**iCAP 2020: Transportation Objectives**

**Contributions: Marie Hubbard, Student (MH), Trevor Gresham, Student (TG), Lindsey M. Braun, Faculty (LMB), Julie Cidell, Chair and Faculty (JC), Sarthak Prasad, Staff (SP), Zhuo Chen, Student (ZC), Paul Slezak, Staff (PS), Pete Varney, Staff (PV), Yanfeng Ouyang, Faculty (YO)**

*Reduce number of Cars on Campus*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | Follow Campus Master Plan (CMP) | Continuously Pursue a decrease in automobile travel through the campus core. |
| **Metric Data Source** | CMP | Parking |
| **Metric** | Completion % (of aspects we decide to emphasize) | ? |
| **Estimated Cost** | Depends on which aspects of the CMP we expect to support. | Minimal costs (<$1000), unless signs need to be replaced. |
| **Who would pay this cost?** | ? | Parking/Cities/University budget for signage and such. |
| **How Would this be implemented?** | **MH:** One way that UC Davis attempted to reduce the number of cars on campus was to require apartment developers to include less parking spots at new buildings than there were tenants - this only works when there are reliable options for students to get around, especially in the cold months that we have and they don’t | Traffic loops should be set up in a way to prevent central parking.UC Davis has closed off campus core to all vehicles; is there some way for UI to pursue this?Collaboration with the cities of Urbana and Champaign would be required.Would go through F&S, Public Safety, and Upper Management.Locations which would be impacted by this need to be determined before cost is estimated.The costs related to this objective would be subject to road ownership.Lower speed limits discourage central parking and travel.Campus representatives currently partner with CUUATS to ensure road diet (reducing road width and size) and complete street policies (to consider all modes of transportation, including those with disabilities, younger and older populations).Both road diet and complete street policies are supported.Safe alternatives for people staying out during evening/night hours must be provided (SafeRides and SafeWalks are some examples)Active distribution of information whenever possible (information packets, tabling events, library information, professor outreach, “papering”, etc.).“It’s your MTD, too” type workshop/class with contacting departments and collaborating with MTD and UIPD to show how to use SafeRides/SafeWalk.Encouraging use of SafeRides/SafeWalks in both undergraduate & graduate student populations.Encourage commuter systems among university faculty & staff.See Active Transportation Objectives.Encourage Hourly Rental vehicle services (Ex: Zipcar)Existing encouragements: Subsidized for all campus affiliates (faculty, staff, students, and alumni), publicized at tabling events, zipcar ambassadors, etc.The current publicity efforts should be improved.Making the opportunity more visible by collaborating with ZipCar Ambassadors and Management.Actively distributing information whenever possible (information packets, tabling events, library information, professor outreach, “papering”, etc.).Encourage sustainable grocery delivery services (ex: Instacart/GoPuff) to reduce student car ownership on campus.No existing subsidies or known support.Can we pursue a subsidy for grocery services, too?**MH:** Alternatively, working with the services to provide a discount for UI students at the beginning of the year.Although this is similar to ZipCar, are there differences that make it impossible (Ex: Zipcar may have a deal for free parking)?Actively distributing information whenever possible (information packets, tabling events, library information, professor outreach, “papering”, etc.). |
| **Which Unit/Department would implement this?** | **MH:** F&S would have to work in collaboration with Parking to coordinate with the cities of Champaign and Urbana in order to enforce any parking restrictions or road closures. The rideshare services could also be coordinated as part of the plan for a commuter program  | Parking? |
| **Why does this objective need to be implemented by the date stated?** | **MH:** Something like closing different roads or making more roads bus only will take time to implement, so it needs to be started as soon as possible |  |
| **Potential Project ideas?** | N/A, as CMP specifies all projects | N/A |
| **Miscellaneous information** | Need more information on what specifically should be targeted within CMP.Contact Ximing Cai | N/A |

*Increase Low Emission Vehicle (LEV) use*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | Have at least 3 fleets certified green (by NAFA or CalStart) by FY25, with departments replacing vehicles when end of life cycle (when the vehicle is no longer usable) is reached and a low emission vehicle alternative is technologically feasible (Ex: vans, pick-up trucks, etc versus passenger vehicles) | Create a Facilities Standard for electric vehicle charging stations on campus and encourage these as a recommended LEED point in the “LEED Requirements” Facilities Standard. | Provide a Renewable Natural Gas option.  |
| **Metric Data Source** | CALSTART and Nafa provide data collection and calculation tools.  | F&S | **SP:** UCSD or the Anaerobic Digester operating team |
| **Metric** | Efficiency, fuel reduction, and emission reduction. | Y/N Has the Standard been Created? | **SP:**Amount of Biogas produced, Upgradation unit efficiency |
| **Estimated Cost** | $5250 for basic membership (NAFA fleets get 20% discount). $3300 extra to become an accredited fleet. | No cost to create the standard. | **SP:** Biogas Upgradation unit costs ~$1M (Cost could be shared with UCSD)+Staff time  |
| **Who would pay this cost?** | **TG:** Each Department? Maybe university can provide funding to incentivize three initial fleets to get started. | **TG:** Cost would be incorporated into the cost of the new building. | **SP:** UCSD and University |
| **How Would this be implemented?** | **TG:** Enroll in program online. Need to provide historical data. Checklist and recommendations are provided by CALSTART. | **TG:** Policy change would need to be made. Charging stations can be placed near ‘front’ parking spaces to motivate use of electric vehicles.  | **SP:** Work closely with Energy, Zero Waste, Land and Water, and Resilience SWATeams.**SP:** Work closely with faculty and staff with experience and interest in Anaerobic Digestion.**SP:** Get support from the University higher ups.**SP:** Collaborate with UCSD. |
| **Which Unit/Department would implement this?** | ? | **TG:** F&S/Parking | **SP:** University higher management (I think) |
| **Why does this objective need to be implemented by the date stated?** | **TG:** Creating three green fleets will be a steppingstone and guide for converting all fleets to green. By starting with a few green fleets, we will have a better understanding of cost, maintenance, work impact, etc. Five years is a reasonable time for purchasing a small number of vehicles and charging stations and will contribute the overall goal of lowering emissions on campus. | **TG:** The sooner the better/promotes EV on campus. | **TG:** Need to work with UCSD timeline.**SP:** This objective directly supports the University’s commitments. Bioenergy is one of the most important components of sustainability, and we have barely done anything about this. Only with the vision of using Bioenergy will help us achieve our goal of becoming carbon neutral by 2050. |
| **Potential Project ideas?** | **MH:** Club Car has a Sustainability Grant Program that would be worth looking into | **TG:** Install charging stations in existing parking lots (near high traffic/parking). Conduct survey to see where most electric vehicle owners are located/work. | Collaborate with UCSD to convert their Biogas into Pipeline Quality Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) that could be used by campus vehicles. |
| **Miscellaneous Information** |   |  | **SP:** Energy SWATeam and Zero Waste SWATeam are in favor of constructing an Anaerobic Digester on-campus. So, we could look into that option as well.  |

*Reduce Business Air Travel Emissions*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | Reduce Business air travel emissions by X% by following protocol noted miscellaneous. | Establish an offset program option for business travel by FY25 and have at least 5 units actively participating. | Take complete inventory of teleconferencing facilities on campus and the accessibility by FY21. |
| **Metric Data Source** | Modeshare Survey | iSEE | Technology Services have no Central source; iSEE may be hub for central inventory. |
| **Metric** | Travel Emissions  | Y/N Has the program been implementedNumber out of 5 units which are participating. | Percent of campus assessed. |
| **Estimated Cost** | High costs, depending on program details (>$10,000) | Medium costs (<$5000) to implement offset program across campus; designing software, advertising software, etc. | Minimal costs (<$1000); administrative costs. |
| **More on Cost Estimation:** | **MH:** Cost of installing new teleconferencing technology  | **TG:** Dependent on travel for each department. 1 person per 1000 miles (est. 500 lbs CO2) will pay $3.10. (from <https://sustainabletravel.org/our-work/carbon-offsets/calculate-footprint/#gf_25>) | **MH:** Low, as long as it’s done within departments**TG:** Minimal cost. Mostly administrative cost. |
| **Who would pay this cost?** | ? | **TG:** Each Department | ? |
| **Which Unit/Department would implement this?** | ? | ? | **MH:** Each Department should summarize each of their data and report back to a single unit.This would have to be standardized to receive the same quality of information. |
| **Why does this objective need to be implemented by the date stated?** |  | **TG:** 100% is needed to be reached by FY50. By starting out with lower percentages with incremental increases, departmental budgets won’t be significantly strained during the first year of implementation. Additionally, slow increases allow departments to make adjustments to current travel routines and search for alternative methods (teleconference) if possible, to ease burden on budget. Or a list of alternative ideas can be provided before implementation. |  |
| **Potential Project ideas?** | Work with the Sustainability Programs Coordinator at iSEE, who will be conducting Modeshare Survey, to create questions which would gather information to assess reasons for business travel emissions every year until at least FY2025.Use information from FY21 and FY22 Modeshare surveys to find a valid number to reduce business travel emissions for FY24 & FY25 by in FY2023 (Ex: Reduce air travel emissions by 5% each fiscal year).Reduce emissions by the percent determined in FY24 & FY25.MH: Campaign between University of Illinois systems to reduce air travel for conferencing.This would be in direct support of UI Ride. | Explore all offset programs by FY23. | ? |
| **Miscellaneous Information** | N/A | N/A | The goal is to pursue improvements in teleconferencing technology. |

*Road Management Systems*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | Create a Campus Directive to utilize Central Receiving for distribution at the Campus Level (Administration) and have 3 departments utilize the facility by FY25. F&S uses Central Receiving for its purchases | Follow the Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) through the F&S TDM department. – Increase the average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for campus roads to 65 by the end of FY25, and 70 by FY30. | All campus units should adopt and enforce an idling engine restriction by FY25. |
| **Metric Data Source** | Chancellor’s Office | TDM | ? |
| **Metric** | Y/N Has the directive been implemented?How many units out of 3 utilize the Central Receiving center? | PCI Index | ? |
| **Estimated Cost** | Medium cost to enforce (<$5000)**SP:** We already have the Central Receiving location. No need to have the building cost. | For TDM Coordinator’s budget, High cost ($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]) | No cost. |
| **Who would pay this cost?** | ? | University budget | N/A |
| **How Would this be implemented?** | Identify the objects that could be delivered to a Central location before moving it to its destination on a smaller vehicle – Non-perishable items, Toiletries, Cutlery (knives, forks, spoons, kitchen utensils), paper, etc.Identify the departments to target – Housing, Campus Rec, Document Services or Illini Union, etc. | Follow the TAMP. | **TG:** Policy would need to be created. Supervisors in each department would be responsible for enforcement. |
| **Which Unit/Department would implement this?** | ? | ? | **TG:** All departments using campus vehicles. |
| **Why does this objective need to be implemented by the date stated?** | **SP:** Maintenance (to reduce stress on the U of I roads) and Safety (to reduce the number of large vehicles on campus) | **SP:** To be able to maintain the U of I roads and to reduce the possibility of total reconstruction, which will be the case if PCI goes below 55 (I think) | **TG:** Has potential to save money on fuel. Sooner implemented, more money saved. |
| **Potential Project ideas?** | ? | Using Biobinders during road/sidewalk/bike path construction  | ? |
| **Miscellaneous** | There are many deliveries made by private enterprises, such as sororities, fraternities, and on campus restaurants. The effect that this initiative would have on them is likely negligible.This will improve the road conditions, safety, and disability accommodations.GHG emission from a semi-truck may be equivalent to GHG emission from several smaller vehicles | N/A | N/A |

*Increase the Mode Share of Active Travel*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | Complete the 2014 Campus Bike Plan (CBP) in its entirety. | Rewrite/revise/renew the Campus Bike Plan by 2024, with the aim of achieving Bicycle Friendly University Gold status by 2027. | Improve traffic calming measures |
| **Metric Data Source** | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) |
| **Metric** | Number of miles or feet of bike path/lane repaired/added/renovated | LMB: Plan completion (Y/N); LAB status | LMB: Number of traffic calming projects implemented |
| **Estimated Cost** | LMB: $4 million in 2014 USD (according to plan) | LMB: $75,000 | LMB: Too many unknowns to estimate at this point |
| **Who would pay this cost?** | LMB: Varies by project | LMB: Will vary by project | LMB: University; city? |
| **How Would this be implemented?** | **SP:** A lot of funding is required.  | ? | ? |
| **Which Unit/Department would implement this?** | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM + Sustainability) | Facilities and Services (TDM + Sustainability) | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) |
| **Why does this objective need to be implemented by the date stated?** |  |  |  |
| **Potential Project ideas?** | LMB: Already provided in plan | LMB: Implementation of projects remaining from the 2014 plan; road diets; advance stop bars/signage | LMB: Raised crosswalks, curb extensions, painted crosswalks and bike lanes |
| **Miscellaneous** | There are several goals and objectives that have not been addressed yetSupport the High, Medium, and Low Priority projects for Bicycle Infrastructure | University of Illinois achieved Silver-Level BFU Certification in October 2019 (This status is valid from 2019-23)Next application for BFU will be available in 2023 (Retain the Silver-level certification in 2023)Strive to achieve Gold-level BFU status following the application in 2027. | Need further clarification of current policies and plans concerning traffic calming; SP is contacting S. Delorenzo about the current measures. |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Objective** | Improve transit use each FY by conducting at least two “It’s Your MTD, Too” workshops, including a survey at the beginning and end of the workshop. | Create a master list of commuter/rideshare opportunities on campus and distribute throughout campus by end of FY2020. | Develop a Commuter Program (Bus, Bike, and Hike) for Faculty and Staff, and have 100 faculty and staff registered in the program by FY25. Have 500 people registered by FY30. |
| **Metric Data Source** | LMB: MTD; survey | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) |
| **Metric** | LMB: Number of workshops conducted; number of surveys completed; % of participants who respond to survey questions in a certain way (e.g., satisfaction with current or planned service) | Units distributed | LMB: Number of faculty and staff registered |
| **Estimated Cost** | **SP:** Minimal costs (<$1000) Staff time only | Minimal Costs (<$1000) | (Minimal Costs (<$1000) |
| **Who would pay this cost?** | LMB: MTD?**SP:** There is no direct cost. Only Staff Time for the University and MTD | LMB: N/A | LMB: N/A |
| **Response to iWG** | (SG) How is attendance of the It’s Your MTD, Too workshops ensured?**SP:** F&S TDM will organize a minimum of 1 workshop per semester. We will utilize the marketing powers of Newsletters, Digital Signage, MTD, etc.  | Transportation SWATeam: The units distributed is just to assess how many departments have access to the material, not necessarily how many people within that department have gained access. | N/A |
| **How Would this be implemented?** | LMB: Coordination with MTD | ? | **MH:** Several other universities serve as great models. Contacting relevant professionals at these universities would be necessary to move forward in planning. |
| **Which Unit/Department would implement this?** | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM)**SP:** Parking, F&S, Public Safety, MTD, etc.  |
| **Why does this objective need to be implemented by the date stated?** |  |  |  |
| **Potential Project ideas?** | LMB: N/A (inherent in the objective description) | LMB: N/A (inherent in the objective description) | LMB: N/A (inherent in the objective description) |
| **Miscellaneous** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Objective** | Include Bicycle and pedestrian safety and rules of the road to one of the initial lectures for professors to mention at the beginning of their lecture. The content should be distributed on a separate day from the Run/Hide/Fight and TitleIX content. | Encourage walking on campus.  | Increase Long Term Bike Storage |
| **Metric Data Source** | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM); individual professors | Modeshare Survey | LMB: Facilities and Services (TDM) |
| **Metric** | LMB: Number of professors contacted; number of professors who include the curriculum; number of students reached in those classes | Count of student walking rates | LMB: Number of long-term bike storage spaces added |
| **Estimated Cost** | LMB: Cost would be minimal (<$1000). Mostly administrative costs. | LMB: Cost would be minimal (<$1000). Mostly administrative costs.If including signage, cost would be medium (<$5000) | LMB: Per locker: ~$4000 capital + ~$300 annual operating**SP:** I think it is more likely be a garage type space that could hold 1,000 or more bicycles. I am not sure how much it will cost. |
| **Who would pay this cost?** | LMB: N/A | N/A | LMB: University, student fees (?), user fees (for those storing bicycles) |
| **Response to iWG** | (AS) We should be sensitive to how many items faculty are asked to mention in their lectures or in their syllabi. Do we have a master list of all of those? I feel as though there are already many items we ask for (school shooter/run, hide, fight; building emergency action plan, sexual assault/Title IX protocol; etc.) Perhaps stock language for the syllabus may be better, I would not want far more important messages to be crowded out.**SP:** I think this is an important message as well. We are hoping that professors will include bicycle and pedestrian safety information sporadically (maybe 1-2 times a semester). I understand that professors have to go through their curriculum, but more than 80% of our students walk (50%)/take the bus (31%), and 10-20% use bicycles as their primary source of transportation. I believe safety is of the utmost importance to our university and we need to address road safety. Professors have regular interactions with students and have a better chance of spreading this message. Professors could just give students a brief intro about this and add the links to the Safety information in their digital lecture slides.  | Encourage walking and tie it to wellness programs for students/faculty/staff. [Idea to] Define specific paths with distances and/or steps?Response: I like this idea! We would have to work with Campus Rec, but I’m thinking of it as especially a way to encourage students to walk from the dorms to the quad instead of taking the bus.This program would support orienting university visitors, as well as promoting student health.(JM) Is an ad campaign appropriate for incentivization of walking?**Answer:** The need for an ad campaign is necessary to publicize a program like mentioned above.  | **SP:** There has been a need of Long Term bicycle storage units.**SP:** Also included in the Campus Bicycle Plan |
| **How Would this be implemented?** |  | **MH:** It would be worth looking into an online module for pedestrian and bike safety that would be required of all students before they register for classes. Another idea would be for cyclists that register their bike to have to complete a safety quiz but have an incentive via a commuter program to register their bike.**TG:** Work with education team. Promote walking as healthier option in new student orientation (provide statistics/benefits). | Collaborate with Parking, Campus Rec, F&S, Public Safety etc.  |
| **Which Unit/Department would implement this?** | Departments that participate could be incentivized. | **TG:** Education SWATeam. | F&S + Parking + Campus Rec + Public Safety |
| **Why does this objective need to be implemented by the date stated?** |  |  | Huge demand of long term bicycle storage, especially during winter season. |
| **Potential Project ideas?** | LMB: N/A (inherent in the objective description) | ? | LMB: N/A (inherent in the objective description) |
| **Miscellaneous** | Could be a collaboration opportunity with the Education SWATeam.Must consider which classes are most realistic to target. Freshman orientation courses are a possibility.**MH:** RHET105, Freshman seminars, etc.An online bicycle safety quiz currently exists.The quiz should bePublicized. | According to the Modeshare Survey(February 2019) andA pilot survey (Spring2018) suggest thatAround 50-60% ofStudents commute toClass. | N/A |

Miscellaneous Question Responses:

1. (MW) How can parking hunting be reduced (meaning driving around trying to find a parking spot)?

**PS:**

1. (MW) How many parking permits are owned by students and how ownership has changed over the last years?

**PS:**

1. **(General) How are “solid objectives” and “potential objectives” defined?**

**Answer:** Eliminated.