



**BALTIMORE REGIONAL OPERATIONS COORDINATION SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Local Agency Representatives**

**SHA State Operations Center (SOC) Training Room**

**7491 Connelley Drive, Hanover, Maryland**

**October 1, 2008**

**10:00 A.M.**

**ATTENDEES**

Tanya King – Daniel Consultants, Inc.  
 Chris Letnaunchyn – Carroll County DPW, Bureau of Engineering  
 Larry Mabe – Harford Co EOC  
 Donna Nelson – Daniel Consultants, Inc.  
 Edward Sherlock – Annapolis Emergency Mgmt  
 Eileen Singleton – Baltimore Metropolitan Council

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:** Chris Letnaunchyn called the meeting to order at 10 A.M.

**TODAY'S MEETING OBJECTIVES:** The primary objectives of the meeting were to discuss the needs and roles of local agencies in the B-ROC Committee, and if the committee should set up meetings with key incident management and response stakeholders within local jurisdictions to explore how B-ROC can best meet their needs.

**[Handouts: Agenda]**

**BROC Today:** Eileen Singleton made a presentation prepared for the ITS MD Annual Meeting. The presentation described the mission, roles and objectives of B-ROC, and the status of recent and on-going B-ROC efforts.

**[Handout: Baltimore Regional Operations Coordination Committee: Where are we? Why are we here? and Where are we going?]**

**GROUP DISCUSSION – Local Jurisdiction Perspectives:**

- B-ROC has an important role to play in the region; however, the needs of local agencies and how they participate in B-ROC can be different than those of state-level agencies and/or local agencies who are more frequently involved in multi-agency response in corridors along I-95 and I-695.
- Information/activities during bi-monthly B-ROC meetings are often not that relevant to representatives that local agencies send to B-ROC meetings. They may not see the connection to their job or to their traffic incident management (TIM) activities.
- While agencies in the vicinity of the interstates may send representatives to meetings, jurisdictions with fewer miles of interstate may not think the meetings are as relevant for them.
- If local agencies can send one person to B-ROC Committee meetings, that person can serve as a point of contact to disseminate information to the right people within their jurisdiction, and communicate the interests and needs of others in their jurisdiction back to the B-ROC Committee.

- Needs of all TIM agencies have been evolving, and the types of outreach activities they need are different now than they were several years ago. Some agencies with more turn-over of staff (perhaps like volunteer fire agencies), may need different kinds of activities than those with more stable staffs.
- Most local jurisdictions are likely to have regular meetings that provide opportunities for representatives from local agencies to interact and build relationships with their peers in other agencies. The meetings/ways in which interaction takes place may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but the specific way in which this interaction takes place may not be that important.
- One role B-ROC might play is to help local agencies build “peer-networks” within their jurisdictions or provide opportunities for them to network with their peers in other jurisdictions. This could be particularly valuable for staff that may not have these opportunities on a regular basis. For example, supervisors and managers are likely to have more opportunities than maintenance personnel to network with their peers in other agencies/jurisdictions to build relationships. Specific needs in this area should be explored with local agencies.
- Agencies (like volunteer fire departments) with more turn-over of field staff might benefit from help to ensure that information about resources and best practices is passed on to new staff, and to help new staff develop and maintain valuable relationships with their peers in other jurisdictions.
- Indirectly, participants also noted that the “needs and interests” of TIM agencies in “less urban” areas or those not adjacent to I-95 and I-695 may be different.
- Reduced budgets are causing local jurisdictions to cut back so B-ROC activities might be able to help address the items that are getting less funding.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

- Participants encouraged B-ROC to approach local jurisdictions to organize discussion sessions about TIM coordination to explore practices in those jurisdictions and what their needs and interests are.
- B-ROC should try to identify a few (one to three) people who may serve as “champions” who will help to identify the key stakeholders who should be involved, and to define an agenda that addresses local issues and needs. For example, roles and relationships of SHA Districts/local shops may be different across local jurisdictions. The local jurisdiction can decide who should attend these meetings (i.e., some may want their SHA Resident Maintenance Engineer and others may not).
- Some local jurisdictions may feel that things are “working just fine” and that no special, new efforts are required. This may be because they have made significant progress in the areas of TIM coordination and cooperation that they have been focusing on over the past few years; and opportunities for further improvement may not have been identified yet.
- Hold forums that explain the roles of each agency and why they do what they do.
- Where (with which jurisdictions) would we like to start?

#### **IDEAS and LESSONS for BROOC:**

- Most TIM coordination efforts have focused on larger-scale incidents; which in most cases, are being handled very well. There may be opportunities for improving response to smaller

incidents. While improvements for each minor incident may be small, the large number of these incidents means small improvements can add up.

- Local agencies might benefit from activities that can help them raise awareness of the importance of TIM and build the support they need from the public and elected officials; or from higher-level managers. Clearly communicating the needs and benefits to the right people can help them obtain the support and resources agencies need. B-ROC could support these efforts a number of ways that could include from sharing best practices and helping to draft materials that can be used as a resource in communicating the importance of TIM and TIM training with decision-makers.
- Awareness of the need to address the safety of responders (and the traveling public) during all stages of TIM is getting increasing attention. This topic should be of interest to all agencies, regardless of where their jurisdiction is located.
- The minutes of the meetings should be reformatted to highlight key points for a broader audience.
- Focus on educating / getting support of manager decision-makers, who develop the programs, rather than elected officials.

**NEXT MEETING SCHEDULE:** The next full meeting of the B-ROC Committee will be held on **Wednesday, December 3, 2008**, at the SHA Hanover complex, Building #4 (New Building).