DEKALB TO DENVER:
CURRENT ISSUES AND PRIORITIES FOR
ALL-HAZARDS INCIDENT MANAGEMENT TEAMS

Dr. Amy K. Donahue, Principal Investigator

Candace Fitzpatrick, Project Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose

In 2008, the Incident Management Training Consortium (IMTC) initiated an effort to enhance the capability of All-Hazards Incident Management Teams (AHIMTs) and thereby improve the nation's ability to respond to incidents of all types. The goals of IMTC's effort are to understand AHIMT capabilities, document the challenges they face, inform governments about their needs, and enable the teams to learn. To date, IMTC has convened three national learning conferences for AHIMT stakeholders. At the first conference, in 2008, attendees participated in a systematic process to identify priorities for the national AHIMT program. At the most recent conference, in December 2010, attendees participated in a study designed to review and update the insights gained from the 2008 conference. This report presents the findings of the 2010 study.

Methodology

This study was designed to solicit stakeholder input about priorities for the national AHIMT program and barriers that inhibit the success of AHIMTs. First, registrants for the 2010 conference participated in an internet survey that asked respondents to provide their individual assessments of the most important priorities identified in 2008. Next, ten facilitated break-out discussions were conducted during the 2010 conference. These focus groups allowed conference participants to review and update the national priorities for AHIMTs collaboratively. Finally, a written survey was conducted at the conclusion of the conference. This survey obtained each participant's overall assessment of the needs and issues discussed both in 2008 and during the 2010 break-out discussions to generate a final set of priorities.

Key Findings

The top priorities identified by AHIMT stakeholders today are:
1. A lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.
2. A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience for all IMTs and all positions.
3. Expansion, improvement, and clarification of opportunities to complete task books, including during planned events and field exercises.

The biggest barriers to success identified by AHIMT stakeholders today are:
1. State and local elected and appointed leaders are not aware of and do not understand the value, benefits, advantages, of the use of AHIMTs.
2. There are inadequate opportunities for shadowing.
3. Sustainable funding streams are too limited to provide for ongoing support of AHIMTs.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Emergency responders have long understood the value of a systematic methodology for the management of incidents. The need for a clear set of coordination, command, and control procedures is especially acute when incidents are complex, and multiple agencies are involved in a response. Moreover, a common approach that can be applied across all hazard types allows agencies to work together regardless of function or discipline.

Forty years ago, these principles gave rise to a standard system, the Incident Command System (ICS), now commonly used by responders nationwide.[1] Meanwhile, the wildland firefighting community formalized a national program called the National Interagency Incident Management System (NIIMS) which develops and deploys functional Incident Management Teams (IMTs) to direct responses to wildfires and other types of incidents using ICS. In 2003, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) began work to adapt NIIMS to create the National Incident Management System (NIMS). NIMS now "provides a systematic, proactive approach to guide departments and agencies at all levels of government, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector to work seamlessly to prevent, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the effects of incidents, regardless of cause, size, location, or complexity, in order to reduce the loss of life and property and harm to the environment."[2]

As NIMS was developed and implemented, states and local governments also recognized the need to develop their own incident management capabilities to direct response to the incidents they face. In 2003, this gave rise to the All-Hazards incident Management (AHIMT) program. AHIMTs provide a regional incident management capability that can quickly assist a jurisdiction when its own incident management capabilities are overwhelmed or exceeded. At the national level, the National Fire Programs Branch of the United States Fire Administration in FEMA supports the implementation of AHIMTs through a technical assistance program.

The extension of the Incident Management Team model to create state AHIMTs is emergent. As teams mature and states and local governments learn how to employ and collaborate with them, teams continue to confront needs and challenges that demand attention to assure a robust capability can emerge nationwide. To help the Department of Homeland Security and the teams themselves better understand the myriad challenges and needs teams face, it is useful to ask AHIMT members directly to obtain their perspective as the leaders working to make this program succeed in the field. To facilitate this, the Incident Management Training Consortium (IMTC) convened the first national AHIMT learning conference in DeKalb, Illinois on the campus of Northern Illinois University in October 2008. Over one hundred AHIMT managers, training coordinators, and team members representing 30 states and Puerto Rico attended the conference to discuss issues, concerns, and opportunities surrounding the

development of AHIMTs. These stakeholders participated in an exercise that helped them systematically identify and rank their priorities for the AHIMT program. The results of that study were disseminated to assist DHS, FEMA, and a variety of interested agencies, offices, programs, and working groups in developing the strategy, infrastructure, and guidance required for a robust national all-hazards incident management capability. AHIMT stakeholders came together again in Houston in 2009.

In December, 2010 IMTC convened the third annual national AHIMT Training and Education conference. Approximately 600 AHIMT managers, team members, and stakeholders from multiple disciplines and all levels of government attended. At FEMA's behest, the conference agenda included a process to update the findings from the 2008 DeKalb conference. Specifically, the conference members participated in a series of surveys and discussions designed to identify current AHIMT priorities, important barriers to success, and areas of concern for the national program and at the local level. This report describes methodology employed at the 2010 conference and presents the findings of the study.

DEKALB 2008 SYNOPSIS

In October 2008, over one hundred AHIMT team managers, training coordinators, and team members representing over 30 states and Puerto Rico attended the first national learning conference to discuss issues and opportunities surrounding the development of AHIMTs. Conference organizers collaborated with a research team to design and execute a methodology to systematically characterize the broad range of issues relevant to developing national AHIMT capacity. Ahead of the 2008 conference, participants were queried about the topics they thought were most pressing for AHIMTs. The responses fell into six broad categories: credentialing, deployment, formation, funding, support, and training. At the conference, the research team began by facilitating a series of twelve interactive discussions during which two groups of participants explored in detail each of the six areas. The twelve groups identified some 60 needs and concerns. The stakeholders then participated in a sorting exercise to prioritize those needs. Finally, an analytic technique called Q Methodology was used analyze the exercise data and identify patterns of viewpoints and areas of consensus across all participants. The research method and findings are described in detail in the conference report published in March, 2009.[3]

Though many imperatives were identified, a preponderance of the 2008 AHIMT conference participants agreed about the primary importance of six issues:

- DHS needs to assure that sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training opportunities are available to meet credentialing requirements.

- A single web-based repository for important information and resources should be created.

- A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and for all positions.

- The federal government should identify a specific, sustainable funding stream for the creation and ongoing support of AHIMTs.

- The relationship between national-level teams, state teams, and AHIMTs should be formalized and expanded to enhance field training, shadowing, and opportunities to build experience.

- A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.

METHODOLOGY

In early 2010, FEMA and IMTC agreed that it was time to revisit the issues first identified by AHIMT stakeholders in 2008 in order to assess progress and identify current priorities. Specifically, the goals of the 2010 study were to solicit stakeholder input about:

- Priorities for the national AHIMT program[4]
- Successes that should be supported
- Lessons that should be shared
- Barriers that inhibit the success of AHIMTs locally and the program nationally

To meet the study goals, the research team employed a three-phase study design.

Phase one: Pre-conference survey

In the first phase, those who registered for the December 2010 conference were asked to participate in a self-administered internet survey. Ahead of the conference, registrants were provided a link to the survey, which they completed online. A small number of attendees completed the survey when they arrived at the conference. This survey asked participants to provide their independent, individual assessments of the most important priorities identified at the 2008 conference in DeKalb. A total of 484 respondents completed the survey. The results of this survey were used to design the second and third stages of the study.

Phase two: Focus group discussions

In the second phase, facilitated break-out discussions were conducted during the 2010 conference. The purpose of the focus groups was to allow conference participants to review and update the national priorities for the AHIMT program collaboratively. The sessions enabled participants to express their views on existing priorities, to propose new priorities, and to explain in detail their perspective on the health, progress, and needs of their own team and the national AHIMT program overall. The sessions also offered participants an opportunity to learn from each other.

Ten two-hour sessions were held. Approximately 30-50 people participated in each. Participants were assigned to groups at random, though an effort was made to prevent multiple people from the same AHIMT from participating in the same session. Each session was facilitated according to a standardized protocol, to assure that discussions accomplished study goals, and to get an indication about the stability of views across the population of conferees.

Specifically, the facilitators' charge was to determine, for each of the 2008 priorities, whether members felt it had been addressed adequately enough to drop off the list of priorities, or whether it remained an urgent issue. Facilitators also queried their groups about new issues and priorities not raised in 2008. At the end of the session, each group created an unranked list of their top-ten priorities, which could include any newly identified ones. These discussions allowed a diverse set of stakeholders to develop inputs about progress and priorities collaboratively. While consensus was neither expected nor required, interactive discussions served to draw out the nuances of key issues. Each session was recorded by two note-takers facilitated by structured forms to help assure comprehensive documentation.

Phase three: Final survey

The pre-conference survey and facilitated discussions informed the design of the third study phase, a survey conducted at the conclusion of the conference. The survey was a self-administered, sixty-two question written survey. A total of 236 individuals were in attendance on the final day and responded to the survey.

The purpose of the final survey was to obtain each participant's overall assessment of the needs and issues discussed in both the 2008 and 2010 conferences to generate a current set of priorities for the national program. The survey asked respondents to evaluate a total of seventeen priorities that emerged from the focus group discussions. Eight of these were new priorities. Nine were among the top priorities identified at the 2008 conference. For each of the priorities, respondents were instructed to rate the level of urgency of the priority from "Not at all urgent" to "Extremely urgent." Then, to determine the top priorities, respondents were asked to choose three from the list of seventeen, and to rank their highest priority as "1," their next highest priority as "2," and their third highest priority as "3." In addition, the respondents were asked to evaluate a set of thirteen problems and barriers that had been raised during the focus group discussions. Respondents reported how serious each problem was for their team and for the national AHIMT program by indicating whether each was "Not a problem," "A minor problem," or "A major problem." Respondents were also asked to assess the value of the new AHIMT association and its role. Finally, to permit classification, respondents provided demographic information about themselves and their team. The survey instrument is included at Appendix A.

Respondent Profile

A total of 484 registrants responded to the pre-conference survey. Of these, about twelve percent had attended the 2008 conference in DeKalb. The 236 respondents to the final survey represent 34 states and have an average of 17 years of incident management experience. Most

(81%) of the respondents are members of an AHIMT, and most of these AHIMTs are Type 3 teams. The average age of the respondents' teams is 5.2 years, with an average roster size of 50, and an average of about 9 total deployments. Most teams have their own equipment cache. A majority of respondents work in the local government sector (64%), and the remainder work in state government (22%), federal government (10%), or the private (4%), and nonprofit/NGO (2%) sectors. About a third of respondents are employed in municipal fire departments and about a third in emergency management. Eleven percent of the respondents work in wildland fire and ten percent in law enforcement. About three percent work in the emergency medical services.

FINDINGS

This section presents findings from the surveys conducted before and after the 2010 AHIMT conference. An annotated survey that shows the distribution of responses for the pre-conference survey is provided at Appendix B. An annotated survey that shows the distribution of responses for the post-conference survey is provided at Appendix C.

Current assessment of the 2008 priorities

During the pre-conference survey, respondents were asked how well they think AHIMTs nationwide are doing, compared to how they were doing in 2008. A strong majority (64%) consider AHIMTs to be doing better (58%) or a lot better (6%). Less than three percent of respondents believe that AHIMTs are doing worse than they were in 2008.

Respondents were then asked to reflect on ten top priorities that emerged during the 2008 conference in DeKalb. They were asked how important the priorities are currently, how urgent they are now, and how successful the nation has been with regard to meeting these needs. For each priority, respondents ranked importance, urgency, and success on a scale of zero to ten, where zero meant not at all and ten meant extremely. The order in which priorities were presented varied randomly across respondents to control for ordering effects. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate which three of the ten 2008 priorities they consider to be the top priorities. Table 1 shows the results for all ten of the 2008 priorities. The table shows mean scores out of ten for importance, urgency, and success.

Overall, the respondents judged the importance and urgency of all of the 2008 priorities to be high (mean scores above 7 for all). Evaluations of success were moderate (mean scores in the range of 3.5 to 5.75). Of the ten 2008 priorities, respondents judged the need for "sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training opportunities to meet credentialing requirements" to be the most important today. At the same time, they find that the nation has been most successful with respect to this priority. They believe that "a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion" is the most urgent of the 2008 needs. Participants from the National Integration Center (NIC) point out that the NIC has developed qualification guidance, incident management job titles, resource type definitions, and all-hazards task books. Additionally, FEMA is developing guidance specific to Incident Management Assistance Team formation and operations which may be adaptable as a "road map" for AHIMTs at the local level. Finally, respondents think the nation has been least successful at creating "a national deployment coordination center that tracks all teams nationwide, their capabilities, and their availability for emergency and planned events." Participants from the NIC and others in the 2010 discussion groups note that Emergency

Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) offers some capacity here. Several respondents agree that a system similar to the Resource Ordering Status System (ROSS) is desirable to avoid the problem of "multiple teams showing up with various assignments."

The last column of the table shows the percentage of respondents that included the priority as one of the top three priorities. Interestingly, every one of the 2008 priorities was considered the top priority by at least some respondents. Most respondents (42%) said that the need for specific and sustainable funding streams was the #1 priority.

2008 Priority	Importance	Urgency	Success	Top 3
The federal government should identify a specific, sustainable funding stream for the creation and ongoing support of AHIMTs.	8.94	8.63	4.12	69%
A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and for all positions.	8.64	8.04	5.00	55%
DHS needs to assure that sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training opportunities are available to meet credentialing requirements.	9.10	8.70	5.72	41%
A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.	8.3	8.91	4.17	33%
A national credentialing working group should be established to resolve issues and concerns related to credentialing.	8.22	7.78	3.97	32%
The federal government should identify and define a lead agency to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.	8.24	7.83	4.81	28%
DHS should ensure that State Homeland Security Strategies include IMTs as a resource.	8.86	8.35	4.49	27%
DHS should develop and disseminate a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.	8.52	8.93	4.78	23%
A single web-based repository for important information and resources should be created.	7.83	7.26	4.20	21%
DHS should create a national deployment coordination center that tracks all teams nationwide, their capabilities, and their availability for emergency and planned events.	7.69	7.09	3.48	19%

Table 1. Pre-conference assessment of 2008 AHIMT priorities.

Today's top priorities

In the final survey, respondents were asked to evaluate seventeen needs. All of these issues were discussed in the break-out sessions. Nine of these were 2008 priorities that participants identified as continuing to require attention. Eight of these were new concerns.

For each need, respondents were asked to rate the level of urgency of the need from "Not at all urgent" to "Extremely urgent." Table 2 shows the mean level of urgency for each of the seventeen needs on a scale of zero (not at all urgent) to four (extremely urgent). On average, respondents judged the seventeen needs to be somewhat or very urgent (with a mean score of 2.6 across all seventeen). Respondents identified the most urgent need to be a lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program. The least urgent need was a national standard that specifies minimum equipment and resource requirements for Type 3 AHIMTs, though this need was still rated as somewhat urgent overall. Participants from the NIC point out that some federal efforts are already under way that support these priorities. These include the position task books that FEMA coordinates, credentialing guidelines that are already under development, and efforts to reduce the extent to which projects of the Incident Management Work Group and National Wildfire Coordinating Group are stovepiped.

Respondents were then asked to select their top three priorities from the seventeen needs. Table 2 also shows the seventeen priorities in rank order from highest to lowest based on the number of respondents that ranked each among their top three priorities. Notably, every priority received a top ranking from at least some respondents. In general those needs that respondents ranked as higher priorities were judged to be more urgent, and lower priorities were less urgent, though priority and urgency are not perfectly correlated. Priority is a broader concept that encompasses a sense of importance in addition to urgency. Moreover, the level of urgency does not vary much across the seventeen needs. The top priorities are:

> **#1:   A lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program[5] (also ranked as the most urgent need).**

> **#2:   A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience for all IMTs and all positions.**

> **#3:   Expansion, improvement, and clarification of opportunities to complete task books, including during planned events and field exercises.**

The issue of national leadership and the need for a national standard got considerable attention in the focus group discussions. The underlying question seems to be, as one stakeholder put it, "Is there going to be consistency between all states or are all states going to continue to do their own thing?" One particular challenge stakeholders raised in this regard is the wide variety of priorities a national standard would need to accommodate. As one participant put it, "What is important to those in a city is not necessarily as important to a more rural population"—and, at this point, "a Type 3 team from Montana and a type 3 team from New York would not have comparable capability to handle the same type of incident." Moreover, stakeholders emphasized the importance of teams as a local resource that should be focused on serving the local community. Beyond this, many stakeholders expressed the view that the wildfire standards and approaches offer a solid and useful conceptual foundation, but do not necessarily "fit" the diversity of disciplines engaged in a truly all-hazards system.

At the same time, stakeholders lament that a lack of standards and coordination of resources to meet them means that training programs are "scattered," whereas working together would "build synergy" and allow more teams access to qualified instructors. They also value the consistency and confidence in capability that adherence to national standards can bring. As one participant expressed it, "With NWCG I can go anywhere in the country and operate. I think it would be a terrible mistake if I have a major disaster and call in others from out of state and get a variety of responders with different experience and credentials." Another said, "If we can't be sure we can manage our own incidents locally, how can we help on the big ones?" Along these lines, stakeholders were reticent about having DHS dictate requirements to states, but clearly want federal leaders to bring states and locals together.

Ultimately, many stakeholders expressed the need for criteria that articulate minimum requirements, and the need for commonality to facilitate better coordination and sharing, but also the flexibility and local control required to adapt to unique incidents and be responsive to local conditions and needs.

Priorities in rank order	Urgency	Percent
The federal government should identify and define a lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.	3.06	45.0
A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and all positions.	2.98	41.0
Opportunities to complete task books, including during planned events and field exercises, should be expanded, improved, and clarified.	2.88	28.0
A marketing strategy to inform and educate federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions about the capabilities of AHIMTs should be developed.	2.63	23.2
DHS should develop a national training system to make sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training is available.	2.83	21.9
A national qualifications working group should be established to develop qualification standards for AHIMTs and individual members.	2.65	21.9
State, local, regional, tribal, and UASI homeland security strategies should include AHIMTs as resources.	2.92	17.4
A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.	2.70	14.9
DHS should create a national resource coordination center, process, and tools to track all AHIMTs, capabilities, and availability.	2.27	13.0
A national credentialing working group should be established to resolve issues and concerns related to credentialing.	2.58	12.6
The federal government should designate or create a single web-based system for sharing information.	2.51	12.5
A process should be formalized to facilitate the ability of newly-formed AHIMTs to shadow well-established AHIMTs.	2.69	14.3
A streamlined process for review and dissemination of guidelines and standards should be developed.	2.91	11.7
A national standard should be established that specifies minimum equipment and resource requirements for Type 3 AHIMTs.	2.17	5.9
Mechanisms to share training and exercise opportunities across jurisdictions should be developed.	2.47	6.2
DHS should develop and disseminate a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.	2.22	6.3
A standardized lexicon (vocabulary and concepts) for AHIMTs should be developed and disseminated.	2.28	4.5

Table 2. 2010 AHIMT priorities.

Top barriers

In the final survey, respondents were asked to evaluate a series of barriers to success that were identified during the focus group discussions. Respondents were asked to say how big a problem each was for their team and for the national AHIMT program. Table 3 shows the barriers and the percentage of respondents that judged each to be a major problem for their team and the program as a whole. The barriers are presented in rank order from the biggest to the smallest problem for the national program.

Respondents perceive the biggest problem for the AHIMT program as a whole and for their own teams to be that state and local elected and appointed leaders are not aware of and do not understand the value, benefits, advantages, of the use of AHIMTs. (73.5% assessed this to be a major problem for the national program, and 59.7% assessed this to be a major problem for their team.) As one group said, "Even with federal leadership and great ideas, we can't form teams without state and local support."

The next largest barrier to success for the national program and for individual teams is inadequate opportunities for shadowing. As one group explained, "Since shadowing opportunities are not there, it is hard to get through the credentialing process." This is related to the high priority given to expansion, improvement, and clarification of opportunities to complete task books. In part, there seems to be a cultural problem here—in several of the focus groups, stakeholders reported that some evaluators accustomed to National Wildfire Coordinating Group standards have not yet heard about all-hazards teams and therefore are reticent to sign off. Some stakeholders said that the wildland evaluators seemed biased against AHIMTs and did not want to sign off because the AHIMT members had not yet "paid their dues." This is exacerbated by confusion about signing off for type 3 AHIMTs versus for Type 1 teams, and by the question of whether planned events are acceptable.

The third serious barrier stakeholders identify is the lack of sustainable funding streams. With regard to funding, stakeholders believe that AHIMTs do not get enough emphasis in federal grant guidance, and that federal grant programs could be employed more forcefully to support AHIMTs. While the NIC does encourage the use of preparedness awards to support AHIMTs, stakeholders point out that states do not necessarily follow suit because the federal requirement is not strong enough. Stakeholders also reported confusion about what grants were available to support AHIMT formation and sustainment and how these funds might be distributed to reach AHIMTs.

In all cases, more respondents perceived the barriers to be major problems for the AHIMT program nationwide than for their own teams. In two cases, problems seem to operate much

more at the national level than at the team level. Sixty-nine percent of respondents see the lack of grant funds available to support the formation of AHIMTs as a major problem for the nation, whereas only 41.2 percent see this as a major problem for their teams. This may be because most participants are from teams that are already formed. Also, participants from the NIC point out that AHIMTs can build justifications to use DHS preparedness awards for the development, maintenance, and deployment of local AHIMTs. Likewise, 68.2 percent of respondents see the lack of a clear lead federal program office for the AHIMT program as a major problem for the nation, whereas only 39.1 percent see this as a major problem for their teams.

Barriers to success in rank order	Team	Nation
State and local elected and appointed leaders are not aware of and do not understand the value, benefits, advantages, of the use of AHIMTs.	59.7	73.5
There are inadequate opportunities for shadowing.	58.2	73.3
Sustainable funding streams are too limited to provide for the ongoing support of AHIMTs.	54.6	72.7
There are not enough grant funds available to support the formation of AHIMTs.	41.2	69.0
There is no clear lead federal program office for the AHIMT program.	39.1	68.2
It is difficult to provide workers' compensation and liability protection across state lines, or to people who are not insured by an agency.	45.8	60.5
Integration and coordination among IMTs at all levels is weak.	37.0	58.4
There are not enough evaluators at qualifying exercises to support certification/task book sign-off.	42.1	54.3
Cultural differences and "turf battles" across disciplines are impeding development of AHIMTs.	33.3	53.0
Existing web-based informational resources (tools and templates) are not coordinated.	39.6	51.9
Approved equipment lists for DHS grant funds do not account for AHIMT resource needs.	44.5	49.5
State exercise strategies do not include adequate opportunities for AHIMTs to participate.	36.6	48.3
There is no national standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.	30.0	41.7

Table 3. Barriers to success.

AHIMT association

Several break-out groups discussed the new AHIMT association. The survey therefore asked respondents for their views about the association. Table 4 shows the percent of respondents who agreed or disagreed with three statements about the AHIMT association's role and utility. There is a high degree of consensus among respondents about the value of the association. Almost everyone agrees that the association should play a leadership role in setting the agenda for the program. Stakeholders commented in particular about the need for a national vision for the future of all-hazards incident management to unify the diverse capabilities and interests of AHIMTs across the nation. Absent shared values, stakeholders pointed out that "interagency disagreements will undermine how well the incident management system works." Likewise, if AHIMTs form and operate in isolation, no national vision can emerge, and future capability will be stifled.

In addition, almost all of the stakeholder focus groups expressed frustration that they were not well understood by state and local government officials, and expressed the need for AHIMTs to be included explicitly in response plans and actual responses. The survey results show that most participants believe the Association can add value here—that it should be a key stakeholder, and should facilitate relationships among all stakeholders. Some focus groups suggested active engagement with the National Governor's Association, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the International City/County Management Association, and other similar organizations.

Percent who said they agreed or disagreed that…	Very Strongly or Strongly AGREE	Very Strongly or Strongly DISAGREE
The AHIMT Association should develop unified goals, strategies, and a path forward, and should communicate these broadly.	91.9%	0.4%
The AHIMT Association should be recognized as a key national stakeholder at local, state, and federal levels, including by Congress.	78.2%	2.1%
The AHIMT Association should serve as the liaison for coordination and dialogue between states, local governments, tribal governments, and the federal government.	66.6%	4.3%

Table 4. Opinions about the AHIMT Association.

CONCLUSION

The national effort to form AHIMTs and make them more robust has clear momentum. The level of participation in the national conference has more than quadrupled. Most of the stakeholders who participated in the 2010 AHIMT learning conference concur that their own teams and the AHIMT program overall is stronger than it was two years ago. FEMA's National Integration Center continues to support the endeavor and to lead initiatives to strengthen all hazards incident management capacity writ large. That said, key needs identified in 2008 remain urgent priorities—in short: much has been accomplished, but there is more work to do.

As they did two years ago, AHIMT stakeholders express unambiguous support for federal leadership, and continue to call for a lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program. Stakeholders also assert that criteria are necessary to drive development of solid AHIMT capability. A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience was a top priority in 2008 and—even in light of considerable progress with regard to qualification guidance, resource typing, job titles, and position task books—continues to be very important to stakeholders. Likewise, they want to see more robust qualification standards. With this foundation laid, another top priority in 2008 that remains a top priority today is training. Stakeholders continue to seek a national training system that can offer more and better field training opportunities and openings to meet credentialing requirements during planned events and exercises.

As AHIMTs mature, it is important to stakeholders that elected and appointed public leaders know about, understand, and employ their capabilities. They view lack of awareness of the value AHIMTs add to be the most serious barrier to their success, and see a marketing strategy for the program as an urgent need. Stakeholders expressed strong support for the new AHIMT Association, and see representation of AHIMT capability to all levels of governments as an important role for the Association.

Overall, this study and the learning conferences on which it is based make three things plain: 1. The nation's incident management capability has grown ever more robust; 2. The nation benefits from AHIMT stakeholders deeply committed to keeping the nation and their communities safe, to their missions as emergency responders, and to the continuous improvement of AHIMT capability; 3. Absent continued and concerted attention to the maturation of AHIMTs and their integration into response systems at all levels of government, the substantial investments made in this capability will be squandered. The feedback provided by AHIMT stakeholders over the course of this study can serve to guide future decisions to further strengthen AHIMTs and secure this capability for the nation.

NOTES

1. National Wildfire Coordinating Group. 1994. "History of ICS." National Training Curriculum: Incident Command System. Available at: http://www.nwcg.gov/pms/forms/compan/history.pdf.

2. NIMS Resource Center. 2008. "National Incident Management System." Available at: http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/.

3. The research method and findings are described in detail in the conference report published in March, 2009: "Perspectives on Success: Issues and Priorities for All-Hazard Incident Management Teams. Findings from the 2008 All-Hazard IMT Training and Education Conference." Available at: http://www.wildlandfire.com/docs/2009/fed/AHIMT-TEC-conf030609.pdf.

4. In this context, the term "AHIMT program" refers to the national endeavor to develop and implement a plan, system, and set of activities that enables the formation, sustainment, and deployment of AHIMTs. This endeavor requires funding to succeed, and many respondents believe the program should be supported by federal (as well as state and local) funds, but the term "program," as used in this study, does not refer to a designated funding line.

5. See note 4, above.

2010 All-Hazards Incident Management Team
Training and Education Conference

FINAL SURVEY

DIRECTIONS:

Please answer all questions in this survey booklet. The survey should take about 30 minutes to complete. You do not need to provide your name, so your answers will be anonymous. When you are finished, turn in your survey to a conference team member.

Thank you for your dedication to high-quality incident management and your support of this process. Your participation is an invaluable service. We are grateful for it. When this report is finalized, it will be available to you.

Please tell us how urgent you think each of the needs listed below is today.

Opportunities to complete task books, including during planned events and field exercises, should be expanded, improved, and clarified.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

A standardized lexicon (vocabulary and concepts) for AHIMTs should be developed and disseminated.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

The federal government should designate or create a single web-based system for sharing information.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

A streamlined process for review and dissemination of guidelines and standards should be developed.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

DHS should develop a national training system to make sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training available.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

A marketing strategy to inform and educate federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions about the capabilities of AHIMTs should be developed.

☐ Not at all urgent ☐ Not very urgent ☐ Somewhat urgent ☐ Very urgent ☐ Extremely urgent

A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and all positions.

☐ Not at all urgent ☐ Not very urgent ☐ Somewhat urgent ☐ Very urgent ☐ Extremely urgent

DHS should create a national resource coordination center, process, and tools to track all AHIMTs, capabilities, and availability.

☐ Not at all urgent ☐ Not very urgent ☐ Somewhat urgent ☐ Very urgent ☐ Extremely urgent

A national standard should be established that specifies minimum equipment and resource requirements for Type 3 AHIMTs.

☐ Not at all urgent ☐ Not very urgent ☐ Somewhat urgent ☐ Very urgent ☐ Extremely urgent

A national credentialing working group should be established to resolve issues and concerns related to credentialing.

☐ Not at all urgent ☐ Not very urgent ☐ Somewhat urgent ☐ Very urgent ☐ Extremely urgent

A national qualifications working group should be established to develop qualification standards for AHIMTs and individual members.

☐ Not at all urgent ☐ Not very urgent ☐ Somewhat urgent ☐ Very urgent ☐ Extremely urgent

State, local, regional, tribal, and UASI homeland security strategies should include AHIMTs as resources.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

The federal government should identify and define a lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

DHS should develop and disseminate a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

A process should be formalized to facilitate the ability of newly-formed AHIMTs to shadow well-established AHIMTs.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

Mechanisms to share training and exercise opportunities across jurisdictions should be developed.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.

☐ Not at all urgent   ☐ Not very urgent   ☐ Somewhat urgent   ☐ Very urgent   ☐ Extremely urgent

For each of the challenges, problems, barriers, or obstacles listed below, please evaluate how big a problem each is for your team and how big a problem each is for the national AHIMT program as a whole.

	How big a problem is this **for your team**?	How big a problem is this **for the national AHIMT program**?
There are not enough grant funds available to support the formation of AHIMTs.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
Sustainable funding streams are too limited to provide for the ongoing support of AHIMTs.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
There is no national standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
Approved equipment lists for DHS grant funds do not account for AHIMT resource needs.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem

	How big a problem is this **for your team**?	How big a problem is this **for the national AHIMT program**?
There are inadequate opportunities for shadowing.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
State exercise strategies do not include adequate opportunities for AHIMTs to participate.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
There are not enough evaluators at qualifying exercises to support certification/task book sign-off.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
Existing web-based informational resources (tools and templates) are not coordinated.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
Integration and coordination among IMTs at all levels is weak.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem

	How big a problem is this **for your team**?	How big a problem is this **for the national AHIMT program**?
There is no clear lead federal program office for the AHIMT program.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
Cultural differences and "turf battles" across disciplines are impeding development of AHIMTs.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
It is difficult to provide workers' compensation and liability protection across state lines, or to people who are not insured by an agency.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem
State and local elected and appointed leaders are not aware of and do not understand the value, benefits, advantages, of the use of AHIMTs.	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem	☐ A major problem ☐ A minor problem ☐ Not a problem

Several break-out groups mentioned the new AHIMT Association. Please give us your opinion about the following:

The AHIMT Association should develop unified goals, strategies, and a path forward, and should communicate these broadly.

- ☐ Very strongly agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Mildly agree
- ☐ Mildly disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Very strongly disagree

The AHIMT Association should be recognized as a key national stakeholder at local, state, and federal levels, including by Congress.

- ☐ Very strongly agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Mildly agree
- ☐ Mildly disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Very strongly disagree

The AHIMT Association should serve as the liaison for coordination and dialogue between states, local governments, tribal governments, and the federal government.

- ☐ Very strongly agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Mildly agree
- ☐ Mildly disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Very strongly disagree

Please rank your top priorities:

From the list below, please identify your top **three** priorities in rank order. You do not need to rank the whole list. Write the number "1" in the space next to your first priority, the number "2" next to your second, and "3" next to your third.

Opportunities to complete task books, including during planned events and field exercises, should be expanded, improved, and clarified.	
A standardized lexicon (vocabulary and concepts) for AHIMTs should be developed and disseminated.	
The federal government should designate or create a single web-based system for sharing information.	
A streamlined process for review and dissemination of guidelines and standards should be developed.	
DHS should develop a national training system to make sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training is available.	
A marketing strategy to inform and educate federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions about the capabilities of AHIMTs should be developed.	
A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and all positions.	
DHS should create a national resource coordination center, process, and tools to track all AHIMTs, capabilities, and availability.	
A national standard should be established that specifies minimum equipment and resource requirements for Type 3 AHIMTs.	
A national credentialing working group should be established to resolve issues and concerns related to credentialing.	
A national qualifications working group should be established to develop qualification standards for AHIMTs and individual members.	
State, local, regional, tribal, and UASI homeland security strategies should include AHIMTs as resources.	
The federal government should identify and define a lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.	
DHS should develop and disseminate a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.	
A process should be formalized to facilitate the ability of newly-formed AHIMTs to shadow well-established AHIMTs.	
Mechanisms to share training and exercise opportunities across jurisdictions should be developed.	
A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.	

Finally, please answer the following questions about yourself and your team:

What discipline do you consider yourself a member of? (If you have more than one discipline, pick the one where you have the most experience or spend most of your time.)

☐ Municipal fire ☐ Emergency management ☐ Other
☐ Wildland fire ☐ Public health/hospitals *Please specify*:
☐ Law enforcement ☐ Public works
☐ EMS ☐ Communications/dispatch _____

How many years of incident management experience do you have? _____

In what state do you work primarily? _____

In what sector are you primarily employed?

☐ Federal government ☐ Tribal government
☐ State government ☐ NGO/Nonprofit sector
☐ Local government ☐ Private sector

What is your current job title in your "day job" (not on the AHIMT)? _____

Are you a member of an AHIMT? ☐ Yes   ☐ No

If so, please answer the following questions:

What is your role on the team? _____

In what year was your team formed? _____

What type of team is it?

☐ Type 1   ☐ Type 2   ☐ Type 3   ☐ Type 4

How many people are on your team roster? _____

Does your team have its own equipment cache? ☐ Yes   ☐ No

How many times has your team been deployed in total? _____

How many times has your team been deployed out of state? _____

This completes the survey. Please turn it in to a staff member.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY

APPENDIX B. Annotated Pre-Conference Survey

AHIMT Pre-Conference Survey

Two years ago at the 2008 AHIMT in DeKalb, Illinois attendees participated in a study to identify the most pressing issues facing AHIMTs. Participant concerns were reported to DHS. DHS has asked for an update on the progress, needs, and priorities of AHIMTs.

This survey will ask you about priorities identified in 2008, how you view them today, and new concerns you might have. Your input is important for two reasons: 1) it will help to set the agenda for the 2010 conference; and 2) it will give DHS feedback about the priorities for AHIMTs. The survey should take about 10 minutes. Your responses are confidential, meaning your responses will not be attributed to you.

1. Compared to two years ago, how well do you think AHIMTs nationwide are doing overall?

A lot better than before	6%
Better than before	58%
About the same	34%
Worse than before	2%
A lot worse than before	<1%

2. In your opinion, what is the biggest challenge, problem, or need facing AHIMTs today?

   [OPEN-ENDED]

[INTRO]
The next section will show you a series of participant concerns one at a time. It will ask you a few questions about how they stand today, about the level of success in addressing the concern, and about potential barriers to addressing each issue. [Probably need to work on this.]

ISSUES [ROTATE BLOCKS A-J]

[BLOCK A]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and for all positions. *Please answer the following questions about this issue.*

1. Overall, how important do you think it is to have a national standard?   **[Mean = 8.64]**

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.8%	2.2%	3.7%	11.7%	20.9%	15.0%	43.6%

2. Currently, how urgent a need is developing a national standard? **[Mean = 8.04]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	0.0%	0.7%	2.2%	1.5%	4.8%	8.8%	11.8%	23.2%	21.7%	25.0%

3. Overall, how successful has the nation been in developing a national standard for all IMTs? **[Mean = 5.00]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.1%	3.4%	7.9%	11.6%	12.4%	24.7%	15.7%	10.9%	8.6%	3.4%	0.4%

4. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress developing a national standard for all IMTs?

[OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK B]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

A single web-based repository for important information and resources (team contacts; lessons learned; best practices; ICS forms; model SOPs, IAPs, and MOUs; example policies and procedures) should be created.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

5. Overall, how important do you think it is to have a web-based repository? **[Mean = 7.83]**

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	3.3%	5.6%	8.5%	21.1%	21.5%	15.2%	23.0%

6. Currently, how urgent a need is creating a web-based repository? **[Mean = 7.26]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	2.6%	3.7%	11.9%	13.3%	16.3%	23.0%	13.7%	14.1%

7. Overall, how successful has the nation been in creating a web-based repository? **[Mean = 4.20]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4.3%	3.1%	9.3%	15.1%	18.2%	23.3%	13.2%	8.1%	3.1%	0.8%	1.6%

8. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in creating a web-based repository?

   [OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK C]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

The federal government should identify a specific, sustainable funding stream for the creation and ongoing support of AHIMTs.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

9. Overall, how important do you think it is to identify specific, sustainable funding? **[Mean = 8.94]**

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.0%	**0.0%**	**0.8%**	**0.8%**	**0.4%**	**1.9%**	**2.3%**	**9.9%**	**12.5%**	**18.6%**	**52.9%**

10. Currently, how urgent a need is identifying specific, sustainable funding? **[Mean = 8.63]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.0%	**0.4%**	**1.1%**	**0.8%**	**1.9%**	**3.8%**	**4.6%**	**7.3%**	**13.0%**	**21.8%**	**45.2%**

11. Overall, how successful has the federal government been in identifying specific, sustainable funding?
    [Mean = 4.12]

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10.9%	**7.4%**	**8.9%**	**10.9%**	**14.0%**	**19.5%**	**12.5%**	**7.0%**	**5.4%**	**1.6%**	**1.9%**

12. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in identifying specific, sustainable funding?

   [OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK D]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) needs to assure that sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training opportunities are available to meet credentialing requirements.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

13. Overall, how important do you think it is to assure the availability of sufficient training opportunities?
    [Mean = 9.10]

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	**0.4%**	**1.2%**	**7.7%**	**13.1%**	**24.2%**	**52.3%**

14. Currently, how urgent a need is assuring the availability of sufficient training opportunities? **[Mean = 8.70]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.0%	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	**0.4%**	**4.3%**	**4.7%**	**11.2%**	**17.4%**	**21.3%**	**40.3%**

15. Overall, how successful has DHS been in assuring the availability of sufficient training opportunities?
    [Mean = 5.72]

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.6%	**2.7%**	**5.5%**	**7.8%**	**9.8%**	**17.3%**	**12.5%**	**18.4%**	**16.9%**	**4.3%**	**3.1%**

16. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in assuring the availability of sufficient training opportunities?

    [OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK E]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

The federal government should identify and define a lead federal agency to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

17. Overall, how important do you think it is to have a lead federal agency to support the AHIMT program?
    [Mean = 8.24]

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.8%	**0.8%**	**0.8%**	**0.8%**	**2.3%**	**6.9%**	**5.4%**	**8.5%**	**18.1%**	**17.4%**	**38.2%**

18. Currently, how urgent a need is identifying a lead federal agency to support the AHIMT program? **[Mean = 7.83]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.8%	**0.8%**	**2.3%**	**1.9%**	**2.7%**	**9.3%**	**6.6%**	**11.6%**	**14.7%**	**16.3%**	**32.9%**

19. Overall, how successful has the federal government been in identifying a lead agency to support the AHIMT program? **[Mean = 4.81]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5.5%	**6.7%**	**7.5%**	**9.8%**	**13.4%**	**19.7%**	**9.4%**	**11.4%**	**9.8%**	**4.3%**	**2.4%**

20. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in identifying a lead federal agency to support the AHIMT program?

[OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK F]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) should develop and disseminate a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

21. Overall, how important do you think it is to have a road map for team formation? **[Mean = 8.52]**

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.0%	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	**1.6%**	**3.9%**	**5.1%**	**14.0%**	**18.7%**	**16.7%**	**39.7%**

22. Currently, how urgent a need is developing a road map for team formation? **[Mean = 8.93]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	**0.0%**	**1.6%**	**2.3%**	**2.7%**	**5.9%**	**7.8%**	**14.8%**	**17.6%**	**17.2%**	**29.7%**

23. Overall, how successful has DHS been in developing a road map for team formation? **[Mean = 4.78]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5.2%	3.2%	8.4%	12.7%	12.7%	22.3%	12.4%	11.2%	4.8%	5.2%	2.0%

24. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in developing a road map for team formation?

[OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK G]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) should create a national deployment coordination center that tracks all teams nationwide, their capabilities, and their availability for emergency and planned events.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

25. Overall, how important do you think it is to have a deployment coordination center? **[Mean = 7.69]**

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2.7%	0.4%	1.2%	1.2%	1.9%	10.1%	8.6%	10.9%	16.0%	21.4%	25.7%

26. Currently, how urgent a need is creating a deployment coordination center? **[Mean = 7.09]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3.9%	0.4%	1.2%	2.3%	4.3%	15.6%	8.2%	13.7%	14.8%	15.2%	20.3%

27. Overall, how successful has DHS been in creating a deployment coordination center? **[Mean = 3.48]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
16.1%	7.7%	12.1%	10.9%	15.3%	22.2%	5.6%	6.0%	2.8%	0.0%	1.2%

28. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in creating a deployment coordination center?

[OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK H]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

A national credentialing working group should be established to resolve issues and concerns related to credentialing.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

29. Overall, how important do you think it is to have a national credentialing working group? **[Mean = 8.22]**

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	0.0%	1.6%	2.0%	1.2%	4.4%	5.6%	12.4%	19.6%	19.6%	33.2%

30. Currently, how urgent a need is establishing a national credentialing group? **[Mean = 7.78]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.2%	0.8%	1.6%	3.6%	2.0%	6.0%	7.2%	13.5%	19.1%	15.5%	29.5%

31. Overall, how successful has the nation been in establishing a national credentialing group? **[Mean = 3.97]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9.7%	8.5%	10.9%	13.3%	14.1%	22.6%	5.6%	5.2%	6.0%	2.0%	2.0%

32. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in establishing a national credentialing group?

[OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK I]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) should ensure that State Homeland Security Strategies include IMTs as a state, regional, and local resource.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

33. Overall, how important do you think it is to include IMTs in State Homeland Security strategies?
[Mean = 8.86]

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.0%	2.0%	7.1%	18.4%	16.5%	51.4%

34. Currently, how urgent a need is including IMTs in State Homeland Security strategies? **[Mean = 8.35]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.8%	**1.2%**	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	**1.6%**	**5.9%**	**6.7%**	**9.1%**	**17.3%**	**15.7%**	**41.3%**

35. Overall, how successful has DHS been in ensuring IMTs are included as a state, regional, and local resource? **[Mean = 4.49]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6.1%	**7.7%**	**8.9%**	**10.9%**	**11.7%**	**25.9%**	**8.1%**	**8.5%**	**6.5%**	**2.4%**	**3.2%**

36. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in ensuring IMTs are included as a state, regional, and local resource?

[OPEN-ENDED]

[BLOCK J]

One of the top issues facing AHIMTs identified two years ago was:

A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.

Please answer the following questions about this issue.

37. Overall, how important do you think it is to specify equivalency of training and experience? **[Mean = 8.3]**

Not at all important										Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	**0.0%**	**0.4%**	**1.2%**	**1.6%**	**4.8%**	**6.0%**	**13.9%**	**20.3%**	**14.3%**	**37.1%**

38. Currently, how urgent a need is establishing a process for specifying equivalency of training and experience? **[Mean = 8.91]**

Not at all urgent										Extremely urgent
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.4%	**0.8%**	**0.4%**	**2.8%**	**1.6%**	**6.0%**	**9.2%**	**16.0%**	**18.0%**	**14.4%**	**30.4%**

39. Overall, how successful has the nation been in establishing a process for specifying equivalency of training and experience? **[Mean = 4.17]**

Not at all successful										Extremely successful
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4.9%	**3.6%**	**15.4%**	**17.0%**	**13.0%**	**22.3%**	**10.5%**	**6.9%**	**3.2%**	**1.2%**	**2.0%**

40. In your opinion, what is the number one barrier to progress in establishing a process for specifying equivalency of training and experience?

[OPEN-ENDED]

RANKING OF ISSUES

Of the ten issues you have just reviewed, we would like to know which three you see as the top priorities. In the lists below, please check the box next to your first, second, and third priorities.

Issues:	1st Priority	2nd Priority	3rd Priority	% of Respondents including in Top 3 Priorities
Federal government should identify specific and sustainable funding streams to support AHIMTs	42%	14%	13%	69%
A national standard for minimum training, knowledge, and experience for IMTs	22%	22%	11%	55%
DHS needs to assure that there is enough training to meet credentialing requirements	9%	16%	16%	41%
A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established	9%	13%	11%	33%
A national credentialing work group should be established to resolve credentialing issues	9%	12%	11%	32%
Federal government should identify a lead federal agency to support and coordinate AHIMT program	12%	9%	7%	28%
DHS should ensure that state homeland security strategies include IMTs as resources	9%	11%	7%	27%
DHS should develop a standardized road map of team formation	6%	9%	8%	23%
A web-based repository of information and resources	3%	8%	10%	21%
DHS should create a national deployment coordination center	4%	8%	7%	19%

Please answer the following questions about your role in incident management.

41. Did you attend the 2008 AHIMT conference in DeKalb?
    Yes   11.8%
    No   88.2%

42. Do you plan to attend the 2010 AHIMT conference in Denver?
    Yes   99.2%
    No   0.8%

43. What level of government do you work for?
    Local   65.8%
    State   20.1%
    Federal   4.7%
    Not employed by government   9.5%

44. What is your job title?
    [OPEN-ENDED]

45. How many years have you been in that (job/position)?

    Mean = 8 years
    <1 to 32 years
    A few listed IMT "employment," most listed paid positions. Many had serial employment in 1st response
    community, but answered question correctly by supplying 'years in current job.'

46. How many years of experience do you have in incident management?

    [OPEN-ENDED]

47. In what state do you work primarily?

    [LIST]

APPENDIX C. Annotated Final Survey

AHIMT FINAL SURVEY

Please tell us how urgent you think each of the needs listed below is today.

1. Opportunities to complete task books, including during planned events and field exercises, should be expanded, improved, and clarified.

Statistics	
n =	231
Mean	2.88
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.763

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	0.4
Not very urgent	2.6
Somewhat urgent	25.1
Very urgent	51.9
Extremely urgent	19.9

2. A standardized lexicon (vocabulary and concepts) for AHIMTs should be developed and disseminated.

Statistics	
n =	232
Mean	2.28
Median	2.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.881

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	1.3
Not very urgent	15.9
Somewhat urgent	44.4
Very urgent	29.7
Extremely urgent	8.6

3. The federal government should designate or create a single web-based system for sharing information.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.51
Median	2.50
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.990

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	2.1
Not very urgent	12.4
Somewhat urgent	35.5
Very urgent	32.5
Extremely urgent	17.5

4. A streamlined process for review and dissemination of guidelines and standards should be developed.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.91
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.792

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	0.4
Not very urgent	2.6
Somewhat urgent	25.6
Very urgent	47.9
Extremely urgent	23.5

5. DHS should develop a national training system to make sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training available.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.83
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.862

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	0.9
Not very urgent	4.3
Somewhat urgent	29.1
Very urgent	42.7
Extremely urgent	23.1

6. A marketing strategy to inform and educate federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions about the capabilities of AHIMTs should be developed.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.63
Median	3.00
Range	3
Std. Deviation	.977

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	0
Not very urgent	12.8
Somewhat urgent	34.2
Very urgent	29.9
Extremely urgent	23.1

7. A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and all positions.

Statistics	
n =	235
Mean	2.98
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.847

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	0.9
Not very urgent	2.1
Somewhat urgent	25.1
Very urgent	41.7
Extremely urgent	30.2

8. DHS should create a national resource coordination center, process, and tools to track all AHIMTs, capabilities, and availability.

Statistics	
n =	231
Mean	2.27
Median	2.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	1.059

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	5.6
Not very urgent	16.5
Somewhat urgent	35.5
Very urgent	29.9
Extremely urgent	12.6

9. A national standard should be established that specifies minimum equipment and resource requirements for Type 3 AHIMTs.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.17
Median	2.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.891

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	2.1
Not very urgent	19.2
Somewhat urgent	44.9
Very urgent	26.9
Extremely urgent	6.8

10. A national credentialing working group should be established to resolve issues and concerns related to credentialing.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.58
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.901

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	2.1
Not very urgent	6.4
Somewhat urgent	38.0
Very urgent	38.0
Extremely urgent	15.4

11. A national qualifications working group should be established to develop qualification standards for AHIMTs and individual members.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.65
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.901

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	1.3
Not very urgent	6.8
Somewhat urgent	35.5
Very urgent	38.0
Extremely urgent	18.4

12. State, local, regional, tribal, and UASI homeland security strategies should include AHIMTs as resources.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.92
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.895

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	1.3
Not very urgent	4.7
Somewhat urgent	22.2
Very urgent	44.0
Extremely urgent	27.8

13. The federal government should identify and define a lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.

Statistics	
n =	233
Mean	3.06
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.940

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	1.3
Not very urgent	4.3
Somewhat urgent	20.6
Very urgent	34.8
Extremely urgent	39.1

14. DHS should develop and disseminate a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	2.22
Median	2.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	1.112

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	6.0
Not very urgent	20.5
Somewhat urgent	33.8
Very urgent	25.2
Extremely urgent	14.5

15. A process should be formalized to facilitate the ability of newly-formed AHIMTs to shadow well-established AHIMTs.

Statistics	
n =	232
Mean	2.69
Median	3.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.891

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	0.9
Not very urgent	6.5
Somewhat urgent	34.9
Very urgent	37.9
Extremely urgent	19.8

16. Mechanisms to share training and exercise opportunities across jurisdictions should be developed.

Statistics	
n =	233
Mean	2.47
Median	2.00
Range	4
Std. Deviation	.886

Scale	Total (%)
Not at all urgent	2.1
Not very urgent	9.0
Somewhat urgent	39.5
Very urgent	38.2
Extremely urgent	11.2

17. A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.

Statistics		Scale	Total (%)
n =	235	Not at all urgent	1.3
Mean	2.70	Not very urgent	7.7
Median	3.00	Somewhat urgent	30.2
Range	4	Very urgent	41.3
Std. Deviation	.913	Extremely urgent	19.6

For each of the challenges, problems, barriers, or obstacles listed below, please evaluate how big a problem each is for your team and for the national AHIMT program as a whole.

18. There are not enough grant funds available to support the formation of AHIMTs.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.13
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.822

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	27.8
A minor problem	31.0
A major problem	41.2

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.67
Median	2.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.519

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	2.3
A minor problem	28.7
A major problem	69.0

19. Sustainable funding streams are too limited to provide for the ongoing support of AHIMTs.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.43
Median	2.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.698

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	12.0
A minor problem	33.3
A major problem	54.6

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.70
Median	2.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.506

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	2.3
A minor problem	25.0
A major problem	72.7

20. There is no national standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	220
Mean	.98
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.788

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	31.8
A minor problem	38.2
A major problem	30.0

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.33
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.631

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	8.8
A minor problem	49.5
A major problem	41.7

21. Approved equipment lists for DHS grant funds do not account for AHIMT resource needs.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	211
Mean	1.29
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.722

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	15.6
A minor problem	39.8
A major problem	44.5

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	208
Mean	1.44
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.603

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	5.8
A minor problem	44.7
A major problem	49.5

22. There are inadequate opportunities for shadowing.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	220
Mean	1.50
Median	2.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.652

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	8.6
A minor problem	33.2
A major problem	58.2

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	221
Mean	1.71
Median	2.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.491

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	1.8
A minor problem	24.9
A major problem	73.3

23. State exercise strategies do not include adequate opportunities for AHIMTs to participate.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.14
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.759

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	22.7
A minor problem	40.7
A major problem	36.6

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	203
Mean	1.45
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.555

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	3.0
A minor problem	48.8
A major problem	48.3

24. There are not enough evaluators at qualifying exercises to support certification/task book sign-off.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.24
Median	1.00
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.744

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	18.5
A minor problem	39.4
A major problem	42.1

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	210
Mean	1.49
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.605

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	5.7
A minor problem	40.0
A major problem	54.3

25. Existing web-based informational resources (tools and templates) are not coordinated.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	217
Mean	1.27
Median	1
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.670

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	12.4
A minor problem	47.9
A major problem	39.6

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.45
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.616

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	6.5
A minor problem	41.7
A major problem	51.9

26. Integration and coordination among IMTs at all levels is weak.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.45
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.616

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	16.2
A minor problem	46.8
A major problem	37.0

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	214
Mean	1.55
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.561

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	3.3
A minor problem	38.3
A major problem	58.4

27. There is no clear lead federal program office for the AHIMT program.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	215
Mean	1.15
Median	1
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.783

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	24.2
A minor problem	36.7
A major problem	39.1

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	214
Mean	1.62
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.607

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	6.5
A minor problem	25.2
A major problem	68.2

28. Cultural differences and "turf battles" across disciplines are impeding development of AHIMTs.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	219
Mean	1.02
Median	1
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.804

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	31.1
A minor problem	35.6
A major problem	33.3

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	215
Mean	1.49
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.579

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	4.2
A minor problem	42.8
A major problem	53.0

29. It is difficult to provide workers' compensation and liability protection across state lines, or to people who are not insured by an agency.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	216
Mean	1.13
Median	1
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.876

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	32.4
A minor problem	21.8
A major problem	45.8

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	210
Mean	1.55
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.603

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	5.7
A minor problem	33.8
A major problem	60.5

30. State and local elected and appointed leaders are not aware of and do not understand the value, benefits, advantages, of the use of AHIMTs.

(A) How big a problem is this <u>for your team</u>?

Statistics	
n =	221
Mean	1.49
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.685

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	10.9
A minor problem	29.4
A major problem	59.7

(B) How big a problem is this <u>for the national AHIMT program</u>?

Statistics	
n =	219
Mean	1.73
Median	2
Range	2
Std. Deviation	.455

Scale	Total (%)
Not a problem	0.5
A minor problem	26.0
A major problem	73.5

Several break-out groups mentioned the new AHIMT Association. Please give us your opinion about the following:

31. The AHIMT Association should develop unified goals, strategies, and a path forward, and should communicate these broadly.

Statistics	
n =	235
Mean	4.4
Median	4
Range	5
Std. Deviation	.705

Scale	Total (%)
Very strongly disagree	0.4
Strongly disagree	0.0
Mildly disagree	0.4
Mildly agree	7.2
Strongly agree	42.1
Very strongly agree	49.8

32. The AHIMT Association should be recognized as a key national stakeholder at local, state, and federal levels, including by Congress.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	4.18
Median	4
Range	5
Std. Deviation	.976

Scale	Total (%)
Very strongly disagree	1.7
Strongly disagree	0.4
Mildly disagree	0.4
Mildly agree	19.2
Strongly agree	32.5
Very strongly agree	45.7

33. The AHIMT Association should serve as the liaison for coordination and dialogue between states, local governments, tribal governments, and the federal government.

Statistics	
n =	234
Mean	3.85
Median	4
Range	5
Std. Deviation	1.139

Scale	Total (%)
Very strongly disagree	2.6
Strongly disagree	1.7
Mildly disagree	4.3
Mildly agree	24.8
Strongly agree	33.3
Very strongly agree	33.3

34. From the list below, please identify your top **three** priorities in rank order. You do not need to rank the whole list. Write the number "1" in the space next to your first priority, the number "2" next to your second, and "3" next to your third.

LIST OF PRIORITIES	Totals (%)		
PRIORITY LEVEL	(A) 1st	(B) 2nd	(C) 3rd
1 - Opportunities to complete task books, including during planned events and field exercises, should be expanded, improved, and clarified.	12.4	9.3	6.3
2 - A standardized lexicon (vocabulary and concepts) for AHIMTs should be developed and disseminated.	0.9	1.3	2.3
3 - The federal government should designate or create a single web-based system for sharing information.	3.6	3.6	5.4
4 - A streamlined process for review and dissemination of guidelines and standards should be developed.	1.8	6.7	3.2
5 - DHS should develop a national training system to make sufficient ICS, team, position-specific, and unit-level training is available.	3.6	8.4	9.9
6 - A marketing strategy to inform and educate federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions about the capabilities of AHIMTs should be developed.	4.9	11.1	7.2
7 - A national standard that specifies required minimum training, knowledge, and experience should be developed for all IMTs and all positions.	16.9	13.3	10.8
8 - DHS should create a national resource coordination center, process, and tools to track all AHIMTs, capabilities, and availability.	1.8	4.4	8.1
9 - A national standard should be established that specifies minimum equipment and resource requirements for Type 3 AHIMTs.	0.4	3.6	2.3
10 - A national credentialing working group should be established to resolve issues and concerns related to credentialing.	4.0	3.1	5.9
11 - A national qualifications working group should be established to develop qualification standards for AHIMTs and individual members.	3.1	10.7	8.1
12 - State, local, regional, tribal, and UASI homeland security strategies should include AHIMTs as resources.	5.3	4.9	7.2
13 - The federal government should identify and define a lead federal program office to support, fund, and coordinate the AHIMT program.	31.1	6.7	7.2
14 - DHS should develop and disseminate a standardized road map that explains the steps in team formation from concept to completion.	2.7	2.7	0.5
15 - A process should be formalized to facilitate the ability of newly-formed AHIMTs to shadow well-established AHIMTs.	2.7	4.4	5.4
16 - Mechanisms to share training and exercise opportunities across jurisdictions should be developed.	1.3	2.2	2.7
17 - A process for specifying equivalency of training and experience across disciplines should be established.	3.6	3.6	7.7

Statistics	(A) 1st	(B) 2nd	(C) 3rd
n =	225	225	222

Finally, please answer the following questions about yourself and your team:

35. What discipline do you consider yourself a member of? (If you have more than one discipline, pick the one where you have the most experience or spend most of your time.)?

Statistics	
n =	236

Disciplines	Total (%)
Municipal fire	30.5
Wildland fire	11.0
Law enforcement	10.2
EMS	3.4
Emergency management	29.7
Public health/hospitals	0.4
Public works	0.8
Communications/dispatch	1.3
Other	12.7

36. How many years of incident management experience do you have?

Statistics	
n =	231
Mean	17.54
Median	18
Low Value	0
High Value	47
Range	47
Std. Deviation	10.463

37. In what state do you work primarily?

Statistics	
n =	236

38. In what sector are you primarily employed?

Statistics	
n =	233

Sectors	Total (%)
Federal government	9.4
State government	21.5
Local government	63.5
Tribal government	0.0
NGO/Nonprofit sector	1.7
Private sector	3.9

39. What is your current job title in your "day job" (not on the AHIMT)?

Statistics	
n =	230

40. Are you a member of an AHIMT?

Statistics	
n =	231

Response	Total (%)
Yes	81
No	19

If so, please answer the following questions:

41. What is your role on the team?

Statistics	
n =	183

42. In what year was your team formed?

Statistics	
n =	178

43. What type of team is it?

Statistics	
n =	186

Team types	Total (%)
Type 1	4.3
Type 2	7.5
Type 3	72.0
Type 4	14.5
Type 2 and Type 3	1.6

44. How many people are on your team roster?

Statistics	
n =	178
Mean	50.03
Median	36
Low Value	7
High Value	250
Range	243
Std. Deviation	38.72

45. Does your team have its own equipment cache?

Statistics	
n =	184

Response	Total (%)
Yes	83.2
No	16.8

46. How many times has your team been deployed in total?

Statistics	
n =	179
Mean	8.77
Median	5
Low Value	0
High Value	80
Range	80
Std. Deviation	12.57

47. How many times has your team been deployed out of state?

Statistics	
n =	174
Mean	1.03
Median	0.00
Low Value	0
High Value	24
Range	24
Std. Deviation	2.61

DISASTER RISK PERCEPTION, PREFERENCES, AND PREPAREDNESS
Project contact information:

Dr. Amy K. Donahue, Principal Investigator
Candace Fitzpatrick, Project Manager

Department of Public Policy
University of Connecticut
1800 Asylum Avenue
West Hartford, CT 06117
http://dpp.uconn.edu

The All-Hazards Incident Management Team Training and Education Conference
http://www.ahimt.net/