

EV Technical Advisory Series  
Meeting #3 Notes  
May 25, 2021

**Attendees:** Joy Alise (Imagine Black), Alex Bejarano (PBOT), Anthony Bencivengo (Portland Tenants United), Tammy Boren-King (PBOT), Shanna Brownstein (PGE), Brian Crise (BDS), Bill Cunningham (BPS), Charles Funches (Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives), Flavio Garcia (Hacienda CDC), Jason Henry (It's All Good Energy), Masaye Hoshide (PHB), Eric Huang (Forth Mobility), Joanne Johnson (Water Bureau), Alice Livermore (EV owner & resident), Steve Lockhart (MKE & Associates), Sergio Lopez (Verde), Barry Manning (BPS), Silva Rose Palleroni (Hacienda CDC), Matt Wickstom (BPS), Sara Wright (Oregon Environmental Council)

**Staff:** Ingrid Fish, Marty Stockton, and Phil Nameny

**Meeting Purpose/Overview**

An overview of the meeting agenda was provided.

**Legislative Update** – all heading to Governor for signature

HB2180: Requires 20% EV ready for multi-dwelling and commercial/mixed use. It also allows local jurisdictions to require a higher percentage than 20% through land use process. HB2180 goes into effect on 7/1/22. Doesn't impact single dwelling

HB2165: Extends EV rebate incentives, expands program for lower income, requires utilities to invest

HB2475: Allows differentiated utility rate structure addressing utility burden of lower income residents.

Q&A

Anthony Bencivengo: Differences between HB2165 and SB314. 2165 had more safeguards for rate increases, with max amount.

**Economic Analysis** – Consultant hired for work this summer.

Generally done to quantify impact of legislative code amendments. It will look at two things

- Impact on development
- Potential benefits to household related to access

Q&A

Steve Lockhart: Review of impact of new construction versus waiting and having to retrofit?

Marty: The inclusion of retrofit costs may not be explicitly part of study per se since the requirement will be for just new construction and not impact existing development.

Ingrid: It might be beneficial to know the cost differential between new construction and retrofit.

**Code Topics from Previous Meetings**

1. EV Ready vs. EV Installed

Can we go further and require the outlet/installation? This may go against building code pre-emption and so are not allowed to exceed that.

2. Landscaping waiver for installation

Installation often gets placed in the landscape strips next to parking spaces. Can allow it within parking space, can exempt screening of the equipment, exempt from DZ or Hist review, but limit in perimeter landscaping.

3. Car-share and short-term parking options

Possible requirements for car share or short-term parking options. There are existing provisions for car share for required parking that could be expanded for EV. Consider EV infrastructure in short term parking. Consider signage to encourage multiple use of EV spaces. We could also update our TDM requirements in the future to accommodate EV infrastructure

Q&A on first 3?

Anthony Bencivengo: Adding EV to car share is a good idea.

Shanna Brownstein: PBOT is working to bring car share programs back to Portland and how PGE/PPL can help to encourage the fleet is electric, and to create a tiered structure for charging and income.

Jason Henry: Any thought on the economic impact and potential revenue sharing among residents/owners?

This is worth additional discussion about whether EV charger site hosts can benefit from future EV charging related revenue. There could be different ways to structure these financially, both in terms of revenue, and in terms of gaining clean energy credits.

4. Rent control issues

How to prevent the passing on of costs to tenants. State has a maximum cap on increases, but it's limited. City also has relocation requirements if rents are increasing above the threshold.

5. Cost burden issue for developer/owners

Potential alternatives could be utility credits, incentives for chargers, of fund development to offset costs.

Steve Lockhart: PGE & PP&L do not generally pay for the conduit and installation/transformers. Also, often additional incentives may not be available since there are already line extension credits to offset the above costs.

Shanna Brownstein: The items being considered would be the additional costs to go from conduit to the actual plug/charger.

Q&A on these Code Topics

Eric Huang: Is there a way to work to right size shared charging and power management (smart charging) with requirements for transformers.

Steve L: There are some changes to not require 100% charging capability to address smart chargers

Anthony B: Does the city have the authority on who can claim incentives and or the relationship between incentives and rent increases.

Good question. There are lots of issues related to where the incentives are generated and who controls or regulates them.

Overview of Code Concepts

100% for up to 6 and 50% of the parking of 7 or more for multi-dwelling or mixed use with residential

20% for other commercial uses

### **General Q&A**

Bill Cunningham: Thinking about the cost of retrofitting existing parking spaces and allowing them to be used by nonresidents. Is there a way to do this with residential zones and residential units? For example, the ability to use as commercial parking.

Marty: This does seem like something appropriate to consider along Neighborhood and Civic Corridors where the land use pattern is often a patchwork of commercial mixed use and multi-dwelling zoning. Although, much depends on the management of the parking and whether it can be available.

Eric Huang: It would be good to allow rather than prohibit it.

Ingrid: Yes, could help with site revenue generation.

### **Next Steps**

Fourth and final meeting on June 29.

Future sharing of a report

Timeline moving forward into 2022.

Website: <https://www.portland.gov/bps/ev-ready>