

# Drill Plan and Report



Cupertino  
ARES/RACES

## 1. Overview

- Plan Date:** 21 September 2002  
**CARES Identifier:** CUP-2002-09T  
**RACES Activation:** None  
**Control:** Cupertino OES  
**Drill Date:** 16 November 2002, 9:00am to 11:00am

## 2. Planning

- Reference Docs:**
1. Fire-Open-Net-Drill.xls
  2. Medical-Open-Net-Drill.xls

- Drill Objectives:**
1. Practice message handling between CARES field responders in an open net environment.
  2. Test field message handling procedures.

**Scenario:** Two Scenarios will be used:

1. Medical: There was an explosion at a local school requiring a medical evacuation of students and teaches to the City's Medical Center. CARES is asked to support.
2. Fire: There is a large wildland fire in the hills above Cupertino. CARES has been tasked with supplying a resource net between the Operations Chief, the staging area and base camp.

- General Information:**
1. Because of the characteristics of Open Nets (low traffic volumes / small number of participating stations), teams of CARES members will be established to run through each scenario. For each scenario, there will be three operator teams. Each team consists of an Operator and a Simulator. The Simulator has most of the information and either requests information or provides the answer to an incoming question.
  2. Participants will receive credit toward a Field Responder qualification (Ref: CARES Training and Certification Plan)

## 3. Preparation

- Training:**
- CARES Orientation Training, "Operating in an Open Net, Field Message Handling Procedures."
  - Hand-out, "021003-Open-Nets.ppt", October 2002 General Meeting.

**Drill Prep:** Two scenarios were developed and reviewed.

- Required Personnel:**
1. CARES Field Responders: 3 members per scenario
  2. Simulators : 3 members per scenario

**Schedule:**

9:00a: Meet at City Hall for the drill  
9:15a: Review the plans, make drill assignments  
9:30a: Begin the drill  
10:30a: Drill ends, in person debrief  
11:00a: Secure the drill

## 4. Results

**Participants:** Thirteen (13) CARES members participated. Additionally, one prospective member also participated. These members were:

Andy W9BJX	Simulator, Medical Scenario
Ken KR6CO	Simulator, Fire Scenario
Phil K6FUZ	Operator, Fire Scenario
Ian KG6JWG	Operator, Medical Scenario
Sean KG6KTY	Operator, Medical Scenario
Takeo KG6NCB	Operator, Medical Scenario
Al KG6NCC	Operator, Medical Scenario
Jim KN6PE	Simulator, Medical Scenario
Alan KD6QPP	Operator, Medical Scenario
Bill KD6TQJ	Operator, Fire Scenario
Bob KD6US	Simulator, Fire Scenario
Bryn N1UZW	Operator, Fire Scenario
Skip WA6VFD	Simulator, Medical Scenario
Ann Stedler	Simulator, Fire Scenario

**Narrative:** At 9:00am, Jim KN6PE and Ken KR6CO reviewed the intent of the initiated the drill, formed teams, and handed out the individual scenarios.

At 9:30am, the two scenarios were initiated, the Fire scenario operating on CARES Tac-2 (146.460) and the Medical scenario operating on CARES Tac-1 (147.570).

Each Simulator initiated requests for information from other same-scenario participants. All traffic was passed and completed.

The drill secured around 10:15am. At that point, each Scenario Team held their own debrief as to how the drill went, what worked, and what could be improved.

**What worked:**

1. Delivering the actual message. All participants agreed that messages were delivered successfully.
2. Operators acknowledged how hard it was to actually get the message passed (easier said than done).
3. There were good requests for message “repeats” from the recipients of a message when it was not copied completely the first time.
4. There were a mixed use of Message Forms by field operators.
5. Good informal traffic (what is going on, what an operator sees)

**What didn't work/could be improved:**

1. Speed of delivery was too fast in some cases.
2. Hand-writing on message forms were occasionally difficult to read. Asking for repeats or requesting the sender slow down should be used.
3. Definitely saw the need for two operators to cover a field assignment. The roles would be operator and individual working with the person being shadowed.

## 5. Conclusions

**Recommendations:** For future drills, the following recommendations were made:

1. Simulator should ask for hard copies of received messages from their operators to re-enforce the need for written messages.
2. Schedule more of these types of message handling traffic drills.
3. Spread out the traffic to 3 minutes per message (vs 2, 2.5 for this drill).

4. Pre-brief the simulators prior to future drills. Ensure they understand the intent of the drill and how their actions support the drill's objectives.

- Next Steps:**
1. Update scenarios with corrections and/or modifications per specific scenario feedback.
  2. Schedule message handling drills every 2 months. The next drill is the January Preliminary Damage Assessment Drill.