

**TRT Subcommittee Teleconference  
February 26, 2009  
TRT Principles Draft**

Andy Everett, Seyem Petrites, Bob Cullen, Rita Evans (recorder)

1. The subcommittee notes that the “Comments to the TRT Principles Document” (November 2008) and “Additional Comments from the TRT Subcommittee” (January 2009) all were approved by the subcommittee at its January 13, 2009 meeting. NTL needs to incorporate all of these into the draft *TRT Principles*.

In particular, the subcommittee notes the following from the “Additional Comments”: “Suggest adding a Section between Section 2: Foundation, and Section 3 Scope, that describes the management, maintenance and ownership of the TRT. Describe the roles and responsibilities of the NTL, the NTL’s TRT Team, the TRB and the TRB LIST TRT Subcommittee. We understand some of this is still to be discussed.”

NTL should contact Andy, Bob, Seyem or Rita if there are any comments, questions or need for clarification.

2. The revisions by NTL to the draft *TRT Principles* and the draft *TRT Development and Maintenance Procedures* (3 February 2009) will be reviewed for possible approval at the TRT Subcommittee meeting in July 2009. Rita has sent NTL comments on the *TRT Development and Maintenance Procedures*.

3. NTL should compare the TRT Glossary ([http://trt.trb.org/trt\\_glossary.asp](http://trt.trb.org/trt_glossary.asp)) of back-end terms, the ANSI/NISO standard, and Transport Canada’s glossary ([http://search.tc.gc.ca/thesaurus/about\\_e.htm#1](http://search.tc.gc.ca/thesaurus/about_e.htm#1)) and forward suggestions for additions to the TRT Glossary to the subcommittee for review and possible approval.

4. NTL should use approved term “Used for” rather than “Lead in.”

5. *TRT Principles*, Section 4, Structure – Scope notes and definitions for new terms will be proposed by NTL and reviewed for approval by the TRT Subcommittee once NCHRP 20-79 is complete.

6. *TRT Principles*, Section 6.1.1 – Add “national and international thesauri” to the list of sources.

7. The document *TRT Development and Maintenance Procedures* will be attached to the *TRT Principles* document as an appendix.

8. The subcommittee reviewed Michael Kleiber's comments which provide historical background and perspective; they do not require further action.

**TRB 88<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting  
TRT Subcommittee Meeting  
January 13, 2009  
Hilton Hotel, Chevy Chase**

*EXCERPTS FROM DRAFT MINUTES, recorded by Rita Evans*

3. TRT Principles document draft

Discussion of this document began at the previous subcommittee meeting. Previous comments can be found in “Comments to TRT Principles Document” and comments from Lexicographer Michael Kleiber.

3 Scope

Note comments from Michael Kleiber regarding following LCSH practice. Kendra Levine asked about implications if we continue to use LCSH. The scope session doesn't note what the TRT is used for, or why, and something should be added regarding its domain. Sandy Tucker has written some language for problem statements related to how the TRT is used that may be applicable; she will send that text to Bob Cullen. Is the scope beyond transportation? If so, to what extent? The scope is already beyond research since it covers many practices.

Glossary – Batty and Associates are adding definitions under contract; no one else should be adding any definitions.

Paul Burley – Where are instructions for use of lead-in terms? In Report 450? Note that the correct term is “Used for” (UF) rather than “Lead-in.”

Andrew Meier observed that thesaurus is a fabulous tool for educating people. If you're new to a discipline, can be excellent way to orient someone to discipline or some aspect of it. Ontology can help in terms of grasping concepts – pretend you're writing a book for someone completely unfamiliar with field. Indexing is a way to tell a story.

4 Structure

Scope notes are being handled by panel. There are scope notes for all facets except Facet X.

5 Term Suggestion

Suggestions gathered from candidate terms (TRB indexers, TLib contributors) and considers new uncontrolled terms along with list of most used uncontrolled terms for that month. NTL looks at search logs. There are various TRT suggestion forms; noted difficulty in finding suggestion form on NTL website.

### Section 6 Term Selection

Paul suggested adding “national and international thesauri” to list of sources to 6.1.1 and subcommittee agreed.

Section 6.3 –Keep language as written.

Section 6.4.3 – Paul asked if Use For (aka lead-in) terms will be qualified if they’re acronyms – should they be spelled out? Barbara Post noted that acronyms are spelled out in their first use within an abstract. Sandy suggested that we look at NISO standard and then determine if we need to change current practice.

Amanda Wilson said NTL plans to include scope notes for all new terms. Adding them to existing terms is not planned.

Rita Evans asked if the subcommittee agreed to all of the comments in the “Comments to TRT Principles Document.” The subcommittee confirmed that all of these items were agreed to, and the comments document is to be appended to these minutes.

## Comments to TRT Principles Document [November 2008]

Entire document:

1 “I would also include a section on Domain Analysis and definitions for each of the top term facets. This will assist us in determining whether a term belongs in a certain facet or not.” (Andy Everett) –

*Kim’s Comments:*

*I think this is a great idea. There are contractors currently creating definitions of all the terms in the TRT. I’m not certain when that project is due to be completed, but perhaps this can be done in the next version of the Principles document?*

*Subcommittee response:*

*There are scope notes for each facet within the NCHRP Report 450. This group feels that since the scope notes are circa 2001 that the subcommittee and NTL may want to review them for currency. Reviewing these definitions are currently not within the scope of NCHRP Project 20-79.*

*Kendra Levine at UC Berkeley has been conducting domain analysis on Facet X: Information Organization as a part of her work on Intelligent Transportation Systems. She will have a paper ready for review by the subcommittee meeting in January.*

“I think a glossary would be helpful at the end of the document. A combination of what is contained in the Glossary of NCHRP Report 450 (TRT and User’s Guide) (see pg. 57) & the definitions contained in the Transport Canada Thesaurus (see [http://search.tc.gc.ca/thesaurus/about\\_e.htm#1](http://search.tc.gc.ca/thesaurus/about_e.htm#1) - under "Thesaurus Structure and Display - Definitions") would be useful.” (Seyem Petrites).

*Kim’s Comments:*

*I think a glossary is a great idea – maybe this could be rolled into the next version too?*

*Subcommittee response:*

*Agreed. See accompanying sample Glossary that could be used as a starting point*

Section 3 (Scope):

- “For WSDOT data the US Board of Geographic Names is the sole source for geographic names for our data. It replaces the FIPS 55 codes that were used for Cities and County names. So for WSDOT it is the preferred source. I would suggest that State DOTs check with their technology departments to find out what source that they use. All FHWA HPMS data use the Geographic Names Information Service from the USBGN which all state DOTs are required to report.” (Andy Everett) –

*Kim’s Comments:*

*-I think this may be a misreading of the paragraph. We’re mostly just saying that we don’t provide geographic names and that we recommend they find a good source for them. We mentioned two of the larger sources for names in the paragraph, but the organizations using the TRT are welcome to use any geographic name source that works with their collection*

*Subcommittee Comments:*

*Editorially this is fine. At end of second paragraph, United States Board of Geographic Names should read “United States Board on Geographic Names”.*

Section 5 (Term collection):

“Warrant should be under term selection. From a collection standpoint, with a web based form open to anyone, we have no control over whether the submitter is using warrant or not. So we cannot say for certain that any collection is done with deliberate warrant. We can infer it but we can say that it is so. ANSI/NISO talks about warrant in

reference to selection not collection. In this section we should include our procedures for term submissions and other collection methods” (Andy Everett) –

*Kim’s Comments:*

*I’ve left all of Andy’s comment in here because although I agreed with Andy that the warrant sections should be moved to the Term Selection section of the paper, and did so, this has left the Term Collection section empty. I liked his idea that we include guidelines for term submission, but I believe the committee is still finalizing those at this point, so these should be included once they’ve been agreed upon.*

*Subcommittee Comments:*

*Agreed. When the NTL and the TRT Subcommittee as a whole have finalized the Submission form, the forms along with a narrative about the submission process should be included.*

Section 6 (Term selection):

*“As lead-in terms are so woefully underrepresented, does a specific section stating that lead-in terms are a target area need to appear? Or is that a committee focus and need not appear in the principles document?” (Amanda Wilson)*

*Kim’s Comments:*

*I think this is more of a committee focus.*

*Subcommittee Comments:*

*Agree with Kim’s comments. The focus for this document is long term guidance and policy. Projects or areas of need should be within another document.*

*“It might be helpful to have some goals/guidelines regarding the rate of growth of the TRT, as that could impact decisions involving specificity and completeness. If the idea is to be somewhat conservative in order to keep it manageable, we need to start relying more heavily on the use and addition of lead-in (non-preferred) terms. I think most of us are in agreement that the TRT is insufficient in this area.” (Pat DeSalvo)*

*Kim’s Comments:*

*I agree across the board on this statement. I think that the rate of growth is more of a committee decision than a policy decision though. Given that there seem to be a growing number of these sorts of issues coming up (i.e., the committee-specific issues), perhaps some sort of document of intent could be written from the committee’s standpoint?*

*Subcommittee Comments:*

*Agree that this issue should be addressed by subcommittee*

Section 6.2 (Ambiguity and qualifiers):

- *“This only addresses one such example of using parentheticals We also need to address the use of parentheticals where the concept is the different i.e. Crane(Animal), Crane(Mechanics).” (Andy Everett)*

*Kim’s Comments:*

*This section addresses that already; the explanation provided reads “Ambiguity occurs when a word or a phrase describes more than one concept. In such cases, qualifiers are added to assign context to the terms”*

*“Additionally, we need a rule on what the term should be in the parenthetical. My suggestion is the term is the name of the facet that it is in.” (Andy Everett)*

*Kim’s Comments:*

*This is something that will ultimately be a committee decision, but I think it would create unnecessary complications in regards to term selection. I agree that rules as to parenthetical choice would be helpful to the selectors, but I*

*think that requiring that the name comes from the facet name would severely limit the parenthetical's usefulness as a clarification tool.*

*Subcommittee Comments:*

*Agree on both comments about this section. It may be beneficial to include the section about ambiguity from the ANSI/NISO standard here to reinforce the idea. We suggest that a subsection on qualifiers be written to give guidance on how to use them. Additionally, we suggest separating the last paragraph in the section to another subsection and clearly describe polyhierarchies. Not all within the TRT Subcommittee are familiar with its meaning and impact to the TRT.*

## **Additional Comments from the TRT Subcommittee: [January 2009]**

### **Entire document:**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*Document needs a title page, with originating organization, date, logos etc*

*Suggest that a glossary go before the Bibliography when one is developed.*

*Suggest adding a Section between Section 2: Foundation and Section 3 Scope that describes the management, maintenance and ownership of the TRT. Describe the roles and responsibilities of the NTL, the NTL's TRT Team, the TRB and the TRB LIST TRT Subcommittee. We understand some of this is still to be discussed.*

*Suggest adding a Section, between Section 3: Scope and Section 4: Structure, to clarify who the user group that this thesaurus is intended. This will further assist the TRT Subcommittee in term selection. In Section 6.1.3 Organizational warrant, the term transportation community is mentioned. This term should be clarified early in the document. Suggest calling section Intended Audience of TRT. When defining the transportation community make sure mention is made about academic researchers and government and non-government organizations (NGOs). (i.e State DOTs, AASHTO, and companies like Battelle, UPS, FedEx, UAL etc)*

### **Section 6.1.1 (Literary warrant):**

In section 6.1.1: Literary warrant. "In the case of the TRT, this need is met in part through: the **regular** Transportation Research Information Service (TRIS) and National Transportation Library (NTL) Digital Repository and library catalog reports of uncontrolled terms and keywords used in records of those databases; state departments of transportation websites; transportation industry websites; and transportation industry publications."

*Subcommittee comments:*

*What is meant by "regular"? Sentence needs to be reworded. Was the attempt here to list all of the literary warrant for the TRT? Missing is transportation academic journals, transportation related research organizations, and academic institutions, and non-transportation journals that have relevance to the transportation domain like IEEE and Association of Computer Machinery (ACM) journals. May we suggest another approach where it is a clear that the list is not exhaustive and is only a sample?*

*Last Sentence in 6.1.1 needs to be struck. It is an obvious statement.*

### **Section 6.1.2 (User warrant)**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*Does NTL have search logs available from their site? Amanda, Keith? Does TRIS also capture Search logs? Barbara? User warrant should not be limited to NTL and TRIS as the next section indicates that the organizational warrant is the transportation community. User warrant should cover the same community not just NTL and TRIS. How we assess user warrant for the greater community may be a topic of discussion for a subcommittee meeting.*

### **Section 6.1.3 (Organizational warrant):**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*See comments under Entire document in second paragraph of this section.*

### **Section 6.2 (Pre-coordinated and post coordinated terms):**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*It seems that the intent of this section is to discuss compound terms (see Section 7 of the ANSI/NISO standard). Suggest adding a distilled version of section 7.*

**Section 6.4 (Form of term):**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*Suggest a section on how to handle hyphens. Nothing seems to exist in the ANSI/NISO standard. It may be that a statement to refer to the Chicago Manual of Style or Associated Press Stylebook is included*

**Section 6.4.3 (Acronyms and abbreviations):**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*Show examples of TRT preferred terms that are acronyms for clarity.*

**Section 6.4.5 (American form):**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*Would like to see a policy on how we handle non-American forms in the catalog. For example terms from the International Transportation Research Documentation (ITRD)*

*Is there a process for international terms from ITRD being included in the TRT?*

*Suggest including the process here for including those terms*

**Section 7.2 (Definitions):**

*Subcommittee comments:*

*Once the NCHRP 20-79 project is complete, we need to document the process of including definitions with new preferred terms. This process should be documented here including information on preferred authoritative should include a process for including new definition for new preferred terms.*

Michael Kleiber

Brief comments on Principles Document and Comments to that document:

1) **Hyphens:** The developers of the TRT in almost every case omitted hyphens in the interest of ease of searching. They have wormed their way back in the TRT by grammatical purists.

2) **ITRD:** ITRD terms are not based on the same principles as the TRT. There is a conversion dictionary for ITRD Terms. That dictionary converts ITRD terms into TRT terms and/or TRIS uncontrolled terms.

3) **American Usage:** Terms that are chiefly British (Kerbs, Sleepers, Aeroplanes, Colour, Licences, etc.) appear in the TRT as UFs. An effort was made to include them when the TRT was developed and as it was maintained from 2001-Sept. 2007.

4) **Geographic Authority Lists:** Geographic names in TRIS follow LCSH practice as amended by a brief set of rules developed by TRIS management. The two chief differences between TRIS and LCSH are: a) qualifiers are spelled out; b) qualifiers for Canadian and Australian cities are "Canada" and "Australia" rather than the state/province. All geographic names entering TRIS are reviewed in detail by MK and SM.

5) **Literary Warrant:** In the past 16 months there has been a consistent lack of attention to new TRIS terms (UFs, etc.) as a literary warrant. A major source for literary warrant is the "media", i.e., news coverage of transportation events, mostly accidents, failures, etc.

6) **TRT Focus:** Although the needs of TRIS indexing and retrieval precipitated the development of the TRT, it was recognized by the TRT developers (CDB Enterprises) and the TRT Committee in 1993 that the focus would be multimodal and international in scope. The TRT, e.g., includes quite a bit of detail on vehicle/craft bodies where such detail is not warranted by TRIS needs.

Michael Kleiber

Jan. 9, 2008

## TRT Development and Maintenance Procedures

3 Feb 2009

1. NTL collects suggested TRT terms; primary sources are as follows: *(delete “as follows”)*
  - a. Submissions to TRT Suggestion forms *(include URLs:*  
<http://trt.trb.org/newterms.asp>  
[http://ntl.bts.gov/tools/trt/trt\\_suggestion.html](http://ntl.bts.gov/tools/trt/trt_suggestion.html)  
*(note: NTL’s form is difficult to find - perhaps include it on TRT page at*  
<http://ntlsearch.bts.gov/tris/trt.do>*)*
  - b. Monthly reports from TRIS
    - i. most popular uncontrolled terms
    - ii. suggestions from **TRB** indexers, *Lexicographer* Michael Kleiber, and TLIB librarians *at Northwestern and UC Berkeley*
  - c. Monthly reports of search logs from TRIS Online/NTL Integrated Search and other transportation search engines, *(delete such as State DOT search engines), that* the TRT Subcommittee, TRB, or NTL can secure with permission.
2. NTL researches suggested terms for candidacy for the TRT *(is this the only “research” that takes place?)*
  - a. search TRIS Online for number of occurrences *(disagree, as # of occurrences in TRIS is not a good way to measure)*
  - b. terms that occur >10 times are considered for candidacy *(instead of 10, how about 100?)*
  - c. *eliminate pre-coordinated terms*
3. NTL creates Term Review Forms\* for each candidate TRT term
  - a. use *(delete of the)* VDOT OneSearch to conduct an initial review of the term; primary sources are as follows:
    - i. TRIS Online
    - ii. TRB Research in Progress (RIP)
    - iii. TRB Research Needs Statements (RNS) database
    - iv. WorldCat.org
    - v. Custom Google Searches for Transportation *(replace w/Transportation Meta Search)*
    - vi. Google Scholar
  - b. terms appearing multiple times in the title of resources are noted
  - c. variant forms and related concepts for the term are noted during this process
  - d. TRT is searched and reviewed for appropriate placement of term (preferred or lead-in, as well as notation)
  - e. term summary forms are uploaded to Sharepoint in the appropriate quarterly folder

\*see p. 4 for a blank Term Review Form

4. Quarterly, NTL notifies TRB(*who at TRB?*) of terms ready to review and submits Term Summary Form *for each term*
  - a. TRB then contacts the *Sub*committee with the Term Summary Form and notification (*what is “notification”?*)
  - b. Submission months are February, May, August, November
  
5. *Sub*committee completes review of terms by deadline\*:
  - a. Committee members access Sharepoint, review each Term Review Form, and provide comments using discussion threads in Sharepoint.
  - b. See calendar on following page
  - c. New terms are forwarded to NTL and TRB (from Data Harmony) for upload on the web

\*see page 3 for a copy of the Term Review Schedule
  
6. NTL announces new TRT terms
  - a. notice sent to TRANLIB on quarterly basis (March, June, September, December)
  - b. notice of new TRT terms posted to TRT websites at TRB and NTL

TERM REVIEW CALENDAR (repeated for each quarter):

1st Monday: NTL notifies TRB of new terms

+2 Weeks: *Sub*committee reviews terms and provides comments in Sharepoint

+2 Weeks (3rd Monday): NTL schedules conference call for last week of the month

+2 Weeks, 2 days (3rd Thursday): NTL provides consensus of comments and electronic ballot (two-day voting period)

+3 Weeks (4th Monday): NTL provides results of ballot; terms without consensus get discussed on conference call

+3 Weeks: Conference call

+4 Weeks: NTL sends out second ballot for vote on terms from conference call (2-day voting period)

+5 Weeks (Friday): New terms uploaded to TRB and NTL website

+6 Weeks (Monday): NTL announces new terms to TRANLIB and on TRT website

*See next page for possible format for TRT Term Review Calendar*

### TRT TERM REVIEW CALENDAR

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
<b>WEEK 1</b>	NTL notifies TRB of new terms				
<b>WEEK 2</b> Subcommittee reviews terms & provides comments in Sharepoint					
<b>WEEK 3</b>	NTL schedules conference call for last week of the month			NTL provides consensus of comments & electronic ballot 2-day voting period	<i>Voting continues?</i>
<b>WEEK 4</b>	NTL provides results of ballot; terms w/o consensus get discussed on conf call	<i>Conf call?</i>	<i>Conf call?</i>	<i>Conf call?</i>	<i>Conf call?</i>
<b>WEEK 5</b> NTL sends out 2 <sup>nd</sup> ballot for vote on terms from conf call	<i>Subcomm. makes decisions during this week?</i>				
<b>WEEK 6</b>					New terms uploaded to TRB & NTL website
<b>WEEK 7</b>	NTL announces new terms to TRANLIB & on TRT website				