INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SOCIETY OF MARYLAND

To: Board of Directors

From: Keith Riniker

Date: April 25, 2014

Subject: Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Minutes of the ITS Maryland Board Meeting held on April 25, 2014 at Sabra Wang & Associates

Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ATTENDANCE
Board Members			
Diederick VanDillen	Jacobs Engineering, Inc.	diederick.vandillen@jacobs.com	X
Keith Riniker	Sabra Wang & Assoc.	kriniker@sabra-wang.com	X
Kevin Lee	Kittelson Associates	klee@kittelson.com	T
Richard Easley	E-Squared Engineering	reasley@e-squared.org	T
Adison Zoretic	JMT	azoretic@jmt.com	X
Eileen Singleton	Baltimore Metro Council	esingleton@baltometro.org	X
Eric Metheny	URS Corporation	eric.metheny@urs.com	
Gerry Amato	COHU HD	gamato@cohuhd.com	X
Hubert Clay	Total Traffic Network	HubertClay@TotalTraffic.com	
Jim McCullough	Elite Contracting Group	Jim.McCullough@elitecompany.us	
Neil Robinson	Century Engineering	nrobinson@centuryeng.com	X
Roger Boothe	CH2M Hill	Roger.BootheJR@ch2m.com	
Ruihua Tao	MD SHA	rtao@sha.state.md.us	X
Dwight Gordon	P.G. County Trip Center	dcgordon@co.pg.md.us	T
Liz Parrish	Montgomery County	elizabeth.parrish@montgomerycountymd.gov	
Sandi Dunmyer	Traffic Systems & Technology	sandi@trafficsystems.us	X
Jeremy Mocny	Whitman Requardt	jmocny@wrallp.com	X
Other Members			
Bob Winick	Motion Maps	RMWinick@motionmaps.com	X
Keith Hodges	Sabra Wang & Assoc.	khodges@sabra-wang.com	X
Robin Fish	Sabra Wang & Assoc.	rfish@sabra-wang.com	X

X – in-person, T - teleconference

Items:

1. **Welcome**
   The meeting began at 10:10 AM in the office of Sabra Wang and Associates.

2. **Minutes of February 2014 Meeting**
   The group reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting.
   a. Bob provided an overview of the initial draft.
   b. Feb. 28 – Change the location to the CATT lab at 10:00 AM.

c. Item 3, goal was to get 1 new chapter, not 1 at each.
d. Change DDOT to DelDOT.
e. Item 4, Change December to November board meeting/strike from item 4 as it is now in item 2.
f. Clarify in item 4 University of Maryland student chapter.
g. Clarification on item 17, 12:00 noon.
h. Diederick suggestion helpful to highlight action items in the meeting minutes – provide list of action items at the end.
i. Also can we get a copy of the meeting minutes prior so that we can take action on the action items.
j. Change Sandi's email to sandi@trafficsystems.us
k. Add HD to all COHU email addresses- gamato@cohuhd.com
l. Change Richard's email to reasley@e-squared.org

Eileen moved to accept the revisions to the meeting minutes. Sandi seconded the motion at 10:20 AM.

3. **Governance, Budget, Finance**
Ruihua gave a brief overview of the budget, indicating the budget projections look good currently.
a. Discussed the current payment for membership (2014) which is currently $11,450.00. We invoiced $17,050.
b. Keith passed out the current list of members that have paid and that have been invoiced but no paid. Keith indicated that all firms highlighted in yellow are those that have not paid their dues, and will be removed from the member list on the ITSMD website thus revising the 2014 membership list. The Board agreed. *Follow up: this was updated on the website*
   i. We will remove Delcan and CSC from the member list.
   ii. CSC indicated that they have a freeze on funds and will not be able to join. If they rejoin, they will as a new member (and will not pay past unpaid dues).
   iii. We should also remove AECOM as they have not paid for the last two years and have not responded to inquiries.
c. Should add WRA to the list and send Jeremy an invoice. *Follow – up: Carly sent the invoice.*
d. PG County has not received an invoice. ITSMD will send it to Dwight. *Follow – up: Carly sent the invoice*
e. Diederick indicated Ruihua should reach out to Carly to determine if we have been invoiced for 2014 insurance.
f. Diederick indicated Ruihua should check with ITSA to complete taxes.
g. Remind Carly to send the Telvent invoice directly to Marcelino. *Follow – up: Keith emailed Carly.*

4. **Awards & Nominating Committee**
a. Applications sent to the same 4 universities (Maryland, Howard, Morgan State, and Delaware) for the student scholarship.
b. Diederick, Keith, Richard, Eileen, and a couple of others on the selection committee.
c. Indicated our growth is expected to be larger than last year – we should go for the ITSA award. Then evaluate our accomplishments for the year to determine if we want to go after any other awards.
d. Do want to start doing a project of the year award?
   i. Award would give recognition at the annual meeting.
   ii. Could be a team award i.e. public agency, consultant, and vender who worked together.
   iii. This could be another way to reinforce that this is a partnership between public and private entities.
   iv. Bob indicated that at the national level this is already established, and we could possibly feed our award for the national award.
   v. Keith indicated he likes the idea, could help with membership if we require that only members can submit. (i.e. a consultant could submit for DDOT who is not a member).
   vi. Richard asked would this be something that would benefit the citizens of Maryland. What will the criteria be and what do we want to do with it after (keeping legislators in mind).

       vii. **ACTION ITEM - Diederick will follow up with a conference call to discuss purpose, scope, audience for the award.**

5. **Old Business**
   a. New Bylaws were approved by way of a poll conducted on Survey Monkey. The minimum number of votes were met; all voted in favor of adoption.
   b. Send a copy of the bylaws to ITSA. *Follow up: Keith emailed them to Tom Kern at ITSA.*

6. **Old Business**
   Legislative Tech Fair Report (handed out at the meeting and attached herein)
   a. Senator Forehand and Senator Robey have announced their retirement.
      i. Only senators are allowed to sponsor the event.
      ii. We will need to find new sponsors.
      iii. May have to wait until after the elections to find new sponsors (November).
         1. May want to start prior to the primaries concluding.
         2. **ACTION ITEM – Bala and Bob to begin reaching out and determining new sponsors.**
      iv. Sandi indicated that it was too crowded for the vendors. We had 21 vendors this year, possibly limit to 19/20 vendors next year.
         1. We should spell out what the intent of the event is specifically to the attending Universities.
         2. Perhaps have 5 people in the hallway.
         3. Could possibly move the registration table.
         4. By limiting the event it makes it a bit more exclusive which could be a good thing. It could also help with teaming.
         5. Next year, suggest limiting to 17-18 sponsor tables, as this is the maximum that can fit within the room.
      v. Gerry asked if a presentation (5 minutes) to give a general overview of what ITS is would be beneficial to the Senators, delegates, and aides.
      vi. Richard has over 90 pictures of the event.

7. **UMD Contract Support**
   a. **ACTION ITEM –**Keith's to mark up the contract and send to UMD.
   b. We expect them to have less of a role in the future.
   c. Expect main roles would be invoicing, mailings, send out emails, minor website updates to update content that the Board creates (such as list of new officers).
   d. Keith said that ITS MD Board would be responsible for doing the Eventbrite event setup.
   e. Could make it part of the contract that we would want on-site support (up to 2 days a year – one for the annual meeting, one for the legislative fair).

8. **Board Meeting Benefits**
   a. Richard's idea that Keith developed into the current proposal of a 50% discount on the individual cost to attend the Annual meeting was distributed (attached).
   b. Richard said that the Google calendar is difficult to determine when and how many events there are and as such it is difficult to plan for attendance at 50% of events. Keith will address this.
   c. Sandi questioned discount for exhibitors. Keith explained that the individual discount would be applied to the vendors cost.
   d. The Board, after some discussion agreed that the discount should only apply to the annual meeting.
   e. Motion to approve from Diederick
   f. Eileen seconded the motion.

9. **Discussion on Tuesday's Tech and Golf Event**

a. Only 19 people registered; some are only attending for Golf. Approximately 10-15 attending for the technical session.
b. Board agreed that 20 should be the minimum for 3 speakers.
c. We have 3 speakers, should we push the event due to low turnout.
d. Board recommended to cancel tech session, move golf to coincide with June 12th item. Reschedule the technical session to another date later in the year.
e. Keith will reach out to Roger to get these events postponed. *Follow-up: Keith emailed Roger.*

10. USDOT Event
Postpone discussion to subcommittee. **ACTION ITEM – Kevin Lee will discuss in a subcommittee meeting to be scheduled.**

11. Baseball Event
a. Subsidize the event more to provide more member value.
b. July 11 – Baseball game
   i. Same date as initially reserved with Hubert
   ii. Hubert is looking into reserving Museum space for the afternoon. Possible board meeting at museum
c. Pricing:
   i. Food is $200 facility fee + $20/person
   ii. Tickets range from $25-$45. Recommendation is $25 ticket. It's in the upper deck but right behind home plate. A large section of tickets are available.
   iii. About $50/person total.
d. Option as discussed:
e. ITSMD sponsored event.
   i. Members are $XX and family members are discounted at $XX.
   ii. Limited tickets available.
   iii. Board members and families first dibs.
   iv. Open it up to members – still at discounted price
   v. Then open it up to non-members. Non-member fees are at cost.
f. Proposal: Charge an average of $25 (lower for members and higher for family/non-members), the cost to ITSMD would be around $1500. Previous years ITSMD subsidized at $450-$500. So an additional $1000 of funds.
g. Discussed the subsidy.
h. Ask the budget committee regarding the subsidy
   i. Budged committee indicates we can increase to $1000
i. Board approved the increase in the subsidy
j. **ACTION ITEM – Kevin Lee will send out a pricing structure**

12. 2014 Annual Meeting/TRB Signal Forum
a. November 6th locked in for annual meeting, initial contract in with Maritime Center.
b. Discussed an idea of doing a day of training prior to the annual meeting date but decided not to pursue this.
c. Joint with the traffic signal forum.

13. ITE/ ITS MD Event Last Week at Morgan State University
a. Very well attended.
b. Dwight Gordon presented for ITS MD, and Diederick attended
c. One presentation from ITE.
d. Very good representation from Morgan State students.
e. Diederick recommend that we continue to do the event with ITE.

14. Communications Subcommittee Update
   a. Eric Metheny, the chair was not able to attend and this item was skipped.
   b. **ACTION ITEM –** Keith to follow up with Eric regarding production of the next newsletter.

15. Brief website update
   a. Draft logos were passed out.
   b. Richard, links should open to a new window.
   c. Change ITS Maryland Member Firms to ITS Maryland Members
   d. Forward any old newsletters to Yu-Ling Wang
   e. Eileen yellow text is hard to read, change to red? Keep with the Maryland flag theme.
   f. Richard, on the members page, include local contact information. The Board agreed to this.
      i. On new membership forms we could indicate a preferred point of contact.
   g. Discussion on the logo
      i. Must have the text INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SOCIETY OF MARYLAND in the logo since it is used for letterhead, on shirts, etc.
      ii. Most agreed the communication symbol (looked like a target symbol) was not preferred as ITS is broader than communication.
      iii. Could we add a roads to the map – ITS is about transportation. However, some said that ITS is not just about roads. *Response from Helen: On smaller versions (i.e. letterhead), roads may be too difficult to see, but will try to incorporate suggestion into next round of drafts*
      iv. Option 4 (see Figure 1) was preferred with some modifications, as discussed.

Figure 1: ITS MD Logo, Option 4

      1. Richard sent an image from DDOT (see figure 2) with the different modes of transportation. Some of the modes could possibly be incorporated into the logo somewhere.

Figure 2: DDOT Logo

      2. There was some discussion, about which of the modes of transport from the DDOT logo to possible incorporate into the ITS MD log. Ideas included car, light rail, truck, bus, airplane, and/or pedestrian, ship / port. There was general consensus about

including logos for car, truck, bus, Metro or Light Rail Transit Vehicle, and pedestrian. There was no consensus about including the port since ITS does not typically involve shipping, however, it does involve the Port of Maryland. There was general consensus that the airplane symbol should NOT be included.

3. If the symbols are included, or roads are shown on the state map, please make sure that it is readable on different typical formats.
4. There was a comment on the website regarding use of the color yellow and it was difficult to read. Please check to see if there will be similar difficulties with the use of yellow in the logo. However the choice of red is good.
5. Suggestion to expand the text encircling the logo so that it is longer and goes further around the yellow circle around the logo.
6. There was a comment about filling in the white space in the area within the circle – possibly color the bay area blue?

    v. Keith said that he will have logo out within a week. The Board asked to have one more round of comments on logo via email. Additional comments on website are due within the next week.

    vi. **Action item – send out via email, allow 3-day comment period, then send out 3 logos with online vote. Once the online poll is finished, the new website will launch.**

h. Keith suggested that CATT Lab, maybe Tom Jacobs should be the website administrator on record. Keith needs to first update the CATT Lab contract language then he will discuss with the CATT Lab.

i. Soft launch for members to review for 2 weeks, and then announce it to the public.

16. New Business

a. Eileen suggested that ITS MD participate in working with the state of Maryland to participate in some manner for the Connected Vehicle test-bed

b. Eileen will coordinate with FHWA and ITSA to see if there is a role for ITS MD to play to help encourage using Maryland as a connected vehicle testbed.

17. Meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM

18. Action Item List

Action Item	Responsible	Date to be Completed by:
Updated ITSMD website member list to reflect firms that have paid	Keith	*Completed*
Add WRA to member list and send Jeremy an invoice	Keith/Carly	*Carly sent invoice*
Send invoice to PG County/Dwight	Keith/Carly	*Carly sent invoice*
Determine if ITSMD has been invoiced for 2014 insurance	Ruihua	*No Date Specified*
Check with ITSA to complete taxes	Ruihua	*Completed*
Send Telvent invoice to Marcelino	Keith/Carly	*Keith e-mailed Carly*

Action Item	Responsible	Date to be Completed by:
Follow up with a conference call to discuss purpose, scope, audience for the project of the year award.	Diederick	*Completed*
Send a copy of the bylaws to ITSA		*Keith emailed them to Tom Kern at ITSA.*
Reach out and determining new sponsor(s) for Legislative Tech Fair	Bala and Bob	*In Progress*
Mark up contract with UMD and send out	Keith	*In Progress*
Reach out to Roger to get golf and tech events postponed	Keith/Roger	*Keith emailed Roger*
Discuss USDOT event in a subcommittee meeting (to be scheduled)	Kevin	*Completed*
Send out a pricing structure for Baseball Event	Kevin	*Completed*
Follow up with Eric regarding production of the next newsletter.	Keith Riniker	*Completed*
Send out new logo drafts via email	Keith Riniker	*5/2/14; Completed*

Report to the Board of Summary of Attendance at the ITS Maryland Transportation Technology Fair of March 19, 2014 at the Maryland Legislature

Overview: This report to the Board confirms what most of us felt at the Technology Fair last month – we were more successful this year in getting the officials and their aides to the Fair, particularly for House of Delegates members. We were also very pleased that we had the largest number of exhibitors this year compared to any prior year. In addition, we also had a number of non-ITS Maryland transportation professionals attend who were there to seek information and interact with the exhibitors – thus we also had some secondary outreach benefits from the event.

Below is a summary of acknowledgements, background to our evaluation, a synopsis of the key performance indicators, and recommendations for subsequent Transportation Technology Fairs.

Acknowledgements: The event was co-chaired by Bala Akundi and Bob Winick and able assistance in organizing for the event was provided by Sandi Dunmyer, Dwight Gordon, Tanya King, Eric Metheny, Liz Parrish, Keith Riniker, Eileen Singleton, and Diederick VanDillen. Graphic support was provided by Helen of Keith's office as well as support from Tanya's office. We greatly appreciate the combined efforts of the 21 exhibitors who participated this year in the time they took to prepare and to the 44 staff representatives of the exhibitors for the time and energy they put into interacting with the attendees. A list of the exhibitors is available.

Some 10 to 12 ITS members, including some from the Board, were in attendance and many helped during the event to escort attendees to various exhibits. In addition, we had many photographs taken by Timothy Hyman of SHA and by some others as well. We also want to make a special note of thanks to Jennifer Harrison, the ITS America Director of Membership, who was in attendance and who in an impromptu fashion helped us out at the sign-in table. We also appreciate our event-sponsor Senator Jennie Forehand, and her aide Christie Carlsen, who helped with securing the room and other logistics.

Background to the Evaluation: A summary "attendance spreadsheet" was derived mainly from the sign-in sheets and business cards that were collected from the 2014 Transportation Technology Fair of March 19. Our evaluation spreadsheet from the four prior years was updated with the new information and it is available by request from Bala or Bob. The spreadsheet was edited to account for some minor turn-over in new officials for specific districts, which are appropriately noted.

A challenge to the evaluation this year in particular is that we found it more difficult this year to get all attendees to either sign-in or drop-off their business card. While we knew that a good number of officials or staff entered the room without signing-in, we judged at the time that it was better to interact with them in the room at the exhibits than to try to get them to go back and sign-in. The impromptu assistance we had at the sign-in table did help us reduce the number of "walk-ins without signing in". However, we nevertheless supplemented the sign-in sheet with our collective recollection particularly of the officials who were there but who did not sign-in as well as reviewing the collection of photos helpfully taken by Timothy Hyman of SHA and others.

Summary of the Performance Evaluation Indicators: The following is a synopsis of our key indicators of performance
   Depth of Outreach:
   - **Senators**: 11 of the 47 senators personally attended this year that brought the cumulative 5-year total to 23 senators, or 49% of the total number of senators, which was an increase of 1 new senator attending for the first time

- **Delegates**: 27 of the 141 delegates personally attended this year, 15 of whom attended for the first time. That brought the cumulative 5-year total to 38 delegates, or 27% of the total number of delegates

Breadth of Outreach:
- **Aides to Senators**: 21 aides from 12 of the Senatorial Districts signed in and we did not make an effort to try estimating the number who attended without signing-in. However, in reviewing the number of distinct districts covered cumulatively over the past 5 years, that number increased by 2 to be 38, which is 81% of the total number of 47 districts
- **Aides to Delegates**: 35 aides from 28 of the house districts signed in and we did not make an effort to try estimating the number who attended without signing-in. However, in reviewing the number of distinct house districts covered cumulatively over the past 5 years, that number increased by 7 to be 90, which is 64% of the total number of 141 house districts

Additional Outreach Benefits:
- **Outreach to Non-ITS Maryland Members**: This year we had some non-ITS Maryland transportation professionals attend who were there to seek information and interact with the exhibitors. We also had one member bring his "boss" to help better familiarize the boss with ITS Maryland activities. Responses such as those are some secondary outreach benefits associated with this event.
- **Outreach to Other State Officials**: We also had some state officials attend who are not senators or delegates.

Recommendations for Future Transportation Technology Fairs: First of all we recommend that this event be planned again for next year. We still have a significant way to go to get higher proportions of attendance by the elected officials. A long term cumulative target could perhaps be two thirds to three quarters of the senators and 40 to 50 percent of the delegates. We have been fortunate to have rotating sponsorship by Senator Forehand and Senator Robey for many years now – however both have announced their retirements. One action for next year will be to seek out and obtain the support of one or two new senators to act as sponsors for our event.

Having a larger organizing group was beneficial and that approach should be used again next year with perhaps more delegation of specific tasks. Given the increasing importance to the activity of knowing who was there in attendance, the task group should plan more straight forwardly for having appropriate coverage at the sign-in table. Several options for doing so, such as, (a) paying for UMD support staff services, (b) seeking student chapter volunteers, (c) requesting volunteers from the organizing committee and/or Board to staff the table in set time-shifts of say one hour each, or (d) seeking donated services from sponsor-companies in lieu of a cash sponsorship payment.

We look forward to hearing the views of the Board members at the April 25, 2014 meeting.

2014 ITS MD Board Member Benefits Proposal

Date Approved: April 25, 2014

Board Members have a responsibility to be active members of ITS Maryland, which includes attending Board of Director meetings, ITS MD sponsored events, the Annual Meeting, participating on subcommittees, and other events throughout their 3-year term, and consistently on a year-to-year basis.

As required in the ITS Maryland bylaws, Directors shall not be compensated for serving on the Board.

Board Members are expected to attend these events, including paying for admission to these events.

As an expression of gratitude for their willingness to serve on the Board of Directors, expend time and energy promoting ITS Maryland, and for attending ITS Maryland events, it is proposed that:

- Board of Directors be granted 50% reduced admission fees for the individual rate to the ITS Maryland Annual Meeting

So that reduced admission fees are only granted to those Board of Directors that have performed their required duties, it is proposed that, in order to be granted reduced admission fees, that Board of Directors meet the following requirements on an annual basis:

- Attend at least 50% Board of Directors Meetings, and
- Attend 50% of ITS Maryland sponsored Events, such as Baseball, Lunch & Learn's, Spring Event, Training, Annual Meeting, Legislative Fair, and others as scheduled.

It shall be at the Board's discretion to forgive absences.

It shall be the responsibility of the ITS Maryland Secretary to keep a record of attendance at meetings.

draft option 1

draft option 2

draft option 3

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SOCIETY OF MARYLAND

draft option 4