iCAP Transportation Team

November Meeting Minutes

11/3/2023 3:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.

*Teams*

**Action Items**

* Erin- Try to find out how many EV cars are commuting to campus or how to access this data.
* Share additional comments on the DESMAN proposal with Olivia or Sarthak.
* Campus Transportation Advisory Committee meeting Friday, December 1st, 11-12:30 PM
* Brainstorm ways to encourage commuters to relinquish their parking pass.

**Meeting Minutes**

* Introductions
	+ Sarthak Prasad
	+ Olivia Messerges
	+ Miriam Keep
	+ Ria Kontou
	+ John Rubins
	+ Mitchell Byrant
	+ Sebby Vega
	+ Sam Hince
	+ Shawn Patterson
	+ Erin Kristovich
* Review the EV Proposal by DESMAN Group and associated comments.
	+ Overall concerns with the proposal and EV charging on campus
		- DESMAN wants to serve a proportion of people who have EVs. UIUC must serve more than that proportion, so we should install DC charging because it will quadruple the amount of people able to charge.
		- DESMAN does not consider the lot's usage and dwell time of vehicles in the lot when choosing where to put chargers and which kind to install, but this needs to be addressed.
		- DESMAN proposes that university fleet vehicles should use fast chargers. With 6 EV trucks and 2 EV vans, that don't drive very far distances, university fleet vehicles should use level 2.
		- The issue with level 2 chargers is that they don't move their cars after 4 hours.
			* An education/awareness campaign is needed to teach people how to use EV chargers on campus.
		- The biggest problems in EV charging are that the chargers cost a lot upfront and to install, the lack of infrastructure, and the lack of willingness to move the EV.
	+ Individual concerns
	+ Sam Hince (Ph.D. student):
		- The DESMAN study aimed to serve a percentage of people (2-7%) with EVs. UIUC’s goal should be to encourage more people to get EVs.
		- Level 2 chargers are dying out; if we install more level 2 chargers, we can only serve 2-7% of people. We are restricting the number of EVs that could be driven to campus by installing level 2 chargers.
		- For EVs to catch on at UIUC, we have to be able to serve more than 2-7% of the population, so we must install DC charging because it will quadruple the number of people able to charge their EVs.
		- Notes errors in pricing and power output of level 2 charging
		- EV users know that they need to move their car, but out of convivence, they don’t
	+ Erin Kristovich (parking department):
		- The goal of chargers is for people to charge for 4 hours and move. The problem is that people don’t move their car after 4 hours.
		- Level 2 chargers should be able to serve 4-5 people a day, but because people don’t move their cars after 4 hours, the chargers never serve this many people.
		- Chargers cost a lot and the parking department does not have a way to recoup that cost. UIUC is one of the only schools that charge for energy, but does not make back the cost of chargers.
		- Parking is a self-funded department, 95% of funds come from what they do.
		- Parking is installing more EV chargers, it’s just a slow process, with lots of learning, for the entire campus.
		- Currently, the price for EV charging increases after you’ve had your car parked there for four hours.
		- It’s impossible to tell how many parking permit holders have an EV car because EV car users often have another car that’s not an EV and might not drive their EV daily. There is no set standard model of EV, so you can’t tell from the type and model of car. You might be able to tell how many EVs by how many credit cards were used.
		- Data used by DESMAN is from 2020, COVID numbers, so they are a bit lower than usual. It’s hard to get accurate data because the numbers are constantly changing.
	+ Shawn Patterson (Facilities and Services):
		- Biggest challenger is power supplies. Currently have 5 Level 2 charges and no space for a Level 3. Need to revamp the whole system to get the wattage to those places.
		- No wattage for level 3, parking lots were not designed recently.
	+ Ria Kontou (Professor of Civil & Environmental Engineering):
		- Staff are not likely to move their EV if they will be on campus for an 8-hour workday. This needs to be changed via etiquette, pricing, and communication.
		- Proposed EV metered parking spots.
		- DESMAN focused on keeping the number of EV spots proportional to the number of non-EV spots but did not consider what the lot’s purpose is. For example, a stadium parking lot might attract more alumni who are willing to charge at a fast rate at higher prices. The usage of a lot and the dwell time of a vehicle in a lot must be considered when choosing where to put chargers and which kind to install.
		- Working on a survey to assess how many EV users there are on campus.
		- The license plate of EV must have “EL” ending.
	+ Sarthak Prasad (iCAP Chair):
		- Education/awareness campaign is needed to teach people how to use EV chargers on campus.
		- Employment numbers are incorrect.
		- DESMAN proposes that university fleet vehicles should use fast chargers. With 6 EV trucks and 2 EV vans, that don't drive very far distances, university fleet vehicles should use level 2.
	+ John Rubins (English Professor):
		- Capital expenses for improved energy infrastructure might have to be part of a proposal rather than paid solely by parking. This unduly increases pressure on the parking department.
		- Should we be reactive (like the study) or proactive?
		- The proposal should have included increases in staffing and employment.
	+ Sebby Vega (undergraduate student):
		- The audience of the DESMAN proposal is incorrect.