

HW 1

Hayden Atchley

9 September 2022

1

The systems boundary for SLC Int'l Airport is below:




Figure 1: SLC Int'l Airport systems boundary.

I think most of the elements of the diagram are fairly straightforward, where emissions sources produced directly by the airport are entirely inside the boundary, though a few elements are worth mentioning specifically. I considered personal travel to be a part of the trip in which a dropoff/pickup occurs, so the idling and minimal driving that happens with a dropoff/pickup is entirely within the airport boundary, while the transportation to and from the airport is not. Additionally, while the airport *does* in a sense generate flights, the in-flight emissions themselves are outside the boundary of the airport (the emissions during landing, takeoff, and taxiing are entirely in the boundary).

Another, perhaps easier, way to think about it (and how I thought about it) is a question of control. What emissions sources does the airport have total control over, and what sources are only partially under their control? The airport can, for example, control how much electricity it uses, but not the electricity to emissions

2

The diagram illustrates the following causal relationships and feedback loops:

- Top Level:** A large question mark (?) is positioned at the top center.
- Central Loop:**
 - Emissions** (+) → **Fuel economy** (+) → **Demand for better fuel economy** (+) → **Gasoline price** (-) → **Gasoline demand** (+) → **Gas usage** (+) → **Emissions** (+). This is a reinforcing loop labeled **R**.
 - Gasoline price** (-) → **Gasoline vehicles** (+) → **Gasoline demand** (+) → **Gasoline price** (-). This is a balancing loop labeled **B**.
 - Gasoline price** (-) → **Gasoline vehicles** (+) → **Gasoline demand** (+) → **Gasoline price** (-). This is a balancing loop labeled **B**.
- Left Side:**
 - Emissions regulation** (+) → **Electric vehicles** (+) → **EV production cost** (-) → **EV production cost** (+) → **Electric vehicles** (+). This is a reinforcing loop labeled **R**.
 - Battery costs** (+) → **EV production cost** (-) → **EV production cost** (+) → **Electric vehicles** (+) → **Battery costs** (+). This is a reinforcing loop labeled **R**.
 - Battery technology** (+) → **Battery costs** (-) → **EV production cost** (-) → **EV production cost** (+) → **Electric vehicles** (+) → **Battery technology** (+). This is a reinforcing loop labeled **R**.
- Right Side:**
 - Gasoline vehicles** (+) → **Gasoline demand** (+) → **Gasoline price** (-) → **Gasoline vehicles** (+). This is a balancing loop labeled **B**.
 - Gasoline vehicles** (+) → **Gasoline demand** (+) → **Gasoline price** (-) → **Gasoline vehicles** (+). This is a balancing loop labeled **B**.
- Bottom:**
 - Rare earth metals availability** (+) → **Demand for better battery technology** (+) → **Battery technology** (+) → **Battery costs** (-) → **EV production cost** (-) → **EV production cost** (+) → **Electric vehicles** (+) → **Rare earth metals usage** (-) → **Rare earth metals availability** (+). This is a reinforcing loop labeled **R**.

This analysis is far from perfect, but it gives a good idea of the relationships at play. I made a few assumptions:

- 2

might have a negative impact on fuel economy. However, there may also be improvements in engine emissions that *increase* fuel economy as well.

- I am assuming that as the supply of rare earth metals decreases, battery technology will improve in a way that uses less of them. This may or not be the case, but I think it's likely.

3