# **TRB Major Cities Committee Conference Call**

**July 11, 2016, 4pm-5pm Eastern**

## Welcome and Introductions – 10min

Steve Buckley, Committee Chair

Scott Fraser, City of Toronto

Stephanie Dock, District of Columbia

Andrea Hamre, Battelle

Trent Lethco, Arup

Trey Wadsworth, MassDOT

Matthew Roe, NACTO

Corinne Kisner, NACTO

Craig Toochek, NACTO

David Kuehn, FHWA

Danielle Elkins, CH2M

Ema Yamamoto, City of Philadelphia

Mike Jelen, AECOM

Daniel Worke, AECOM

Kelly Rodgers, Confluence Planning

Matt Kroneberger, NYC DOT

Peter Cafiero, NYC Transit

Jesse Koehler, Translink

Brian ten Siethoff, Cambridge Systematics

Catherine Cagle, City of Waltham

Eric Tang, VHB

Tom Boast, THB Advisory

Fred Dock, City of Pasadena

Andrea D’Amato, Kleinfelder

Prachi Vakharia

Monica Munowitch, SFMTA

Eduardo Maeyama, Kimley-Horn

\_\_\_, University of Arizona

\_\_\_, CDM Smith

## Sub Committee Reports – 20min

### Research (Wes Marshall)

Our paper call is up on the [TRB website](https://annualmeeting.mytrb.org/CallForPapers/Details/217) and on our [committee website](https://sites.google.com/site/trbabe30/blog/2017annualmeetingcallforpapers). There are several broad ideas included. We are interested in seeing what responses we get back and based on the papers, we will set up our sessions at the annual meeting.

### Communications (Stephanie Dock)

The new website is nearly there! There will be a blog with the ability to post and respond to comments. Stephanie put out a call for blog posters and once the site is up, they will begin posting. If you have ideas for posts or want to write a post, please contact Stephanie (stephanie.dock@dc.gov).

### Webinar (Ivana Tasic)

We have an upcoming webinar in September on vulnerable road users. We are bringing researchers and policymakers to talk about methods for screening high-risk locations, planning and engineering tools and countermeasures for improving safety, and the costs and benefits of investing in these improvements. TRB is putting on this webinar; more details to follow.

We put in an application to TRB to do a webinar about smart cities, following on all the great ideas that came out during the recent USDOT challenge. Even if we cannot get a webinar through TRB, we are still interested in talking about this topic during our committee meeting at the Annual Meeting.

### Annual Meeting Organizing Group (Aimee Jefferson, Jamie Parks, & Fred Dock)

We have applied to co-sponsor a number of workshops:

* Global Street Design Guide – Setting a New Global Baseline for Urban Street Design, co-sponsored with Geometric Design and Safety Management committees. This will be a workshop on the NACTO on Global Street Design Guide. This guide has international examples, broadening and deepening the prior NACTO guides. The workshop will unveil the new guide, discuss the multiple benefits of safe and sustainable street design, showcase global challenge & best practices, and facilitate a street design charrette to transform an urban street.
* Neighborhood Greenways – Applications, Research, and Effectiveness, co-sponsored with the Bicycle committee. Neighborhood Greenways (also called "bicycle boulevards", etc.) are growing in popularity as a tool for encouraging bicycle use on relatively low traffic streets without more dedicated bike facilities, especially as part of low-stress bike network planning. However, treatments vary and there is little research on the comparative effectiveness of specific elements, or which combine to have benefits greater than the sum of their parts. This workshop will explore the state of research and practice.
* Vision Zero - Pathways to the Safe City: Solutions for Prioritizing, Implementing, and Evaluating Vision Zero Programs, co-sponsored with the Bicycle committee. This workshop will explore Vision Zero programs throughout the US, getting into details on strategies for prioritizing, implementing, and evaluating Vision Zero programs.  Through small group discussion, we will also explore how Vision Zero programs have specifically impacted how city transportation agencies use data, prioritize investments, and design projects.
* Andrea D’Amato asked about a proposed workshop – there may be another co-sponsored workshop added to this list later.

We will not hear until later this later this summer which of our workshops have been accepted.

We will be developing the non-workshop sessions going forward – those are driven by the papers but also what the committee wants to hear about. We usually do a session with transportation department heads – last year was on failure, two years ago was on the first year on the job.

### Paper Review (Julia Salinas & Deb Lightman)

Deb Lightman sent an email last week to everyone who is on the paper review list from last year. If you do not respond to this email, we are going to assume that you would like to continue to review papers this coming year.  If you need to be removed, that’s okay.

If you did not get the email, do not worry – you can still review. We will be emailing the larger committee after this call and allow folks to sign up to be paper reviewers.

Paper review is a critical part of what it means to be a member and friend of a TRB committee, and is especially important as we move to elevate the research of urban transportation issues at the TRB annual meeting and throughout transportation research communities. So please participate and be timely in your reviews.

The timeline for reviewing:

* August 1st: papers are due
* August 17th: committee gets papers assigned by TRB
* August 20th: review coordinators will strive to have papers assigned to committee members and friends. You will get an email from TRB if you are assigned a paper.
* September 15th: your paper reviews are due

## Discussion of How to Review a Paper – 10min

Note that you do need to have a myTRB.org account set up – please create one now if you have not (and designate yourself as a friend of the committee when you do!)

The paper review process gets going on August 1st, the due date all TRB manuscripts. Committee paper review coordinators take these papers and assign them to at least three reviewers. Once comments are returned, the committee leadership, paper review coordination and TRB staff work together to determine which papers should be accepted for presentation and publication.

As the paper reviewer, you will be asked to make separate publication and presentation recommendations.

1. **Determine whether you are qualified to review a paper**. Only review a paper if you know enough on a particular topic to successfully review the paper. Don’t be intimidated by the title; give the paper a quick scan to determine if it’s within your area of expertise. ***Do this SOON after the paper is assigned to you*** *– if you cannot review it (too technical, not in your area of expertise, etc.), let the review coordinators know so they can reassign the paper!*
2. **Objectively review a paper for merit and don’t make the review personal.**The paper reviewer should be focused on reviewing a paper for originality, accuracy, and interest to TRB and its committees. Reviews should keep their comments professional and constructive.
3. **Avoid conflicts of interest.** Notify your paper review coordinator if there is any conflict of interest in reviewing a particular paper. As TRB uses a single-blind review process, authors are not anonymous. If you feel that you would have any personal bias, recuse yourself from the review process.
4. **Keep paper manuscripts confidential.** Manuscripts are confidential documents and as such you should avoid discussing the manuscripts or its findings with others.
5. **Support your judgment.**Review managers and the paper authors should be able to understand your basis for criticism.
6. **Please write comments explaining your numerical ratings in each area**. A couple of sentences in each box is generally enough, but please don’t just fill in the numbers. Many papers often end up with similar numerical ratings, so the paper review coordinators read through all of the comments fully as part of putting forward recommendations on which papers should be published/presented.
7. **Please think through each of the ratings individually** – even if you think a paper is good, avoid automatically giving a paper 5’s all the way across the board. If you think it does deserve 5’s across the board, make sure you explain why in the comment boxes.
8. **Call out similarities between this document and other published or unpublished work.**TRB strives to publish and present original research. Note any instances where the manuscript has been published elsewhere or submitted to a concurrent journal
9. **Don’t use or disclose any unpublished information without the consent of the author(s).** Receive permission from the author(s) and properly attribute the paper if you intend to disclose any information, findings, or interpretations from the manuscript.
10. **Call out any instances of plagiarism.** Notify the review manager if you have evidence of plagiarism or falsification of results.

One more note on the single-blind review process: please remember that just because the author does not know who reviewed their papers, it is not a license to be overly critical. The author will see the comments just as you write them, there is no editing process. Be critical where needed, but remember that is a real person receiving the comments at the other end.

Finally, please do not leave reviews until the very end – Labor Day is right before the due date, and we know you don’t want to be inside reviewing… It can take more than one read through a paper to properly review, so leave yourself enough time.

There are blog posts on our site from Raymond Chan for [first-time reviewers](https://sites.google.com/site/trbabe30/blog/firsttimepeerreviewjittersadvicefromonereviewertoanother) and Andrew Zaleweski on a [cheat sheet for reviewing](https://sites.google.com/site/trbabe30/blog/thecheatsheetforreviewingtrbpapers). TRB also usually holds webinars on how to review in the summer, which are good for new reviewers or as a brush-up for returning reviewers.

## Open Floor for Announcements – 5min

No announcements.