Traffic Incident Management (TIM) is a key strategy for improving the efficiency and reliability of highway operations. As concerns about traffic congestion have increased, a call for increased institutional support for highway operations functions, including TIM, has arisen.

One of the major objectives of the National Traffic Incident Management Coalition (NTIMC) is to encourage the formation of strong and stable TIM programs and partnerships. But what, exactly, is a TIM program? TIM is a catch-all phrase. Examples of the broad scope of programs and program elements that may fall under the general rubric of “TIM” include development of unified policies, procedures, operations and/or communication systems among TIM responders; the application of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies to traffic incidents; freeway service patrols; interdisciplinary training in traffic control, unified command and NIMS; improved towing industry procedures and practices, and traveler information.

NTIMC promotes effective and sustainable TIM programs, as distinct from TIM activities that, while beneficial, are vulnerable to administrative personnel changes and annual budgetary fluctuations. Stable and effective public programs require legislative or administrative authorization; strategic missions and goals; written operational policies; and formal organizational structure, including trained and dedicated staff, assigned responsibilities, defined reporting channels, and steady dedicated funding. Most highway operations and TIM programs at the State and regional levels have some of these institutional support elements in place, but none seem to have them all.

Incident Management Plans and Policies

Many state DOTs are starting to recognize the need for strategic planning, as well as operational plans and policies, to improve management of traffic incidents. Formal strategic plans and written operational policies are the foundation of sustainable TIM programs. Some notable models are described below.

Statewide Clearance Policies and Performance Goals: While performance measurement is relatively new to transportation operations professionals, other TIM responders (fire, EMS, law enforcement) long have been publicly accountable for their response times. Within DOTs, there is increased consciousness of performance measurement, and many DOTs are beginning to measure and classify incidents, focusing on quick clearance of major incidents. Currently, the most frequently used performance metric for TIM programs is incident clearance time—either average, or maximum. California, Washington State, and Florida have statewide 90-minute incident clearance goals. Utah’s state performance goals are based on incident severity: 30 minutes for fender-benders; 60 minutes for injury crashes; 90 minutes for fatalities. Effective performance measurement will require additional supporting resources that are not currently available in many States and localities, including capability for continuous collection and analysis of supporting data. Few State Highway Patrols are currently involved in performance measurement related
Typically, DOT efforts to improve highway operations and TIM are not organized as a distinct program or department, but instead consist of activities undertaken by a variety of DOT departments or programs— principally maintenance, traffic engineering, and ITS. Frequently, personnel assigned to TIM duties have other full-time responsibilities in maintenance, traffic engineering, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) or emergency management.

TIM programs and activities nevertheless are rapidly emerging and evolving. Many observers predict that eventually traffic incident management will become a professional sub-specialty within the transportation profession, practiced by full-time personnel who have clear responsibilities and accountability through reporting and performance measurement for stable and funded TIM programs. It is relevant to recall that 75 years ago, the maintenance engineering and traffic engineering sub-specialties had not yet emerged.

As always, there will be no “one size fits all” solution to development of Traffic Incident Management programs and the TIM professional sub-specialty. Each multi-State Region, State, metropolitan or rural region, or locality will build their TIM program to address their unique needs. This paper is intended to provide some “building blocks” for strong TIM programs. While no State or region currently has all of the desired elements of a fully mature TIM program in place, several have developed program elements that can be useful elsewhere.

to traffic incidents, and data definition issues are significant.

- Florida’s Open Roads Policy commits Florida DOT (FDOT) and the Florida Highway Patrol to clearing all incidents within 90 minutes of arrival of the first responding officer.
- Washington DOT (WSDOT) and the Washington State Patrol (WSP) are jointly accountable to the Governor for a 90-minute maximum clearance time performance goal, which is reportable quarterly. Incidents with durations of greater than 90 minutes are examined carefully to identify opportunities for improvement.
- The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the California Highway Patrol (CHP) have agreed to a goal of 90 a minute clearance time. (CHP endorses this policy but it is not a performance measure for CHP field commanders.)

**Statewide TIM Strategic Plans:** Where they exist, statewide traffic incident management plans vary in approach and focus. Kentucky and Tennessee have strategic statewide TIM plans, where strategies and an action plan have been developed based on strategic goals and objectives.

- In 2005, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (Kentucky’s DOT) developed a State Strategic Plan for Highway Incident Management that includes: mission, goals, objectives, and a timeline for implementation of 49 prioritized action strategies. The plan was developed with input from the FHWA, State Police, emergency management, and local agencies.
- In 2003, Tennessee developed a Strategic Plan for Highway Incident Management that represents a coordinated effort among TDOT, the Tennessee Dept. of Safety, Tennessee Dept. of Commerce and Insurance, the Tennessee Emergency Management Agency, and other public and private organizations with responsibilities for highway incident management. A four-department resolution adopted the plan, which looks beyond the major cities. The statewide effort includes four regions that each have an Incident Management Coordinator, statewide service patrol reports, and incident reports.

**Statewide Best Practices Guidelines:** Best Practices Guidelines are a good approach to building more standardized practices across disciplines and jurisdictions, while still operating on a voluntary basis.

- Ohio’s Quick-Clear Best Practices Guide provides guidance on reducing incident duration, reducing secondary crashes, increasing responder safety, and traffic control at incident sites. The Guide was developed in 2003 by a working group including AAA Ohio, Buckeye State Sheriff’s Assoc., Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police, Ohio Dept. of Public Safety, ODOT, Ohio EPA, Ohio Fire Chief’s Assoc., Ohio Fire Marshall’s Office, Ohio Trucking Assoc., and the Towing & Recovery Assoc. of Ohio.

**Regional TIM Operational Plans and Guidelines:** Several States have developed regional- or corridor-level TIM programs, where partners jointly developed recommended operational guidelines or response procedures. In some cases these regional plans later form the basis for statewide plans.
Colorado’s nine corridor-level TIM programs follow the TMC Traffic Incident Response Procedures operational manual. Each corridor-level program was developed by a working group that included local and State traffic engineers, maintenance, law enforcement, fire, EMS and towing.

The Twin Cities Metro Incident Management Steering Committee’s (IMSC’s) Incident Management Recommended Operations Guidelines define the roles and responsibilities of different agencies at incident scenes, and provide guidelines for incident response and clearance. This regional plan is the model for a Minnesota statewide plan under development.

Oregon DOT’s Emergency Operations Plan is a multi-modal, all-hazards plan that is scalable from traffic incident management to disaster transportation management, and includes a business continuity plan. The transportation annex to the State’s Emergency Operations Plan, it is based on FEMA’s Guide for All-Hazard Emergency Operations Planning: State and Local Guide (State and Local Guide 101). The plan includes all statutes and authorities, copies of all emergency response agreements, and information on hazards in the transportation system.

Idaho DOT officials literally have a briefcase of emergency plans, including an incident management plan, hazmat plan, national response plan, Idaho emergency operations plans, business resumption plans, internal policies and procedures, emergency response manual, and an employee phone list. The package also is on the Internet (with secure access).

Interagency and Interdisciplinary Relationships

Strong working partnerships among all responding disciplines and agencies is a basic underlying principle of effective traffic incident management programs. NTIMC encourages partnerships that are formalized through written operational agreements, joint, written operational policies and procedures, and joint training exercises. Ideally, the partnerships include all TIM partners—which, at a minimum, would include transportation, law enforcement, fire, emergency medical services (EMS), and towing and recovery. Additional partners that ideally would be involved include the trucking industry, traffic control industry, insurance industry, and emergency management agencies.

Many State DOT’s work closely with law enforcement, and often, but not always, there is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place between the DOT and SHP defining procedures and responsibilities for traffic incident management. Co-location is increasingly common. In a few cases, emergency dispatch has been integrated through integration of the DOT Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) with the law enforcement Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). Even where MOUs are in place, there is wide variation in the level of formal interac-
tions, such as formal debriefings after major incidents.

Much less common are TIM partnerships that include fire, emergency medical services (EMS), or towing. The typical distant relationship between State DOTs and the fire/EMS communities is based on institutional factors, and tradition. First, fire and EMS are largely local functions, whereas law enforcement has a State-level agency that corresponds to the state DOT. Secondly, the first responder and emergency management communities traditionally have considered transportation to be a secondary responder, and a provider of logistical resources. Consequently transportation often is not included in emergency planning and preparedness activities. NIMS requirements are beginning to open doors for transportation agencies. For example, many State DOTs have been involved in NIMS-required Incident Command System (ICS) training for first responders, and some State DOTs also have been involved in hazard-specific training (earthquake, tsunami, bioterrorism). Those exercises have proven especially valuable for the face-to-face contacts made. The towing industry, as a private-sector TIM partner, wages an across-the-board struggle for recognition. For example, the towing industry has pointed out that the MOUs between DOTs and SHPs typically require DOTs to provide training to all responders who respond on Interstate highways, yet towers are not routinely trained.

Examples where State DOTs are building more inclusive interagency and interdisciplinary partnerships are:

- Arizona’s Statewide Incident Management Plan was developed in 2000 with input obtained from legislative, transportation, law enforcement, fire, medical, towing industry, and other stakeholders in eight regional workshops. The plan includes statewide alternate route plans and Traffic Operations Center (TOC) Incident Management Operations guidelines. In implementing the plan, ADOT has developed traffic control agreements with the towing industry.

- Minnesota DOT’s Responder Safety Committee assists with development of statewide TIM policy and TIM training classes that include all responders. Members include MnDOT, the State Patrol, the State Fire Marshall’s Office, law enforcement, EMS, fire service and towing companies.

- Oregon DOT has a local outreach program, focusing on responder safety, that offers TIM training to local fire and law enforcement responders.

- The Ohio Lane Closure Protocol Committee is a working group comprised of AAA Ohio, Buckeye State Sheriff’s Assoc., Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police, Ohio Dept. of Public Safety, ODOT, Ohio EPA, Ohio Fire Chief’s Assoc., Ohio Fire Marshall’s Office, Ohio Trucking Assoc., and the Towing & Recovery Assoc. of Ohio. They developed the Quick-Clear Guide.

- The Traffic Incident Management Enhancement (TIME) Program in Wisconsin developed and entered into a multi-agency, multi-discipline partnering agreement early in the implementation of the program. The Program Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Department of Transportation and Department of State Patrol.

**Organizational Structure**

Organizational structures for TIM programs vary widely.

- Arizona’s TIM program includes coordination between ADOT and the Department of Public Safety, but there is no formal traffic incident management committee.

- Colorado’s nine TIM corridors were developed by working groups that include local and state engineers, maintenance, law enforcement, fire, EMS, and towing. Statewide or regional working groups are under consideration.

- Connecticut’s Statewide Incident Management Task Force includes fire and regional planning representatives. A subcommittee of this Task Force, together with the Department of Emergency Management & Homeland Security, is developing a Unified Command System (UCS)-NIMS program manual.

- Florida’s TIM Executive Panel is
Freeway Service Patrols are by far the tactical and operational applications. Generally limited to a few very specific programs, and those that exist are regional traffic incident management. There are very few formal statewide or TIM Programs.

- Maryland’s Coordinated Highways Action Response Team (CHART) Board includes representatives from the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), the Maryland Transportation Authority, the Maryland State Police, the University of Maryland, and local government. The Chair is the chief engineer of the SHA.

- The Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) Office of Incident Management coordinates traffic incident management, with direction from the Highway Incident Management Policy Committee, which includes representatives from the State's agencies for transportation, safety, commerce and insurance, and emergency management.

- The Wisconsin Department of Transportation leads the TIME Program in southeastern Wisconsin. The high-level organizational structure for the TIME Program includes a Steering Committee (policy and direction), Freeway Incident Management (technical) Team, and several sub-regional committees and task forces.

**TIM Programs**

There are very few formal statewide or regional traffic incident management programs, and those that exist are generally limited to a few very specific tactical and operational applications. Freeway Service Patrols are by far the most common type of incident management activity or program conducted by State DOTs. The most common model is a State-operated service patrol, with the missions of helping motorists with minor vehicle problems, such as tire changes or gasoline, as well as providing traffic control at traffic incident scenes. Private sector freeway service patrol models also are emerging.

Ideally, DOT Traffic Management Center (TMC) assets are operationally coordinated with incident communications and management, so that changeable message signs, traffic signals, video cameras, and other technology can be used to assist with incident notification, scene traffic control and with motorist information and diversion.

- Maryland’s CHART program is one of the more comprehensive statewide traffic incident management programs. Maryland’s Statewide Operations Center (SOC) provides 24/7 statewide command & control. Satellite Traffic Operations Centers handle peak-period traffic. The CHART freeway service patrol reduced average incident duration by 23 percent in 2005. CHART assisted in 20,515 lane blockage incidents where average incident duration in 2005 was approximately 22 minutes, compared to 29 minutes for similar incidents responded to by other agencies. Using a traffic simulation program, analysts determined that MDOT TIM program reduced travel delay on major Maryland corridors by 38 million vehicle-hours in 2005.

- Florida DOT (FDOT) provides Road Rangers service patrol on all Interstates. In 2005, the overall benefit/cost ratio for the Florida Road Ranger program was 26:1. FDOT’s photogrammetry program helps the Florida Highway Patrol automate crash investigation. The Florida Turnpike provides a combination of financial incentives for quick clearance, and pricing disincentives for slow performance, to improve tower performance and reduce clearance times. On a 320-mile-long turnpike in Florida where this approach is in place, average clearance time to achieve all lanes open is 56 minutes.

- The City of Houston’s SAFEclear program, implemented in 2005, is a private sector freeway service patrol model. Qualified towing companies contract with the City to be responsible for responding within an average of 6 minutes to incidents on a designated section of the state-owned freeways in the Houston metro area. In order to meet the required response times, the tow companies continually patrol the freeways. The towing companies are charged with rapidly removing disabled or crashed vehicles from the highway lanes or the shoulders to a location off the freeway. The private sector arrangement dramatically enhances the previous Motorists Assistance Program (MAP) coordinated by the Transtar Transportation Management Center. Where MAP used 9 trucks to provide services, the private sector fields about 60 tow trucks to patrol the 190 miles of freeway in Houston.

- San Antonio’s TransGuide ITS system combines a communications network, CCTV, and loop detectors to improve incident detection. In the first year of deployment, TransGuide reduced incident response times by 20 percent.
In Wisconsin, efforts are currently underway to establish templates, standards, and consistency for statewide alternate route plans, freeway service patrols, crash reconstruction tools, on-scene traffic control guidelines, evacuation planning, education/training, and several other TIM-related tools and tactics. This is being accomplished in-part by leveraging the successes from the individual regions in the State.

**Chain of Command and Reporting Channels**

Strong and stable public programs require accountability. Personnel must be responsible for reporting performance results up a chain of command. Except where reporting of performance measures is required, DOTs generally do not have established chains of command and reporting channels for traffic incident management functions. Whereas law enforcement and fire agencies have centralized command and control, DOTs typically are decentralized. As a result, chain of command and reporting requirements for traffic incident management functions vary widely. As previously noted, most States do not have separate traffic incident management programs. Instead, traffic incident management functions are conducted by DOT personnel who are housed in maintenance, traffic, and ITS sections. Typically, field operations are conducted by maintenance personnel as a secondary function, and the ITS and traffic control personnel handle communications functions at the TMCs. Further, most States treat transportation emergency and disaster management as a different activity from major traffic incident management in organizational and reporting terms, although within the DOT these activities are most often carried out by the same people at the field operational level.

The NIMS planning framework provides an opportunity to identify a formal DOT chain of incident command, and reporting requirements.

**Budget**

In order to build stronger traffic incident management programs, TIM responder agencies need dedicated resources. Gaining resources within DOTs is especially difficult for traffic incident management, because incident management functions generally are secondary personnel duties, and spread across so many departments within a DOT. It can be very difficult to isolate how much money currently is being spent on traffic incident management personnel and equipment, agency-wide, which impedes the ability to make a solid argument for spending more.

Freeway service patrols are again the exception. Dedicated vehicles and staff may be line-item budget items, and States may track the number and duration of incidents that their personnel respond to.

While ITS is an important element of effective traffic incident management, the ITS budget typically is not integrated with traffic incident management budgets. Many States have developed Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) plans in order to qualify for federal ITS funds. These plans generally list equipment that the DOT hopes to acquire during various time frames should funds become available. However, these plans generally are not put within a strategic functional framework and are not consolidated as programs with separate line item budgets and business plans, so program status is difficult to track.

**Summary**

This paper has introduced the building blocks of the institutional framework for traffic incident management programs—Plans and Policies; Interagency and Interdisciplinary Relationships; Organizational Structure, Formalized TIM Programs; Chain of Command and Reporting Channels; and Budget. We have highlighted some examples of strategies various States are using. The table on the following pages presents additional information on current state DOT practices. While these organizational elements are very important to building stronger, more stable TIM Programs, in the end a culture change is required. Only when all of the responder disciplines train their professionals, from the outset, to operate in a multidisciplinary context; to follow coordinated procedures; and to address common goals for safe, quick clearance of roadway incidents will TIM programs become completely embedded in the fabric of public safety and transportation operations.
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| Arizona | 2000 Statewide Incident Management Plan  
– Statewide alternate route plans  
– TOC Incident Management Operations Guidelines | Plan developed by ADOT in 8 regional workshops, w/ input from legislative, transportation, law enforcement, fire, medical, towing & others. Implementation includes traffic control agreements between the towing industry & ADOT. | Coordination w/ ADOT and Dept. of Public Safety but no formal traffic incident management committee. | ICS and HAZMAT training for responders. | 90 minute average clearance time. (CHP has endorsed, but it is not a priority for CHP field commanders.) | TMT equip and personnel from Caltrans maintenance and traffic operations divisions. |
| California | Mission: “Caltrans improves mobility across California.” Mobility and reliability are key goals, w/ performance measures that are tracked and reported quarterly.  
State Quick Clearance legislation.  
Proposed legislation to ID Caltrans maintenance as first responders.  
Move It law exempts Caltrans and CHP from liability.  
Caltrans and CHP working on promoting the “clear the way – reduce delay” campaign.  
L.A. County has protocols for quick clearance of fatal incidents; trying to take statewide. | Caltrans and CHP have regular meetings on improving incident management. | Caltrans Traffic Management Teams (TMT) responded to 2,415 incidents in 2004-05. Freeway service patrol is contracted out by MPO or local agency using matching funds DOT provides. 13 regions, 425 vehicles. Pay incentive to towing companies for quick clearance. | 30 TMT people statewide and 50-60 pieces of equipment. All field supervisors are trained as first responders and in SEMS (converting to NIMS). Statewide Caltrans has 91 CMS trucks, 70 CMS trailers, 17 HAR trailers, 169 part-time and full-time personnel for incident management. | 90 minute average clearance time. (CHP has endorsed, but it is not a priority for CHP field commanders.) | Maintenance coordinates incidents at district level. District managers report major incident status to HQ. |
| Colorado | CDOT developed statewide Guidelines for Developing Traffic Incident Management Plans for Work Zones.  
TMC Traffic Incident Response Procedures is the operational manual for nine corridor-level TIM programs. | Intent of Guidelines document is to assist in developing management programs that meet the needs of the contractor, CDOT, emergency responders, and the motoring public. | Nine TIM corridors were developed by working groups that include local and state engineers, maintenance, law enforcement, fire, EMS, and towing. Statewide or regional working groups under consideration. | TIM programs have been developed by corridor. CDOT TMC coordinates. | State offers TIM training. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>IM Plans &amp; Policies</th>
<th>Interagency Relationships</th>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>TIM Programs</th>
<th>Staffing &amp; Training</th>
<th>Performance Goals</th>
<th>Reporting Channels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Open Roads Policy commits to clearing all incidents within 90 minutes of arrival of the first responding officer. Statewide TIM team develops global policies and templates, including legislative recommendations. FDOT Statewide TIM team writing strategic plan for TIM.</td>
<td>Open Roads Policy executed by the DOT and the Highway Patrol as a formal document.</td>
<td>Executive Panel comprised of DOT, FHP, Dept. of Environmental Protection. A formal process for this panel is being developed (has been informal for many years). Statewide TIM team is made up of members of local TIM teams. Local TIM teams implement programs, e.g. the Rapid Incident Scene Clearance (RISC) program on the Florida Turnpike.</td>
<td>FDOT provides Road Rangers service patrol on all Inter-states and on I-75 from St. Petersburg to Naples. FDOT photogrammetry program helps FHP automate crash investigation. (RISC) program on the Florida Turnpike pays towers incentive for quick clearance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Idaho DOT officials literally have a briefcase of emergency plans, including an incident management plan, hazmat plan, national response plan, Idaho emergency operations plans, business resumption plans, internal policies &amp; procedures, ER manual, and employee phone list. Also on Intranet. State &quot;Move It&quot; law.</td>
<td>Emergency transportation plan is annex to state emergency plan, and adopted through the Governors’ executive plan. Counties can reflect it in their programs and plans. Co-located dispatching w/ state police in some locations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Section staffs incident response, and are trained in incident response.</td>
<td>Maintenance Section mandates strategic planning &amp; perf. measures. Currently working on development of new perf. measurements for hwy system operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Gary-Chicago-Milwaukee Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Priority Corridor</td>
<td>3 state DOTs, 16 counties, numerous local agencies &amp; FHWA</td>
<td>Work group focuses on traffic incident management.</td>
<td>Public info web site includes real-time info on travel times, congestion, road closures, and traffic video links.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2005 State Strategic Plan for Highway Incident Management: mission, goals, objectives &amp; 49 action strategies (prioritized w/ implementation timeline).</td>
<td>Plan developed for Kentucky Transportation Cabinet w/ input from State Police, Kentucky Emergency Management, FHWA &amp; Lexington-Fayette Urban County Gov't.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHART Board includes reps from Md SHA, Md. Transportation Auth., MD State Police, FHWA, Univ. of MD and local gov’t. Chair is chief engineer of SHA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Regional TIM plans have been developed by local offices or local law enforcement. “Steer It Clear” (Move Over) legislation is being promoted statewide.</td>
<td>Detroit’s TIM working group is multi-disciplinary. Grand Rapids is more transportation-oriented.</td>
<td>Grand Rapids and Detroit metro areas have working groups on TIM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnesota</strong></td>
<td>Highway Incident Management and Emergency Traffic Control Equipment Guidelines outlines general traffic control requirements for highway incidents. (MnDOT document) Developed by Twin Cities Metro IMCT: Incident Management Recommended Operations Guidelines defines the roles and responsibilities of different agencies at incident scenes, and provides guidelines for incident response and clearance. Statewide policy on TIM under development, based on Twin Cities Metro Recommended Operations Guidelines. Twin Cities IMSC has developed legislative proposals for Quick Clearance legislation and proposal to allow Freeway Service Patrol to tow abandoned vehicles.</td>
<td>MnDOT State Traffic Engineer, MN State Fire Marshall, &amp; MN State Patrol have signed off on Emergency Traffic Control Equipment Guidelines. Responder Safety Committee includes reps from Mn/DOT, State Patrol, State Fire Marshall’s Office, law enforcement, EMS, fire service &amp; towing companies serve on Responder Safety Committee. Twin Cities IMSC policy body includes MnDOT Traffic Operations, MnDOT Metro Maintenance, and MSP. The working group (IMCT) includes MnDOT Maintenance, Freeway Service Patrol Drivers, State Patrol, Fire, EMS, and private towing companies.</td>
<td>Responder Safety Committee assists w/ development of statewide TIM policy and training class. Two incident management committees in Twin Cities Metro Area: Incident Management Steering Committee (IMSC) and Incident Management Coordination Team (IMCT) a working group. Primary purpose of IMCT is to debrief major incident and develop new ideas to improve incident management. IMCT developed guidelines document.</td>
<td>Current TIM program focuses on Twin Cities Metro Area. Includes Freeway Service Patrol.</td>
<td>MnDOT incident management training course for all emergency responders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ohio</strong></td>
<td>2003 Ohio Quick-Clear Best Practices Guide provides guidance on reducing incident duration, reducing secondary crashes and increasing responder safety, and traffic control at incident scenes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Lane Closure Protocol Committee is a working group comprised of AAA Ohio, Buckeye State Sheriff’s Assoc., Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police, Ohio Dept. of Public Safety, ODOT, Ohio EPA, Ohio Fire Chief’s Assoc., Ohio Fire Marshall’s Office, Ohio Trucking Assoc., and the Towing &amp; Recovery Assoc. of Ohio. They developed the Quick-Clear guide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>IM Plans &amp; Policies</td>
<td>Interagency Relationships</td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>TIM Programs</td>
<td>Staffing &amp; Training</td>
<td>Performance Goals</td>
<td>Reporting Channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Plan is multi-modal, all hazards, and includes a business continuity plan. It is based on FEMA’s Guide for All-Hazard Emergency Operations Planning: State and Local Guide (State and Local Guide 101) This is a controlled distribution document. Includes all statutes and authorities, copies of all Emergency Response agreements, and info on hazards on the transportation system.</td>
<td>Partnership with state patrol, including TMC co-location and integrated dispatch. Outreach program for developing training for emergency response partners, focusing on responder safety.</td>
<td>ODOT committee wrote Emergency Operations Plan, which was promulgated by the Director. <strong>Statewide TOC in Portland and 3 others integrate w/ State Patrol CAD system.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shortage of state patrol. 1000 highway maintenance DOT employees all considered first responders.</strong> Also have corridor management teams devoted to incident response. 24X7 in operations center since 1996.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Oregon Emergency Response Council keeps statistics on the number of emergency incidents and who was involved.</td>
<td>Law enforcement CAD system captures data on traffic incidents. DOT Maintenance team uses data to track level of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td><strong>Operations Manual update completed October 2005.</strong></td>
<td>Partners with Utah Highway Patrol. TOC co-location with patrol dispatchers.</td>
<td><strong>Day to day oversight by Region Traffic Engineer. Programmatic oversight by Traffic Management Division</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 freeway service patrol vehicles, in Salt Lake metro area. Dispatched by State Highway Patrol dispatchers.</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 fulltime incident responders. Daytime hours plus available on call overnight.</strong></td>
<td>30, 60, 90 clearance time based on severity: fender bender, injury, fatality.</td>
<td>Clearance times are reported as a performance measure for “Make the System Work Better,” one of the “Final Four” UDOT Strategic Goals.</td>
</tr>
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<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | WSDOT/WSP Joint Operations Policy Statement (JOPS) developed in 2002, updated annually. | Working with Coroners/ Medical Examiners to develop agreements for expediting removal of deceased. | Field operations are managed by Regional Offices in partnership with local responding agencies. | 90-min. clearance goal for major incidents.  
|            | More aggressive policy to increase establishment of tow-away zones to reduce capacity loss and collisions resulting from abandoned vehicles. | Worked with tow industry to pilot test “instant dispatch” to blocking incidents in Seattle. |                                                                                      | - Examine incidents > 90 min to determine cause.  
|            |                                                                                      | Funding proposal developed to implement a Tow Incentive Program to expedite clearance of heavy truck incidents. |                                                                                      |                                                                                   |                                                                                   | Performance data provided by WSDOT Washington Incident Tracking System & State Patrol CAD data are used in quarterly report to Governor, Legislature, Commission, Media and Public. |
| Wisconsin  | General TIM Plans typically on a regional basis (e.g. TIME Program Blueprint)        | TIME Program Partnering Agreement                                                             | TIME champion is typically WisDOT.                                                      | Formal regional programs (e.g. TIME)                                               | Regional Incident Management Coordinators (WisDOT RIMCs)                          | Under Development through Statewide TIM initiatives                              |
|            | Alternate Route Plans                                                                 | Relationships fostered through regular meetings in regions and sub-regions.                 | TIME Program (SE WI) includes Program Steering Committee, Freeway Incident Management Team and several committees and task forces.  
|            | Move Over Laws                                                                      | Strong relationship with Wisconsin State Patrol as well as other law enforcement and public safety agencies. | Emerging Statewide Program                                                             | Regional Incident Management Coordinators (WisDOT RIMCs)                          |                                                                                   | Reported through Statewide TOC                                                    |
|            | Quick Clearances/Hold Harmless Laws                                                  |                                                                                              | Similar structures in other regions.                                                   |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |
|            | Evacuation Plans                                                                     |                                                                                              |                                                                                      |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |
|            | Outreach Plans and initiatives                                                       |                                                                                              |                                                                                      |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |
|            | Special event plans                                                                  |                                                                                              |                                                                                      |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |                                                                                   |