

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. TRB 2009, Washington, DC

Attendees: Jeff Arey, Tom Brahms, Phil Caruso, Frank Dolan, Paul Eng-Wong, John Kennedy, Siva Narla, Hibbett Neel, Pat Noyes, Andrew O'Brien, Amir Rizavi, Don Samdahl, Sagar Sonar, Ken Voight, and Robert Wunderlich

Minutes Recorded By: Amir Rizavi

Location: Suite 8219, Marriott Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Date and Time: January 11, 2009; 10-11:30 am

John Kennedy commenced the meeting at 10 am by welcoming everyone and thanking all for attending. He circulated the agenda and a package that included names of the member firms. John and Pat Noyce then informed the Council that the Coordinating Council is involved in a lot of activities and is working on developing an action plan (goals, objectives, etc.) for the various Councils. The emphasis will be lesser on technical details and more on why the Councils exist. The next step would be to discuss priorities from the action plan. The Coordinating Council is also developing plans to improve product delivery (webinars, etc.). Another focus was Energy and Climate Change initiatives which are examples of subjects being tackled by representation from all councils.

The next agenda item was a summary report from various Standing Committee Members

1. Policy and Legislative - Hibbett Neel

Although the committee has not met yet, Hibbett expects that the focus of the discussion would likely be on Reauthorization. Tom Brahms added that traffic signal timing is an important issue that needs to be on the stimulus package. The idea would be to solicit factual information so that ITE can come up with number of technicians or engineers needed. The ideas behind pushing this issue are: to keep people employed; save power; change clearance intervals to account for walking speeds of the elderly or physically challenged; replace first generation LEDs with second generation LEDs; increase savings in fuel; reduce climate impacts; etc.

2. Ethics Task Force - Jeff Arey

The task force has not yet met but they are trying to come up with additional ideas to keep ethics relevant. The conversation circle at the Anaheim meeting was well attended by different agencies. Tom added that Robert Nairn would like to add an Ethics perspective from Australia. He has a lot of international practice and would be looking at Ethics from a contextual standpoint. John requested that Jeff continue on the committee and Jeff agreed.

3. SCORP (Standing Committee On Recommended Practices) – John Kennedy

The timing of Recommended Practices and handbooks, and tying everything together was discussed. John wondered if Hibbett could serve on this committee. Hibbett agreed so now Don and Hibbett would represent this committee on behalf of the TCC.

The next discussion topic was ITE's revisions to the evaluation of opportunities for externally funded projects which was a follow-up summary by John from the August 17, 2008 meeting. This issue came about when VHB found itself in competition with ITE on a solicitation from Easter Seals. This issue has been resolved. As per the email from Phil Caruso dated December 4, 2008:

- ITE would be pursuing project-related contractual arrangements only on a sole-source basis.
- If and when approached, ITE may serve as a subcontractor to any prime contractor only on a non-exclusive basis with the same services to be provided to anyone else expressing an interest in having ITE on its Project Team.

The 2009 Standing Committee Members were then appointed by John and are as follows:

Jeff – Task force on Ethics

John – Policy and Legislative

Hibbett – SCORP Amir – Technical Program Committee

Don – Energy and Climate Change (Hibbett was also going to ask the chair for inclusion.

John then commenced the discussion on the potential reorganization of the TCC. He started off by providing some thoughts on the direction that he was thinking in.

- Member firms should really be getting more benefit for the dollar value they pay.
- The TCC needs to develop webinars, especially in the field of ethics and needs to do more of these to keep the funding coming in and keep the membership costs lower. Tom indicated that the one problem with Ethics is the lack of definition of content. The best way to do this would be to get people to come together for a day and get some productive content.

John also noted that there was an increase in membership to the Council. The membership is now at about 150 firms as compared to 99 firms last year. He then reiterated what was previously emailed by Hibbett on the reorganization issues. He was also curious on how the funding would work.

Tom then explained his idea or thinking for the need to do the reorganization:

- Consultants form more than 50 percent of the ITE membership. The non-technical sectors may not be represented and it is important to get the interest from a non-technical perspective? Do we have a mechanism that could address the non-technical aspect?
- The ITE Board has changed and participation in the Board has changed from what it previously used to be.
- In terms of funding, about \$22,000 comes from the TCC in the form of annual dues.
- It is difficult to find peers on a local level from the online directory. There is a need to have a consultants' directory that people could have access to. The objective would be to engage consultants at all levels and truly get input at all levels.
- Having representation from educational institutions, or research and education is another sector that is not represented.
- Having a TCC Executive Council member sit on ITE's Board or on the Coordinating Council would be beneficial to the TCC.

John indicated that the general feedback from the council in terms of the reorganization was mostly positive. Jeff added that in the past, the objective of the TCC was to try and see how the smaller firms could have more exposure; however, with mergers and acquisitions, this has changed. Then, for the last couple of years, the focus of the Council was webinars, etc. Last year, the Council membership dropped to 99 firms. Jeff felt that there was a need to look at how the overall business is being conducted now. A lot of business is conducted by non-engineers; they are tied to the business aspect as opposed to the technical aspect. So, we need to look at what we can do differently as a Council. We need to be providing a value to our member firms; re-focus our operation. He felt that the Council should not go

away but should try to find a niche and follow up with it....the Young Scholarship Award recipients need to be brought back to get benefit out of them. If we don't do all of this, there is a fear of losing members to other organizations such as ACEC or ASCE.

Tom indicated that the Council needs to define objectives and needs a tool to truly understand how to become relevant to members. How could the TCC achieve the marriage between firms and prospective clients? Robert Wunderlich talked about an RFP that he sent to the list on the online directory provided on the TCC's website but expressed that it would have been nice to know what the firms do. He felt the need make it easy to find out what firms would do.

Don wondered if non-North American firms were on the TCC's list. Andrew O'Brien added that VicRoads maintains a consultant register/database which makes it easier to search for consulting firms. The firm needs to be pre-qualified in order to be on the list.

Pat recommended that the structure of the Council is irrelevant and the focus needs to be on purpose. The question to be asked is do we need a Consultants Council and why? Tom reiterated that the need of the consultant members within ITE should be kept in mind. Hibbett suggested that maybe we should do a needs assessment to which Tom expressed that if this is done in the form of a survey then this survey needs to be structured really well. Jeff added that it also depends on who responds to the survey - executives or engineers? Hibbett and Robert stressed on the importance of training needs, and Sagar Sonar impressed the need to keep newer firms in mind. Phil Caruso added that nevertheless, the emphasis needs to be on focus.

The Action Items coming out the discussion included:

1. John mentioned that at ITE's Technical conference in Phoenix, the TCC should develop an overall purpose and mission statement. The Council should go through and solicit feedback from current councils as well as from about 100 firms to see what they are looking for. At the Phoenix meeting, the Council needs to convene for a meeting in addition to the regular Executive Council meeting. This is the only way for the Council to focus and come up with the mission statement.
2. Tom questioned if the Council would support and co-fund to bring a group together for the Ethics issue that was discussed earlier. The Council agreed to do this. Ken also reminded everyone to keep the non-US firms in mind.
3. Tom wondered if membership to the Council should be made free to all consultants as a starting point. However, Jeff, John, Amir, Hibbett and Ken felt that the Council should keep a status quo for now until there is further discussion and a better idea within the Executive Committee of the direction in which the Council is headed.

No new business items were discussed. The next meeting will be during the ITE Technical Conference in Phoenix, AZ (date and time to be decided). The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.