

## Atlanta

- Atlanta's 20% EV readiness requirement came from the Mayor, who was inspired by the requirements in Vancouver. Other ratios were considered, and those participating in the EV initiative were aware that 20% readiness would be a big push politically. They were originally going to implement an 8% readiness ordinance, and were able to do 20% because the current mayor was leaving—they had a political window in which to make 20% possible
  - o If they were going to re-do their ordinance today, they would likely stipulate a 10% readiness ordinance, as opposed to 20%.
  - o Ordinance doesn't require wiring or panel capacity, just wiring and physical space on panel (which they have identified as the biggest barriers to entry). This makes the 20% requirement more palatable
- Multifamily buildings are considered commercial
  - o The language regarding multifamily installations is left intentionally vague in order to afford owners of multifamily properties a degree of flexibility. The city is not currently aware of any issues that have arisen with regards to multifamily implementation
  - o There was some pushback from construction people with regards to the vagueness of the language. Construction people appreciate clear language
- Also performed a market survey. Found that outreach and communication are very important, as is identifying key stakeholders (property owners, apartment associations, tech advisory commission)
- Commercial property owners and multifamily property groups initially pushed back on the ordinance because they did not want to spend more money on parking spaces, especially associated with housing units that were supposed to be affordable
  - o The city countered that this investment in EV readiness would increase long term access to more affordable transportation
  - o The city is current still facing some degree of pushback from gas stations, who feel that they will not see a large demand for EV charging on their properties
- The city received support from environmental groups, EV drivers, clean energy groups, charging station manufacturers, the local utility (who helped write technical guide and provided permitting applications). They also held workshops
  - o Worked closely with Office of Building, who enforces the requirement through their permitting process
- Noted that some developers are trying to promote retroactive charger installations in order to remain competitive.
- Don't plan to require DC fast charging

## Denver

- About to start updating building codes for EV readiness, have not yet developed final numbers. They plan to work backwards from the City's vehicle electrification goals in order to set readiness requirements.

- Estimates that they will need about 10-20% of new parking spaces to have a charger at some point
- Plan to be aggressive in multifamily readiness requirements, perhaps less so in the commercial sector
- Are considering different tiers of EV readiness (circuit vs conduit). Want to avoid ripping out concrete.
- Mandating EV chargers would not have worked due to cost.
  - They believe that other programs exist that can help cover the cost of EV charger installation
  - However, having a charger physically installed provides tangible proof to the public that charging is ready and available
- Whoever builds the building is responsible for getting necessary equipment installed
- It is hard to attribute EV sales to city activities alone
  - Long time scales in planning are important. The city is thinking about demand for EV charging 30-50 years in the future
- Who helped put together the ordinance, resources used:
  - 8-9 months to write and get policy passed
  - Process included stakeholder outreach (3-4 hours/week) and council person outreach
  - Worked with environmental groups to put out calls-to-action
  - The end of the mayor's term provided a firm political deadline on the process. In the absence of this deadline, the process likely would have taken about 18 months
-