

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202

Memorandum

Date: April 27, 2010

To: Travel Management Subcommittee

From: Anant Choudhary
Transportation Engineer

Subject: Highlights of the February 23, 2009 Travel Management Subcommittee Meeting

The following members and staff participated:

Howard Simons (MDOT)
Lyn Erickson (MDOT)
Bob Owolabi, Fairfax County (phone)
Mark Rawlings, (DDOT)
Austina Casey, (DDOT)
Ron Kirby, DTP staff
Mike Clifford, DTP staff
Andrew Meese, DTP staff (phone)
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP staff
Eulalie Gower-Lucas, DTP staff
Jane Posey, DTP staff
Anant Choudhary, DTP staff
Erin Morrow, DTP staff
Yu Gao, DTP staff
Wenjing Pu, DTP staff
Monica Bansal, DTP staff
Dusan Vuksan, DTP staff
Jinchul Park, DTP staff
Sunil Kumar, DEP staff
Jeffery King, DEP staff

The meeting was called to order by the acting chair Howard Simons and after introductions, highlights of the November 24, 2009 TMS minutes were approved.

Under the item #2 Wenjing Pu made a presentation on the status of the Congestion Management Process (CMP). He informed the members that the preliminary draft of the 2010 CMP Technical Report has been completed and the report was under internal review. He further noted that the highlights of the 2010 update of the CMP Technical Report include, 1) new data source (I-95 Corridor Coalition / INRIX data) for highway performance monitoring, 2) congestion analysis travel time index (TTI), 3) reliability analysis (planning time index), 4)

regional map of signalized intersections, and 5) periodic updates. Wenjing Pu explained various indexes used for congestion and reliability analysis. During the discussion on reliability analysis, Ron Kirby suggested adding buffer index as another performance measure to the reliability analysis. He further noted that it is important to explain the measure of reliability in a more effective way to the general public and elected officials. The members pointed out that the TTI for December 2009 is higher than the TTI for 2009 summer months. Sivasailam noted that the reason could be snow and inclement weather situation which might have caused spike in travel time in December despite low traffic volume. Mr. Kirby further suggested comparing December 2008 and other year data. Sivasailam added that for better understanding we should compare TTI during snow days with other days and also suggested measuring standard deviation.

Under agenda item # 3a Ron Kirby provided an over view of the GHG activities that are going on in various meetings and explained the role of TMS and other committee activities in support of COG's Climate Change initiative.

Erin Morrow presented a draft of the "Preliminary Analysis of Potential Transportation-related Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies for the Washington, DC Region." This draft report is the product of the effort of several members of the DTP staff. This report details the calculation of the baseline used for GHG analysis and detailed calculations of potential GHG reduction strategies analyzed to date. The results of the analysis will be fed into the What Would it Take? (WWIT) Scenario analysis.

Ms. Erin told the members of the subcommittee that the primary purpose for her presentation was to go over the layout of the report and a few new measures that the subcommittee had not yet seen. The majority of the measures had already been presented to either the subcommittee or the TPB Technical Committee. She described the highlights of the report – development of the baseline and CO₂ emission rates, emissions analysis approach for measures, and cost-effectiveness calculations. The measures came from the TERM Tracking Sheet, Potential TERM document, the COG Climate Change Report, and new and potential initiatives. The detailed descriptions of the COG Climate Change measures and new initiatives were included in the appendix and grouped into three categories: fuel economy, alternative fuels and alternative vehicle technology, and travel efficiency.

Howard Simons asked if CAL-LEV II changes were included in this analysis. Erin responded that they were not and Howard provided information he had received on LEV III. Jeff King brought up two items of potential interest related to the report. The first is that the Air Quality Public Advisory Committee has stated the importance of working with TPB on climate issues and may request a briefing by TPB staff. The second item is that there will be a new ozone SIP and TPB may want to take a fresh look and NO_x, VOC, and CO₂ from the Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACM) analysis.

On Signal optimization TERM Ron Kirby asked whether the traffic signal optimization measure had the most current available data. Mr. Sivasailam replied that the staff will look into this and update the measure if there is more recent data.

Ms. Erin presented the eco-driving measure. She was asked why there was not a cost-effectiveness calculation. She responded by saying that there were many different strategies

that would be combined to achieve the reductions in the analysis. It was agreed that the staff would look into estimating costs for an eco-driving program for the next meeting. Suggested strategies included looking at classroom programs that deal with GHG and consulting the Commuter Connections program for the cost of outreach campaigns. Comments on the report from subcommittee members were requested by March 5 in order to be incorporated before presentation to the Scenario Task Force on March 17.

Under item # 3b Monica Bansal provided an overview of the “What Would it Take” scenario, including an overview of the scenario structure and preliminary results. She explained that the scenario begins with regional climate change goals and analyzes many different strategies to see whether the goals can be met. She briefly discussed four groupings of strategies that provide the basis for the results. One grouping looks at emissions without any additional federal or local action, including the new CAFE standards and alternative fuel mandates. The second looks at a high federal role, with much higher CAFE standards, CAFE for heavy duty vehicles, and high gas prices. The third and the fourth looks at regional actions on a short-term and long-term scale. While none of the groupings meet the regional goals, Ms. Bansal highlighted areas of potential focus, such as some short-term regional actions. Comments included discussion on looking into Cal LEV III standards, completing analysis of the eco-driving measure’s cost-effectiveness, and the potential need to build natural CO₂ absorption into forecasts.

Under agenda item # 4 Daivamani Sivasailam updated the subcommittee on MOVES model testing work program and local inputs for MOVES2010 model. Citing his memo on local inputs for MOVES2010 model, he informed the members that in December 2009, the EPA released the final version of MOVES model and data convertor. He noted that in addition a new data convertor for developing average speed distribution was also released. He further added that the staff has developed methodology to convert local data for transportation inputs which include vehicle population, age distribution, VMT percentage and annual VMT by vehicle type. He told the members that his memo also includes recommendations for vehicle population and age distribution inputs.

Further, Mr. Sivasailam explained MOVES model testing work program which include testing MOVES2010 model using default values for 2005 & 2030, develop local inputs using revised EPA convertor, and testing model using local data. He clarified that the testing will be carried out using emissions rate approach, county level inputs, and using custom domain approach. He explained steps involved and time line for these tests. He added that the DEP staff will develop county level inputs which include I/M program, fuel characteristics and meteorology data while DTP staff will develop transportation related inputs. On Howard Simons question, he replied that the staff has yet to finalize which approach to follow. Sunil Kumar added that the tests have shown that the county level approach takes much lower run-time compared to emission rate approach. He further clarified that the county level approach has other problems related to preparing inputs.

Under agenda item # 5, Jane Posey briefed the subcommittee about the schedule for the air quality conformity assessment of the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP. She stated that the analysis will be similar to last year’s, with the exception of the use of new Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecast data. Further she added that compared to last year’s forecasts, the Round 8.0 forecast will have household and jobs projections lowered by 1-2 % regionally. She noted that the deadline for submissions of any projects that affect conformity is Monday,

March 1, 2010.

She further apprised the members on EPA's recent actions related to new standards for Nitrogen Dioxide and Ozone. She reviewed exhibit 1 from the February 17, TPB Item 11, and explained the possible schedule affecting transportation conformity planning in the upcoming years. She also explained the timeline for MOVES transition and conformity results using MOVES model.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 PM