

Transportation

Attendees: Yanfeng Ouyang, Dave Ivey, Morgan White, Micah Kenfield (partly), Julija Sakutyte, Zishen Ye, Julie Cidell, Macie Sinn, and Pete Varney.

Date: 23 January 2019

Time: 12-1 PM

1. Agenda:

- a. Micah Kenfield will be coming in to discuss two topics:
 - i. Delta Airlines Offsets Update/Q&A
 1. Eventual point of recommendation: Preliminary conversations between M. Kenfield and Second Nature, the custodians of the American College and Universities Presidential Climate Commitment (signed by UIUC), on how to mitigate air travel.
 - a. No definitive direction, but other campuses have shown initiative.
 2. Some campuses are pursuing a joint project/buy, so the airline reduces its emissions in the Scope 1 category (actual fuel consumed) and savings passed on to campuses' Scope 3 emissions, because of the goal to be carbon neutral.
 3. Current set-up: UIUC sells their carbon credits; UIUC also take scope 1 reduction and put into air travel.
 4. Questions: Who is included in the count of air travel emissions?
 - a. Answer: Directly Financed travel (anyone who traveled on behalf of the university).
 - ii. iCAP 2020 goals, SWAT role, etc.
 1. Process of drafting 2020 iCAP is beginning. Preparation underway.
 - a. The purpose of the 2020 iCAP is to adjust goals as needed in order to best serve through 2025.
 - b. Goals:
 - i. Consideration: Are there areas of growth, is there progress needed somewhere else, have some goals not served as well as they should have, are there goals which are unnecessary?
 - ii. iCAP objectives and SWATeam analysis
 1. May adjust the SWATeam structure over Summer 2019 so that in Fall 2019 the new teams are in effect.
 - c. Methodology: An honest conversation/dialogue, thoughts, feedback, SWATeam goals and structure, etc.
 - d. Goal: Discussion ending by April
 - iii. Misc.
 1. Modeshare survey—Campus Commuting Distribution
 - a. Getting good response, will share results as the results become more apparent.
 - b. Required to conduct survey every 3 years, with optional increased frequency.
 - b. TEM survey/analysis: Further discussion.

- i. M. White
 - 1. Proponents of TEM are likely adjusting code
 - a. Excellent time to recommend inclusion of certain questions in TEM.
 - i. Response: J. Cidell—Explain that information is being gathered for sustainability, not to check in with the appropriateness of the air travel.
 - 1. Question: what does the SWATeam think are the goal questions and the bare minimum questions.
 - a. Contact: Mike Bass, Senior Associate Vice President (OBFS, Utilities, etc).
 - ii. Contact: John Dallesasse (Academic Senate Chair on Operations).
 - 1. Team want to change TEM system.
 - iii. Faculty Perspective: Much pushback on adding more questions to TEM. University seems to be tightening budgeting expenses.
 - 1. Make a routine of demanding justification for air travel as opposed to other modes of travel.
 - a. Student perspective: Air travel is easily tracked, especially with third party software and through airlines
 - b. Response: M. White: Layovers do not need to be reported.
- c. Morgan White will head the discussion of:
 - i. Veoride
 - 1. Pilot program is doing well, team is responsive.
 - a. Communicated their snow plan (keeping bikes usable).
 - 2. Pilot program, joint licensing program between Champaign and Urbana.
 - a. Veoride have to follow regulations, Ex:
 - i. 24/7, 365 phone number on website and app
 - ii. Remove bikes within 3 hours during peak periods
 - 3. Initial concerns over bikes being littered around campus
 - a. Concerns not validated (some kinks in system but overall functional)
 - 4. Future goals (from Veoride’s perspective)
 - a. Wants a raise of the cap from 500 bikes to 750 bikes.
 - b. Implementing E-Assist biked; they want to replace 150/500 bikes with electric assist bikes.
 - c. Conducting a survey to gather system feedback
 - 5. Champaign wants to continue pilot program (ordinances did not address because of their pilot program option) with permission to renew Veoride with an ongoing status.
 - 6. Summary: expect continued use.
 - ii. Winter Bike Storage
 - 1. Did not have time.
 - iii. EVE Charging Systems
 - 1. Task force put together, some members from the Transportation SWATeam
 - a. Provost put together the team

- i. Chaired by provost fellow for Sustainability
 - 1. Initially: Scott Willenbrock
 - a. No longer provost fellow (ended fellowship)
 - b. Parking director was included in conversation but not entire department.
 - c. End Results:
 - i. Install level 2 charging systems in parking garages/decks
 - 1. Remodeling underway to have at least one station per deck.
 - ii. Expand level 1 charging in parking decks.
 - 1. Issues include necessity of remodeling decks to accommodate.
 - iii. Renew the task force in some number of years in order to assess need as events unfold.
 - iv. Discussion of charging systems.
 - 1. Level 2 systems charge users, so the rate for charging had been recommended to charge based on kW/h, not total time.
 - v. Report from task force completed and sent to Parking department.
 - 1. What does it take for more level 1 charging?
 - a. Parking is reviewing parking rate with upper management, including the new director Marty Paulins.
 - b. M. Paulins— Concerns about level 1, focus on level 2.
2. Question: Should the transportation SWATeam recommend that the task force be activated again, or at least to have the Parking department call a meeting with appropriate members to clarify future proceedings and solidify impact of task force report?
3. Y. Ouyang
 - a. Task Force wanted to suggest more long-term studies concerning charging, because few have been done (one during Earth day).
 - i. Suggestion: Parking entertains a several month study to gauge demand for EVE charging (by offering complimentary charging) over long term period.
 - b. Consideration of whether there should be formal recommendation (from the transportation SWATeam) for such a survey.
 - i. Side One: D. Ivey can request it, likely receive support, so unnecessary to make recommendation.
 - ii. Side two: Recommendations assist in fortifying reasoning and logic of requests.
 - c. Response: D. Ivey
 - i. Questions demand of level 2 AND level 1 charging use.

- ii. Wants to ensure diversity of the group implementing charging policy to answer campus wide-question of charging system usage
 - 1. Question: If there is a demographic invested in EVE, or is that demographic doing it because of the free charging, or is it because of some other interest?
- iii. Testing level 1 is more important than level 2, since more data is available concerning level 2 usage.
- iv. Will put in suggestion to audit level 1 charging systems.
 - 1. Parking is already does audits for parking lots in order to gauge peak time uses.
- v. Handoff of report to EVE task force in order to clarify of where jurisdiction on EVE lies (to parking).
- vi. Response: Y. Ouyang
 - 1. M. Paulins interest in doing these things and interest in the discussion.
- vii. Response: M. White
 - 1. Level 1 Charging—Typical wall outlets
 - 2. Level 2 Charging—Machine, more intimidating structure
 - 3. Comment: Ask M. Paulins if they feel comfortable conducting a “hand-off” in order to clarify the jurisdiction of charging systems and the participation of campus advocates.
 - 4. Comment: Concern of preferential parking spots for low emission vehicles, as well as vehicles charging all day (to be considered in audit).

2. Member Actions:

- a. D. Ivey will (1) suggest conducting an audit of Level 1 charging demand on campus and (2) float the “hand-off” meeting with the inactive task force to M. Paulins.
- b. Faculty (Y. Ouyang and J. Cidell) will test the water with colleagues in their departments to receive insight on TEM use.
- c. M. White will connect the team to John Dallesasse.

3. Future Agenda:

- a. Next Meeting: 6 February 2019
- b. iCAP 2020 discussion: Section 1 (see handout).
- c. Recommendation of questions for TEM system.