

The Performance Scales on the following pages were developed to help improve feedback to Incident Management Teams and Agency Administrators involved in complex, inter-jurisdictional wildfires with the aim of contributing to learning for more safe and effective wildfire response.

Three sets of performance measures are available to you. These are:

**OVERALL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR COMPLEX, INTERJURISDICTIONAL WILDFIRES**-- these are intended for multiple participants involved in the incident, such as the IMT, cooperating local agencies, and local host agency/units. They will provide a comprehensive picture of performance across multiple dimensions associated with a complex, inter-jurisdictional wildfire.

**IMT PERFORMANCE ON COMPLEX, INTERJURISDICTIONAL WILDFIRES**—these are intended to be administered to local cooperators and agency administrators for the purpose of providing feedback on the Incident Management Team’s performance.

**AGENCY ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE ON COMPLEX, INTERJURISDICTIONAL WILDFIRES**—these are intended to be administered to the Incident Management Team for the purpose of providing feedback on the Agency Administrators’ performance.

These performance scales were created by Drs. Branda Nowell and Toddi Steelman, as part of the FireChasers project operated out of North Carolina State University. [www.firechasers.ncsu.edu](http://www.firechasers.ncsu.edu). Funding was provided by the National Science Foundation, Joint Fire Science Program, USFS Northern Research Station, North Carolina State University and the University of Saskatchewan. Please contact [Branda\\_Nowell@ncsu.edu](mailto:Branda_Nowell@ncsu.edu) for further information.

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR COMPLEX, INTERJURISDICTIONAL WILDFIRES

For things to go well on a complex incident, many pieces have to come together. We are interested in your perspective about how well different aspects of incident management were carried out by all parties involved (IMT, cooperating local agencies, local host agency/units) overall for this fire. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements by circling the response that best fits your answer. If you have no knowledge of any of the areas below, please mark dk. Mark n/a if this area was not a factor on this incident.

DK = don't know  
 1 = strongly disagree  
 2 = somewhat disagree  
 3 = neither agree nor disagree  
 4 = somewhat agree  
 5 = strongly agree  
 n/a = not applicable

ON THIS INCIDENT....

### Inter-agency interactions:

1. A coordinated set of fire management objectives were agreed upon among all affected jurisdictions	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
2. All concerned jurisdictions prioritized maintaining good communication across agencies	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
3. Credit for success and effort was shared among agencies during public meetings and media events	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
4. There was a general willingness across agencies to offer assistance to other agencies or jurisdictions	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
5. "Borrowed resources" were released in a timely fashion to minimize burden on the lending agency	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
6. Sufficient attention was paid to creating forums and protocols for effective communication and decision making	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

### Incident management

6. Community values at risk from wildfire were readily identified	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
7. Efforts to protect community values were appropriate given available resources and risks to firefighter safety	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
8. The overall strategy taken in managing this fire was appropriate	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
9. Local resources were incorporated into the incident management operations	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

### Public information

10. Public information was coordinated among cooperating agencies to ensure continuity of the message	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
11. Local resources were leveraged to ensure timely dissemination of public information	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
12. Social media was used effectively to provide timely public updates concerning the status of the fire	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
13. A system for communication with the media was put in place to ensure timely dissemination of public information	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

### Road closures (if applicable)

14. All cooperating and fire management agencies maintained a timely awareness of the status of road closures	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
15. Trigger (or evaluation) points for making decisions about road closures were proactively communicated to the local community	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
16. A consistent message was provided to the public about the status of road closures	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

### Evacuation and sheltering (if applicable)

17. Cooperating agencies were able to use existing evacuation plans to quickly establish a coordinated evacuation strategy	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
--	----	---	---	---	---	---	-----

18. Residents received timely notification of evacuation status using clear, pre-established language to distinguish between an evacuation warning and an evacuation notice	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
19. Repopulation plan and process was established and coordinated among necessary stakeholders	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
Created by Drs. Branda Nowell and Toddi Steelman as part of the FireChasers Project: <a href="http://www.firechasers.ncsu.edu">www.firechasers.ncsu.edu</a> . Branda_Nowell@ncsu.edu							

## IMT PERFORMANCE ON COMPLEX, INTERJURISDICTIONAL WILDFIRES

We'd like to get your perspective on the performance of the incident management team (IMT).

DK = don't know

1= no room for improvement

2= a little room for improvement

3= some room for improvement

4= quite a bit of room for improvement

5= a lot of room for improvement

n/a = not applicable

In terms of room for improvement, how would you rate the performance of this IMT in the following areas ON THIS INCIDENT:

1. Obtaining local context (e.g., burn scars, trail systems, local weather patterns) to inform their operations?	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
2. Being sensitive to the local community culture and political climate?	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
3. Incorporating information about local values at risk (e.g., biological, archeological, cultural, recreational) into the management of the fire	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
4. Being accessible to you	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
5. Rapidly identifying the key local players they needed to be communicating with during the incident	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
6. Seeking to understand the organizational culture, values, and capacities of your agency	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
7. Clarifying roles and responsibilities	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
8. Engaging affected jurisdictions in planning and decision making from the beginning	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
9. Including your agency in the dissemination of vital information during the incident	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
10. Valuing your agency's input	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
11. Getting your agency the information you needed to be effective	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
12. Serving as a positive ambassador in interactions with the local community	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
13. Being flexible in adapting their fire management strategy to account for local preferences	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
14. Being helpful to cooperating agencies	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
15. Clarifying and operating within the scope of their delegation of authority	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
16. Valuing local knowledge and local input	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
17. Sharing credit with your agency	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
18. Acknowledging cooperation	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
19. Using the incident as a training opportunity to build local capacity	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

Created by Drs. Branda Nowell and Toddi Steelman as part of the FireChasers Project:: [www.firechasers.ncsu.edu](http://www.firechasers.ncsu.edu).  
Branda\_Nowell@ncsu.edu

## AGENCY ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE ON COMPLEX, INTERJURISDICTIONAL WILDFIRES

The Host Unit and Administrative Agencies can play an important role in helping an incoming IMT get briefed on the incident and local context. Relative to other fires you've work on, how would you rate the performance of the host Forest and Agency Administrators during this incident in the following areas: Please provide ratings in terms of room for improvement (NOTE: higher numbers = more room for improvement)

DK = don't know  
 1 = no room for improvement  
 2 = a little room for improvement  
 3 = some room for improvement  
 4 = quite a bit of room for improvement  
 5 = a lot of room for improvement

FOR THE HOST FOREST AND AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS ON THIS INCIDENT, HOW MUCH ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT WAS THERE IN:

1. Providing up to date information regarding the location of residential populations that could be at risk	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
2. Providing up to date information about local values at risk (e.g., biological, archeological, recreational, cultural, etc.) in the fire area	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
3. Providing information regarding the bio-physical aspects of the landscape (e.g., roads, burn scars, vegetation, weather patterns, etc.)	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
4. Articulating clear fire management goals	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
5. Clearly articulating priorities and risk tolerance with regards to values at risk	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
6. Helping the IMT understand the political sensitivities of the impacted community(s)	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
7. Providing the IMT timely information about all pertinent media contacts	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
8. Providing the IMT timely contact information for all pertinent local cooperators	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
9. Coordinating with the IMT on public information to ensure a consistent message	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
10. Facilitating introductions between the IMT and important local cooperators	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
11. Providing an agency administrator who was effectively engaged with the IMT	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
12. Demonstrating familiarity with how IMTs operate	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
13. Providing good maps of values at risk needed by IMT	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
14. Providing up-to-date information on key locations for PIO traplines	DK	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

Created by Drs. Branda Nowell and Toddi Steelman as part of the FireChasers Project:: [www.firechasers.ncsu.edu](http://www.firechasers.ncsu.edu).  
 Branda Nowell@ncsu.edu