

iCAP 2020 Renewal

Section 1 Evaluation

Goals (Source: iCAP 2015, Chapter 4):

The 2010 iCAP listed the goal of reducing transportation emissions by 30% relative to the FY08 baseline by FY15. Unfortunately, rather than decreasing, the total estimated emissions from transportation increased 30%, for reasons described above. Therefore, the first transportation emission goal is to bring the current transportation emissions down to the FY08 estimate by FY20 (see Table 4, right), reversing the apparent 30% increase. By accomplishing the objectives listed below, the total transportation emissions can be reduced an additional 15% by FY25, 75% by FY30 (relying upon purchased offsets for all air travel emissions), and 90% by FY40 (relying upon a yet-to-be-determined solution for low emissions for the campus fleet). To provide an indication of the relative efficiency of transportation energy strategies, the campus could evaluate and report on both absolute and relative emission results, providing data for fleet, commuting, and air transportation adjusted per capita and per vehicle whenever possible.

1. Question: Why do you think that it's been difficult for Transportation to reach its goals, or why the goals set in the 2015 iCAP have not been met yet?
 - a. Team Comments:
 - i. Take departmental purchasing of vehicles, for example. Some departments have travel needs that have to be met by certain characteristics (like a four-door truck for F&S or something of that accord), so it's incredibly difficult to enforce or control sustainable transportation policy (like purchasing a hybrid vehicle) when it's not a sufficient vehicle type.
 1. Departmental need plus budgeting constraints make transportation policy and fleet emission reductions incredibly difficult to manage.
 2. However, in light of this, Transportation already began discussing ways to counter such issues in the future, and possible programs to reduce fleet emissions. So, there is hope!
 - ii. A main theme is that many departments have the *option* of being more sustainable (like seeking out Transportation services to find an eco-friendly vehicle that fits departmental needs where possible), they don't *have* to, which hinders the credibility of the policies that Transportation makes, or even campus-wide policy. When people see it as an option, and there isn't direct incentive to, the sustainable option will likely not be taken.
2. Question: In light of the goal that Transportation is supposed to achieve, is there any aspect that is limiting to our endeavors?
 - a. Team Comments:
 - i. The team is, realistically, without authority, so in order to have effect, there needs to be some greater connection with the higher authority that *does* have the capacity for the widespread policy change that the team is trying to achieve, through a top-down approach.
 - ii. The **SWATeams have become somewhat isolated**, trying to achieve the goals that have been set through the lens of a 10-12-person conference room. The best way to make widespread change is to invite more people

(and a larger variety of people) into the conversation, to learn more about why people travel the way they do, engage the community, discovering where points of resistance might be, etc.

3. General:

- a. Should '08 be the baseline year? Maybe it would be worthwhile to set the baseline to a year which had normal economic activity, and subsequent realistic consumption, rather than basing it off of the year of the recession? Or at least to consider why this year was chosen.
 - i. At the very least, take a look at how data is being measured and refine the units which are being taken (Ex: should fleet emissions be measured by percentage of total emissions or rather percentage of NET emissions decreased?)
 - ii. Essentially: Normalize the data.
- b. Next "Goal" Section should be scenario planning, with a realistic goal as to how a world-renowned research university travels, consumes, and emits pollution and how we should counter that without sacrificing what the University means.
- c. Put the emissions into perspective with the university growth rate. If we have more students and buildings on campus, that's more employees and faculty, which therefore increases the number of people emitting through buses, vehicles, air travel, etc.
- d. Should the comparison to the baseline year be more emphasized than looking into the future and where UIUC would *want* to be?

Section 2 Evaluation

Team comments:

An overarching problem which makes it difficult to analyze any of the objectives in iCAP 2015 is that the data is problematic. It's really difficult to gauge how that data was collected, separate confounding variables from actual impact through policy change versus financial hardship, etc.

The iCAP 2020 should address how data for objective metrics will be established, who will collect this data, and really expose the methodology of this data collection for full transparency with the public.

None of the objectives have been achieved for 2020 standards. Some (Percent reduction in air travel) are closer than others (number of bike plan installations).

Some suggestions:

The iCAP website should be updated ASAP; this may require having an intern or someone with a major responsibility to upload this data for a more streamlined experience.

Some data needs to be gathered by an expert, like with 4.3 in complete conversion of the campus fleet to biodegradable fuel. The SWATeam is not well equipped to handle this objective. iSEE should have a plan for situations like this, maybe about how a SWATeam would go about sourcing an expert like this.

Section 3 Evaluation

"Some initial idea as follows:

Work with CUMTD, the Parking Department, and bike-sharing company VeoRide on holistically planning a multimodal system that increases the use of sustainable transportation modes (e.g., biking, transit) for trips on campus, with the goal of eventually eliminating private

vehicles entering the core of campus by FY25,” (Yanfeng Ouyang, Transportation SWATeam Chair).