all agencies involved with the event. For instance he pointed out, "…if Fire is on

scene and it's a Fire event, somebody from Fire should be designated as the incident

commander…" but "…if it's a cop event then the lead cop on scene should be designated as the

IC" (R. Johnson, personal communications, April 4, 2012). Connors (2007) supported this

concept by differentiating the roles between an event managed under a single jurisdictional ICS

structure and an event managed under a multi-jurisdictional or unified ICS structure. In a single

jurisdictional ICS structure the IC is responsible for the overall management of the event and

emergency situations which occur during the event. In a multi-jurisdictional, or Unified ICS

structure, representatives from each jurisdiction are assigned a command position and, "…jointly

determine objectives, plans, and priorities, and work together to execute them" (Connors, 2007,

p. 30). Connors further points out, from the viewpoint of a security and law enforcement

specialist, that plans formulated by specialists in the fields of fire protection and Emergency

Medical Services "…must be integrated into the overall security plan for the event" (Connors,

2007, p. 51).

Currently, recurring planned public events within the jurisdiction of the LFPD are not

managed through the use of Unified Command. During the largest event within the District there

are always LFPD personnel, Douglas County Sheriff's Department personnel, and event

personnel onsite. LFPD utilizes an ICS structure which consists solely of an IC and its own

operational personnel whose primary objectives are fire protection and mitigation, and EMS

services. The Douglas County Sheriff's Department personnel assign a lead deputy who is

responsible for oversight of traffic control and other law enforcement activities. The LFPD IC

facilitates communications between the event and Law Enforcement personnel, however, clear

objectives, plans, and priorities are never adequately communicated among the three

jurisdictional entities involved with the event. For instance, evacuation plans are not know by all

organizations, nor are procedures to be followed in the event of a large wildland fire, civil

disturbance, or acts of domestic terrorism. Such a fragmented form of ICS during such events

has the potential to place event participants, the community, and emergency service providers at

unnecessary risk if emergency situations such as the aforementioned were to occur during a

public event.

   According to literature reviewed, "An IAP provides a concise, coherent means of capturing

and communicating the overall incident priorities, objectives, and strategies of both operational

and support activities" (FEMA, 2009, p. 3.5). Obviously, documentation by ICS personnel is a

vital component of effective mitigation of emergency situations. All of the respondents of the

questionnaire indicated their agencies utilize IAP's for recurring planned public events either

always or occasionally. Sixteen of the agencies however, indicated their agencies do not utilize

any of the standard ICS forms contained in the NIMS/ICS Forms Booklet (2010). The

documentation media used by agencies which utilized IAP's but did not utilize standard ICS

forms was unclear. It was evident however, that 83 (84%) of the respondent's agencies did

utilize standard ICS forms to the extent necessary, apparently dependent upon the nature of the

specific planned public event. Since the majority of respondent's agencies utilize standardized

ICS forms for public event documentation it could be construed that the documents enable them

to effectively capture and communicate, "…the overall incident priorities, objectives, and

strategies of both operational and support activities" during planned public events (FEMS, 2009, p. 3-5).

For several years during the largest recurring planned special event within the District's jurisdiction, the LFPD has utilized IAP's which contain an Incident Briefing Form (ICS 201 form), an Incident Radio Communications Plan (ICS 209 form), and a Communications List (ICS 205A form). The contents of the forms are generally well communicated among the LFPD personnel, however, briefings have never officially included other stakeholders such as on-site Law Enforcement or event personnel. Additionally, the effectiveness of the IAP and the forms, or the need to include additional forms for the event, has never been assessed. If an agency chooses to formulate an IAP and utilize standard ICS forms to document priorities, objectives, strategies, and other vital information, the exclusion of communicating the IAP and its contents to other onsite stakeholders could diminish, or even negate its effectiveness. Similarly, if the effectiveness of the IAP and the forms utilized in the IAP are never assessed for effectiveness, such planning and documentation may prove to be futile. These concepts are summarized by the statement, "Plans must be implemented through communication, processes and exercise" (Sutuza, 2011, para. 4).

Each of the emergency services workers interviewed indicated that documentation of a public event, and emergency situations that occur within the event, using standardized ICS forms should be a common practice. Johnson's opinion was that IAP's should be developed for each day of an event and indicated all forms that would be used on a large scale incident should be used. (R. Johnson, personal communications, April 4, 2012) Similarly, Stark's opinion was that all ICS forms should be available to ICS structure members in the case a large emergency incident occurred during a public event. In reference to utilizing IAP's during recurring planned

public events, Stark believes they are a necessity and, "…a great training tool. They provide

hands on process for when you actually have to create them in the field" (C. Stark, personal

communications, April 13, 2012). Mathena however, believed that the specific ICS forms that

should be included in an IAP depend upon the magnitude of an emergency situation that occurs

during a planned public event. While not mentioning specific types of emergencies which would

require specific ICS forms, he implied that a minimum amount of ICS forms would be needed if

only minor emergency incidents occurred. In reference to large incidents he stated, "…you'll

basically use every form under the sun…" (K. Mathena, personal communications, April 5,

2012). The amount and types of ICS forms utilized for IAP purposes during a planned public

event should be limited to the amounts and types necessary to effectively document and manage

emergency and non-emergency operations during the event. The practice of having the majority

of the spectrum of forms on hand at the Incident Command Post however, is also probably a

prudent practice in the case that an emergency situation were to escalate into a large incident

requiring greater than normal resources and the necessity of an expanded ICS structure.

   The overall results of this study showed that most of the questionnaire respondents whose

agencies had policies governing emergency operations preparedness for planned public events

contained components requiring the use of multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard

assessment/analyses, and evacuation planning. Correspondingly, the majority of the agencies

within each study group utilized ICS to some degree during planned public events. Also, most of

the agencies within each study group utilized IAP's and standardized ICS forms in varying

fashions. The literature reviewed, while it did not specifically address any of the respondent's

agency's internal policies, identified multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard

assessment/analyses, and evacuation planning as three vital components of effective emergency

operations preparedness components. The literature reviewed also indicated ICS and the use of

IAP's and standardized ICS forms is applicable not only to emergency incidents, but to a myriad

of other events, one being recurring planned public events. The results of the interviews with the

emergency service workers closely reflected the information discovered from the questionnaire

results and the literature reviewed.

    In summary, the LFPD's emergency operations preparedness for recurring planned public

events could be more effective. In the past there have been no internal or shared policy

governing emergency operations preparedness for recurring planned public events. Also, the

multidisciplinary planning team concept has never been used by the District. Although the

LFPD conducts hazard assessment and analyses for recurring planned public events within its

boundaries, those risks have never been formally shared with all stakeholders involved nor have

the roles of other stakeholders during emergency situations been shared. Furthermore, Law

Enforcement hazard assessments/analyses, evacuation guidelines, and the roles of other

stakeholders during emergency situations occurring at planned public events have been formally

communicated. Finally, ICS and the use of IAP's in conjunction with standardized ICS forms

have been implemented for the past several years during the largest recurring planned public

event within its boundaries. Unfortunately, the ICS structure has never formally been unified

with other stakeholder organizations and IAP information has never formally been shared with

other stakeholders involved in the event. A fitting comment by the Elbert County, Colorado

Emergency Manager in reference to initiating effective collaboration and communications

among the stakeholders of public events was that a leader is needed "…who can connect

everybody and make awareness, make the point, and make the cooperation that everybody wants

to buy into" (C. Stark, personal communications, April 13, 2012).

Recommendations

The recommendations derived from the research conducted for this ARP were based on the lack of sufficient preparation for emergency operations during recurring planned public events on the part of the District and other stakeholders associated with public events occurring within the LFPD's jurisdictional boundaries. The LFPD has never developed or utilized an official internal written policy or associated procedures which encompass necessary planning requirements, command structure, or documentation of recurring planned public events. All jurisdictions in which such events occur should place a high degree of priority on preparing for non-emergency and emergency situations which may occur during public events.

The first recommendation is that LFPD should strive to initiate effective communications among all primary stakeholders impacted by public events occurring within the District. Literature reviewed and the interview results indicated that establishment of effective communications among stakeholders is paramount if unified planning processes are to occur. Although not inclusive of all stakeholders of all potential planned public events, the primary stakeholders of such events occurring within the jurisdictional boundaries of LFPD generally consist of event sponsors or event management personnel, law enforcement personnel, fire service personnel, county emergency management personnel, and key municipal personnel. Without the establishment of communications among such stakeholders, comprehensive preparedness for emergency operations during recurring planned public events will not be achievable.

The second recommendation is that, following establishment of effective communications among the primary stakeholders, multidisciplinary planning teams should be formed for the

emergency operations planning of various public events which occur within the District's jurisdictional boundaries. The literature reviewed and the responses from local emergency service workers interviewed suggest multidisciplinary planning teams are vital to effective emergency operations preparedness for planned public events. Additionally, a large portion of the questionnaire respondents indicated their agencies utilize a multidisciplinary planning team which, while not definitive, is an indication of the usefulness to such teams. Generally, representatives from the Douglas County Sheriff's Office, the LFPD, and the Douglas County Office of Emergency Management should be included as part of all multidisciplinary planning teams for planned public events occurring within the District since the area is under the jurisdiction of all three agencies. Other planning team members, such as municipal representatives, county parks and recreation department representatives, school district representatives, event representatives, or even department of transportation representatives could be included dependent upon various jurisdictional locations and nature of the planned public event within the District.

   The third recommendation is that LFPD, in conjunction with multidisciplinary planning teams, should draft a policy and associated procedures based on standardized national guidelines which outline the appropriate methods of effectively preparing for emergency operations during planned public events. The research indicated hazard assessment, evacuation planning, ICS structure, and IAP formulation utilizing standardized ICS forms are all very important components of effective emergency operations however, each component is also applicable in a variety of non-emergency settings. Questionnaire responses indicated a large number of respondents' agencies had a formal policy for planned public events which addressed each of the aforementioned components. Furthermore, the emergency service workers indicated a policy

would be useful in effective management of planned public events, whether in a non-emergent or emergent situation. Included in the contents of the planned public event policy and associated procedures should be requirements for utilization of multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard assessment and analysis requirements, and evacuation planning guidelines. Additionally, policies and procedures specific to planned public events developed in conjunction with multidisciplinary planning teams should outline event specific ICS structures to be utilized, what ICS positions are to be filled by representatives of stakeholder organizations, IAP formulation requirements, and associated standardized ICS form usage requirements. Such a policy and associated procedures could be utilized internally solely by the LFPD, however, such limited usage would not effectively communicate the roles of all stakeholder personnel involved in planned public events. All stakeholders involved in the formulation of such a policy and associated procedures should adopt them as common policy to ensure the roles of organizations of differing disciplines involved in an event are understood by all thus, creating effective Unified Command during planned public event non-emergency and emergency situations.

Future readers of this ARP whose organizations or communities are impacted by planned public events should consider the contents of this ARP. Whether events are low or high risk, consist of low or high participation levels, unified planning will result in more effective preparedness for emergency operations during such events. Enhanced preparedness for emergency operations by all organizational stakeholders involved will result in decreased risks to event participants, the communities in which the events take place, and the emergency service workers responsible for mitigating emergency incidents at public events. Additionally, appropriate preparedness will decrease the likelihood of potentially devastating social and legal backlash resulting from the occurrence of emergency incidents during planned public events.

References

Ahmed, S. (2009, November 1). With NIMS and ICS practice makes perfect. *Campus Safety*

   Magazine. Retrieved March 12, 2012 from http://www.campussafetymagazine.com/Channel/

   Emergency-Management/articles/2009/11/With-NIMS-and-ICS-Practice-Makes-Perfect.aspx

Ahmed, S. (2009). NIMS/ICS: The national incident management system/incident command

   system. *College Planning and Management.* Retrieved March 16, 2012 from http://www.

   peterli.com/cpm/resources/articles/archive.php?article_id=2247.

Bickel, K. (2007). Planning and managing security for major special events. *Police Chief*

   Magazine Website. Retrieved March 4, 2012 from http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/

   magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1347&issue_id=122007.

Connors, E. (2007). Planning and managing security for major special events: guidelines for law

   enforcement. *Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.* Retrieved March 6, 2012

   from http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/ric/publications/e07071299_web.pdf

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2005). Special events contigency planning. *Job Aids*

   Manual (Rev. ed. 2010). Retrieved March 4, 2012 from http://emilms.fema.gov/is15b/

   assets/SpecialEvents Planning-JAManual.pdf.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (September, 2010). National incident management

   system, incident command system. *ICS Forms Booklet, FEMA 502-2.* Retrieved March 4,

   2012 from http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/ics_forms_2010.pdf.

Highplains Firemanager (Version 5.3.9) [Computer software]. Centinnial, CO: Highplains

   Information Systems, Inc.

Harkey, J. (2011, June 14). NIMS at the world equestrian games. *Firefighter Nation Website.*

> Retrieved April 20, 2012 from http://www.firefighternation.com/article/incident-command-

> 0/nims-world-equestrian-games.

Marciani, L. (2009). Stadium and arena security. *Security Technology Executive Magazine, 19*

> (5), 30-33

Michigan Department of Agriculture (2008), Fairgrounds emergency plans. *State of Michigan.*

> Retrieved March 6, 2012 from http://www. michigan.gov/documents/mda/fairemerg_238718

> _7.pdf

National Fire Academy. (2009, October 1). Executive fire officer program*, Operational*

> *policies and procedures, applied research guidelines, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's).*

Suzuta, H. (2011). What if? Emergency planning for outdoor events. *Conference Board of*

> *Canada.* Retrieved February 20, 2012 from http://www.conferenceboard.ca/topics/security-

> safety/commentaries/11-07-18/What_If_Emergency_Planning_for_Outdoor_Events.aspx

Shouldis, W. 2010. The emergency operations center: A vital preparedness tool. *Fire*

> *Engineering Website.* Retrieved March 3, 2012 from http://www.fireengineering.com/articles

> /print/volume-163/issue-5/Features/the-emergency-operations-center-a-vital-preparedness-

> tool.html

United States Census Bureau (2010). *Profile of general population and housing characteristics:*

> *2010 demographic profile.* Retrieved April 10, 2012 from http://factfinder2.census.gov

> /faces/ tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_DP_ DPDP1&prod

> Type=table

United States Department of Homeland Security. (2011). *Executive analysis of fire service operations in emergency management: Student manual* (1st ed). Emmitsburg, MD: United States Fire Administration

United States Department of Homeland Security. (2008, December). *National incident management system*. Retrieved March 4, 2012 from http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency /nims/NIMS_core.pdf

United States Fire Administration. (2010). *United States strategic plan fiscal years 2010 - 2014*. Retrieved March 4, 2012 from http://www.usfa.fema.gov/downloads/pdf/strategic_plan.pdf

Appendices

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

Item 1: Which of the following best describes your organization?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS	88.5%	169
B. Law Enforcement	1.6%	3
C. Emergency Management	7.3%	14
Other (please specify)	2.6%	5
answered question		191
skipped question		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify) Categories
1	Mar 20, 2012 6:49 PM	Emergency Management and Incident Management Team housed within the law enforcement organization of a home rule city.
2	Mar 15, 2012 2:43 PM	Combination Fire Department
3	Mar 14, 2012 5:01 AM	Wildland Fire
4	Mar 13, 2012 9:24 PM	Public Safety
5	Mar 13, 2012 7:28 PM	Fire only

Item 2: What is the average number of participants in the largest recurring planned public event within your jurisdiction?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. 0 to 15,000 participants	44.0%	84
B. 15,000 to 30,000 participants	16.8%	32
C. 30,000 to 45,000 participants	8.4%	16
D. 45,000 or more participants	26.7%	51
E. There are no recurring planned public events within my organizations jurisdiction.	4.2%	8
answered question		191
skipped question		0

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

Item 3: Does your organization usually take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events within your jurisdiction?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	66.7%	122
B. No	33.3%	61
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Item 4: Does your organization have an internal policy in place which addresses emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	54.1%	99
B. No	45.9%	84
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Item 5: Does your organization's planned public event policy require the use of a multi-disciplinary planning team?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	55.2%	101
B. No	10.9%	20
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	33.9%	62
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Item 6: Does your organization's planned public event policy require a hazard assessment/analysis to be completed for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	42.1%	77
B. No	24.0%	44
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	33.9%	62
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

Item 7: Does your organization's planned public event policy address evacuation procedures for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	46.4%	85
B. No	18.6%	34
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	35.0%	64
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Item 8: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, what incident command positions are commonly filled? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Incident Commander	86.9%	159
B. Public Information Officer	56.3%	103
C. Safety Officer	57.4%	105
D. Liaison Officer	45.4%	83
Other (please specify)	27.3%	50
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)
1	Mar 27, 2012 2:33 PM	Depending on the event, an Operations Section Chief is often filled. Most of the large events are either broken in to Branches or Divisions
2	Mar 21, 2012 3:45 PM	Operations Section Chief, Division Supervisors, Plans Section Chief with Subordinate Units, Logistics Section Chief, Supply and Service Branches with Subordinate Units, Finance Section Chief
3	Mar 20, 2012 6:52 PM	Ops, Plans, Logs, PIO is handled by the promoter, with City PIO on standby in the event that a public safety emergency takes place.

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

4	Mar 20, 2012 4:00 PM	Operations
5	Mar 16, 2012 11:47 AM	EMS event specific divisions such as: water safety EMS forestry
6	Mar 16, 2012 1:46 AM	JHAT, HAZMAT, EMS, Logistics, Communications, Staging, Accountability.
7	Mar 15, 2012 3:41 PM	Bike Teams
8	Mar 14, 2012 11:24 PM	Positions are filled as needed depending on the event and our level of participation.
9	Mar 14, 2012 11:09 PM	Group or Div assignments as necessary
10	Mar 14, 2012 11:02 PM	A Type IV Incindent Managemant Team is used, depending on the event provides for what position will be filled out.
11	Mar 14, 2012 6:20 PM	Operations Officer, Supply Officer, EMS Coordinator, Branch Officers
12	Mar 14, 2012 6:16 PM	OSC, branch directors
13	Mar 14, 2012 4:36 PM	N/A
14	Mar 14, 2012 4:13 PM	MEDL
15	Mar 14, 2012 4:06 PM	Division/Group Supervisors
16	Mar 14, 2012 3:48 PM	When the public safety sector actually plans for a public event we use the obove listed. However, not every public event receives this attention.

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

17	Mar 14, 2012 2:38 PM	All levels of ICS from IC down through Branch and Divisions
18	Mar 14, 2012 2:09 PM	EMS Officer
19	Mar 14, 2012 1:33 PM	Operations and Finance
20	Mar 14, 2012 1:31 PM	Na
21	Mar 14, 2012 12:09 PM	Usually none
22	Mar 14, 2012 12:09 PM	It really depends on the size of the event as to whether we fill more than the IC and PIO/Liaison
23	Mar 14, 2012 12:02 PM	N/A
24	Mar 14, 2012 11:47 AM	NA
25	Mar 14, 2012 6:54 AM	none
26	Mar 14, 2012 6:02 AM	Agency Reps from adjacent/partner jurisdictions/agencies
27	Mar 14, 2012 5:02 AM	Logistics, Ops/Divisions, Plans/Resource Unit Leader, Situation Unit Leader, GISS
28	Mar 14, 2012 2:33 AM	Events within our jurisdiction are small, we handle with on duty staff.
29	Mar 14, 2012 1:11 AM	We are a small community with limited dedicated resources. These positions you ask about are filled as needed and personnel are available. Other wise as usual the first arriving officer wears all the hats.
30	Mar 14, 2012 12:27 AM	None events are small in nature 100-300 people

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

31	Mar 13, 2012 11:31 PM	Our annual event draws an estimated 400,000 people. Unfortunately, we do not have an emergency operations plan for this event. We usually staff the event with one (1) three-man engine company. We came close to putting a plan in place last year, but extenuating circumstances prevailed.
32	Mar 13, 2012 11:25 PM	Depends on the size of the event and where it's at.
33	Mar 13, 2012 11:08 PM	Besides command staff : Plans Chief Logs Chief Branch chiefs or Group supervisors as appropriate
34	Mar 13, 2012 11:03 PM	No formal ICS positions used
35	Mar 13, 2012 10:25 PM	Ops
36	Mar 13, 2012 10:14 PM	Others as needed depending event or hazard
37	Mar 13, 2012 10:07 PM	None
38	Mar 13, 2012 9:50 PM	Branch Directors (EMS branch, suppression branch, code enforcement branch, etc) All Section Chiefs: Planning, Logistics, Admin
39	Mar 13, 2012 9:44 PM	finance section logistics person usually resource unit leader plans chief and staff and of co0urse the ops group
40	Mar 13, 2012 9:31 PM	For NASCAR and CART races the track has a Emer Ops Center Staffed. We provide a Chief Officer as part of the team.

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

41	Mar 13, 2012 9:29 PM	All command and general staff positions are filled.
42	Mar 13, 2012 9:24 PM	Logs, ops
43	Mar 13, 2012 9:24 PM	We have not addressed this issue.
44	Mar 13, 2012 9:19 PM	Accountability Officer - accounts for all FD, PD, and volunteers that are on the grounds. Normally in the 150-200 range.
45	Mar 13, 2012 8:44 PM	None
46	Mar 13, 2012 8:19 PM	None
47	Mar 13, 2012 8:11 PM	None
48	Mar 13, 2012 8:10 PM	The Parks and Rec Dept take the lead and they do not practice ICS principles
49	Mar 13, 2012 8:07 PM	Medical
50	Mar 13, 2012 7:40 PM	Division areas under operations

Item 9: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, is the activation of any of the following general staff management functions ever necessary? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Operations section	73.8%	135
B. Planning section	49.2%	90
C. Logistics section	45.9%	84
D. Finance/Administration section	15.8%	29
E. None of the above general staff management functions are ever necessary	23.0%	42
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

Item 10: Other than your organization's personnel, what other organization's personnel are routinely assigned to incident command positions during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS personnel	53.6%	98
B. Law enforcement personnel	86.3%	158
C. Office of Emergency Management personnel.	36.1%	66
D. Event promoter personnel	50.3%	92
E. Public works/utilities personnel	48.1%	88
Other (please specify)	18.0%	33
	answered question	183
	skipped question	8

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 27, 2012 5:57 PM	City Admin Staff	
2	Mar 23, 2012 12:29 PM	Federal Agencies	
3	Mar 22, 2012 9:34 PM	Rec. Services and other City Departments	
4	Mar 21, 2012 3:45 PM	CERT Team	
5	Mar 20, 2012 6:56 PM	School District for bus use, Rec District for carts	
6	Mar 20, 2012 6:52 PM	Dispatch center personnel, City administration, IMT	
7	Mar 20, 2012 6:18 PM	Medical and Safety Personnel	
8	Mar 20, 2012 4:00 PM	Parks	
9	Mar 15, 2012 1:44 AM	Amateur Radio	
10	Mar 14, 2012 4:36 PM	N/A	
11	Mar 14, 2012 4:08 PM	Medical reserve Corp	
12	Mar 14, 2012 3:48 PM	CERT, Sheriff's Posse, police volunteers	
13	Mar 14, 2012 2:09 PM	Communications set up and repeater stations	
14	Mar 14, 2012 1:54 PM	Parks Department	
15	Mar 14, 2012 1:31 PM	Na	
16	Mar 14, 2012 12:09 PM	Usually none	
17	Mar 14, 2012 12:02 PM	N/A	
18	Mar 14, 2012 11:47 AM	NA	

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

19	Mar 14, 2012 6:02 AM	Depends on event type - we include everyone
20	Mar 14, 2012 2:33 AM	Only have small events within our fire district, have provided special operations/haz mat support to the Kentucky Derby Event
21	Mar 14, 2012 2:01 AM	none really, the police are in charge until something goes wrong and they call us to solve the problem
22	Mar 14, 2012 1:17 AM	athletic association
23	Mar 13, 2012 11:25 PM	All of the above only if needed. We've only needed it once.
24	Mar 13, 2012 11:08 PM	Private industry and companies involved in the events
25	Mar 13, 2012 10:40 PM	Medical Director & Medical Helicopter
26	Mar 13, 2012 10:07 PM	None routinely
27	Mar 13, 2012 10:00 PM	School District, Amateur Radio Volunteers
28	Mar 13, 2012 9:50 PM	CERT
29	Mar 13, 2012 9:24 PM	Private & voads
30	Mar 13, 2012 9:24 PM	A command post is not assigned
31	Mar 13, 2012 8:44 PM	None
32	Mar 13, 2012 8:19 PM	None
33	Mar 13, 2012 8:10 PM	None

Item 11: Does your organization utilize incident action plans for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Always	56.3%	103
B. Occasionally	30.6%	56
C. Never	13.1%	24
	answered question	183
	skipped question	8

Appendix A: Combined Questionnaire Results Excluding Incomplete Responses

(continued)

Item 12: What ICS forms are commonly used by your organization during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Our organization does not use ICS forms	26.8%	49
B. ICS 201 (Incident Briefing)	61.7%	113
C. ICS 202 (Incident Objectives)	64.5%	118
D. ICS 203 (Organization Assignment List)	54.1%	99
E. ICS 204 (Assignment List)	54.6%	100
F. ICS 205 (Incident Radio Communications Plan)	61.7%	113
G. ICS 205A (Communications List)	30.6%	56
H. ICS 206 (Medical Plan)	52.5%	96
I. ICS 207 (Incident Organization Chart)	47.0%	86
J. ICS 208 (Safety Message/Plan)	43.2%	79
K. ICS 209 (Incident Status Summary)	13.7%	25
L. ICS 210 (Resource Status Change)	7.1%	13
M. ICS 211 (Incident Check-In List)	15.8%	29
N. ICS 213 (General Message)	21.3%	39
O. ICS 214 (Activity Log)	33.9%	62
P. ICS 215 (Operational Planning Worksheet)	26.2%	48
Q. ICS 215A (Incident Action Plan Safety Analysis)	15.8%	29
R. ICS 218 (Support Vehicle/Equipment Inventory)	8.7%	16
S. ICS 219 (Resource Status Cards)	7.6%	14
T. ICS 220 (Air Operations Summary Worksheet)	4.9%	9
U. ICS 221 (Demobilization Check-Out)	8.7%	16
V. ICS 225 (Incident Personnel Performance Rating)	3.3%	6
answered question		183
skipped question		8

Appendix B: 0k-15k Group Questionnaire Responses

Item 1: Which of the following best describes your organization?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS	80.0%	32
B. Law Enforcement	2.5%	1
C. Emergency Management	10.0%	4
Other (please specify)	7.5%	3
answered question		40
skipped question		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 14, 2012 5:01 AM	Wildland Fire	
2	Mar 13, 2012 9:24 PM	Public Safety	
3	Mar 13, 2012 7:28 PM	Fire only	

Item 2: What is the average number of participants in the largest recurring planned public event within your jurisdiction?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. 0 to 15,000 participants	100.0%	40
B. 15,000 to 30,000 participants	0.0%	0
C. 30,000 to 45,000 participants	0.0%	0
D. 45,000 or more participants	0.0%	0
E. There are no recurring planned public events within my organizations jurisdiction.	0.0%	0
answered question		40
skipped question		0

Item 3: Does your organization usually take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events within your jurisdiction?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	75.0%	30
B. No	25.0%	10
answered question		40
skipped question		0

Appendix B: 0k-15k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 4: Does your organization have an internal policy in place which addresses emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	100.0%	40
B. No	0.0%	0
	answered question	40
	skipped question	0

Item 5: Does your organization's planned public event policy require the use of a multi-disciplinary planning team?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	85.0%	34
B. No	15.0%	6
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
	answered question	40
	skipped question	0

Item 6: Does your organization's planned public event policy require a hazard assessment/analysis to be completed for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	57.5%	23
B. No	42.5%	17
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
	answered question	40
	skipped question	0

Item 7: Does your organization's planned public event policy address evacuation procedures for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	65.0%	26
B. No	35.0%	14
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
	answered question	40
	skipped question	0

Appendix B: 0k-15k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, what incident command positions are commonly filled? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Incident Commander	95.0%	38
B. Public Information Officer	62.5%	25
C. Safety Officer	65.0%	26
D. Liaison Officer	42.5%	17
Other (please specify)	22.5%	9
answered question		40
skipped question		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 16, 2012 11:47 AM	event specific divisions such as: water safety, EMS, forestry	
2	Mar 14, 2012 4:13 PM	MEDL	
3	Mar 14, 2012 1:33 PM	Operations and Finance	
4	Mar 14, 2012 12:09 PM	It reeally depends on the size of the event as to whether we fill more than the IC and PIO/Liaison	
5	Mar 14, 2012 6:54 AM	none	
6	Mar 14, 2012 5:02 AM	Logistics, Ops/Divisions, Plans/Resource Unit Leader, Situation Unit Leader, GISS	
7	Mar 13, 2012 10:14 PM	Others as needed depending event or hazard	
8	Mar 13, 2012 9:44 PM	finance section logistics person usually resource unit leader plans chief and staff and of co0urse the ops group	
9	Mar 13, 2012 9:19 PM	Accountability Officer - accounts for all FD, PD, and volunteers that are on the grounds. Normally in the 150-200 range.	

Appendix B: 0k-15k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 9: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, is the activation of any of the following general staff management functions ever necessary? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Operations section	77.5%	31
B. Planning section	57.5%	23
C. Logistics section	52.5%	21
D. Finance/Administration section	20.0%	8
E. None of the above general staff management functions are ever necessary	15.0%	6
	answered question	40
	skipped question	0

Item 10: Other than your organization's personnel, what other organization's personnel are routinely assigned to incident command positions during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS personnel	50.0%	20
B. Law enforcement personnel	90.0%	36
C. Office of Emergency Management personnel.	30.0%	12
D. Event promoter personnel	57.5%	23
E. Public works/utilities personnel	60.0%	24
Other (please specify)	7.5%	3
	answered question	40
	skipped question	0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 22, 2012 9:34 PM	Rec. Services and other City Departments	
2	Mar 20, 2012 6:18 PM	Medical and Safety Personnel	
3	Mar 13, 2012 9:50 PM	CERT	

Appendix B: 0k-15k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 11: Does your organization utilize incident action plans for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Always	60.0%	24
B. Occasionally	40.0%	16
C. Never	0.0%	0
answered question		40
skipped question		0

Item 12: What ICS forms are commonly used by your organization during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Our organization does not use ICS forms	10.0%	4
B. ICS 201 (Incident Briefing)	77.5%	31
C. ICS 202 (Incident Objectives)	77.5%	31
D. ICS 203 (Organization Assignment List)	67.5%	27
E. ICS 204 (Assignment List)	65.0%	26
F. ICS 205 (Incident Radio Communications Plan)	60.0%	24
G. ICS 205A (Communications List)	40.0%	16
H. ICS 206 (Medical Plan)	70.0%	28
I. ICS 207 (Incident Organization Chart)	50.0%	20
J. ICS 208 (Safety Message/Plan)	42.5%	17
K. ICS 209 (Incident Status Summary)	25.0%	10
L. ICS 210 (Resource Status Change)	10.0%	4
M. ICS 211 (Incident Check-In List)	25.0%	10
N. ICS 213 (General Message)	15.0%	6
O. ICS 214 (Activity Log)	42.5%	17
P. ICS 215 (Operational Planning Worksheet)	32.5%	13
Q. ICS 215A (Incident Action Plan Safety Analysis)	17.5%	7
R. ICS 218 (Support Vehicle/Equipment Inventory)	7.5%	3
S. ICS 219 (Resource Status Cards)	12.5%	5
T. ICS 220 (Air Operations Summary Worksheet)	7.5%	3
U. ICS 221 (Demobilization Check-Out)	7.5%	3
V. ICS 225 (Incident Personnel Performance Rating)	5.0%	2
answered question		40
skipped question		0

Appendix C: 15k-30k Group Questionnaire Responses

Item 1: Which of the following best describes your organization?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS	88.9%	16
B. Law Enforcement	5.6%	1
C. Emergency Management	5.6%	1
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Item 2: What is the average number of participants in the largest recurring planned public event within your jurisdiction?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. 0 to 15,000 participants	0.0%	0
B. 15,000 to 30,000 participants	100.0%	18
C. 30,000 to 45,000 participants	0.0%	0
D. 45,000 or more participants	0.0%	0
E. There are no recurring planned public events within my organizations jurisdiction.	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Item 3: Does your organization usually take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events within your jurisdiction?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	83.3%	15
B. No	16.7%	3
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Item 4: Does your organization have an internal policy in place which addresses emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	100.0%	18
B. No	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Appendix C: 15k-30k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 5: Does your organization's planned public event policy require the use of a multi-disciplinary planning team?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	83.3%	15
B. No	16.7%	3
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Item 6: Does your organization's planned public event policy require a hazard assessment/analysis to be completed for recurring planned public events?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	66.7%	12
B. No	33.3%	6
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Item 7: Does your organization's planned public event policy address evacuation procedures for recurring planned public events?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	77.8%	14
B. No	22.2%	4
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Appendix C: 15k-30k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 8: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, what incident command positions are commonly filled? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Incident Commander	100.0%	18
B. Public Information Officer	55.6%	10
C. Safety Officer	55.6%	10
D. Liaison Officer	55.6%	10
Other (please specify)	22.2%	4
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 14, 2012 11:02 PM	A Type IV Incindent Managemant Team is used, depending on the event provides for what position will be filled out.	
2	Mar 13, 2012 11:08 PM	Besides command staff : Plans Chief Logs Chief Branch chiefs or Group supervisors as appropriate	
3	Mar 13, 2012 8:07 PM	Medical	
4	Mar 13, 2012 7:40 PM	Division areas under operations	

Item 9: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, is the activation of any of the following general staff management functions ever necessary? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Operations section	100.0%	18
B. Planning section	55.6%	10
C. Logistics section	33.3%	6
D. Finance/Administration section	5.6%	1
E. None of the above general staff management functions are ever necessary	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Appendix C: 15k-30k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 10: Other than your organization's personnel, what other organization's personnel are routinely assigned to incident command positions during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS personnel	66.7%	12
B. Law enforcement personnel	94.4%	17
C. Office of Emergency Management personnel.	61.1%	11
D. Event promoter personnel	55.6%	10
E. Public works/utilities personnel	38.9%	7
Other (please specify)	16.7%	3
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 15, 2012 1:44 AM	Amateur Radio	
2	Mar 14, 2012 4:08 PM	Medical reserve Corp	
3	Mar 13, 2012 11:08 PM	Private industry and companies involved in the events	

Item 11: Does your organization utilize incident action plans for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Always	88.9%	16
B. Occasionally	11.1%	2
C. Never	0.0%	0
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Appendix C: 15k-30k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 12: What ICS forms are commonly used by your organization during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Our organization does not use ICS forms	27.8%	5
B. ICS 201 (Incident Briefing)	61.1%	11
C. ICS 202 (Incident Objectives)	66.7%	12
D. ICS 203 (Organization Assignment List)	50.0%	9
E. ICS 204 (Assignment List)	38.9%	7
F. ICS 205 (Incident Radio Communications Plan)	72.2%	13
G. ICS 205A (Communications List)	33.3%	6
H. ICS 206 (Medical Plan)	33.3%	6
I. ICS 207 (Incident Organization Chart)	50.0%	9
J. ICS 208 (Safety Message/Plan)	50.0%	9
K. ICS 209 (Incident Status Summary)	16.7%	3
L. ICS 210 (Resource Status Change)	0.0%	0
M. ICS 211 (Incident Check-In List)	22.2%	4
N. ICS 213 (General Message)	16.7%	3
O. ICS 214 (Activity Log)	27.8%	5
P. ICS 215 (Operational Planning Worksheet)	33.3%	6
Q. ICS 215A (Incident Action Plan Safety Analysis)	22.2%	4
R. ICS 218 (Support Vehicle/Equipment Inventory)	11.1%	2
S. ICS 219 (Resource Status Cards)	0.0%	0
T. ICS 220 (Air Operations Summary Worksheet)	11.1%	2
U. ICS 221 (Demobilization Check-Out)	11.1%	2
V. ICS 225 (Incident Personnel Performance Rating)	5.6%	1
answered question		18
skipped question		0

Appendix D: 30k-45k Group Questionnaire Responses

Item 1: Which of the following best describes your organization?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS	90.0%	9
B. Law Enforcement	0.0%	0
C. Emergency Management	10.0%	1
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
	answered question	10
	skipped question	0

Item 2: What is the average number of participants in the largest recurring planned public event within your jurisdiction?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. 0 to 15,000 participants	0.0%	0
B. 15,000 to 30,000 participants	0.0%	0
C. 30,000 to 45,000 participants	100.0%	10
D. 45,000 or more participants	0.0%	0
E. There are no recurring planned public events within my organizations jurisdiction.	0.0%	0
	answered question	10
	skipped question	0

Item 3: Does your organization usually take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events within your jurisdiction?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	80.0%	8
B. No	20.0%	2
	answered question	10
	skipped question	0

Item 4: Does your organization have an internal policy in place which addresses emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	100.0%	10
B. No	0.0%	0
	answered question	10
	skipped question	0

Appendix D: 30k-45k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 5: Does your organization's planned public event policy require the use of a multi-disciplinary planning team?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	100.0%	10
B. No	0.0%	0
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		10
skipped question		0

Item 6: Does your organization's planned public event policy require a hazard assessment/analysis to be completed for recurring planned public events?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	80.0%	8
B. No	20.0%	2
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		10
skipped question		0

Item 7: Does your organization's planned public event policy address evacuation procedures for recurring planned public events?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	90.0%	9
B. No	10.0%	1
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		10
skipped question		0

Appendix D: 30k-45k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 8: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, what incident command positions are commonly filled? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Incident Commander	100.0%	10
B. Public Information Officer	90.0%	9
C. Safety Officer	100.0%	10
D. Liaison Officer	70.0%	7
Other (please specify)	10.0%	1
	answered question	10
	skipped question	0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 13, 2012 10:25 PM	Ops	

Item 9: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, is the activation of any of the following general staff management functions ever necessary? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Operations section	100.0%	10
B. Planning section	70.0%	7
C. Logistics section	80.0%	8
D. Finance/Administration section	40.0%	4
E. None of the above general staff management functions are ever necessary	0.0%	0
	answered question	10
	skipped question	0

Item 10: Other than your organization's personnel, what other organization's personnel are routinely assigned to incident command positions during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS personnel	20.0%	2
B. Law enforcement personnel	100.0%	10
C. Office of Emergency Management personnel.	40.0%	4
D. Event promoter personnel	40.0%	4
E. Public works/utilities personnel	50.0%	5
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
	answered question	10
	skipped question	0

Appendix D: 30k-45k Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 11: Does your organization utilize incident action plans for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Always	90.0%	9
B. Occasionally	10.0%	1
C. Never	0.0%	0
answered question		10
skipped question		0

Item 12: What ICS forms are commonly used by your organization during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Our organization does not use ICS forms	10.0%	1
B. ICS 201 (Incident Briefing)	80.0%	8
C. ICS 202 (Incident Objectives)	90.0%	9
D. ICS 203 (Organization Assignment List)	70.0%	7
E. ICS 204 (Assignment List)	80.0%	8
F. ICS 205 (Incident Radio Communications Plan)	90.0%	9
G. ICS 205A (Communications List)	20.0%	2
H. ICS 206 (Medical Plan)	70.0%	7
I. ICS 207 (Incident Organization Chart)	80.0%	8
J. ICS 208 (Safety Message/Plan)	60.0%	6
K. ICS 209 (Incident Status Summary)	20.0%	2
L. ICS 210 (Resource Status Change)	10.0%	1
M. ICS 211 (Incident Check-In List)	30.0%	3
N. ICS 213 (General Message)	30.0%	3
O. ICS 214 (Activity Log)	40.0%	4
P. ICS 215 (Operational Planning Worksheet)	40.0%	4
Q. ICS 215A (Incident Action Plan Safety Analysis)	40.0%	4
R. ICS 218 (Support Vehicle/Equipment Inventory)	0.0%	0
S. ICS 219 (Resource Status Cards)	10.0%	1
T. ICS 220 (Air Operations Summary Worksheet)	0.0%	0
U. ICS 221 (Demobilization Check-Out)	10.0%	1
V. ICS 225 (Incident Personnel Performance Rating)	0.0%	0
answered question		10
skipped question		0

Appendix E: 45k Plus Group Questionnaire Responses

Item 1: Which of the following best describes your organization?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Fire/EMS	93.5%	29
B. Law Enforcement	3.2%	1
C. Emergency Management	3.2%	1
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
	answered question	31
	skipped question	0

Item 2: What is the average number of participants in the largest recurring planned public event within your jurisdiction?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. 0 to 15,000 participants	0.0%	0
B. 15,000 to 30,000 participants	0.0%	0
C. 30,000 to 45,000 participants	0.0%	0
D. 45,000 or more participants	100.0%	31
E. There are no recurring planned public events within my organizations jurisdiction.	0.0%	0
	answered question	31
	skipped question	0

Item 3: Does your organization usually take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events within your jurisdiction?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	74.2%	23
B. No	25.8%	8
	answered question	31
	skipped question	0

Item 4: Does your organization have an internal policy in place which addresses emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	100.0%	31
B. No	0.0%	0
	answered question	31
	skipped question	0

Appendix E: 45k Plus Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 5: Does your organization's planned public event policy require the use of a multi-disciplinary planning team?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	93.5%	29
B. No	6.5%	2
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		31
skipped question		0

Item 6: Does your organization's planned public event policy require a hazard assessment/analysis to be completed for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	77.4%	24
B. No	22.6%	7
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		31
skipped question		0

Item 7: Does your organization's planned public event policy address evacuation procedures for recurring planned public events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Yes	83.9%	26
B. No	16.1%	5
C. Not applicable. My organization does not have a planned public event policy.	0.0%	0
answered question		31
skipped question		0

Appendix E: 45k Plus Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 8: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, what incident command positions are commonly filled? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Incident Commander	100.0%	31
B. Public Information Officer	80.6%	25
C. Safety Officer	71.0%	22
D. Liaison Officer	67.7%	21
Other (please specify)	22.6%	7
answered question		31
skipped question		0

Number	Response Date	Other (please specify)	Categories
1	Mar 27, 2012 2:33 PM	Depending on the event, an Operations Section Chief is often filled. Most of the large events are either broken in to Branches or Divisions	
2	Mar 16, 2012 1:46 AM	JHAT, HAZMAT, EMS, Logistics, Communications, Staging, Accountability.	
3	Mar 14, 2012 6:20 PM	Operations Officer, Supply Officer, EMS Coordinator, Branch Officers	
4	Mar 14, 2012 2:38 PM	All levels of ICS from IC down through Branch and Divisions	
5	Mar 14, 2012 6:02 AM	Agency Reps from adjacent/partner jurisdictions/agencies	
6	Mar 13, 2012 9:50 PM	Branch Directors (EMS branch, suppression branch, code enforcement branch, etc) All Section Chiefs: Planning, Logistics, Admin	
7	Mar 13, 2012 9:24 PM	Logs, ops	

Appendix E: 45k Plus Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 9: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, is the activation of any of the following general staff management functions ever necessary? (Please select all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Operations section	87.1%	27
B. Planning section	71.0%	22
C. Logistics section	67.7%	21
D. Finance/Administration section	29.0%	9
E. None of the above general staff management functions are ever necessary	9.7%	3
	answered question	31
	skipped question	0

Item 10: During recurring planned public events within your organization's jurisdiction, is the activation of any of the following general staff management functions ever necessary? (Please select all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Operations section	87.1%	27
B. Planning section	71.0%	22
C. Logistics section	67.7%	21
D. Finance/Administration section	29.0%	9
E. None of the above general staff management functions are ever necessary	9.7%	3
	answered question	31
	skipped question	0

Item 11: Does your organization utilize incident action plans for recurring planned public events?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Always	71.0%	22
B. Occasionally	29.0%	9
C. Never	0.0%	0
	answered question	31
	skipped question	0

Appendix E: 45k Plus Group Questionnaire Responses (continued)

Item 12: What ICS forms are commonly used by your organization during recurring planned public events? (Please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
A. Our organization does not use ICS forms	19.4%	6
B. ICS 201 (Incident Briefing)	71.0%	22
C. ICS 202 (Incident Objectives)	74.2%	23
D. ICS 203 (Organization Assignment List)	61.3%	19
E. ICS 204 (Assignment List)	64.5%	20
F. ICS 205 (Incident Radio Communications Plan)	80.6%	25
G. ICS 205A (Communications List)	48.4%	15
H. ICS 206 (Medical Plan)	67.7%	21
I. ICS 207 (Incident Organization Chart)	71.0%	22
J. ICS 208 (Safety Message/Plan)	61.3%	19
K. ICS 209 (Incident Status Summary)	19.4%	6
L. ICS 210 (Resource Status Change)	12.9%	4
M. ICS 211 (Incident Check-In List)	29.0%	9
N. ICS 213 (General Message)	38.7%	12
O. ICS 214 (Activity Log)	51.6%	16
P. ICS 215 (Operational Planning Worksheet)	48.4%	15
Q. ICS 215A (Incident Action Plan Safety Analysis)	22.6%	7
R. ICS 218 (Support Vehicle/Equipment Inventory)	22.6%	7
S. ICS 219 (Resource Status Cards)	16.1%	5
T. ICS 220 (Air Operations Summary Worksheet)	9.7%	3
U. ICS 221 (Demobilization Check-Out)	12.9%	4
V. ICS 225 (Incident Personnel Performance Rating)	6.5%	2
answered question		31
skipped question		0

Appendix F: Interview with Randal Johnson

Organization: Larkspur Fire Protection District

Interviewee: Randal Johnson, LFPD Fire Marshal

Date: April 4, 2012 Time: 1400

1. Who do you feel should take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?

   I believe that numerous agencies should be involved in the preparedness and operational management of the renaissance festival for the simple reason that it is a multi-agency event. Douglas County Sheriff's Office is on scene, Larkspur Fire is on scene and the event can get anywhere between an average of 10,000 to 15,000 people per day. This gives it a magnitude which could be a concern to Douglas County Emergency Management. So I believe that Douglas County Emergency Management, Douglas County Sheriff's Office and the Larkspur Fire Department should be involved with that. In addition, it would probably be good to involve 2 other parties, and that would be the owner of the fair and his personnel, and also the Town of Larkspur because there's impacts to the town directly. So, essentially you're looking at 5 organizations that ought to be involved in the planning and preparedness of that.

2. Do believe that agencies responsible for the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events would benefit from having an internal policy which provides guidelines for such events?

   Yes. I think you need to have standardization as far as the organizational roles when looking at any kind of event. Each event is going to have particulars that will be unique to that event but, if you're all over the board for different events, that's not good. You should have a standard approach with your agency and other agencies involved. Then the particulars of each event will just kind of shake themselves out in that process.

3. What specific components do you believe should be included in an internal policy for recurring planned public events?

   I do believe within the internal policy various specific components could include multidisciplinary planning teams, hazard assessment analysis, and evacuation procedures. I think the other thing is definition of roles for a particular type of incident. So you really need to run through the library of potential things for that event, what type of things could happen. You look at the Renaissance Festival, you could have a large sweeping fire, you could have an active shooter event, you could have a tornado or a major lightening strike that took out a bunch of people. Each one of those events is probably going to require a different lead as far as the agencies concerned. I think those

Appendix F: Interview with Randal Johnson (continued)

are the considerations that need to be put on the table and should be included in a standard analysis format.

4. How extensively do you believe the Incident Command System should be used during recurring planned public events and who do you believe should fill ICS positions?

   I think ICS is imperative. It should be used all the time; there should not be exceptions to that. It's what we do in all other aspects of our work and needs to be applied to a specific event also. Unified command is going to be a likely scenario when there's multiple agencies involved. I do believe that as far as the incident commander is concerned, it's going to be probably specific to the incident. So, if fire is on scene and it's a fire event, somebody from fire should be designated as the incident commander for that type of event. The same thing with the cops; if it's a cop event then the lead cop on scene should be designated as the IC.

   Primarily what you need is an IC, and operations person designated, and I would also recommend planning and logistics. Finances probably are not that important right off the bat unless it's a rapidly escalating event that is going to have an impact possibly outside the area of concern. Finances can usually get picked up at some point...its usually not necessary for an initial command team. You may not use logistics right off the bat either but somebody should be designated in that position in case the event does start to expand a little bit, or becomes a longer time frame. Like an active shooter where they have somebody holed up for 20 or so hours, so they'll have logistical needs at that time.

5. To what extent do you believe the use of Incident Action Plans should be used for recurring planned public events?

   IAP's should be done for every planned event and for every day of the event because there are specifics that change from day to day. For instance, weather. Possibly communications (issues) due to other large events that may be occurring in the county, so you may have changes to comms plans. That may also impact other resources that are available for that event during an emergency. So yes, daily and every day you need to have an IAP for those types of events.

6. What ICS forms should be commonly used during recurring planned public events?

   I think all the ICS forms that are used to put together and IAP are appropriate. If you look at any major wildland IAP you're going to have a 201, a 204, a 215, your comm plan your medical plan...so everything that would normally be used to put together a wildland fire IAP should be used for planned event IAP's.

Appendix F: Interview with Randal Johnson (continued)

7. Do you have any final comments pertaining to the questions of this interview?

> *I feel it would be in the best interest of our agency, the Larkspur Fire Protection District, to follow through with having an IAP for the Renassaince Fair, for having an overall plan, and for establishing a command structure every single day that the event is in progress involving all of the agencies that were previously mentioned; Larkspur Fire Protection District, Douglas County Sheriff's Department, Douglas County Emergency Management, the owner of the festival, and the Town of Larkspur.*

Appendix G: Interview with Keith Mathena

Organization: <u>Douglas County Sheriff's Department</u>

Interviewee: <u>Keith Mathena</u>

Date: <u>April 5, 2012</u> Time: <u>1510</u>

1. Who do you feel should take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?

   I feel that for local recurring planned public events, people that are the stakeholders, i.e., the fire department, the police department, the Sheriff's departments should have a role in making those decisions and in a unified manner all take the lead role.

2. Do believe that agencies responsible for the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events would benefit from having an internal policy which provides guidelines for such events?

   I think there should be some sort of internal policy, however I know it's going to get sticky when you start working with fire departments, police departments, Sheriff's departments, and other agencies to get everyone on the same page and create one policy. I think it's important to have a general policy for all the stakeholders.

3. What specific components do you believe should be included in an internal policy for recurring planned public events?

   In any general plan you have to have to some degree, what hazards may affect this public event. You need to have basic comms plan, your evacuation plans; do you keep people in the area, do you move them out of the area. Your hazard plans, your assessment of the entire event.

4. How extensively do you believe the Incident Command System should be used during recurring planned public events and who do you believe should fill ICS positions?

   I think any event, whether its minor to extreme, you should utilize the ICS. There's some times, for instance, me being in law enforcement, you can't use ICS for every traffic stop. But, with you being in fire, you can use ICS for every MVA on the highway because you've got multiple units coming and multiple people to take care of the situation. In these public events you need to use it because if something happens it could end up being a major event. As far as who should be in that position (ICS positions) it should be the most qualified person. It doesn't matter if it's a line guy or a chief officer, just whoever

Appendix G: Interview with Keith Mathena (continued)

has the most knowledge of the situation going on at hand should take it. If they need to be relieved down the road by someone with more experience, then they should be relieved. If someone from another adjoining fire department comes in and has more experience in the specific job at hand with the emergency that's going on, and that particular IC says "Yeah, why don't you go ahead and take this for me," and their briefed and turn in (IC) over to them, there's no problem with that. Most jurisdictions are going to want to hang on to it because it's a control issue I think, but, I believe if someone's more qualified to do it, then let them have it. It's going to be a bit harder with a unified command between the cop world and fire world because the fire world is not going to understand the cop side of things and the cop side is not going to understand the fire world's side of things.

5. To what extent do you believe the use of Incident Action Plans should be used for recurring planned public events?

    It's reasonable, and probably expected anymore, to have and IAP for any potential sized event; whether it's 500 to 15,000 (people) or more. You probably should have something in writing so everyone knows what's going on. The potential is great when you have a whole bunch of people gathering in one place, you just don't know what's going to happen that day. You could have an active shooter, you could have a thunder storm, or you could have a tornado. I think it's something that should be implemented (IAP).

6. What ICS forms should be commonly used during recurring planned public events?

    Depending on the size of the event is dependent on what course you're going to take. If it's a small MVA, you're not going to use any forms. If it turns out to be a major wildfire or huge event where you're bringing in overhead teams you'll use basically every form under the sun to accomplish what you need for accountability, resource ordering, and all the stuff that goes along with it.

7. Do you have any final comments pertaining to the questions of this interview?

    No.

Appendix H: Interview with Cory Stark

Organization: <u>Elbert County Office of Emergency Management</u>

Interviewee: <u>Cory Stark</u>

Date: <u>April 13, 2012</u> Time: <u>0905</u>

1. Who do you feel should take the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events?

   I think that taking a proactive approach to start the management of these ongoing or recurring events is a positive step for everybody involved. I think there's a couple of things you need to immediately consider and that's the jurisdictional issues involved. In an environment like this where you have multiple different disciplines that have specialized functions at large gatherings in a recurring event, they all need to have a stakeholder position and need to have input. I think that from a jurisdictional standpoint, part of that initiation should start there in collaboration with the county level that may provide a fair amount of resources from county law enforcement and county emergency management. I think that this type of concept in preparedness and planning has a big role in the emergency management component. I think having a liaison or a lead from that discipline is paramount.

   I think for us here in Elbert County, I'm going to use us as an example because we actually have started this in the last 2 years, with an event called the Stampede Rodeo. It's one of our weekend events that brings the bulk of what we see in one setting from the community both inside and out. We have anywhere from 5,000 to 7,000 people that will show up through the duration of the weekend on each day for the rodeo. We have things that we consider in that plan like severe weather because it does fall in our spring and summer weather season and tornado patterns. It (the rodeo) falls in an area where we have wildfire hazard…so we look at that and from a joint collaboration standpoint, the event lies in the Elizabeth Fire Protection District Jurisdiction, but it falls under county law enforcement. From a planners standpoint in emergency management I'm utilized to help and coordinate those functions. So, it's unified but it starts in jurisdiction and I think by having everybody come to the table to begin building a process and a plan it becomes a shared process. I think the key is to get everybody's buy-in, get everybody's input so that when it comes to the following year, or the next year, under these management practices it doesn't necessarily come to the question of whose going to initiate, or who's going to take the lead. It just becomes a scheduled recurrence where everybody comes to the table and brings their strengths and provides guidance for that process.

Appendix H: Interview with Cory Stark (continued)

2. Do believe that agencies responsible for the lead role in emergency operations preparedness and emergency operations management of recurring planned public events would benefit from having an internal policy which provides guidelines for such events?

    Yes. Personally and professionally I do agree that agencies can benefit from that. Plans and policies and guidelines are frameworks to provide guidance for these initiatives. Part of that process is being able to create layers of succession for the future. Having these things in place limit some of the questions and some of the gaps that could be created when new folks are entered into the mix, when new challenges or new concepts are added to the plan that you're working on. Having those initial frameworks is what keeps people on track. So, personally, I do believe they could be of benefit.

3. What specific components do you believe should be included in an internal policy for recurring planned public events?

    I do believe there should be specific components included in that kind of a policy that goes beyond the initial formulation of the team or the initial process to get it started. Obviously, having all the stakeholders buy-in is imperative to understand strengths and capabilities and limitations. When you look at all of the strengths and capabilities, the concept is we should be building those based around our hazards and our vulnerabilities in those areas, so it's a given that those should be a natural guide to be able to build processes on. From a county level, in a planning component you're always looking at what the county hazards, and those should be priorities in the emergency operations plans that everybody can use as a framework or as a guideline. Additional components should also outline your process.

    We talk about evacuations from wildfires, so what's your process, have you outlines the notification system? Communication is going to be huge for the public more than anything. How are you going to put the public information piece out? That's one of the number one areas that can be a failure point. Working to identify that is going to be huge. When you're sending those notification messages, not only how are you going to do it, but what are you going to be saying (in the notification messages). In our Stampede Rodeo plan we have specific templates that have been made that are uniform so that everybody in the event in the emergency preparedness piece knows what its going to say. So when we issue a tornado warning or an evacuation warning, the template has already been reviewed and vetted so that there's no question when it comes out, everybody's on the same page. Then you can start to focus on putting the next process in place which maybe, it's your evacuation routes.

    Additional components then might be evacuation route planning, equipment needs, things like that. It might even include folks from other agencies where you have shortfalls. In addition to that, I think each of the stakeholders should have some kind of guideline to provide a framework for what their specialty is…what are the district response plans for

Appendix H: Interview with Cory Stark (continued)

> *Larkspur Fire, for example. What's your specific process for your egress routes and EMS care, if that your primary function?*

> *I think all of those pieces when you start going down the list become part of that guideline, that policy that with everybody's buy-in and support becomes a standard operating picture that everybody can build off of.*

4. How extensively do you believe the Incident Command System should be used during recurring planned public events and who do you believe should fill ICS positions?

> *I think it's imperative that (ICS) is used. I think the ICS system is proven to be of great value in functionality in crisis and in these types of recurring events that are, for the most part, routine in nature. I think it creates a positive management function and tool that everybody can understand and work within. The number one thing I think that when using these types of functions is communications. When you look at all the different kind of disciplines involved, it goes without saying, you've got to be able to create an environment that everybody supports and is willing to work in.*

> *We all know that there are differences in the way different agencies run and different disciplines run. We're still always working on being able to perfect the understanding ICS at the field level and getting our first responders trained and getting our first responders to understand how the process works. There's always going to be an ongoing effort there. But I think that ongoing effort also starts at the CEO level where we can get that positive buy-in from our chiefs and from our Sheriff's and from our lead folks that take on these responsibilities to create that collaboration. With the right steps in place and with the right effort, it actually can become valuable, beneficial, and achievable.*

> *Let me draw back personally to what we're developing and have been developing with our Stampede Rodeo plan. All stakeholders that have come to the table on this have agreed to work under the ICS guideline. When we are setting up the stampede rodeo each year, from the very inception on a whiteboard took a picture of how this things going to look from an IC standpoint down. One of the things that was involved in that was we have to fill staff positions. So, one of the key components in this was communications...being able to have operations with a communications commonality. Obviously you have a gap if on that scene you've got different agencies aren't talking or communicating with each other, you've got a problem, a breakdown. If you're able to work through that (communication breakdown) you can eliminate it. For us it took time and effort to get the folks to the table but what we had was a law enforcement component that came to the table and said "yes. We're going to operate inside this operating picture for this event," we had a fire district that said, "Yes. We're going to operate inside this operating picture for this event." Then it started to evolve, so now what happens is we can put this communications component in and fill out the operational pieces of our chart. Now, when we get on site, the incident command post acts as the hub for this process and we assign an operational channel for the grounds. With the buy-in from all*

Appendix H: Interview with Cory Stark (continued)

the different agency heads, everybody that comes in and checks in on that event that day takes that operational channel. So we can then eliminate that communication problem. In addition, with our IC or our Incident Command Post, we create an incident dispatch component, or a mobile dispatch component where we're actually filling staff positions through the duration of the weekend by set hours where we're putting somebody at the mobile command post that has radios and has the communication setup to be able to monitor the onsite traffic, to be able to go direct to 911 dispatch. We can take the pressure off that regional 911 component and handle our own onsite situations.

We've got a few caveats in there that, obviously if there's an active shooter where law enforcement becomes a function that needs to go direct, they switch and go direct on the main channel with the regional 911. But if you're dealing with routine stuff around the grounds, everything funnels back to that mobile command post. That mobile command post can then funnel the information and go direct with the 911 regional dispatch or vice-versa. With the regional dispatch, if there's a report of an injury on the grounds or on the facility they go direct to the mobile command post because we have set in our plan medical staff onsite, dedicated ambulances, and we have dedicated cops to the facility. So, from a mobile command post we can then move around our resources and take some of that burden off the outside stuff their dealing with in the outside community. So, with painting that picture, with that buy-in, you're able to close those gaps. But you can't just expect it to happen.

Having that coordinator in the middle to be able to reach out and discuss and to share and sell the benefits of the system and becomes part of able to put that into process, and then ultimately building out your organizational chart under the ICS structure to be able to have some basic functions like operations and logistics. Most times that's where the system stays because there's not much need for finance because you know what you're expecting until something changes.

The IC role provides the ultimate opportunity to test your local system under ICS with folks that may not normally or ultimately get to take the commander level roles on incidents with already well established and well seasoned commanders. This may be an opportunity to say for a period of time, by taking lower level officers that may have an interest in IC duties and letting them fill the events IC position. From the law enforcement standpoint you can do the same thing. These can be training opportunities.

5. To what extent do you believe the use of Incident Action Plans should be used for recurring planned public events?

    The extent that IAP's should be used during these recurring events, again, IAP's are processes to be able to create frameworks to hit objectives and to be able to operate within the ICS picture. I think not only are they great in providing a framework for operations, but they're great in being able provide insight into where shortfalls are, and where gaps may be. So, I think taking the time to actually create and have a system in

Appendix H: Interview with Cory Stark (continued)

> *place to formulate IAP's I think is critical. Not only critical for the event and understanding what you're dealing with in that (event), they're a great training tool. They provide hands on process for when you actually have to create them in the field.*

6. What ICS forms should be commonly used during recurring planned public events?

> *For me, having all the forms at the ready is critical, whether you use them or not. You still have to tailor down to the ones that you know you may want to use. For example, like the 203 where you have your organizational assignments. Those are basic, your med plans…again that concept is inside that IAP, the more you have to strengthen that IAP and the more you can tailor to the functions of all the different agencies and equipment is only going to strengthen that IAP. I don't think there's necessarily a limit. I think that you just have to decide what's going to be the best for that (event). In my personal and professional opinion is the more you can add, the better off you are. You always want to be in the position where you don't have to go and find it when you need it vs. having it and not needing it.*

7. Do you have any final comments pertaining to the questions of this interview?

> *My final comments would be that you're absolutely asking the right questions and taking the right steps to ultimately protect the community. These are proven concepts that work. Being able to utilize these functions outside of actual emergencies is good practice. It's good organization, its good coordination. I think the key for any community is finding that leader within those disciplines who can connect everybody and make awareness, make the point, and make the cooperation that everybody wants to buy into. It only takes one time for everybody to see the true value when everything starts to click and everything comes together, and then you never have to go back and fight for the buy-in. Asking questions of other agencies in other areas that include these types of planning efforts in their recurring events is critical. Never confine yourself to one area because, as we all know, what works for one area and one community might be different. Applying a regional or national philosophy to allow that seamless integration at some level in that planning still allows you that ability for others to come in and be a part of those (regional or national philosophies).*

Appendix I: Interview with Matt Krimmer and Sharon Roman

Organization: The Town of Larkspur

Interviewee: Matt Krimmer (Town Clerk and Manager) and Sharon Roman (Deputy Town Clerk

Date: April 17, 2012 Time: 1000

1. Do you know the average number of customers that attend the Renaissance Festival?

   Roman: *I would assume 10,000 to 15,000 per day, per weekend. That's from past records and I work there so I kind of get an idea of what the crowd looks like.*

2. Do you know how many employees are at the festival from beginning to end?

   Roman: *I would have no idea.*

   Krimmer: *I don't either.*

3. Does the Town of Larkspur participate in planning meetings with the festival and other organizations associated with the festival?

   Krimmer: *Not really. They submit a plan every year which describes traffic control and traffic management. That's pretty much the extent to which we coordinate anything with them. Since the festival has been going on for so long its really kind of redundant with the things that they do so we don't go over all that.*

4. What do you believe the greatest impacts the festival has on the community?

   Roman: *A good impact is that it allows the town to still be a town; the biggest part of our revenue is from the Renaissance (Festival). A bad impact is possibly the traffic but after you've been around it for so many years you just know that it's there and it…happens.*

   Krimmer: *It (the traffic) restricts the local residents from being able to go about their routine on a weekend in terms of going to a place and coming from a place between certain hours, particularly in the morning before the Renaissance opens and late afternoon when their getting ready to close when the traffic gets real heavy.*

5. Do you have any final comments pertaining to the questions of this interview?

   No (both Krimmer & Roman)

Appendix J: Interview with Jim Paradise

Organization: <u>Colorado Renaissance Festival</u>

Interviewee: <u>Jim Paradise</u>

Date: <u>May 8, 2012</u> Time: <u>2250</u>

1. What is the average number of customers that attend the Renaissance Festival?

   Per day the average would be around 7,000. Last year we drew around 169,000 people in the 18 days.

2. How many employees are at the festival from beginning to end?

   Year round we have 4. During the festival we have around 200 with the food and beverage and site crew, and merchandise and different count room employees.

3. How many vendors stay on the festival property from beginning to end?

   I would say probably 20%. We have around 300 vendors with carts and with booths. Then we have a lot of weekenders that just come out for the weekend that would stay overnight...mostly entertainers.

4. Does the festival have an EAP in place?

   We have one personally, although we would like to get involved with the Sheriff's department and the fire department to make it more specific so, forbidding anything happens, that we're prepared.

5. Do you have any final comments pertaining to the questions of this interview?

   I really don't. Things have gone so well the last few years there. We all remember the Hayman Fire (Colorado's largest wildland fire which occurred on June 8, 2002) and we were scared and nobody wants to go through that again.