

TRAFFIC INCIDENT MANAGEMENT				
Definition: Traffic Incident Management is the intersection of many different TSMO strategies to respond to and manage incidents on the roadways safely and efficiently. Traffic Incident Management can be implemented at any setting or location and involves high levels of collaboration between agencies. A maximized TIM program includes rapid detection and verification of incidents location and severity, quick response to the scene, safe management at the scene, and quickly clearing the incident to reopen the lanes. Each of these tasks can take many forms and includes various activities.				
	What is placing us in our current tier? • SCDOT manages the TIM program in the State. • The SHEP program covers all control-of-access roadways in the region 7 days per week, extended hours on weekends. • SHEP/DPS have regional TIM meetings with SCDOT, first responders, and public works agencies to discuss education, lessons learned, and challenges. • 511 Program provides capability for users to define commuter routes and time of day to receive notifications of atypical traffic conditions. • North Charleston Fire Department, City of Charleston Police, and potentially others use HAAS Alert Devices to alert travelers via Waze of an approaching emergency vehicle. • Charleston County, Dorchester County, and Berkely County Dispatch Centers use Alastar software to integrate data, manage incident response, and execute dynamic dispatching. • Some public safety agencies are capturing performance measures for incident duration and clearance times. • Quick Clearance legislation is in place. • Regional coordination meetings among emergency responders		What is keeping us from advancing to the next level? • The TIM program is currently focused on freeways and limited on arterials. • Limited performance measures used by agencies for TIM, except for local public agencies. • Limited data integration or coordination between agencies. • Video sharing is not in place between transportation agencies. • Alastar is integrating a lot of data, but not integrated between external agencies. • Traveler information data is not integrated so users may not get comprehensive trip information. • Limitations in the usefulness of data captured on crash reports. • Poor EMS coordination on clearing lanes on interstate after crashes • Lack of regular AAR meetings • Lack of peer exchange between local emergency responders and state-level agencies	
	Level 1 (Ad-hoc)	Level 2 (Managed)	Level 3 (Proactive)	Level 4 (Fully Collaborative)
Strategic	TIM activities are ad hoc, and no formal TIM program exists. Activities are reactive only. TIM activities are only independently funded from the operational budgets of partner agencies.	A TIM program has been established by a single agency with one or two key initiatives. TIM planning is mostly ad-hoc.	There is a multidisciplinary TIM program that meets at a semi-regular interval. The leadership is clear with routine participation from key agencies. TIM is included in regional transportation plans at a high level. Some activities are annually funded.	A formalized multidisciplinary TIM program is supported by dedicated staff, and routinely meets. There is a full-time position dedicated to the TIM program. Regional planning is routine and integrated. The TIM program is well-funded.
Performance Measures	Performance measures are not typically measured. Data are present but not accessible or useful. No performance targets have been established. Status quo is generally acceptable.	Some performance measures (RCT, ICT) are routinely measured. Some data is integrated but only for a small subset of incidents. Subjective or qualitative targets for RCT and ICT are established.	Performance measures are routinely measured and reported. Data is collected for a significant proportion of incidents. Quantitative, data-driven performance targets are established.	Performance measures are routinely measured, reported, and used to improve the system or region-wide outcomes.
Tactical	There is no authority removal law or driver removal law in place. There is minimal outreach and education. There is no formalized incident response program or procedures.	An authority removal law and driver removal law is in place but may not be ideally worded or complete. A simple SSP provides motorist assistance only along some major roadways based on volumes or incident frequency. Some consideration is given to incident response procedures.	An authority removal law and driver removal law is in place but may not be well understood or enforced. A mid-level SSP is in place that provides services beyond motorist assistance. Procedures for incident response are well-documented though not universally understood or followed.	An authority removal and driver removal law is integrated and utilized on a regular basis. There is a sustained and fully-functional SSP that provides motorist assistance, clearance and recovery services, and emergency traffic control assistance. Procedures for incident response are well-documented and adopted.
Support	Minimal investment is made into public safety agency coordination and incident monitoring. There is no preplanned alternate routing or support for signal timing adjustments. Detour planning happens on-scene and is based on responder knowledge of the area.	There is some video sharing with the public but no or minimal SCDOT access to CAD software and systems. There is some pre-planning for alternate routes.	Video sharing is available between agencies but not all agencies are aware. CAD information is viewed by the TMC on a dedicated system or monitor. A standard policy is in place for alternate routing and signal timing but might not be widely distributed or viewed.	TIM related data/video is routinely shared among all responding agencies. CAD data is electronically transmitted to TMC/TOC and can populate data fields in TMC/TOC software. Alternate route and signal timing policies are widely known, and comprehensive guides are followed.
Service Layer Actions to Advance to Next Level				