Traffic Incident Management (TIM) Program Self-Assessment 2014: Jurisdiction Summary

Location: FL-Sarasota - Manatee County

Overall Score: 85.3%

Rating Legend

Low - Little to no activity in this area.

No Activity- No activity or discussion of this issue.

Some Activity- Issue has been acknowledged and there has been some single agency activity.

Medium - There is some level or a good level of activity in this area.

Fair Level of Activity- Some good processes exist, but they may not be well integrated or Good Level of Activity **Good Level of Activity-** Efforts in this area are strong and results are promising, though there is still room for improvement.

High - Activity in this area is outstanding.

Efforts in this area are well coordinated with a high level of cooperation among agencies.

| Section 4.1 - Strategic - 30% | | 22.8% | |
|--|-----------|---|---|
| 4.1.1 Multi-Agency TIM Teams | | Rating | Comments |
| Does the TIM program: | | | |
| 4.1.1.1 Have a TIM multi-agency team or task force which meets regularly to discuss and plan for TIM activities? | 4.1.1.1 | High | |
| 4.1.1.1.a. What agencies are represented on the team/task force? | 4.1.1.1.a | EMSDER RO MANA COMMUN AND PUI | TY AND CITY FIRE & RESCUE-FHP-COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICES-FDOT-EAP-COUNTY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENTFLORIDA TURNPIKE ENTERPRISE-FDOT ADRANGERS & ASSET MANAGEMENT CONTRACTOR-COUNTY TRAFFIC AGEMENTFLORIDAINDEPENDAENT TOWING & RECOVERY ASSOCIATION-MITYAND CITYPOLICE DEPARTMENTS-DIVISION OF FORESTRY-COUNTY DOT BLIC WORKS FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT- SOUTHWEST REGIONALPLANNING COUNCIL- AAA-CLEAR CHANNEL RADIO-ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS. |
| 4.1.1.1.b. How frequently does the team/task force meet? | 4.1.1.1.b | | Bi-Monthly |
| 4.1.1.1.c. Who provides administrative support (agenda, minutes, meeting planning, etc.) for the team/task force? Is that support funded externally (consultant support) or done by a team/task force member as a function of their core job responsibilities? | 4.1.1.1.c | | FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (FDOT), WITH FDOT FUNDEDCONSULTANT SUPPORT. |

| 4.1.1.2. Is multi-agency training held at least | once a year | on TIM-s _l | pecific topics? (Composite score for 4.1.1.2.a through 4.1.1.2.e below) |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|---|
| 4.1.1.2.a. NIMS/ ICS 100? | 4.1.1.2.a | High | |
| 4.1.1.2.b. Training of mid-level managers from the primary agencies on the National Unified Goal? | 4.1.1.2.b | Good | |
| 4.1.1.2.c. Traffic control? | 4.1.1.2.c | Some | |
| 4.1.1.2.d. Work zone safety? | 4.1.1.2.d | Good | |
| 4.1.1.2.e. Safe parking? | 4.1.1.2.e | High | |
| 4.1.1.3 Conduct multi-agency post-incident debriefings? | 4.1.1.3 | Some | |
| 4.1.1.3.a. Is there a defined incident level or threshold at which mandatory, multiagency post-incident reviews are conducted? If yes, what is that level? How many post-incident reviews were held in the last 12 months? | 4.1.1.3.a | | No |
| 4.1.1.4. Conduct planning for special events | (Composite | e score fo | r 4.1.2.4.a. through 4.1.2.4.d. below) |
| 4.1.1.4.a. Construction and maintenance? | 4.1.1.4.a | None | |
| 4.1.1.4.b. Sporting events/concerts/conventions/etc? | 4.1.1.4.b | Fair | |
| 4.1.1.4.c. Weather-related events? | 4.1.1.4.c | High | |
| 4.1.1.4.d. Catastrophic events? | 4.1.1.4.d | High | |

| 4.1.2 Formal Traffic Incident Management Programs | | Rating | Comments |
|---|--------------|-----------|--|
| 4.1.2.1. Is the TIM program supported by mu 4.1.2.1.d. below) | lti-agency a | greements | s/memoranda of understanding? (Composite score for 4.1.2.1.a. through |
| 4.1.2.1.a. Is the agreement/MOU signed by top officials from participating agencies? | 4.1.2.1.a | Some | |
| 4.1.2.1.a.1. How often is the document updated? | 4.1.2.1.a.1 | | No Schedule |
| 4.1.2.1.a.2. Which agencies are signatories on the agreement/MOU? | 4.1.2.1.a.2 | West Ma | anatee Fire-Manatee County Sheriff-Holmes Beach Police -City of Bradenton-City of Venice-Director Florida Department of Enviormental Protection. |
| 4.1.2.1.b. Are incident scene roles and responsibilities for each participating agency clearly defined in the agreement and communicated to all participating agencies? | 4.1.2.1.b | Good | |
| 4.1.2.1.b.1 How are the roles and responsibilities defined in the agreement/MOU communicated to participating agencies? | 4.1.2.1.b.1 | BASED | ON NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM GUIDANCE. |
| 4.1.2.1.c. Are agency roles and responsibilities for planning for and funding for the TIM program clearly defined in the agreement/MOU? | 4.1.2.1.c | High | |
| 4.1.2.1.d. Are safe, quick clearance goals stated as time goals for incident clearance (e.g. 90 minutes) in the agreement/MOU? | 4.1.2.1.d | High | |
| 4.1.2.2. Is planning to support the TIM activities done across and among participating agencies? | 4.1.2.2 | High | |
| 4.1.2.3. Is there someone from at least one of the participating agencies responsible for coordinating the TIM program as their primary job function? | 4.1.2.3 | High | |

| 4.1.3. TIM Performance Measures | | Rating | Comments |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Does the TIM program: | | | |
| 4.1.3.1. Have multi-agency agreement on the | two perforn | nance me | asures being tracked: (Composite score for 4.1.3.1.a and 4.1.3.1.b below) |
| 4.1.3.1.a. Roadway Clearance Time? | 4.1.3.1.a | High | |
| 4.1.3.1.b. Incident Clearance Time? | 4.1.3.1.b | High | |
| 4.1.3.1.c. Is data being collected on other performance measures by any of the following agencies? (check all that apply)Law EnforcementFire/RescueMPODOTOther (please specify) If yes, describe | 4.1.3.1.c | Yes- Law | r Enforcement; Fire/Rescue; DOT; Description: Performance measures of reporting agencyies can be retrived from the SunGuide system. |
| 4.1.3.2. Has the TIM program established | | | |
| methods to collect and analyze the data necessary to measure performance in reduced roadway clearance time and reduced incident clearance time? | 4.1.3.2 | High | |
| 4.1.3.2.a If yes, what is your locale's average Roadway Clearance Time for the prior year (September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013) in minutes? | 4.1.3.2.a.1 | | 66 min |
| What type of incident data are used to calculate Roadway Clearance Time? | 4.1.3.2.a.2 | | All incidents |
| FHWA defines Roadway Clearance Time as the "time between first recordable awareness of an incident by a responsible agency and first confirmation that all lanes are available for traffic flow." How does your performance measure relate to the FHWA definition? | 4.1.3.2.a.3 | Consistent with FHWA's definition | |

| 4.1.3.2.b If yes, what is your locale's average Incident Clearance Time for the prior year (September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013) in minutes? | 4.1.3.2.b.1 | 88 min | |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| What type of incident data are used to calculate Incident Clearance Time? | 4.1.3.2.b.2 | | All incidents |
| FHWA defines Incident Clearance Time as the "time between the first recordable awareness of the incident and the time at which the last responder has left the scene." How does your performance measure relate to the FHWA definition? | 4.1.3.2.b.3 | Consistent with FHWA's definition | |
| 4.1.3.3. Have targets (e.g. time goals) for performance of the two measures? | 4.1.3.3 | Fair | 90 min goal for Roadway clear / No goal for Incident Clear. |
| 4.1.3.3.a. What criteria were used to set the time goals? | 4.1.3.3.a | State-Wide "Open Roads Policy" signed by Florida Departments of Highway Patrol ar Transportation. | |
| 4.1.3.4. Routinely review whether progress is made in achieving the targets? | 4.1.3.4 | Good | SunGuide menu for annual performace measurement reports are set for January- December. Secondary incident number unavailable. |
| 4.1.3.4.a. How is progress measured? | 4.1.3.4.a | Annually | |
| 4.1.3.5. Track performance in reducing secondary accidents? | 4.1.3.5 | Fair | |
| 4.1.3.5.a If yes, what is your locale's estimate of the number of secondary incidents relative to total incidents for the prior year (September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013)? | 4.1.3.5.a.1 | | |
| What type of incident data are used to calculate Secondary Incident metrics? | 4.1.3.5.a.2 | All incidents | |
| FHWA defines Secondary Incidents as "unplanned incidents beginning with the time of detection of the primary incident where a collision occurs either (a) within the incident scene or (b) within the queue, including the opposite direction, resulting from the original incident." How does your performance measure relate to the FHWA definition? | 4.1.3.5.a.3 | Consistent with FHWA's definition | |

| | _ | | |
|---|-------------|---|--|
| Section 4.2- Tactical – 40% | | 36.9% | |
| 4.2.1. Policies and Procedures for Incident Response and Clearance | | Rating | Comments |
| Does the TIM program: | | | |
| 4.2.1.1. Have "authority removal" laws allow (Composite score for 4.2.1.1.a. and 4.2.1.1.b | | gnated res | sponders to remove disabled or wrecked vehicles and spilled cargo? |
| 4.2.1.1.a. Is there an "authority removal" law in place? | 4.2.1.1.a | High | |
| 4.2.1.1.b. Is it understood and utilized by responders? | 4.2.1.1.b | High | |
| 4.2.1.2. Have "driver removal" laws which relanes? (Composite score for 4.2.1.2.a. and 4 | • | | I in minor crashes (not involving injuries) to move vehicles out of the travel |
| 4.2.1.2.a. Is there a "driver removal" law in place? | 4.2.1.2.a | High | |
| 4.2.1.2.b. Is it communicated to motorists? | 4.2.1.2.b | Fair | |
| 4.2.1.2.b.1 How is it communicated to motorists? | 4.2.1.2.b.1 | | |
| 4.2.1.3. Use a Safety Service Patrol for incident and emergency response? | 4.2.1.3 | High | |
| 4.2.1.3.a. If there is a safety service patrol, please provide details: Lane miles covered Hours of operation Days of operation Services provided Number of vehicles Equipment on vehicles Operator training | 4.2.1.3.a | Opera Provided REMOVA Vehicles: BOARD, AIR, V GAUGE, SPOT L FIRST- TRA | ne Miles: Centerline Miles: 122 CENTERLINE MILES;; Hours of Operation: Hours of ation: MONDAY-FRIDAY; Days of Operation: Seven; Services Provided: Services d: EMERGENCY INCIDENT RESPONCE, MOTORIST ASSISTANCE AND DEBRIS AL; Number of Vehicles: 2 Vehicles on patrol per county plus 1 spare; Equipment on Equipment on Vehicles: JACKS, HAND TOOLS, EMERGENCY LIGHTING, ARROW 24-36" CONES FOR MAINTAINCE OF TRAFFIC, CELL PHONES, COMPRESSED VATER, 10 GAL GAS, 5 GAL DIESEL FUEL, WRENCH SETS, TIRE PRESSURE 1-20 lbs FIRE EXTINGUISHER, STREET BROOM, PRY BAR, SHOVELS, FLARES, LIGHT, POWER OUTLETS, BOOSTER CABLES, 30 lbsABSORBENT MATERIAL, FAID KIT; Operator Training: CPR, QUICK CLEARANCE OF ROADWAY, SAFETY INING, STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT RADIO TRAINING, MAINTENANCE OF AFFIC, FIRST RESPONDER TRAINING, INCIDENT RESPONDER TRAINING |

| 4.2.1.4. Utilize the Incident Command System on-scene? | 4.2.1.4 | High | |
|--|-----------|------|--|
| 4.2.1.5. Have response equipment pre-staged for timely response? | 4.2.1.5 | Good | |
| 4.2.1.6. Identify and type resources so that a list of towing and recovery operators (including operator capabilities and special equipment) is available for incident response and clearance? | 4.2.1.6 | High | NARG = Notification Agency Resource Guide book |
| 4.2.1.6.a. Deployed based on incident type and severity? | 4.2.1.6.a | | Yes- And on Incident location |
| 4.2.1.6.b. Is there an incentive program for expedited removal of commercial vehicles/spilled cargo/other large incidents? | 4.2.1.6.b | | RISC= Rapid Incident Scene Clearence contracts |
| 4.2.1.7. Identify and type resources so that a list of HazMat contractors (including capabilities and equipment) is available for incident response? | 4.2.1.7 | High | |
| 4.2.1.7.a. Policy in place that clearly identifies reportable types and amount of HazMat? | 4.2.1.7.a | | Yes |
| 4.2.1.8. Does at least one responding agency have the authority to override the decision to utilize the responsible party's HazMat contractor and call in other resources? | 4.2.1.8 | High | |
| 4.2.1.9. In incidents involving fatalities, is the Medical Examiner response clearly defined and understood? | 4.2.1.9 | Fair | |
| 4.2.1.9.a. Is there a procedure for early notification of the Medical Examiner? | 4.2.1.9.a | | No |
| 4.2.1.9.b. Is there a procedure for removal of the deceased prior to Medical Examiner arrival? | 4.2.1.9.b | | No |

| 4.2.1.10. Are there procedures in place for expedited accident reconstruction/investigation? | 4.2.1.10 | High | |
|---|-------------|-------------------|--|
| 4.2.1.10.a. Is the use of technology part of the reconstruction procedures? If yes, what technologies are used? | 4.2.1.10.a | | Yes- Total Station |
| 4.2.1.11. Is there a policy in place for removal of abandoned vehicles? | 4.2.1.11 | High | |
| 4.2.1.12. Is there a Policy and Procedures Manual with standard operating guidelines for responders? If yes, is there a process in place for updating the manual? | 4.2.1.12 | | No |
| 4.2.2. Responder and Motorist Safety | | Rating | Comments |
| Does the TIM program: | | | |
| responders and equipment in the roadway? 4.2.2.1.a. Is there a "move over" law in place? | 4.2.2.1.a | score for High | 4.2.2.1.a. and 4.2.2.1.b. below) |
| 4.2.2.1.b. Is it communicated to drivers? | 4.2.2.1.b | High | |
| 4.2.2.1.b.1. How is Move Over communicated to drivers? | 4.2.2.1.b.1 | | BLIC SERVICES ANNOUNCEMENTS, BILL BOARD SIGNS, NEWS PAPER, NFORCEMENT, AGENCY INTERNET WEB SITES, DYNAMIC MESSAGE SIGNS. |
| 4.2.2.1.b.2 Is it enforced? | 4.2.2.1.b.2 | | Yes |
| 4.2.2.1.c.1. In addition to internal agency-specific reporting, is information on responder injuries sustained during traffic incident response being recorded in a "responder struck-by database?" | 4.2.2.1.c.1 | No | |
| 4.2.2.1.c.2. In addition to internal agency-specific reporting, is information on responder fatalities which occur during traffic incident response being recorded in a "responder struck-by database?" | 4.2.2.1.c.2 | No | |

| 4.2.2.1.c.3. If yes to either/both questions above, who maintains the database? | 4.2.2.1.c.3 | | |
|---|------------------------|------|---|
| 4.2.2.1.c.4. If yes to either/both questions above, how is the struck-by information being reported? | 4.2.2.1.c.4 | | |
| 4.2.2.1.c. Comments | 4.2.2.1.c. Comments | | |
| 4.2.2.2. Train all responders in traffic control following MUTCD guidelines? | 4.2.2.2 | High | |
| 4.2.2.3. Routinely utilize transportation resources to conduct traffic control procedures for various levels of incidents in compliance with the MUTCD? | 4.2.2.3 | High | |
| 4.2.2.4. Routinely utilize traffic control procedures for the end of the incident traffic queue? | 4.2.2.4 | High | |
| 4.2.2.5. Have mutually understood equipmer providing responder safety? (Composite sco | | | ncy lighting procedures on-site to maximize traffic flow past an incident while h 4.2.2.5.d. below) |
| 4.2.2.5.a. Vehicle and equipment staging procedures? | 4.2.2.5.a | High | |
| 4.2.2.5.b. Light-shedding procedures? | 4.2.2.5.b | High | |
| 4.2.2.5.c. PPE used by responders? | 4.2.2.5.c | High | |
| 4.2.2.5.c.1. Which responders are using PPE? | 4.2.2.5.c.1 | | |
| 4.2.2.5.d. Pre-established, signed accident investigation sites? | 4.2.2.5.d | None | |

| Section 4.3 – Support – 30% | | 25.6% | |
|--|--------------|------------|---|
| 4.3.1. Data Collection/ Integration/ Sharing | | Rating | Comments |
| 4.3.1.1. Does the TIM program use a Traffic Management Center/Traffic Operations Center to coordinate incident detection, notification and response? | 4.3.1.1 | High | |
| 4.3.1.2. Is there data/video sharing between agencies? | 4.3.1.2 | Good | |
| 4.3.1.3. Does the TIM program have specific | policies and | l procedui | res for traffic management during incident response (Composite score of |
| 4.3.1.3.a. through 4.3.1.3.b. below) | | | |
| 4.3.1.3.a. Signal timing changes? | 4.3.1.3.a | High | |
| 4.3.1.3.b. Pre-planned detour and alternate routes identified and shared between agencies? | 4.3.1.3.b | Good | |
| 4.3.1.3.c. Opening/closing of HOV lanes? | 4.3.1.3.c | | No |
| 4.3.1.3.d. Ramp metering? | 4.3.1.3.d | | No |
| 4.3.1.4. Does the TIM program provide for interoperable, interagency communications onsite between incident responders? | 4.3.1.4 | Good | |
| 4.3.2. Traveler Information | | Rating | Comments |
| Does the TIM program: | | | |
| | n system pro | oviding in | cident-specific information? (Composite score for 4.3.2.1.a through 4.3.2.1.c |
| 4.3.2.1.a. Traveler information delivered via 511/ website? | 4.3.2.1.a | High | |
| 4.3.2.1.b. Traveler information delivered via mobile applications? | 4.3.2.1.b | Fair | |
| 4.3.2.1.c. Traveler information delivered through traffic media access to TMC/ TOC data/ information? | 4.3.2.1.c | Good | |
| 4.3.2.2. Are motorists provided with travel time estimates for route segments? | 4.3.2.2 | High | |

| National TIM Responder Training | Unscored for 2014 but will be scored beginning in 2015 | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| FHWA is offering the first national, multi-disciplinary TIM process and training program. The unique training for first responders promotes a shared understanding of the requirements for safe, quick clearance at traffic incident scenes; prompt, reliable and open communications; and motorist and responder safeguards. | | | | | | | |
| In order to encourage deployment of the TIM training program nationwide, the 2015 TIM SA will include a scored question on the National TIM Responder Training. In the interim, the following non-scored questions on the National TIM Responder Training were included for the 2014 TII SA cycle. If you are interested in hosting the National TIM Responder Training in your region, please contact Paul Jodoin at paul.jodoin@dot.gov. | | | | | | | |
| Are there trainers in your TIM SA region that have attended a | | | | | | | |
| National TIM Train-the-Trainer session or approved equivalent and are trainers? | Medium: Yes, but many of those trainers have yet to lead subsequent training sessions | | | | | | |
| If "High", how many National TIM Responder Training sessions have they taught in your TIM SA region? | | | | | | | |
| If "High" or "Medium", how many responders have been trained in your TIM SA region? | | | | | | | |