



in.gov/isdh/17855.htm

All response begins at the local level. Being prepared to prevent, respond to, and recover from all types of public health threats requires that states and localities improve their capabilities in surveillance, epidemiology, laboratories, and response readiness. Facts on laboratories and response readiness activities appear below. See appendices 1 and 7 for a more detailed description of data points and data sources.

A healthy population is more resilient in public health emergencies. People with chronic conditions may require additional care such as specialized medications, equipment, and other assistance. To develop an effective response plan, a state or locality must consider the unique needs of its own population. In Indiana, 9.2% of adults reported having asthma, 9.6% diabetes, 6.9% heart disease, and 2.8% had a stroke. In addition, 20.0% reported a limiting disability and 63.6% were overweight or obese.* *CDC, ONCDIEH (NCCDPHP) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2008

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

	Laboratories: General			Labor	atories: Chemical Capabiliti	es
Maintaining core laboratory functions during an emergency	Status of continuity of operations State had a COOP that inc laboratory operation State had a standardized	ncluded		Participation in Laboratory Response Network for chemical agents (LRN-C)	LRN-C laboratories with capabilities for responding if the public is exposed to chemical agents ⁵ Note: There are three levels, with Level 1 having the most	One Level 2 Iab
Ensuring availability of Laboratory Response Network (LRN) laboratory results for decision making	electronic data system capable of messaging laboratory results between LRN laboratories and also to CDC ² Note: For a description of LRN laboratories, see appendix 1.	Yes		Evaluating LRN-C laboratory	advanced capabilities. See appendix 1. Core methods successfully demonstrated by Level 1 and/or Level 2 laboratories to rapidly detect chemical agents ⁵	6 out of 6 methods
Labor	atories: Biological Capabiliti	es		capabilities through	Additional methods	
Participation in LRN for biological agents	LRN reference and/or national laboratories that could test for biological agents ³	1 reference lab		proficiency testing	successfully demonstrated by Level 1 and/or Level 2 laboratories to rapidly detect chemical agents ⁵	2 out of 2 methods
Assessing if laboratory emergency contacts could be reached 24/7	LRN laboratories successfully contacted during a non- business hours telephone drill ³	1 out of 1 lab		Assessing LRN-C laboratory capabilities through exercises	LRN-C laboratory ability to collect, package, and ship samples properly during LRN exercise ⁵	Passed
Evaluating LRN laboratory capabilities	Proficiency tests passed by LRN reference and/or national laboratories ³	4 out of 4 tests			Chemical agents detected by Level 1 and/or Level 2 laboratories in unknown samples during the LRN Emergency Response Pop	2 out of 2 agents
Rapid identification of disease-	 Rapidly identified <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7 using advanced DNA tests (PFGE)⁴ Samples for which state performed tests Test results submitted to PulseNet database within 4 working days (target: 90%) 	49 69%			Hours to process and report on 500 samples by Level 1 laboratory during the LRN Surge Capacity Exercise (range was 71 to 126 hours) ⁵	N/A
causing bacteria by PulseNet	Rapidly identified			Response Readiness: Communication		
laboratories	 L. monocytogenes using advanced DNA tests (PFGE)⁴ Samples for which state performed tests Test results submitted to PulseNet database within 4 working days (target: 90%) 	2 50%			State public health department had a 24/7 reporting capacity system that could receive urgent disease reports any time of the day ⁷	Yes
Assessing laboratory competency and reporting through exercises	State public health laboratory conducted exercises to assess competency of sentinel	Yes		Communicating	Responded to Health Alert Network (HAN) test message within 30 minutes ⁸ State public health	Yes
	laboratories to rule out bioterrorism agents ¹ CDC-funded LRN laboratory ability to contact the CDC Emergency Operations Center within 2 hours during LRN notification drill ³ Note: There is one CDC-	Passed	emerging healti information	emerging health information	laboratory used HAN or other rapid method (blast email or fax) to communicate with sentinel laboratories and other partners for outbreaks, routine updates, training events, and other applications ¹	10 times
	funded LRN laboratory in DC and in each state, with the exception of CA, IL, and NY, which have two.				Epidemic Information Exchange users responded to system-wide notification test within 3 hours ⁹	42%

¹APHL; 2008 ²CDC, OSELS; 2008 ³CDC, OID (NCEZID); 2008 ⁴CDC, OPHPR (DSLR); 2008 ⁵CDC, ONDIEH (NCEH); 2009 ⁶CDC, ONDIEH (NCEH); 2008 ⁷State data; 2008 ⁸CDC, OPHPR (DEO); 2009 ⁹CDC, OPHPR (DEO); 2008

Response	Readiness: Communication (co	ontinued)	Respons	se Readiness: Exercises and Incic	lents	
<i>Improving public health information exchange</i>	Participated in a Public Health Information Network forum (community of practice) to leverage best practices for information exchange ¹⁰	Yes		Pre-identified staff notified to fill all eight Incident Command System core functional roles due to a drill, exercise, or real incident ¹⁴ Note: State must report 2 and	4 times	
R	esponse Readiness: Planning		Notifying	could report up to 12 notifications.		
	CDC technical assistance review (TAR) state score ^{11, 12}	2007-08: 96	emergency operations center staff	Pre-identified staff acknowledged notification within the target time of 60 minutes ¹⁴	2 out of 4 times	
Assessing	Scoring Note: A score of 69 or higher indicates performance in an acceptable range in plans to receive, distribute, and dispense	2008-09: 100		Conducted at least one unannounced notification outside of normal business hours ¹⁴	Yes	
plans to receive, distribute, and dispense medical assets from the Strategic National Stockpile and other sources	medical assets. Cities Readiness Initiative (CRI) location and 2007-08 TAR score ¹¹ *Cohort I: Chicago, IL: 80 *Cohort II: Cincinnati, OH: 62; Indianapolis, IN: 83 *Cohort III: Louisville, KY: 68 See Scoring Note above. CRI locations can consist of multiple jurisdictions, some located in more than one state. See appendix 6.		Activating	Public health EOC activated as part of a drill, exercise, or real incident ¹⁴ Note: State must report 2 and could report up to 12 activations.	3 times	
			the emergency operations center (EOC)	Pre-identified staff reported to the public health EOC within the target time of 2.5 hours ¹⁴	3 out of 3 times	
				Conducted at least one unannounced activation ¹⁴	Yes	
	*Cohort I, II or III refers to the year when the location was added to CRI. See appendix 1.		Response Readiness: Evaluation			
Enhancing response capability for chemical	CHEMPACK nerve-agent antidote containers ¹¹	38	Assessing response	AAR/IPs developed following an exercise or real incident ¹⁴ Note: State must report 2 and could report up to 12 AAR/IPs.	4 AAR/IPs	
events	events capabilities through after	capabilities through after action report/	AAR/IPs developed within target time of 60 days ¹⁴	4 out of 4 AAR/IPs		
Meeting preparedness standards for local health departments	Local health departments meeting voluntary Project Public Health Ready preparedness standards ¹³	0	improvement plans (AAR/IPs)	Re-evaluated response capabilities following approval and completion of corrective actions identified in AAR/IPs ¹⁴	Yes	

¹⁰CDC, OSTLTS; 2008 ¹¹CDC, OPHPR (DSNS); 2008 ¹²CDC, OPHPR (DSNS); 2009 ¹³NACCHO; 2008 ¹⁴CDC, OPHPR (DSLR); 2008

In addition to the activities listed above, CDC supported other projects and activities to enhance preparedness efforts. Snapshots of these CDC efforts are provided below.

Research, Training, Education, and Promising Demonstration Projects						
Project	Location/Project Name	Amount				
Centers for Public Health Preparedness ¹⁵	_	N/A				
Preparedness and Emergency Response Research Centers ¹⁵	_	N/A				
Advanced Practice Centers ¹⁶	_	N/A				
Centers of Excellence in Public Health Informatics ¹⁷	_	N/A				
Pandemic Influenza Promising Practices Demonstration Projects ¹⁴	Addressing Vulnerabilities in Populations; Collaborative Planning for Delivery of Essential Healthcare Services	\$275,000 \$523,719				
Additional CDC Resources Supporting Preparedness in States and Localities						
 Epidemic Intelligence Service Epidemic Intelligence Service Field Officers¹⁷ Investigations conducted by Epidemic Intelligence Service Field Officers¹⁷ 	1 2					
Deployments Type of Incident (number of CDC staff)¹⁸ 	Neurological Illness (4); Neuropathy (1)					
Career Epidemiology Field Officers ¹⁵	1					
Quarantine Stations ¹⁹	-					

¹⁴CDC, OPHPR (DSLR); 2008 ¹⁵CDC, OPHPR (OD); 2008 ¹⁶NACCHO; 2008 ¹⁷CDC, OSELS; 2008 ¹⁸CDC, OPHPR (DEO); 2008 ¹⁹CDC, OID (NCEZID); 2008