

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: November 24, 2008

To: Travel Management Subcommittee

From: Anant Choudhary
Transportation Engineer

Subject: Highlights of the October 21, 2008 Travel Management Subcommittee Meeting

The following members participated:

Kanathur Srikanth (Chair)
Jim Ponticello, VDOT (phone)
Lyn Erickson (MDOT)
Bob Owolabi (Fairfax County)
K. Haldeman (WMATA)
Ron Kirby
Mike Clifford, DTP staff
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP staff
Jane Posey
Monica Bansal
Erin Morrow, DTP staff
Anant Choudhary, DTP staff

The meeting was called to order by the chair Kanathur Srikanth of VDOT and after introductions, highlights of the September 23, 2008 TMS minutes were approved.

Under agenda item # 2, Mike Clifford briefed the subcommittee on the draft air quality conformity assessment of the 2008 CLRP & FY 2009-2014 TIP which was released for public comments at its October meeting. He noted that the TPB is scheduled to act on this document at its November meeting. He referred to his memo and provided snapshots of events associated with the conformity assessment. He explained the attachments to his memo which include summary of travel demand results, vehicles trips, and emissions factors for various pollutants and conformity results. He noted that we are well within budget. He noted the budgets shown for 2009 and 2010. In addition we are showing the budget for 2008. In response to Mr. Srikanth's question whether 2008 inventories are required prior to TPB approval Mr. Clifford replied no and the reason the 2008 budget is shown in case EPA finds the 2009 and 2010 SIP budgets as inadequate by disapproving the SIP.

Under agenda item # 3 Mike Clifford informed members that the Climate Change report has a number of transportation measures and the TPB staff has been asked to review and analyze these measures. Daivamani Sivasailam briefed members on FY2009 Greenhouse Gas Work Program and preliminary activities. He explained the various tasks in the work program. He noted that under task 1 staff will prepare 2002 CO2 emissions inventory. Mike Clifford added that staff will prepare year 2005 GHG inventory which will be base inventory for the CO2 analysis. Further Sivasailam briefly explained how the CO2 rates are been arrived at using mobile emission model. He noted that even though CO2 varies by speed we will use a constant rate as provided by the Mobile 6.2 model. Mike Clifford added that the inventories will provide for all the greenhouse gas emissions as CO2 equivalents. Siva added that we have now new CAFE' standards and our travel model results do not reflect the new CAFE standards. Hence the CO2 inventory will have to adjust for new CAFE' standards of 35 mph using off-line methodology. In reply to Kanti's question Mike Clifford said that for speed related measures staff will use speed corresponding CO2 emissions factors. In reply to a question Sivasailam noted that the task 1 will be completed by December. Siva informed members that task 2 includes analysis and methodologies for the 28 types of transportation related measures included in the Climate Change Report. He stated that task 3 includes scenarios analysis including land use and travel modeling exercise for CO2 analysis.

He briefed the members that Group A measures in the report included measures 1-5, 7-11, 17-18 and 20-22 and these will be analyzed by the staff under TMS direction. He added Group B measures are the goals and these are not specific measures. These goals are to be discussed at the Board level and hence they can not be analyzed. Group C measures fall under the scenario and land use strategies and will be analyzed later. Measures numbered 23, 26, 27, and 28 are fall outside of scope of transportation. Measures 24-25 are related to transportation but will be analyzed at a later stage as a part of scenario analysis.

On the issue related to CO2 emissions vs. total GHG emissions and unit used for reporting CO2 emissions (metric tons vs. long tons) Mike Clifford added that staff will coordinate with DEP to be consistent with the overall emissions inventory effort.

Following this discussion Mike Clifford briefly explained measure 1 & 2 and their analysis approach, assumptions, impacts and cost-effectiveness methods. He reminded members that measures listed in Tracking Sheets can be accounted for. Ron Kirby added that TMS committee should come up with measures which will reduce CO2 emissions. He further explained issues related to Green Fleet Policy, federal and local government fleet and incentives.

In the end Kanti summarized the discussion and added that in the coming months the TMS will be working on the Group A measures and asked the member to send their suggestions and comments by October 31.

Under agenda item # 4 Daivamani Sivasailam explained his memo on transit bus CO₂ emissions, costs and cost-effectiveness. He told members that the staff has carried out analysis for hybrid diesel-electric, CNG and Diesel buses which is shown as attachment A and B and explained the Montgomery County and WMATA experiences on clean diesel and hybrid diesel-electric buses. He noted that DTP staff obtained cost inputs, such as annual miles driven, fuel economy in miles per gallon, cost of fuel, and cost of maintenance from Montgomery County, and used the WMATA provided emissions rate of CO₂ for hybrid

electric buses, new diesel buses, and compressed natural gas (CNG) buses. Referring to table 1 from his memo he noted that the hybrid diesel-electric buses produce the lowest CO₂ emissions, followed by CNG and diesel. He further added that on cost effective criteria CNG buses are the most cost-effective followed by diesel, and hybrid diesel-electric buses. It also note that the CNG costs did not include capital cost of a CNG refueling facility since Montgomery County has existing facilities. The subcommittee did not see a need for a workshop on this subject and advised staff to present the memorandum to the regional bus subcommittee.

Under agenda item # 5 Ron Kirby explained SB375 California Bill and its relevance to COG's greenhouse gas reduction efforts. He cited his PowerPoint slides and elaborated finding and declaration from the bill and topics of interest to TMS committee. He added that California spent two years deliberating this before it became a bill. He noted that this bill is different in the way that it is based on a target and incentive approach rather than a penalty and goals approach.