

## **MINUTES**

### **International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike Association**

#### **Board of Directors Meeting**

**August 22, 2014**

**(By Conference call)**

**IBTTA Board members present:** Buddy Croft, Andy Fremier, Diane Scaccetti, Mike Heiligenstein, Rob Horr, Samuel Johnson, Kristi Lafleur, John McCuskey, Peter Merfeld, Javier Rodriguez, Tim Stewart, Chris Tomlinson, Joe Waggoner, Cyndi Ward, Chris Waszczuk. **IBTTA staff:** Bill Cramer, Neil Gray, Pat Jones, Wanda Klayman. **Guests:** Rosa Rountree, Chair, Communications and Marketing Subcommittee; Richard Sommerville, Conrad Welzel.

#### **Call to Order**

IBTTA President Mike Heiligenstein called the meeting to order at about 11:05 a.m. The purpose of the call was to have a high level discussion on the progress of the work of the Communications and Marketing Subcommittee and the Governance Subcommittee.

#### **Election of New Honorary Members**

**There was a motion and second to approve a resolution to elect Jordi Graells and Neil Schuster as Honorary Members of IBTTA. The motion passed.** The two will be recognized during the IBTTA annual meeting in Austin in September.

#### **Summary of Presentation by Rosa Rountree on Communications & Marketing Subcommittee Efforts**

1 – Talked about the symbols that are being considered that will convey “this is national interoperability.” Group has narrowed consideration to 5 symbols. Thanks to Florida’s Turnpike Enterprise for their support in providing services of marketing firm (Beber) to the task. The short list of symbols will be shared by the subcommittee members within their regions of the country seeking a ranking of the five symbols; they plan to share the 5 symbols with the Steering committee in September.

2 – Pooled funds study discussion. An early issue of consideration was whether the IOP symbol should be submitted to and/or be compliant with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Maurice Palumbo, a member of the subcommittee, also serves as IBTTA’s representative to the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the entity responsible for maintaining the MUTCD. It has been suggested that financial support for testing a potential IOP symbol might be available through pooled fund studies (federal-aid funds pooled by the recipient states for research purposes). It may be possible to garner such support, which would be used with focus groups to determine if the proposed IOP symbols convey the intended message. The Subcommittee intends to recommend that the IBTTA Board consider earmarking funds for focus group testing (such contribution, from \$5,000-50,000,

would improve odds of receiving pooled-fund support) as well as funding for registering the proposed symbols (trademark).

Chris Tomlinson observed that you can append “TM” on the image at any time which notes that you are seeking registration. “TM” just means that you are claiming ownership. The R with circle around it [®] means that you have registered it with the federal government.

Bill Cramer noted that he has been involved in registering trademarks with U.S. Patent Office and observed that it’s not overly expensive, about \$1,000 apiece.

Rosa explained, “Our brand will go through the same process as the Nike Swoosh. We not only have the symbol but also need to have the name for the symbol.” “Interoperability” might not be the word we use to name it. The subcommittee has a list of 100 other possible descriptors which will also be shared with the regional folks for ranking.

The subcommittee is continuing to work on the communication plan. There is a draft infographic that is being edited in addition to a 2-page flyer. We want anyone who understands anything about tolling to understand what the symbol means, etc.

Question: Why wouldn’t the board be part of the focus group process?

Answer: We could include the Board; we are not limited by who should be in the focus groups. We want to be in the audience in these focus groups.

Question: the 5 symbols – who is making the final decision and when?

Answer: the Subcommittee will ultimately make recommendations to the IOP Steering Committee.

It was noted that a possibility exists that the pooled fund study could result in some symbol being identified other than those being considered internally. The Subcommittee’s view is that this becomes a question of governance, better addressed by the Governance Subcommittee.

### **Summary of Presentation by Samuel Johnston on the Governance Subcommittee Efforts**

The Governance subcommittee is the most recently established working group and is still getting basic issues sorted out. They are working on identifying specifically what elements need to be governed. What has to be maintained on a continuing basis that needs to happen to continue interoperability? Once we define those issues, then we can define the organizations that need to be involved.

Three elements have early consensus that they will need ongoing oversight:

- Protocol functional requirements: agencies and regions evolve and the protocol requirements will have to reflect this.

- File exchange: What data must be provided to allow other entities to complete transactions?
- The protocol itself may evolve: selection of the “national” protocol may change in the future.

Other elements/questions are more involved and consensus has not been achieved:

- Certification process for technical equipment: How do we know the protocols will work together? As agencies go to buy equipment, what assurance is there that the technology works? Who does the certification? The group envisions developing a descriptive document of the process and test procedures.
- Membership: how does an agency come along and say “I am part of national IOP”? What about new entities? We don’t want to create additional hurdles for agencies to come on board. We want to expand opportunities for tolling for transportation finance.
- Compliance with IOP: what to do if an agency is not accepting NIOP or payments – what enforcement mechanisms are needed? Is market pressure enough to enforce? – Topic of ongoing discussion.
- Branding: Once a national symbol is adopted there will need to be rules for appropriate use – literature and signage. This is still a topic in preliminary discussion – awaiting additional input for the Communications & Marketing Subcommittee.
- Transaction fees: there is a major disconnect between agencies that do and those that don’t charge them. What will the future be?

The Governance Subcommittee has established liaison with the other subcommittees and the group has noted multiple documents generated by the other groups that make reference to “Governance.” We are working on that and don’t want to have any gaps.

People also have sensitivity about the role of USDOT. Is that a path we want to go down? It could have strings attached and unintended consequences that we don’t want to have. What is the cost to have a national body? We’ve had a voluntary effort so far. This discussion continues to evolve. What we start out with may need to adapt. We may need to loosen or tighten certain things.

Kristick: The IOP Steering Committee will be reporting out issues from the subcommittees for the Board of Director’s consideration. Dave anticipates holding a teleconference of the Steering Committee before the Austin annual meeting to clear material for the board.

The IOP Steering Committee will request IBTTA board action on:

- Nat’l Interoperability Protocol (NIOP) Requirements documents from the Roadside Subcommittee;
- Business rules assembled by the Back Office subcommittee. The subcommittee is still reviewing comments offered since San Diego. Intellectual property counsel has also been engaged to review aspects of this.

Rosa Rountree intends to recommend that the Steering Committee ask the IBTTA board to consider providing funds to support the pooled fund study and trademark registrations.

The call adjourned at 12:05

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick D. Jones  
Executive Director & CEO