**Transportation SWATeam**

Attendees: Stacey DeLorenzo (Transportation Demand Management Coordinator), Julie Cidell (Chair & Faculty), Sarthak Prasad (Staff), Trevor Gresham (Student), Marie Hubbard (Student), Julija Sakutyte (clerk)
Date: 24 October 2019
Time: 1:30PM-2:30PM.

1. Notes from the Clerk
	1. Any objectives you may see in this document, or others, pertain to the Transportation SWATeam draft objectives which will be sent to iWG for a first round of approval. The objectives will be made as their own project update for reference on the iCAP portal
2. Agenda
	1. Discuss Active Transportation & Road Maintenance Systems objectives
		1. Stacey DeLorenzo will be attending to give insight and answer questions, particularly about central receiving
	2. Discuss Reducing number of cars, increasing EV use, and reducing business travel emissions objectives with any extra time.
3. Meeting
	1. Stacey DeLorenzo, Transportation Demand Management Coordinator, introduced herself.
	2. S. Prasad mentioned the commuter system after a question about why students were not included in the commuter system (“Bus, Bike, and Hike”) was asked. Students are not included because it’s difficult to track their involvement and the correlated decrease in car use on campus; S. Prasad reiterated that there is absolutely demand for student commuter opportunities.
	3. Road management systems: Central Receiving
		1. S. DeLorenzo amended SWATeam idea to change from an F&S standard for a central receiving warehouse/system to a campus directive.
		2. S. DeLorenzo specified the product type which would be stored in the central receiving warehouse: non-perishable goods, such as paper towels, napkins, toilet paper, cleaning products, office supplies, etc.
		3. S. DeLorenzo specified that UIUC sororities, fraternities, and independently owned restaurants will not be included in a central receiving system, necessarily.
		4. S. DeLorenzo would hope that a stock of non-perishable goods in the warehouse would be used by those private entities. There should also be an incentivization plan.
		5. This idea came from the realization that delivery trucks are emitting a lot as they make multiple (upwards of 30) stops around campus, blocking roads, and posing a safety hazard, particularly to bicyclists.
		6. The Central Receiving system would be facilitated by campus administration, not the TDM coordinator.
		7. Since implementation would take a while, the goal is lower for the first 5 years, and then increasing later on.
		8. The Union has their own warehouse, albeit a low utilization rate, and F&S is using central receiving for all except daily mail.
		9. Potential targets include Housing and Dining, campus recreation, libraries
		10. A concern was the increase in emissions due to increasing total number of vehicles. The emissions from this system would not be comparable to the current system of multiple semi-trucks making numerous stops along campus.
		11. The Central Receiving objective was officially set.
	4. Road Management Systems: TAMP
		1. S. DeLorenzo specified that current roads were last assessed at 65 (as of 2016) on the PCI, but little road maintenance occurred, so presently, it is likely below that. The critical number is 55, with a sharp increase in cost ($1/sqft, $2/sqft…$20/sqft) below that number.
		2. In the most recent budget request, S. DeLorenzo requested $9M over the next 5 years, with $1.6M for the first year, $1.4M for the first year…with an eventual drop-off to $100K/year until next investment phase required (roads degrade eventually, and these are not preventable). The priority is areas which have a potential repair, not the $25M high capital projects, which include total reconstruction. Budget has not been confirmed by administration.
		3. PCI assessment should be done every 5 years, with 2016 being the last PCI assessment.
		4. Supporting this initiative would increase safety (encouraging bike use), decrease wear & tear on vehicles (therefore increasing lifespan of vehicles and decreasing waste), and require less investment into high capital projects (smaller repairs over a longer time will be less intensive and disruptive than entire road repair).
		5. TAMP support objective was officially set.
	5. Active Transportation: Bike Plan
		1. SSC denied funding for Armory bike path.
	6. Active Transportation: Walking Incentivization Plan
		1. Walk Friendly University.
		2. Sidewalk conditions are probably similar to the road conditions.
		3. Not a part of commuter systems.
		4. Objective has been tabled.
	7. Active Transportation: Biking & Rules of the Road
		1. Those who are opposed to bikes on campus are likely the demographic which can reinforce rules of the road.
		2. Curriculum education in some way is ideal, as the Transportation Department cannot get the same interaction with bicyclists as the community can.
		3. Housing information packet, etc. are sources of outreach.
	8. Reducing Business Travel Emissions: Carbon Offset Programs
		1. Active research into Carbon Offset Program and find fit for UIUC.
		2. Have a suggestion prepared to be established by FY23. Implement program and track data until at least FY25, with 5 units participating.
	9. Reducing Business Travel Emissions: Teleconferencing Facilities
		1. New Objective Introduced to pursue more teleconferencing opportunities.
			1. Assessment of current facilities available and create inventory of current options.
	10. Increase LEV Use: Collaborate with UCSD (Urbana-Champaign Sanitary District) to upgrade pipeline.
		1. Lance Schideman at ISTC worked with S. Prasad in the past and they discussed this idea.
		2. Recommendation or objective.
	11. Increase LEV use: Green Fleet.
		1. Still don’t know how many fleets there are.