

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: October 21, 2008
To: Travel Management Subcommittee
From: Anant Choudhary
Transportation Engineer
Subject: Highlights of the September 23, 2008 Travel Management Subcommittee Meeting

The following members participated:

Kanathur Srikanth (Chair)
Jim Ponticello, VDOT (phone)
Mark Rawlings, DDOT (Phone)
Ronald Mitchell (DDOT)
Lyn Erickson (MDOT)
Bob Owolabi (Fairfax County)
Monica Backmon (Prince William)
Ron Kirby
Mike Clifford, DTP staff
Andrew Meese, 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 May 27, 2008 TMS minutes were approved.

Under agenda item # 2, Andrew Meese briefed the members on the final 2008 Congestion Management Process Technical report. He noted that this is the final report and has been posted on MWCOG website. He further added that there is no change to the report received by the TPB Technical Committee at its June 27, 2008 meeting. He added that a 2009 version of CMP Technical Report was planned.

Under agenda item # 3, Andrew Meese referring to his memorandum briefed the members on the Congestion Management Process component of the Draft 2009 CLRP 'Call for Projects' document. He noted that there are three major sections; technical report, CMP section of CLRP, and CMP component that are associated with individual line items in CLRP or TIP. For the third part, staff depends on the submitting agencies for information on

congestion management associated with project. He noted that his memorandum explains the process of submitting the CMP form. He reminded the subcommittee members that in January, members asked for an opportunity to revisit the CMP portion of the call for projects document. He noted that the members can now look at the contents and provide recommendation for any change. He noted that it is important to come to consensus if possible on any changes based on comments or recommendations at this September 23 TMS meeting as the TPB is scheduled to approve the 'Call for Projects' document at its October 15, 2008 meeting. In reply Kanti Srikanth noted that VDOT may need more time to go through the document and provide comments. Meese noted that the CMP document form addresses the requirements for capacity increase projects. The requirement says that the region must demonstrate the CMP alternative before it takes up a capacity increasing project.

Later Andrew Meese and Subcommittee members reviewed the CMP matrix and questions which include exemption criteria, benchmark construction costs and other criteria for specific types of projects. The subcommittee proposed following recommendation and changes to the CMP related questions and in the 'Call for Projects' submission form shown in the attachment to the Andrew Meese memo (CMP matrix).

Recommended changes to the CMP form

- Item 4 – Identifying if the congestion is on a different facility: Though staff recommended taking this question out as it was rarely used, the Subcommittee recommended keeping this item as is.
- Item 5 – Identifying facility Level of Service: Subcommittee agreed on deleting this question as proposed.
- Item 15 – Minimum construction cost: Subcommittee agreed to an increase of the \$5 million rule-of-thumb amount to \$10 million based upon staff's analysis of the federal Producer Price Index for civil engineering construction cost increases since the mid-1990s.
- Item 16 – Use of federal funds: Subcommittee agreed to the staff recommendation for keeping this item on the exemption list, and placing it at the top of the list on the form.
- Overall wording of Question 26: Subcommittee opined that further explanation is needed and suggested change in languages for going from sub question a to b.
- The Subcommittee agreed to other minor wording changes recommended by staff throughout the document.

The Subcommittee consented to the changes listed above, but allowed for members to send in additional comments by Monday, September 29 [none were received], in order for the item to be presented at the October 3 TPB Technical Committee meeting.

Under agenda item # 4 Daivamani Sivasailam briefed the subcommittee on the TERM section of the draft 2009 CLRP 'Call for Projects' document. He noted that appendix A of this document provides guidelines for the TERM analysis and emissions factors for ozone and PM2.5 pollutants. He further stated that the appendix B of this document includes TERM reporting instructions. He told the members that staff will need status report on the TERM status at the end of April 2009. Kanti Srikanth made a suggestion that staff should provide a list of ongoing TERMS which are not yet complete while requesting the status report. On Jim Ponticello's question Sivasailam noted that we do not have a similar document for analysis of

CMAQ projects. Kanti Srikanth noted that VDOT has developed a spreadsheet which calculates emissions using the rates included in the TERM section of the 'Call for Projects' document.

Under agenda item # 5 Daivamani Sivasailam briefed the subcommittee on transit buses, CO2 emissions and its cost-effectiveness. He informed the members that at the May 2008 MWAQC TAC meeting there was a discussion on the emissions benefits, cost-effectiveness of hybrid transit buses and different technologies being implemented. He informed the members that Montgomery County carried out CO2 analysis for their hybrid diesel-electric and clean diesel bus purchase programs. He also referred to the WMATA's initiative for new transit bus and implementation of new technology which would help reduce CO2. He further added that staff has attempted to carry out emissions analysis and cost estimation for the Montgomery County and WMATA transit bus purchase program. On Mike Clifford's suggestion, it was decided to discuss this item during the October 21, 2008 TMS meeting so as to provide additional time to staff for cost-estimation calculation.

Under agenda item # 6, Daivamani Sivasailam briefed the committee on the highlights of the Climate Change Report and TPB's comments. Sivasailam explained regional CO2 emissions, emissions from transportation sector and goals stipulated in the Climate Change Committee Report. He further apprised members about the letter from TPB chairman Phil Mendelson to MWAQC chairman Michael Knapp regarding TPB's comments on the Climate Change Report and TPB's willingness to collaborate with Climate Change Committee in addressing GHG reduction strategies. In response to Jim Ponticelo's question Kanti Srikanth noted that this report does not take into account 35 mpg CAFE' standards. Siva noted that TPB is looking into GHG reduction goals through 'What Would It Take' scenario analysis.

Monica Bansal in her presentation described the "What Would It Take" scenarios. She provided study timeline and explained goals to reduce GHG by 10%, 20% and 80% below 2005 level in 2012, 2020 and 2050. She noted that staff is looking at the scale and combination of reduction measures and strategies to meet 2030 goal. She noted that 35 mpg CAFE' standard gives good improvement on reduction but 168 mpg CAFE' standard is needed to meet the goal. She noted that about 46% reductions in VMT would be needed to meet 2030 goal. She also noted that CO2 is a long lasting pollutant and benefits added up are huge.

Under agenda item # 7, Daivamani Sivasailam explained his memo on the GHG emissions reduction measures. He noted that the attachment includes the list of Potential TERMS, candidate measures from the Climate Change Report and list of the common measures as identified by the staff. Referring to Monica Bansal's presentation slides and Climate Change Report Mike Clifford noted that these provides overall context for scenario assessment. He told the members that in order to proceed for further analysis staff has to look at measures that are already implemented and the potential measures which staff has analyzed. He noted that this would serve as a logical building block for further analysis. Referring to the table 2 of handout he noted that the Climate Change Report has identified broad categories of mobile sector measures. He further noted that that staff is developing specific measures within these broad categories.