

**ADC 50 Committee
Research Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
January 10, 2005**

Mark Edwards, Subcommittee Chair

Members of the ADC 50 Research Subcommittee met on January 10, 2005 at the TRB Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. At present, committee members include:

Mary Alfson (present)
Ira Beckerman (present)
Mark Edwards (present)
Terry Klein (present)
Hope Luhman (present)
Fenelle Miller (absent)

At the request of Acting ADC50 Committee Chair Tony Opperman, the subcommittee was asked to discuss and generate ideas for three topic areas: 1) annual meeting panels; 2) papers to be presented at the TRB annual meeting; and 3) topics for synthesis study.

Regarding item #3, an information brochure available at the annual meeting stated that the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) and the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) were actively seeking topics for the 2005 Synthesis Program. This year, NCHRP will select 12 new topics, and TCRP will select 5. These result in widely used reports on key topics in transportation. Ideas for study topics may be submitted by anyone or by any TRB Committee. Due dates are as follows:

NCHRP – January 31, 2005
TCRP - March 31, 2005

An electronic form, entitled “Suggest an NCHRP or TCRP Synthesis Topic” is available on the TRB homepage as:

<http://www4.trb.org/trb/synthesisn.nsf>

This site provides detailed information on this topic, a list of past and current synthesis topic areas, etc.

The following factors are considered in the selection process for new topics:

- Does the topic address a problem that is widespread and of general interest?
- Is the topic timely and critical?
- Is there sufficient information on the topic to warrant synthesizing what has been learned or what has been written?

- Is there ongoing or recently completed research that makes a new research effort unnecessary?

For more information, one should contact:

John Williams, Manager, Synthesis Studies
(202) 334-3245
jwilliams@nas.edu

Based on written ideas submitted by ADC50 Committee attendees, the following ideas were discussed and agreed upon for further evaluation:

Panel Presentations at TRB Annual Meetings

- Discussion of issue of National Register integrity of historic farmsteads – from geographic perspective (State of Georgia, Fort Drum, and Arizona mentioned);
- Review of legal court cases involving successful and unsuccessful definition of “Areas of Potential Effects” (APE) in the transportation project planning process (perhaps co-sponsored with TRB Transportation Law Committee?); and
- Review of new research on evolution of trails (pre-history through the automobile age). Would include discussion on different research approaches, which work best for different trail types. (NPS Trails office in Southwest mentioned as possible speaker.)

Refereed Papers – to be Presented at Future TRB Annual Meetings

- Presentation of results of Historic Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement Decision-Making Project (NOTE – This is current synthesis topic.);
- Successful re-use and marketing strategies for historic bridges;
- Transportation design/build projects that have unfortunately consequences for historic and archaeological properties;
- Review of legal court cases involving successful and unsuccessful definition of “Areas of Potential Effect” (APE) in the transportation project planning process (perhaps co-sponsored with TRB Transportation Law Committee?);
- How “Context-Sensitive Solutions” have affected the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) process.
- “Beating the Bulldozers” – completing archaeology prior to construction, within strictures of the NHPA and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); and

- Preserving historic values in the repair, rehabilitation, and reuse of bridges, roads, and other transportation facilities. Papers/presentations could illustrate processes for evaluating potential impacts or strategies, approaches, and methods for minimizing adverse effects. Examples could include strategies developed for adding bike paths to the historic San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. (Idea suggested by John Hinman, CH2M Hill; could also be synthesis topic.);

Synthesis Study Topics

- Review and compilation of public involvement “best practices” – from a Cultural Resource Management perspective;
- Compilation of materials regarding noise and vibration impacts to historic properties; overview of “best practices”;
- “Traditional Cultural Property/Place” (TCP) evaluation across the United States – within DOTs (State, Tribal), and FHWA. Would include examples on how to successfully integrate into NEPA scoping process. (Disseminate to SHPOs, DOTs, Tribes, and consultants.);
- “Tool Kit” for public involvement. (Perhaps involving members of TRB Public Involvement in Transportation Committee?);
- Historic context “Tool Kit” (recommendation from February 2004 “Working Conference on Historic Preservation in Transportation: Enhancing and Streamlining Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act,” Santa Fe, New Mexico. Project’s goal is to re-energize agencies/communities in the development and appropriate use of historic contexts;
- Compendium of special provisions used in construction documents for historic properties. (Results might be made available through Committee web page, or other Internet source.);
- Strategies for public involvement and preservation, with eye on Context Sensitive Solutions. Questions to be explored could include 1) is process changing how preservation is carried out?; and 2) if yes, how?
- Nationwide synthesis of historic bridge survey results.

The Committee also briefly discussed other ideas that might be more fully developed, and added to one of these lists in the future. These ideas focused on:

- 1) the care and management of archaeological collections, specifically how to pay for ongoing operation of these facilities, with differing directives from federal, state, and Tribal interests;

- 2) Evaluation of the effectiveness of geomorphological studies; and
- 3) Use of ground-penetrating radar and other remote-sensing technologies.

When the full ADC50 meeting reconvened, Mr. Edwards briefly summarized the results of this discussion, and noted that more detailed information would be made available within the full ADC 50 Committee report, which will be posted on the ADC50 Committee web page.

Mr. Edwards also discussed the need to try to capture the results of each ADC50 summer meeting, making this available to both meeting attendees, as well as others who were unable to attend each meeting. Hope Luhman noted that this issue had come up in the Sunday Strategic Planning meeting, with Ms. Luhman stating that it is relatively easy for her to burn CDs of meeting materials, making this available, on an individual per-request basis. As an alternative, Mr. Edwards noted that perhaps this information could be put on the ADC50 web page; Ms. Luhman pointed out that this is currently limited in overall size, and probably could not be accomplished. Mr. Edwards stated that he would speak to ADC50 Committee TRB Staff Representative Kimberly Fisher and determine whether this information could be made available on the TRB's web page (which presumably has no size limitation). The Research Subcommittee will report back on this topic at the Fall 2005 meeting in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Prepared by: Mark Edwards 1/12/05