Results of Review of Triennial Strategic Plan by Scope, Organization and Function Subcommittee of the Design and Construction Group Executive Board

*RATING RANGE: OUTSTANDING, EXCELLENT, GOOD, FAIR, AND POOR*

Comments and Ratings of Individual Members of SOF Committee

**AFF60**

Tunnels and Underground Structures

Year Due: 2010
Year Submitted: 2010

**Technology Transfer/Committee Interaction:**
Overall Rating Good

**Research Needs:**
Overall Rating Excellent

**Future Goals:**
Overall Rating Good
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 1

Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
No change in name or scop requested

Tech Transfer:
Good. The committee has been active in organizing sessions and workshops. Publication of papers has been lacking. At least one paper has to be published during the evaluation period. The membership is slightly tilted toward consultants, but it seems efforts are underway to diversify membership affiliation.

Research Needs:
Outstanding. The committee has been active in generating RNS. Two RNS have been funded developed into research projects funded by NCHRP.

Future Goals:
Excellent. The committee identified areas of concern and specified action plans in the short and long terms. Coordination with other TRB committees and outside TRB is emphasized in its future plan.
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 2
Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
Good

Tech Transfer:
Good

Research Needs:
Good

Future Goals:
Good - Committee's future goals are reasonable.
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 3
Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
The committee reviewed their name and scope statement over the period between November 2009 and January 2010; Thirty committee members agreed that the name and scope of the committee need not change.

Tech Transfer:
Fair to Good - met most of the minimum criteria except the committee did not have a publication; diversity of members is excellent, however, liaison activity is minimal; the committee did sponsor or co-sponsor a total of four TRB workshops; the committee did not published a TR Circular.

Research Needs:
Good to Excellent - met minimum criteria, however, the committee has a small number of RNSs in the committee's database; two RNSs have been selected for inclusion in the research program.

Future Goals:
Good - current and emerging technical concerns are identified but not explained in any detail; there is some discussion of cooperative efforts on cross cutting issues; lists of both short term and long term goals are provided but seem too general; the goals could be elaborated upon with more detail that provides a basis for measurement.
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 4
Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
Name and Scope reviewed - no changes proposed

Tech Transfer:
Good - Good attendance at meetings, 2 sessions sponsored/co-sponsored, 14 presentations at meetings; 3 papers reviewed; no papers published; 4 TRB workshops sponsored; geographic diversity skewed to NE; employment skewed to consultants; effective collaboration with AASHTO T-20.

Research Needs:
Good - 6 RNS developed and posted.

Future Goals:
Fair - a number of issues were identified and potential activities described in general terms. Potential collaborations should be identified and specific activities should be targeted to address these issues with planned sessions, workshops, circulars, and RNS or synthesis proposals.
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 5

Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
While required information is given, not sure why only two years are included.

Tech Transfer:
Fair. Meeting attendance is okay. There is a disparity between the number of sessions
sponsored/cosponsored, the number of papers reviewed versus the number of papers presented
and published. No explanation. They have sponsored/cosponsored two workshops. They do
recognize the imbalance both regionally and by discipline in their membership. They do have
good diversity in the membership. They show very little opportunity for interaction with other
TRB committees or outside organizations through their membership.

Research Needs:
Good. The write-up for this section is confusing. They show having developed 3 new RNS each
year, but only show a total of three posted. A couple have been funded, but the table doesn't
indicate submitting any for funding, and a couple of the ones shown as funded aren't, at least by
title shown in the listing of developed statements.

Future Goals:
Fair. A very general write-up of future goals with no real specifics as to topics or work plan for
accomplishing the goals.
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 6
Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
No changes proposed

Tech Transfer:
Fair. Minimal papers reviews & sessions sponsored. The low rating is due to no papers published or presented. Documentation on liason membership low.

Research Needs:
Good. Research needs table does not match descriptions. Funding details provided on topic but not shown in table. Synthesis topic counted in table but not provided in description. Number of new RNSs developed should be commended.

Future Goals:
Fair Concerns identified. Goals lack specific details
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 7
Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
GOOD - This committee did a review of their scope and name at each of the annual meetings which is great. There is a very brief listing of their previous TSP goals and objectives, but there was not a lot of substance there.

Tech Transfer:
EXCELLENT - Committee has been active at the Annual Meeting even coordinating with their AASHTO Technical Committee at Annual Meeting. They are receiving and generating a few papers on topic and issues but should look to generate more, sessions including workshops and sponsoring of specialty conferences are part of the committees work. This Committee is still a newer committee and their adaptation into the Transportation Realm is still being sorted out. This was helped along by the formation of the AASHTO Technical Committee. Distribution of committee geographically should be looked at as they are very heavy in North East US. Also the Committee is very heavy on consultants versus government and academia. It is unclear what cross-pollination there is between other organizations and committees and this should be added to make complete.

Research Needs:
EXCELLENT - This committee has done a great job generating new RNS and a single synthesis statement during this period. It appears this is an annual task and the committee is diligent with it. I believe that some of these statements were actually accepted for funding and if so this should be corrected.

Future Goals:
GOOD - The current and emerging goals and concerns are stated and the discussion could be more in-depth. There are both short and long term goals listed but there could be more information or more clearly organized thoughts in how to achieve these goals. Overall though the information is there.
Reviewer Name: Reviewer 8
Committee: AFF60, Tunnels and Underground Structures

Part 1:
No change in committee name or scope proposed. Reviewed in 2010.

Tech Transfer:
Good. This Committee has maintained a reasonable degree of activity with committee meetings, sponsored sessions, informal presentations, paper reviews, and published papers. It has good geographic diversity in membership, however next rotation should attempt to reduce the number of consultants and increase representation from federal, state, and local government. Well documented liaison memberships and collaborative efforts with other TRB committees and outside organizations. Need to publish a TR circular and/or special report and consider sponsoring/cosponsoring a workshop or specialty symposia.

Research Needs:
Excellent. This Committee indicates that 3 new RN statements were developed each year during the evaluation period. The titles were included in the TSP. Two research needs topics were selected for funding. More effort towards creating Synthesis Topics appears warranted.

Future Goals:
Fair. The short term plans and future goals are vague and non-specific, need to identify individuals/subcommittees, milestones, and timelines assigned to each goal. Some short-term hot topic goals with milestones should have been identified. There is little tie in with concerns requiring cooperative efforts. Additional effort required on preparation of circulars, state-of-the-art reports, etc.