

Executive Summary

The Company Performed Very Well Before and After the Storm

Employees rated their company's performance as very well both on preparing in advance for the storms and then during the response and restoration efforts. The overall performance rating was better for the company's performance during the response and restoration phase (mean score of 4.02 on a scale of 1 to 5) than in the preparation phase (mean score of 3.43). This was true for each individual company as well.

Employees Rate Communications about the Storms Positively

Overall, employees rated their company in a positive manner for its communications on most of the measures in the survey. On a scale of 1 to 5, employees gave their company an average score of 3.95 on communicating to customers about the impact of the storm. COMPANY NAME #1 employees rated their company slightly better (4.05) than both COMPANY NAME #2 and COMPANY NAME #3 employees (3.77 for each company).

In the preparations before the storm hit their service area, the company's communications efforts to customers were deemed similar or better than their internal communications to employees. Two-thirds of employees agreed that the company's communications with customers were both effective (67%) and timely (66%). In addition, two-thirds (67%) of employees also agreed that communications to employees were informative. However, fewer employees disagreed with the statements about the company's communications with customers (13% disagree that they were effective; 14% disagree that they were timely) than that the communications to employees were informative (31% disagree). Employees were split on whether expectations for employees were clearly communicated (49% agree; 47% disagree).

In the response and restoration phase, the company's communications efforts to employees were rated positively to varying degrees. Three-quarters (77%) agreed that their company kept employees informed about the progress of restoration

efforts, while a majority (58%) agreed that communications to employees provided enough advance notice to make personal plans. Finally, by just a 46% to 35% margin, employees agreed that expectations were clearly communicated.

The IMT Meetings Went Well

One-third (34%) of respondents had a role on the Incident Management Team (IMT) and they reported good things about the meetings and the shift schedule. Four-fifths of employees with a role on the IMT reported that they met about the right amount (80%), followed a standard agenda (80%) and had meetings that were about the right length of time (79%). Three-quarters (73%) said the meetings focused on both high level strategic issues and the details of what was happening on the ground.

Employees also gave a mostly positive report about the shift schedule. Seven in ten (71%) said the shift changes including a briefing from both the incoming and outgoing team members, while about three in five said the shift schedule was set before the storm hit (60%) and that they were given enough advance notice so they could plan accordingly (57%). On the down side, more employees on the IMT said the minutes of the shift change briefings were not documented and circulated (54%) than said they were (46%).

Those with a Storm Role Reported Good Things

One-quarter (25%) of respondents reported having a storm role and they also reported good things about the experience. Few employees with a storm role experienced material shortages (19%), problems with their company vehicle (9%) or fuel shortages (2%). Seven in ten (71%) said they also didn't experience personnel shortages either. Four-fifths reported that they were kept informed of the progress of the restoration (80%). Three-quarters (76%) said they were assigned the right amount of work every day and the work they were assigned was managed at least somewhat effectively for four in five (80%).

Reports about the Restoration Efforts Were Positive

A majority (59%) of COMPANY NAME #1 and COMPANY NAME #2 employees who had a storm role or worked on the IMT supported the COMPANY NAME #3 restoration efforts. Three-quarters (77%) of these employees said that they had the information they needed to support the efforts.

The small number of employees from COMPANY NAME #1 and COMPANY NAME #2 who said they worked on the PLACE in the response and restoration phase reported having a positive experience. Over four in five agreed that they were provided with adequate logistical support (88%) and that they were assigned work in a timely fashion (82%). Just one in six (16%) agreed that they experienced material shortage, while half (53%) disagreed.

Employees Not Asked Were Willing to Help

Overall, it appears that those employees who were not asked to help out with the COMPANY NAME #1 restoration efforts were willing to help out. Two-fifths (40%) of employees said they did not have either an IMT or storm role during the COMPANY NAME #1 restoration. Over four-fifths (85%) of these employees said they were not asked to support the restoration efforts. However, seven in ten (71%) of these employees indicated that they wanted to help out in some way.

Survey Methodology

The Executive Summary is based on the results of a survey of 470 tri-company employees (COMPANY NAME #1, COMPANY NAME #2 and COMPANY NAME #3) conducted by CLIENT NAME from September 5-19, 2014. The margin of error for the entire survey is +/- 4.1% at the 95% confidence level.¹

¹ Margin of error is based on 2,801 Tri-Company employees as reported to CLIENT NAME on Friday, September 19, 2014.