

Traffic Incident Management (TIM) Program Self-Assessment 2009- Jurisdiction Summary

Location: Atlanta, GA

Overall Score: 60.3%

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 or 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%

18.4%

4.1.1 Formal Traffic Incident Management Programs

Rating

Comments

4.1.1.1 Is the TIM program supported by multi-agency agreements/memoranda of understanding detailing resource sharing (facilities, services, personnel and budget)?

Fair

4.1.1.2. Is there a process in place to ensure the continuity of these agreements/memoranda of understanding through integrated planning and budgeting across and among participating agencies?

None

4.1.2 Multi-Agency TIM Teams	Rating	Comments
Does the TIM program:		
4.1.2.1. Have a formalized TIM multi-agency team which meets regularly to discuss and plan for TIM activities?	Good	
4.1.2.2. Conduct training: (Composite score for 4.1.2.2.a through 4.1.2.2.c below)		
4.1.2.2.a. NIMS training?	High	
4.1.2.2.b. Training on the NTIMC National Unified Goal?	Good	
4.1.2.2.c. Other training?	High	
4.1.2.3 Conduct post-incident debriefings?	High	
4.1.2.4 Conduct planning for special events: (Composite score for 4.1.2.4.a through 4.1.2.4.d below)		
4.1.2.4.a. Construction and maintenance?	Some	
4.1.2.4.b. Sporting events/concerts/conventions/etc?	Some	
4.1.2.4.c. Weather-related events?	High	
4.1.2.4.d. Catastrophic events?	Good	

4.1.3. TIM Performance Measures	Rating	Comments
Does the TIM program:		
4.1.3.1. Have multi-agency agreement on the two performance measures 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?	Good	
4.1.3.1.b. Incident Clearance Time?	Good	
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?	Fair	
4.1.3.3. Have targets (i.e. time goals) for performance of the two measures?	High	
4.1.3.4. Routinely review whether progress is made in achieving the targets?	Fair	
4.1.3.5 Track performance in reducing secondary incidents?	Some	

Section 4.2- Tactical – 40%	26.9%	
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 allowing pre-designated responders to remove disabled or wrecked vehicles and spilled cargo?	High	
4.2.1.2. have “driver removal” laws which require drivers involved in minor crashes (not involving injuries) to move vehicles out of the travel lanes?	High	
4.2.1.3. use a safety service patrol for incident and emergency response?	High	
4.2.1.4. utilize the Incident Command System?	High	
4.2.1.5. have response equipment pre-staged for timely response?	Good	
4.2.1.6. identify and type resources so that a list of towing, recovery and hazardous materials response operators (including operator capabilities and special equipment) is available for incident response and clearance?	Good	
4.2.1.6.a. Is that list organized so that resources are identified and deployed based on incident type and severity?	Some	
4.2.1.7. have specific policies and procedures for hazmat and fatal accident response that also address maintaining traffic flow around the incident?	Some	

4.2.2. Responder and Motorist Safety	Rating	Comments
Does the TIM program:		
4.2.2.1. have "move over" laws which require drivers to slow down and if possible move over to the adjacent lane when approaching workers or responders and equipment in the roadway?	High	
4.2.2.2. train all responders in traffic control procedures?	Fair	
4.2.2.3. utilize transportation resources to conduct traffic control procedures for various levels of incidents in compliance with the MUTCD?	Fair	
4.2.2.4. utilize traffic control procedures for the end of the incident traffic queue?	None	
4.2.2.5. have mutually understood equipment staging and emergency lighting procedures on-site to maximize traffic flow past an incident while providing responder safety?	Good	

Section 4.3 – Support – 30%	15.0%	
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?	High	
4.3.1.2. Is public safety co-located with transportation in the TMC/TOC?	None	
4.3.1.3. Has the TIM program achieved TMC-CAD integration so that incident data and video information is transferred between agencies and applications?	Some	
4.3.1.4. Does the TIM program have specific policies and procedures for traffic management during incident response (i.e. signal timing changes, opening/closing of HOV lanes/ramp metering)?	Fair	
4.3.1.5. Does the TIM program provide for interoperable, interagency communications on-site between incident responders?	Some	

4.3.2. Traveler Information	Rating	Comments
Does the TIM program:		
4.3.2.1. have a real-time motorist information system providing incident-specific information? (Composite score for 4.3.2.1.a through 4.3.2.1.c below)		
4.3.2.1.a. Traveler information delivered via 511?	High	
4.3.2.1.b. Traveler information delivered via website?	High	
4.3.2.1.c. Traveler information delivered through traffic media access to TMC/TOC data/information?	High	
4.3.2.2. Are motorists provided with travel time estimates for route segments?	Fair	