

**The Effectiveness of the Accountability System  
on the Sharonville Fire Department**

By: John R. Mackey  
Assistant Fire Chief  
Sharonville Fire Department  
11210 Reading Road  
Sharonville, OH 45241

Class IV

A research project submitted to the Ohio Fire Executive Program

27 July 2005

## CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I hereby certify that the following statements are true:

1. This paper constitutes my own product, that where the language of others is set forth, quotation marks so indicate, and that appropriate credit is given where I have used the language, ideas, expressions, or writings of another.

2. I have affirmed the use of proper spelling and grammar in this document by using the spell and grammar check functions of a word processing software program and correcting the errors as suggested by the program.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

## ABSTRACT

This research paper investigated how the current accountability system that is being used by the Sharonville Fire Department compares to the standards and procedures that are accepted by the fire service. The accountability of all personnel that are on the emergency scene is one of the most important steps that an incident commander can do to ensure their safety. This study looked at items like: Does this accountability system meet the present NFPA standards of 1500 and 1561? Do the members of the Sharonville Fire Department view the current system to be thorough enough when it is used on an emergency scene? Do the members of the Sharonville Fire Department understand the terminology currently being used? And finally, is the training being done on the current accountability system adequate enough to ensure complete involvement of all members?

An evaluative research method was used to survey the members of the Sharonville Fire Department and other department throughout the State of Ohio that had the same make-up of the Sharonville Fire Department. The results pointed out that the accountability system was being used most of the time on emergency runs. It also stated that the language being used was viewed as “clear and precise” most of the time. These surveys asked how they would rate their current accountability system, with most of the respondents stating that their system was a “Good” system to use.

After compiling the information from the surveys, recommendations were made to: 1) Improve the training each member receives on the current system, 2) Improve terminology being used while on an emergency scene, and 3) Ensure that the accountability system is set-up and used on every emergency scene.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT.....2

ABSTRACT.....2

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....3

INTRODUCTION.....4

    Statement of the Problem.....4

    Purpose of the Study.....5

    Research Questions.....5

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE.....6

LITERATURE REVIEW..... 10

PROCEDURES..... 19

    Definition of Terms..... 20

    Limitations of the Study..... 21

RESULTS..... 22

DISCUSSION..... 29

RECOMMENDATIONS..... 33

REFERENCES..... 31

APPENDIX 1 - Accountability Survey..... 39

APPENDIX 2 - List of Departments Surveyed..... 41

APPENDIX 3 - Survey Responses from Inside the Department..... 44

APPENDIX 4 - Survey Responses from Outside the Department..... 46

## INTRODUCTION

### **Statement of the Problem**

*The problem this study investigated was how the accountability system currently being used by the Sharonville Fire Department compares to the nationally accepted standards and procedures of the fire service.* In the fire service, the accountability of personnel on an emergency scene is considered to be one of the most important things command can do to ensure firefighter safety and survival. Knowing who is in the “HOT” zone and where they are working could mean the difference between everyone leaving the emergency scene safely or having someone injured or worse, killed. An accountability system needs to be in place from the start of the emergency until the last unit leaves the scene. This ensures that everyone who is operating at an emergency scene is accounted for at all times.

This accountability system needs to be adaptable to each emergency. That means the system should be flexible enough to be used on a small fire, but in turn it needs to be expandable to the point it can handle any large-scale emergency. This system also needs to use components that will make the system effective, which would enable the Incident Commander to know at all times where his personnel are and their status. For everyone to know what is expected of them while on an emergency scene and how to operate within the system, Standard Operating Procedures (SOP’s) need to be in place. This is a concern because when multiple crews are working in the “HOT” zone and their tasks are changed, the Accountability Officer needs to know where everyone is and what their new assignments are.

Emergency radio traffic procedures need to be included in these SOP’s, because this type of radio traffic can be transmitted at any time and the Incident Commander needs to be able to hear the broadcast. This emergency traffic could include having a firefighter down or any

dramatic change in the hot zone. If an emergency would happen, the Incident Commander and the Accountability Officer need to know where everyone is and that they are accounted for.

### **Purpose of the Study**

*The purpose of this study was to evaluate the current accountability system used by the Sharonville Fire Department. By evaluating the current system, this study looked to see if it contained all of the components needed for a comprehensive and thorough system. To be a comprehensive system, an accountability system needs to be user friendly and everyone on the emergency scene understands the terminology and procedures. It must also be able to be adapted to every type of emergency run. This study looked at the training that the personnel received to operate within this system, and finally it looked at the SOP's of the Sharonville Fire Department. The results and recommendations of this study were forwarded to the Chief Officers of the department for their review.*

### **Research Questions**

*The research questions this evaluative study will investigate are:*

1. Does the current system that is being used meet the NFPA standards 1500 and 1561?
2. Is the current accountability system used by the Sharonville Fire Department viewed by the members as being thorough enough while they are operating on an emergency scene?
3. Do the members of the Sharonville Fire Department understand the terminology that is currently being used in this accountability system?
4. Is the training being done on the operation of the current system adequate enough to ensure complete involvement of all members?

## **BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE**

In the early 1980's, The Hamilton County Fire Chiefs Association started to address the lack of an accountability system throughout the county. Through their efforts, different types of systems were researched and a standard system for the county was adopted. This system consisted of tags that showed apparatus designations (passports) and helmet tags with the names of the individual personnel on them (name tags). When someone was assigned to a piece of apparatus, they would put their name tag on the passport and when they arrived at an emergency scene, they would give this passport to the accountability officer.

The Sharonville Fire Department has used this basic system since its inception. Problems arose with the system because they did not use it on every emergency scene. The only time this system was used was if there was a large-scale incident and implementation was not until they were well into the incident. Everyone from the officers to the firefighters failed to establish accountability when they arrived on an emergency scene. This led to freelancing by some firefighters and the Incident Commander's inability to account for the whereabouts of every firefighter while they were at the scene. This department was heading in a dangerous direction and it was only a matter of time before an incident would occur where everyone on an emergency scene would need to be accounted for and the Incident Commander would be unable to do it.

In June of 2002, The Sharonville Fire Department started a transition from having mostly paid-on-call personnel to a combination full-time/part-time department. During this transition period, they hired people from different departments who had established accountability systems already in place. In the opinions of the new personnel, the current system needed a complete overhaul. The Chief Officers met with the Company Officers of the department and gave them the job of revising this system so that it could be used on every emergency run. The officers met

and started working on this problem. Within a short time, they came up with their recommendations to improve the current system. Their first and most important recommendation was that whoever arrives on the emergency scene first must take command and set up accountability. Another recommendation was that the officers felt that the crew designation should indicate their location, task, and crew number. An example of this would be “First Floor Attack One or Second Floor Attack Two”. A third recommendation was that an “Accountability Board” would be placed on the first responder vehicle and the shift officer would have the responsibility of setting up this board at the start of their shift. This board would have on it everyone assigned to their crew on that day and their shift assignments.

One of their final recommendations was to have Standard Operating Procedures (SOP’s) written up to address this area. By having these SOP’s, the members of the department would have guidelines to follow while they are operating at an emergency scene.

After they submitted all of their recommendations to the Chief Officers, it was decided to institute these changes and require that whoever arrives on the scene first take command of the incident and set up accountability. One of the problems that have arisen since these recommendations were instituted is that when the accountability board is set up, it includes both fire and EMS crews. The crews on the apparatus also set up a passport with the names of the people who are on that unit for that specific shift and this passport is kept with the apparatus. So when an EMS call comes in, the crew assigned to the EMS unit leaves the station. If in the meantime a fire call comes in, the remaining crew takes the fire truck to the scene and hands over to the Incident Commander/Accountability Officer their passport. The problem arises when the crew from the fire truck fails to remove the EMS crew’s names from the passport. By leaving their names on the passport, command could assume there are more personnel on the scene than there really are.



Another problem that arose was that this new system incorporated new unit designations for the crews that were operating at an emergency scene. Call signs like “First Floor Attack One” or “Second Floor Ventilation Two” were put in place to better pinpoint location, task, and crew. When there are multiple crews operating in the same area of a structure, the crews were finding the new call signs to be confusing. And still another problem that had arisen is that The Sharonville Fire Department is the only department in the area that is using these crew identifiers. This has caused some confusion when mutual aid departments responded into Sharonville or when Sharonville was called into neighboring areas. With Sharonville’s accountability system not matching up with theirs, different departments at the same time were using different crew and location identifiers. This has again caused confusion to both the Incident Commanders and the crews that are operating on the scene.

With the new crew identifiers, the members that are working at an emergency scene were becoming confused when relaying information to command. The current language causes radio traffic to be too long and with some crews using crew identifiers that sounded alike, the Accountability Officer became overburdened and confused while trying to keep track of everyone.

Everyone on the department must be able to operate within this system. They must also be able to run the accountability sector while on an emergency scene. If a shift officer is not available and an engine company arrives on a scene first, the person in charge of that engine must be able to take command and run accountability. A problem that has come up is that most of the time the shift officer is in command of an incident, and they have been able to run accountability, but the other line personnel have had only limited opportunity or exposure to these positions.

The potential impact this study would have on Sharonville Fire Department is that it will look at the terminology that is currently being used and how user friendly it is. It would also look to see if additional training is needed for the department members so that they would be able to either operate within the accountability system or run the accountability sector if needed. Everyone on the scene needs to be able to work within the system or run it if necessary. By ensuring that everyone is trained thoroughly, less time will be needed in setting up the accountability sector and a more accurate accounting of the location and number of personnel that are at an emergency scene will be accomplished.

It also looked at the terminology used by the crews that are operating inside of a structure. By eliminating the possibility of misidentifying crews, their location and status would be more accurately tracked. This would in turn allow the Accountability Officer to ensure that the crews are safe and accounted for. Finally, the need to look at accounting for everyone who is at the scene, not just fire department personnel, but police, by-standers, utility crews, and anyone else who is there. Too many times additional resources are called to a scene, but when they arrive, the Incident Commander or the Accountability Officer loses track of their location. They need to be accounted for just as the personnel who are operating inside a structure.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Avillo (2002) stated, "Personnel accountability is a critical concern at any incident" (p.256). This is true, but the types of accountability systems vary widely. Systems that were looked at were as simple as a tag system, to those that were as complex as turnout gear with implanted computer chips that can be tracked by global positioning satellites. While he was discussing computer chips, Avillo (2002) wrote "Incidentally do not work inside of buildings" (p.256). In his book, Avillo (2002) felt that the tag type of system is reactive and not proactive, and only shows where the crewmembers should be and not where they are. He also felt that the only sure thing that the tag system would provide is "It is a sure way to identify a body" (p.257). He states, "Most firefighters that are lost or trapped usually occurs when they are alone and not with their crews" (p.256).

Another problem with the tag system is that most of the times, the tags and passports are left on the apparatus and not collected. This adds to commands inability to account for the locations of the interior crews. Avillo (2002) feels "The best way command can know where his crews are by calling for a Personal Accountability Report (PAR)" (p.258). Thus when the company officer replies to the PAR, they would give the status of his crew and where they are operating. This PAR should be called every 20 minutes, which is about the time it takes to use up an SCBA cylinder.

The span of control by command should be lessened, as the incident grows larger. Company officers have the responsibility of knowing where their crews are at all times and that their crews are safe. If a crewmember is found to be missing, it is the company officers responsibility to notify command that they are unable to account for everyone on their crew. This lets command know that rescue companies need to be deployed and that there is an emergency situation at that moment. The company officer needs to know whom they are in charge of before

they enter the hot zone. They must not rely on tags to know who is in their crew because tags can become damaged and even though they are trained not to, firefighters use other members' equipment. Avillo (2002) stated, "In 1999, 112 firefighters died in the line of duty, so the current systems that are out there are not working and that a new and effective system needs to be developed" (p.261).

Avillo (2002) writes, "The only sure way to ensure accountability at the emergency scene is by training the officers and members of a department to adhere to the departments SOP's. They must have the discipline to remain with their crews and not freelance while in the hot zone. PARS must be called in regular intervals to insure the location of each interior crew" (p.260).

Brunacini (2002) states, "Lack of accountability at the strategic level paves way to a less than safe and effective incident outcome. A lack of accountability on the task level can be, and sometimes is fatal to firefighters who must operate in the toxic environment found within the hazard zone" (p.205). Brunacini also feels that each individual is personally responsible to operate within the accountability system. An integral part of the accountability system is to make sure that all personnel who are assigned to the hazard zone are initially accounted for on a passport. He feels that as the incident grows, command must start assigning sectors and giving the sector officers responsibility of their crew's accountability. Brunacini states, "Nothing can cause an incident to spiral out of control like a lost or missing firefighter" (p.205).

The person that may be assigned to be the Accountability Officer could be anyone from a Chief Officer to someone who is in staging. Command has the overall responsibility of overseeing everything that happens on the emergency scene, and by having an Accountability Officer; it builds a redundancy into the structure. This redundancy tightens up the accountability around the incident and the hot zones where it is needed most.

Barr and Eversole (2003) take a basic approach towards accountability. They state, “The Incident Commander is responsible for filling out the tactical worksheets at the start of the incident. The sector officers are responsible for the tactical accountability and for keeping track of the people assigned to their sectors and their locations. The Company Officer has to maintain the accountability of the crews, and has the responsibility of keeping the crews intact; this means that if the crews come in together, they stay together and leave together” (Barr & Eversole, 2003, p.534).

Barr and Eversole also state “Departments need to use some type of hardware-based system to track personnel. This system needs to be designed to track personnel from the time they enter the hazard zone until they leave it” (p.534). It is Barr and Eversole’s feeling that one of the key components of the accountability system is the PAR. The PAR indicates that the crew, company or sector is intact, their location, and that they are okay. PARs are used to continually update the accountability boards and to let command know where their crews are.

Smith (2002) reinforces the idea that an accountability system needs to be in place to ensure the safe oversight of the firefighters. Smith states that “An accountability system must be in place to track personnel. This system will assist in knowing what everyone is doing and where they are operating” (p.243). He feels that the system can be simple or complex depending on the needs of the department. He also states that whichever type of system is chosen, practicing on the system will hone the firefighter’s skills and all personnel will be familiar with it.

In his book, Smith discusses the different types of accountability systems that are out there. He looked at systems that incorporated both tags and barcodes. He also discussed how to track crews and how crews are assigned. Smith feels that although it is not an easy task, company officers must know where their firefighters are operating at all times.

Finally, Smith looked at the need for PARS while on an emergency scene. He states that “A PAR needs to be requested routinely to ensure accuracy of where the personnel are operating” (p.244). These PARS need to be called whenever a drastic change has happened while on the emergency scene. The most important statement that Smith made was “When doing a PAR, there can be no assumption that a firefighter who is not physically present is accounted for. Each firefighter must be seen or personally report via radio to the company officer (p.244).

In “Firefighter Rescue and Survival”, Kolomay and Hoff (2003) take a different look at the accountability system and firefighter safety. They address this subject by taking the view of the Rapid Intervention Teams (RIT) that would be utilized while on an emergency scene. They bring to light that everyone on the emergency scene must work within the system. They state that “In some cases, certain personnel might assign themselves to the RIT without authority to do so, which places them in a freelance mode without accountability” (p.12). Kolomay and Hoff (2003) state that “A proven technique for accountability and control during RIT operations is that the RIT officer must lead the team into the incident” (p.58). By doing this, the company officer would know who their crew members are and what tasks they were assigned to do.

In their book, Kolomay and Hoff (2003) also state “It is the company officer’s duty to know the location and tasks being performed by their company members. It is the incident commanders’ duty to know the location of assigned companies” (p.77). Keeping track of all personnel that is on the scene is essential. Finally, they discuss the need for PARs while on an emergency scene. Whenever a PAR is requested, the responding crew should state their designator, their location, and their task. By doing this, command would know that they are together and they are where they are supposed to be.

In “Incident Management for the Street-Smart Fire Officer”, Coleman (1997) discusses the need for a coordinated accountability system to track on scene personnel. If any outside

agencies are on the scene, they must be able to be included in this system. Coleman states that anytime that command requests a PAR, the information that is relayed back to command needs to be compared with the information that is on the accountability board. The major difference this author found in this book is that Coleman recommends that location, task and unit number should be given to the crew designators, who are operating at an emergency scene. This is contrary to what other authors, who are being referenced in this research paper, suggest. Coleman states “It is easier for command to know what the assignments are, than whom is filling them out.” (p.116)

In “NFPA 1500” (2002), accountability is addressed in section 8.3 (Personnel Accountability during Emergency Operations) and appendix A.8.3.1 thru A.8.3.11. This standard is in reference to “Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health Program” and addresses areas such as when an accountability system needs to be established, who are responsible for setting up the accountability system on an emergency scene and the responsibilities of the incident commander and company officers at the scene. In addition, it makes reference to standard operating procedures, system components, and the need of additional Accountability Officers. In the appendix A.8.3.1 thru A.8.3.1.1 of this standard, additional information regarding items like system components, procedures and chain of command issues are addressed. This standard references NFPA 1561 (2002) as to how standard operating procedures should be written.

In “NFPA 1561” (2002), accountability is addressed in section 4.8 (Personnel Accountability) the role of the Company Officer and their crewmembers are addressed. This includes to who the crews are to report and the officer’s role in supervising these crewmembers. This standard also references standard operating procedures and when additional accountability officers are needed. It states that everyone on the emergency scene is required to work under the

accountability system. In the appendix, this standard, (C.2.1), addresses ways to reduce the overall risks to members operating at the emergency scene. These include guidelines, procedures, the responsibility of the incident command, and company officers.

“The Ohio Administrative Code” (2003), references accountability in Chapter 4123:1-21-07 sections “B”. In this section, standard operating procedures, and the responsibilities of the incident commander are addressed. The responsibilities of the members operating on the scene are also addressed.

There have been several instances throughout the United States where the cause of a firefighter’s injuries or death was directly related to the lack of accountability on an emergency scene. In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, three firefighters died during a house fire in 1995 (United States Fire Administration Major Fire Investigation Program, Report TR-078). This fire was in a three story single-family residence and the deaths occurred when the firefighters became lost and ran out of air.

Incident command and any type of accountability procedures on this incident were not established upon the arrival of the first arriving company. The command structure was not established until after an acting Battalion Chief had arrived on the scene, and his arrival was delayed because he was responding from another incident. Report TR-078 (1995) states, “Crew integrity did not exist, and crews were doing tasks without the supervision of their Company Officers” (p.1). Because of this, the Incident Commander did not know the number of crews operating inside the structure or their locations. No accountability checks were performed, so no one knew that three firefighters were missing.

In Report TR-078 (1995), the report states that when the window was broken, a captain was found just inside the room semi-conscious. He was removed from the structure and that was when the first report of missing personnel was transmitted. Additional firefighters went back to



the window and found two more firefighters exiting through the window. At that time, an erroneous transmission was sent advising that all firefighters were found, when actually three more firefighters were still missing. At this time an accountability check should have been sent to verify that all personnel were accounted for, but this was not done.

About the time the captain and firefighters were being removed from the building, an acting Deputy Chief arrived on the scene. He was in the process of taking over command when the transmission went out “The missing firefighters had been found”. The acting Deputy Chief assumed that all personnel were accounted for and concentrated on fire suppression. It wasn’t until after the fire was extinguished that the other three firefighters were found inside the structure. A radio transmission was sent advising that three firefighters were found and they were being removed from the structure. The three firefighters were in cardiac arrest and resuscitation efforts began. All three were pronounced dead upon arrival at the hospital.

This report points out the need for the first arriving unit to immediately establish Incident Command and Accountability. The Pittsburgh Fire Department has an accountability system in place with written procedures on accountability implementation on multiple alarm incidents, but its implementation was at the discretion of the Incident Commander and regular safety checks were not required. If these checks had been done at the 20-minute intervals, these firefighters would have been accounted for early in the incident.

After the USFA investigation, a number of changes were presented to the Pittsburgh Fire Department and included in these changes was the reinforcement of the departments Incident Command Structure and Accountability system.

On December 3, 1999, six firefighters died in a cold storage and warehouse fire in Worcester, Massachusetts (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Report #99F47). The Worcester Fire Department was dispatched to a fire in a six-story cold storage

and warehouse building that may have been started by homeless people living in the structure. From the initial dispatch, two incident commanders responded and command was established from the arrival of the first units. From the apparatus that responded on the first alarm, firefighters were ordered to perform a search for the homeless people and also advise command of the extent of the fire. At this time, four additional alarms were dispatched to their location.

It was during this search that two firefighters became lost and an emergency message was sent to command. Command ordered an accountability check and confirmed which firefighters were missing. Additional crews were sent into the structure to search for the two missing firefighters and the homeless people. Report #99F47 states, "During this second search, four additional firefighters were lost" (p.4). It also brought to light that two firefighters did not contact command to advise them they were entering the building. An emergency message was sent to command advising them that the four additional firefighters were lost and could not find their way out.

At this time, command requested another accountability check and realized that a total of six firefighters were now lost. Due to the deteriorating structural integrity of the building, all firefighters were evacuated from the building and a defensive attack was made. It was not until eight days later that the bodies of the six firefighters were removed from the structure.

Report #99F47 shows that even when Incident Command and Accountability are set up from the start of an incident, firefighters can still be lost and killed. Even though command used accountability checks throughout the incident, personnel were still lost. The company officers or the crew leaders must maintain contact with their crews at all times to ensure their locations. Finally, all members of a department must be trained on how the system works and their responsibility to let command know their activity and location. Freelancing on a fire scene is an invitation to lose someone no matter how thorough the accountability system is.

The accountability systems that are being used are as numerous as the number of fire departments that use them. They all use the basic concept of personnel identifiers, task identifiers, and accountability checks or PARS. If the system that a department currently has in place is not used from the start, playing catch up while at an emergency scene is nearly impossible. Crews need to be accounted for before they step into the hot zone and begin to work. Accountability checks or PARS need to be timely and regular to ensure the location of each crew and everyone needs to be trained on how the system they are using works.

These findings provide this research paper with the information needed to look at how the system the Sharonville Fire Department is used and implemented at an emergency scene. It also provides this author with needed material to evaluate the language, training, and impression the members of the department have for the current system.

## PROCEDURES

For this research project, an evaluative research method was used. The first step was to evaluate the current accountability system that is in place. By using NFPA 1500 and 1561 as a standard, this evaluation looked at the terminology used, accountability components currently in place, and the number of the Accountability Officers being utilized. Second, this project surveyed members of the Sharonville Fire Department to see how they perceived the current system. This also included how they interpreted the terminology being used and how it affects them during an emergency operation. The survey also looked to see if additional training on the operation of the current system is needed or if it is adequate. Third, other fire departments were sent surveys requesting data on their accountability system and how it is perceived while being used on an emergency scene. By asking the same questions that were asked to the members of the Sharonville Fire Department, their data was compared to the data gathered from Sharonville. These departments were chosen by how they compare to the Sharonville Fire Department. (See Appendix 1)

By going to the United States Federal Emergency Management Association website, and accessing The Fire Administration link, there is a reference for the fire department census. This is a fire department database of all the fire departments throughout the United States and their make up. The Sharonville Fire Department is a combination department where more than fifty-percent of its members are full-time employees. By entering this information into the search page and specifically requesting Ohio fire departments, 60 departments in the state were found that matches Sharonville's criteria. Surveys were sent to each of these departments with the same questions that were asked of The Sharonville Fire Department members.

## **Definition of Terms**

Accountability Board. A component used to facilitate the tracking of personnel by both location and function. (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA] 1500, 2002, section A.8.3.10)

Accountability Officer. A person assigned by command as a branch director in order to reduce the span of control for the incident commander. (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA], 1561, 2002, Annex C, C.2.1.)

Accountability System. A standard system used on an emergency scene to account for the identity and assignment of each member. (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA], 1500, 2002, section A.8.3.1.)

Incident Commander. The person who is responsible for the overall accountability of personnel for the incident. (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA], 1561, 2002, Annex C, C.2.1.)

Personnel Accountability Reports (PARS). A report given to command, by personnel operating on an emergency scene, to indicate that the crew, company, or sector is intact and okay. (The Fire Chiefs Handbook Sixth Edition, 2003, page 534)

Standard Operating Procedures. An organizational directive that establishes a course of action or policy. (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA], 1561, 2002, Chapter 1, section 3.3.30)

### **Limitation of the Study**

Although this was not a comprehensive method of gaining data, departments that are comparable with Sharonville were used. The numbers of members that are on these departments vary greatly and the ratios between full-time and part-time members also vary. This survey looked at departments that have more than 50% of their members are full-time. It did not look at the number of members on the department or the classification of these members (ex. Volunteer, paid-on-call, part-time, full-time).

A second limitation to the study is the number of different types of accountability systems that are presently being used in the fire service. These systems vary greatly and although each system may use the same basic hardware, the way they track the members that are on the emergency scene varies.

A third limitation is that these surveys were sent to every member of the Sharonville Fire Department, which included the officers and the firefighters. When the surveys were sent out to the departments throughout the state, they were addressed to the chief of the department. It is not known if the chief of the department filled it out or that it was given to another officer or firefighter to be completed. How upper management views how the accountability system they are using and how firefighters view it may vary greatly.

## RESULTS

A survey was sent to the members of the Sharonville Fire Department in order to find out their perspective on the current accountability system that is being used. A total of 68 surveys were sent out with 31 being returned, or a 46% response. (See Appendix 2) In addition to this survey, a survey was also sent out to fire departments throughout the State of Ohio that were comparative in make up to the Sharonville Fire Department. With 60 surveys being sent out, 47 were returned, or a 78% response. (See Appendix 3)

The survey that was sent to the members of the Sharonville Fire Department had a cover letter attached requesting that no names be placed on it. The only information that was asked for was the name of the department that the member who was filling out the survey belonged to. This ensured that the results from the two surveys would not get mixed together. This author feels that the low response from the Sharonville Fire Department members was due to the amount of new members on the department and their reluctance to disagree with the officers whose job it was to overhaul the current system.

Items that this survey addressed were issues like:

1. Is the current system that is being used thorough enough?
2. Do the members feel that they are receiving enough training on the current system?
3. Is the language that is being used clear and precise?
4. Is the accountability system being used on every emergency run?

From this survey, the question “*Is the accountability system being used on every emergency run*”? was asked to all respondents. The members of the Sharonville Fire Department felt that the accountability system was being used “*most of the time*” while they are on an emergency run 58.1%. This is in line with the results from the surveyed departments throughout

the state 51.1%. If an accountability system is to be effective, it must be used on all emergencies. The results of both surveys show that even though their accountability systems are being used, they are not being used on every run.

Another question that this survey asked was ***“Do you feel that the accountability system that your department is currently using comprehensive enough?”*** Of the respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department, 35.5% felt that the current system is *“sufficient”* enough while only 19.4% *“agreed”* that it was comprehensive enough. In contrast, 51.1% of the departments that were surveyed throughout the state felt that they *“agreed”* that their system was comprehensive enough, and 34% felt that it was *“sufficient”*.

These findings illustrate that the departments that were surveyed feel that the current system that they are using is made up of all of the components required. Although, some respondents felt that their accountability system needed some refinement. An accountability system needs to have in place components that will ensure that everyone is accounted for and their location is known at all times.

For everyone on the emergency scene to be able to communicate with the incident commander and the incident commander to communicate back to them, terminology must be used that everyone understands. The survey asked the question ***“Do the members of the Sharonville Fire Department understand the terminology that is currently being used while they are operating on an emergency scene?”*** The respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department indicate that 45.1% of the members feel that the language used is clear and precise *“most of the time”*. This compares to 65.9% of the members from the departments that were surveyed throughout the state.

One of the ways to loose track of personnel while they are operating on the emergency scene would be to use terminology that no one understands. It would be confusing to the



personnel to have the incident commander communicate commands in terms that no one understands. Everyone on the emergency scene must communicate using the same words and these words need to have the same meaning. If this does not happen, when something goes wrong on the emergency scene, the incident commander would be calling out orders and no one would know what he means.

Every one on the department must be able to work within the accountability system and the way to ensure this is to train all the members on how the system works. The survey posed the question ***“Do you feel that your departments training on the accountability system that you are currently using, enables everyone on the department to operate as the Accountability Officer”?*** 48.4% of the respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department felt that the *“training could be better”*. This is in contrast to the responses from the department surveyed throughout the state with 42.6% feeling that they were *“adequately trained”*. This indicates that the members of the Sharonville Fire Department do not feel that they are receiving enough training on their current system and that they do not feel comfortable being the Accountability Officer.

Finally, when asked the question ***“Overall, how would you rate your current accountability system”?*** An equal percentage of respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department felt that their current system was either *“good”* or *“fair”* 35.4% each. Of the departments throughout the state that were surveyed, the majority of respondents or 53.2% felt that their current system was *“good”*. These responses seem to indicate that the members of the Sharonville Fire Department feel that their system is in need of some improvement but it is a system that they can use.

## DISCUSSION

A survey was sent to the members of the Sharonville Fire Department in order to find out their perspective on the current accountability system that is being used. A total of 68 surveys were sent out with 31 being returned, or a 46% response. (See Appendix 2) In addition to this survey, a survey was also sent out to fire departments throughout the State of Ohio that were comparative in make up to the Sharonville Fire Department. With 60 surveys being sent out, 47 were returned, or a 78% response. (See Appendix 3)

The survey that was sent to the members of the Sharonville Fire Department had a cover letter attached requesting that no names be placed on it. The only information that was asked for was the name of the department that the member who was filling out the survey belonged to. This ensured that the results from the two surveys would not get mixed together. This author feels that the low response from the Sharonville Fire Department members was due to the amount of new members on the department and their reluctance to disagree with the officers whose job it was to overhaul the current system.

Items that this survey addressed were issues like:

1. Is the current system that is being used thorough enough?
2. Do the members feel that they are receiving enough training on the current system?
3. Is the language that is being used clear and precise?
4. Is the accountability system being used on every emergency run?

From this survey, the question *“Is the accountability system being used on every emergency run?”* was asked to all respondents. The members of the Sharonville Fire Department felt that the accountability system was being used *“most of the time”* while they are on an emergency run 58.1%. This is in line with the results from the surveyed departments throughout

the state 51.1%. If an accountability system is to be effective, it must be used on all emergencies. The results of both surveys show that even though their accountability systems are being used, they are not being used on every run.

Another question that this survey asked was ***“Do you feel that the accountability system that your department is currently using comprehensive enough?”*** Of the respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department, 35.5% felt that the current system is “*sufficient*” enough while only 19.4% “*agreed*” that it was comprehensive enough. In contrast, 51.1% of the departments that were surveyed throughout the state felt that they “*agreed*” that their system was comprehensive enough, and 34% felt that it was “*sufficient*”.

These findings illustrate that the departments that were surveyed feel that the current system that they are using is made up of all of the components required. Although, some respondents felt that their accountability system needed some refinement. An accountability system needs to have in place components that will ensure that everyone is accounted for and their location is known at all times.

For everyone on the emergency scene to be able to communicate with the incident commander and the incident commander to communicate back to them, terminology must be used that everyone understands. The survey asked the question ***“Do the members of the Sharonville Fire Department understand the terminology that is currently being used while they are operating on an emergency scene?”*** The respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department indicate that 45.1% of the members feel that the language used is clear and precise “*most of the time*”. This compares to 65.9% of the members from the departments that were surveyed throughout the state.

One of the ways to loose track of personnel while they are operating on the emergency scene would be to use terminology that no one understands. It would be confusing to the

personnel to have the incident commander communicate commands in terms that no one understands. Everyone on the emergency scene must communicate using the same words and these words need to have the same meaning. If this does not happen, when something goes wrong on the emergency scene, the incident commander would be calling out orders and no one would know what he means.

Every one on the department must be able to work within the accountability system and the way to ensure this is to train all the members on how the system works. The survey posed the question ***“Do you feel that your departments training on the accountability system that you are currently using, enables everyone on the department to operate as the Accountability Officer”?*** 48.4% of the respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department felt that the *“training could be better”*. This is in contrast to the responses from the department surveyed throughout the state with 42.6% feeling that they were *“adequately trained”*. This indicates that the members of the Sharonville Fire Department do not feel that they are receiving enough training on their current system and that they do not feel comfortable being the Accountability Officer.

Finally, when asked the question ***“Overall, how would you rate your current accountability system”?*** An equal percentage of respondents from the Sharonville Fire Department felt that their current system was either *“good”* or *“fair”* 35.4% each. Of the departments throughout the state that were surveyed, the majority of respondents or 53.2% felt that their current system was *“good”*. These responses seem to indicate that the members of the Sharonville Fire Department feel that their system is in need of some improvement but it is a system that they can use.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

For an accountability system to be effective, the members of the Sharonville Fire Department must feel confident in the system and how it is being operated. Clearly from the results of the survey that was sent to the department, many of the members lack this confidence and feels that their current system needs improvement.

Any accountability system must comply with the NFPA Standards 1500 and 1561. To do this, an accountability system must be used on all emergency scenes. As an example, if it is only used on selected runs, it will be forgotten when it is truly needed. In addition, by using it on all incidents, it would become a standardized part of the incident and the personnel on the scene would know that it is in place.

1) It is recommended that the Sharonville Fire Department institute Standard Operating Procedures that require the accountability system be set up and used on every emergency incident by the first arriving unit. By enacting this recommendation, the accounting of all personnel on the scene would be insured.

To have an effective accountability system, the language that is used needs to be clear and precise. A few of the problems that seems to have arisen from the accountability system that the Sharonville Fire Department uses is that the members that are operating within the system felt that the crew and task designators are confusing. This seems to be the problem that the departments that were surveyed through out the state also have. From both surveys, it appears that the language that is currently being used is not clear and this is not surprising. Each department builds their accountability system around their department and what works for them. For Sharonville, they went to a number/task/location based identification system that assigned crew's numbers, tasks, and location, and an example of this is "First Floor Attack One". This tells the crew that they are the first crew in, they will be operating on the first floor, and they will

be the attack crew.

One problem that has arisen by going to this type of identifiers is that when multiple crews are operating in the same area, it is confusing to both the crews and the accountability officer as to who is updating command and any other information that they are providing. The crews felt that the identifiers are too long and by using apparatus identifiers, it provides a clearer way of assigning crews. The Incident Commander would assign the crews and the accountability officer would track the crew's task and location on the accountability board. When the Incident Commander gives the crew their assignment, he would advise them at that time of their identifier, where they would be located and what their task would be. Then the Accountability Officer would identify them by their identifier, task, and location on the accountability board. Instead of being assigned "First Floor Attack One", the crew would be called "Engine 87". By doing this, this would make Sharonville's Accountability System more in line with the mutual aid departments that they run with.

2) It is recommended that the Sharonville Fire Department change the way they identify crews that are operating on the emergency scene. Crew designators need to be as short and precise as possible. By going to an apparatus based identifier, the crews would know which unit they arrived on and that would their designator. The departments that the Sharonville Fire Department runs mutual aid with currently use this type of identifiers. By implementing this recommendation, confusion concerning accountability on the emergency scene between departments would be greatly reduced.

A department could have the state of the art accountability system available, but if the members of the department were not trained on how it operates or how to run it, then the system would be of no use in an emergency. Training is a key component to make a department's accountability system effective, and this training needs to be more than a classroom session. The

more that a department trains on a subject, the more efficient they will become.

3) It is recommended that the Sharonville Fire Department train on the operation of the accountability system during their weekly training sessions. This training needs to be done with tabletop exercises or out in the field. Everyone needs to be involved in this training and each member needs to be put in the position of the Accountability Officer. By doing this, everyone would realize the responsibility of the Accountability Officer and they would have hands on experience as to what must be done to ensure the personal safety of each person on an emergency scene.

To have a comprehensive accountability system, every part of it needs to be carefully thought out and planned. This includes areas of: Personnel Accountability Reports (PARS), tactical work sheets, passports, and nametags. Every part needs to be used during each and every emergency incident. PARS are a timely report of the location and status of the personnel who is in the hot zone. These PARS are set at a timely interval so that the accountability officer will have a timely check on all personnel so that if something should go wrong, their location will be known and a personnel count can be done efficiently.

Passports and nametags are the items that let the accountability officer who is on the scene and which apparatus they arrived on. These items are given to the accountability officer when personnel enter a hot zone and given back to them when they leave. By doing this, the accountability officer knows who is in the hot zone at all times.

4) It is recommended that the Sharonville Fire Department issue Standard Operating Procedures that address the use of PARS, nametags, and passports. Every member of the department needs to be trained on the use and purpose of these items, and it should be mandatory that these items be used on every emergency scene.

## REFERENCES

- Avillo, Anthony, *Accounting for personnel*, Fire Ground Strategies, pp. 258-362, 2002.
- Brunacini, Alan, *Functions of command: personnel accountability*, Fire Command  
2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. pp. 205-211, 2002.
- Barr, R., and Eversole, J., et al, *Accountability*, Incident Command: The Fire Chief's Handbook  
6<sup>th</sup> Edition. pp. 534, 2003.
- Smith, James, *Building Collapse and Scene Safety*, Strategic and Tactical Considerations on the  
Fire Ground. pp. 243-244. 2002.
- Coleman, John F., *The functions of Command, Sectorization, The Mission of Attack*, Incident  
Management for the Street-Smart Fire Officer. pp.85-166. 1997.
- Kolomay, R., and Hoff, R., *Proactive Firefighting and Training, Rapid Intervention Deployment*  
*Operations, Firefighting Survival Rules*, Firefighter Rescue & Survival. pp. 11-78. 2003.
- National Fire Protection Association [NFPA]. (2002). NFPA 1500, *Personnel accountability*  
*during emergency operations*, Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health Program  
2002 edition. Section 8.3 (Personnel accountability during emergency operations) &  
 Appendix A.8.3.1. Quincy Massachusetts:NFPA.
- National Fire Protection Association [NFPA]. (2002). NFPA 1561, *Personnel accountability*,  
Emergency Services Incident Management System 2002 edition. Section 4.8 (Personnel  
 accountability) & C.2.1 (Risk management during emergency operations). Quincy,  
 Massachusetts:NFPA.
- Workers' Compensation, Bureau of, *Chapter 41231:1-21 Fire Fighting*, Ohio Administrative  
Code. pp. 102, 2003.
- United States Fire Administration Major Fire Investigation Program. TR-078, *Three Firefighters*  
*Die in Pittsburgh House Fire. February 1995*.



**REFERENCES- (*continued*)**

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. Report #99F47. *Six Career Firefighters*

*Killed in Cold-Storage and Warehouse Building Fire – Worcester, Massachusetts.*

## APPENDIX 1 - **Accountability Survey**

Department Name \_\_\_\_\_

**1. How long have you been in the fire service?**

1-5 years  6-10 years  11-15 years  16-20 years  20 + years

**2. Do you feel that the accountability system that your department is currently using comprehensive enough?**

Strongly Agree  Agree  Sufficient  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

**3. While operating within this current system at an emergency scene, do you feel that the “Accountability Officer” knows your location at all times?**

Always  Most of the time  Occasionally  Sometimes  Never

**4. While on an emergency scene, does the Accountability Officer call for a Personnel Accountability Report (PAR) in a timely manner?**

Always  Most of the time  Occasionally  Sometimes  Never

**5. Does the Accountability Officer use timed benchmarks during an emergency operation?**

Always  Most of the time  Occasionally  Sometimes  Never

## APPENDIX 1 – (continued)

- 6. Do you feel that the current language being used in this system is clear and precise?**
- Always    Most of the time    Occasionally    Sometimes    Never
- 7. Is the accountability system being used on every emergency run?**
- Always    Almost Always    Sometimes    Occasionally    Never
- 8. Have you ever been assigned as the “Accountability Officer” at an emergency scene?**
- Always    Almost Always    Sometimes    Occasionally    Never
- 9. Do you feel that you can operate as the “Accountability Officer” while on an emergency scene?**
- I am confident    I am somewhat confident    I can if I have to
- I can with some assistance    I do not feel confident
- 10. Do you feel that your department’s training on the accountability system that you are currently using, enables everyone on the department to operate as the “Accountability Officer”?**
- Trained in depth on subject    Adequately trained
- Trained enough to do the job    Training could be better    No training done
- 11. Overall, how would you rate your current accountability system?**
- Excellent    Good    Sufficient    Fair    Poor
- 12. What changes would you make to the current accountability system?**

## APPENDIX 2 – Departments Surveyed

Anderson Twp. Fire and Rescue Dept.  
6211 Salem Rd.  
Cincinnati, OH 45230

Avon Lake Fire Dept.  
332811 Walker Rd.  
Avon Lake, OH 44012

Boardman Fire Dept.  
136 Boardman-Poland Rd.  
Boardman, OH 44512

Broadview Heights Fire Dept.  
3591 E. Wallings Rd.  
Broadview Heights, OH 44147

Cambell Fire Dept.  
351 Tenny Ave.  
Cambell, OH 44405

City of Ashland Division of Fire  
274 Cleveland Ave.  
Ashland, OH 44805

City of Brooklyn Fire Dept.  
7521 Memphis Ave.  
Brooklyn, OH 44144

City of Brunswick Division of Fire  
4383 Center Rd.  
Brunswick, OH 44212

City of Stow Fire Dept.  
3880 Darrow Rd.  
Stow, OH 44224

Coventry Twp. Fire Dept.  
68 Portage Lakes Dr.  
Akron, OH 44319

Ashtabula Twp. Fire Dept.  
2718 N. Ridge Rd. E.  
Ashtabula, OH 44004

Beavercreek Fire Dept.  
851 Orchard Ln.  
Beavercreek, OH 45434-7220

Bowling Green Fire Division  
552 E. Court St.  
Bowling Green, OH 43402-2531

Bucyrus Fire Dept.  
223 E. Mansfield St.  
Bucyrus, OH 44820

Celina Fire Dept.  
202 N. Main St.  
Celina, OH 45822

City of Blue Ash Fire Dept.  
10647 Kenwood Rd.  
Blue Ash, OH 45242-5699

City of Monroe Division of Fire  
3 S. Main St.  
Monroe, OH 45050

City of St. Marys Fire Dept.  
222 Indiana Ave.  
St. Marys, OH 45885

City of Worthington Division of Fire  
6500 N. High St.  
Worthington, OH 43085

Cumberland Trail Fire District  
142 S. Marietta St.  
P.O. Box 505  
St. Clairsville, OH 43950

**APPENDIX 2 – (continued)**

Defiance Fire and Rescue  
702 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> St.  
Defiance, OH 43512

Fairborn Fire Dept.  
701 N. Broad St.  
Fairborn, OH 45324

Greenville Fire Dept.  
100 Public Square  
Greenville, OH 45331

Huber Heights Fire Dept.  
7008 Brandt Pike  
Huber Heights, OH 45424

Jackson Twp. Fire Dept.  
7383 Fulton Dr. NW  
Massillon, OH 44646-9393

Kent Fire Dept.  
320 S. Depeyster St.  
Kent, OH 44240-7912

London Fire Dept.  
103 E. High St.  
London, OH 43140-1228

Marion Twp. Fire Dept.  
762 E. Center St.  
Marion, OH 43302-4347

Miami Twp. Fire & EMS  
5888 McPicken Dr.  
Milford, OH 45150

North Royalton Fire Dept.  
7000 Royalton Rd.  
North Royalton, OH 44133

Painesville Twp. Fire Dept.  
55 Nye Rd.  
Painesville, OH 44077

Elida Community Fire Co. Inc.  
105 W. Main St.  
Elida, OH 45807

Franklin Twp. Fire Dept.  
5605 Manchester Rd.  
Akron, OH 44319

Highland Heights Fire Dept.  
5827 Highland Rd.  
Highland Heights, OH 44143

Independence Fire Dept.  
6305 Selig Dr.  
Independence, OH 44131

Jackson Twp. Division of Fire  
3650 Hoover Rd.  
P.O. Box 517  
Grove City, OH 43123

Liberty Twp. Fire Dept.  
7761 Liberty Rd.  
Powell, OH 43065

Loveland-Symmes Fire Dept.  
126 S. Lebanon Rd.  
Loveland, OH 45140

Marysville Fire Dept.  
209 S. Main St.  
Marysville, OH 43040

Mifflin Twp. Division of Fire  
475 Rocky Fork Blvd.  
Gahanna, OH 43230

Olmsted Twp. Fire Dept.  
26900 Cook Rd.  
Olmsted Township, OH 44138-1194

Prairie Twp. Fire Dept.  
123 Inah Ave.  
Columbus, OH 43228-1707

**APPENDIX 2 – (continued)**

Perkins Twp. Fire Dept.  
3003 Cambell St.  
Sandusky, OH 44870

Ravenna Fire Dept.  
214 Park Way  
Ravenna, OH 44266

Scioto Twp. Fire Dept.  
25 Harsh Alley Ave.  
P.O. Box 204  
Commercial Point, OH 43116

Sheffield Lake Fire Dept.  
609 Harris Rd.  
Sheffield, OH 44054

Truro Twp. Fire Dept.  
6900 E. Main St.  
Reynoldsburg, OH 43060

Upper Arlington Fire Division  
3600 Tremont Rd.  
Upper Arlington, OH 43221

Van Wert Fire Dept.  
515 E. Main St.  
Van Wert, OH 45891-2625

West Licking Joint Fire District  
851 East Broad St.  
Pataskals, OH 43062

Wickliffe Fire Dept.  
29885 Euclid Ave.  
Wickliffe, OH 44092

Perry Joint Fire district  
3742 Center Rd.  
P.O. Box 439  
Perry, OH 44081-9592

Richmond Heights Fire Dept.  
457 Richmond Rd.  
Richmond Heights, OH 44143

Shawnee Twp. Fire Dept.  
2526 Fort Amanda Rd.  
Lima, OH 45804

Sylvania Twp. Fire Dept.  
6633 Monroe St.  
Sylvania, OH 43560

Union Twp. Fire Dept.  
718 Cincinnati-Batavia Rd.  
Cincinnati, OH 45245-1005

Urbana Fire Dept.  
107 E. Market St.  
Urbana, OH 43078

Washington Twp.- Dublin Fire Dept.  
6279 Shier Rings Rd.  
Dublin, OH 43016

Westerville Division of Fire  
400 W. Main St.  
Westerville, OH 43081

Willoughby Fire Dept.  
37000 Euclid Ave.  
Willoughby, OH 44094

## APPENDIX 3 - Accountability Survey

### Responses from Inside the Department

**31 out of 68 or 46% Return**

**1. How long have you been in the fire service?**

1-5 yrs	5	16.1%	<b>1 - Did not answer the question</b>
6-10 yrs	11	35.5%	
11-15 yrs	7	22.6%	
16-20 yrs	3	9.7%	
20 + yrs	<u>4</u>	<u>12.9%</u>	
	<b>30</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	

**2. Do you feel the accountability system that your department is currently using comprehensive enough?**

Strongly Agree	4	12.9%	<b>1 - Put down two answers</b>
Agree	6	19.4%	
Sufficient	11	35.5%	
Disagree	5	16.1%	
Strongly Disagree	<u>4</u>	<u>12.9%</u>	
	<b>30</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	

**3. While operating within this current system at an emergency scene, do you feel that the Accountability Officer knows your location at all times?**

Always	1	3.2%	<b>1 - Put down two answers</b>
Most of the time	18	58.1%	
Occasionally	4	12.9%	
Sometimes	7	22.6%	
Never	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
	<b>30</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	

**4. While on an emergency scene, does the Accountability Officer call for Personnel Accountability Report (PAR) in a timely manner?**

Always	0	0.0%
Most of the time	8	25.8%
Occasionally	15	48.3%
Sometimes	6	19.4%
Never	<u>2</u>	<u>6.5%</u>
	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**5. Does the Accountability Officer use timed benchmarks during an emergency operation?**

Always	0	0.0%	<b>1 - Put down two answers</b>
Most of the time	8	25.8%	
Occasionally	7	22.6%	
Sometimes	7	22.6%	
Never	<u>8</u>	<u>25.8%</u>	
	<b>30</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	

**APPENDIX 3 – (continued)****6. Do you feel that the current language being used in this system is clear and precise?**

Always	1	3.2%
Most of the time	14	45.1%
Occasionally	2	6.5%
Sometimes	10	32.3%
Never	<u>4</u>	<u>12.9%</u>
	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**7. Is the accountability system being used on every emergency run?**

Always	4	12.9%
Most of the time	18	58.1%
Sometimes	4	12.9%
Occasionally	4	12.9%
Never	<u>1</u>	<u>3.2%</u>
	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**8. Have you ever been assigned as the Accountability Officer while at an emergency scene?**

Always	0	0.0%
Almost Always	0	0.0%
Sometimes	3	9.7%
Occasionally	15	48.4%
Never	<u>13</u>	<u>41.9%</u>
	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**9. Do you feel that you can operate as the Accountability Officer while on an emergency scene?**

I am confident	10	32.3%
I am somewhat confident	9	29.0%
I can if I had to	8	25.8%
I can with some assistance	4	12.9%
I do not feel confident	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**10. Do you feel that your department's training on the accountability system that you are currently using, enable everyone on the department to operate as the Accountability Officer?**

Trained in depth on subject	0	0.0%
Adequately trained	3	9.7%
Trained enough to do the job	4	12.9%
Training could be better	15	48.4%
No training done	<u>9</u>	<u>29.0%</u>
	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**11. Overall, how would you rate your current accountability system?**

Excellent	1	3.2%
Good	11	35.4%
Sufficient	6	19.5%
Fair	11	35.4%
Poor	<u>2</u>	<u>6.5%</u>
	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



## APPENDIX 4 - Accountability Survey

### Responses from Outside Department

**47 out of 60 or 78% Return**

**1. How long have you been in the fire service?**

1-5 yrs	0	0.0%
6-10 yrs	1	2.1%
11-15 yrs	1	2.1%
16-20 yrs	4	8.6%
20 + yrs	<u>41</u>	<u>87.2%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**2. Do you feel the accountability system that your department is currently using comprehensive enough?**

Strongly Agree	3	6.4%
Agree	24	51.1%
Sufficient	16	34.0%
Disagree	3	6.4%
Strongly Disagree	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**3. While operating within this current system at an emergency scene, do you feel that the Accountability Officer knows your location at all times?**

Always	9	19.1%
Most of the time	35	74.5%
Occasionally	2	4.3%
Sometimes	1	2.1%
Never	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**4. While on an emergency scene, does the Accountability Officer call for Personnel Accountability Report (PAR) in a timely manner?**

Always	9	19.1%
Most of the time	22	46.8%
Occasionally	11	23.4%
Sometimes	3	6.4%
Never	<u>2</u>	<u>4.3%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**5. Does the Accountability Officer use timed benchmarks during an emergency operation?**

Always	10	21.3%
Most of the time	19	40.4%
Occasionally	8	17.0%
Sometimes	3	6.4%
Never	<u>7</u>	<u>14.9%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**APPENDIX 4 – (continued)****6. Do you feel that the current language being used in this system is clear and precise?**

Always	10	21.3%	<b>1 - Did not answer the question</b>
Most of the time	31	65.9%	
Occasionally	3	6.4%	
Sometimes	2	4.3%	
Never	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	
	<b>46</b>	<b>97.9%</b>	

**7. Is the accountability system being used on every emergency run?**

Always	9	19.1%	<b>1 - Did not answer the question</b>
Most of the time	23	48.8%	
Sometimes	7	14.9%	<b>1 - Wrote in their own answer</b>
Occasionally	4	8.6%	
Never	<u>2</u>	<u>4.3%</u>	
	<b>45</b>	<b>95.7%</b>	

**8. Have you ever been assigned as the Accountability Officer while at an emergency scene?**

Always	0	0.0%	<b>1 - Wrote in their own answer</b>
Almost Always	4	6.4%	
Sometimes	22	46.8%	
Occasionally	11	23.4%	
Never	<u>9</u>	<u>21.3%</u>	
	<b>46</b>	<b>97.9%</b>	

**9. Do you feel that you can operate as the Accountability Officer while on an emergency scene?**

I am confident	34	72.4%
I am somewhat confident	9	19.1%
I can if I had to	3	6.4%
I can with some assistance	1	2.1%
I do not feel confident	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**10. Do you feel that your department's training on the accountability system that you are currently using, enable everyone on the department to operate as the Accountability Officer?**

Trained in depth on subject	3	6.4%
Adequately trained	20	42.6%
Trained enough to do the job	15	31.9%
Training could be better	8	17.0%
No training done	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**11. Overall, how would you rate your current accountability system?**

Excellent	5	10.7%
Good	25	53.2%
Sufficient	14	29.8%
Fair	2	4.2%
Poor	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1%</u>
	<b>47</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

