

Subject: [EXTERNAL]Request to speak at 3.2.22 public hearing on Parking UDC changes and written comments

Date: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 at 1:07:03 PM Mountain Standard Time

From: Allyson Solomon

To: PlanningCommission

CC: Daniel Bursuck, Koren Manning, Scott Clark, Greg Mohl, Rory Juneman

Good afternoon honorable Commission Chair and Members,

I would like to thank you for your consideration to speak at the public hearing in addition to being able, as a member of the EV stakeholder group, to provide the below written comments:

Firstly, we would like to thank the City leadership for including us in this public process. Thank you as well to the City's staff for all of their work on crafting this policy, for which not much data exists to draw comparison from. Staff has throughout this process met with MPA and it's members whenever requested.

MPA is in support of the proposed changes to section 7.4.5. REDUCTIONS AND EXCEPTIONS item number 3, permitted use and types of development.

We are also in support of the concept of an EV readiness ordinance, and appreciate that the City is being forward thinking in its planning efforts. However, we do have concerns that the proposed code changes are not ready to move past the commission and do require further study as they are more aggressive than what we feel is necessary based upon the noted adoption rates of the other cities in our state.

Given the current number of EVs in greater Pima County (2%), and even more so specifically within City limits(1%), we do not feel there is merit for the higher levels of requirement for the majority of the land use groups and class. When you couple this with the lower adoption rate that has been seen in Flagstaff, the other city in AZ to have an EV required ordinance, the required percentage of 5% really comes into question. We are not comfortable with the reasoning behind the required percentages, ranging from 5-15% and request more scientific and mathematical analysis be applied to the percentage and the level of EV readiness.

Another item that we request further explanation on is the ESVE minimum requirements by land use group and class. What was the methodology and reasoning used to assign these requirements and their associated percentages, what information was used to determine the difference between class uses? Can this be tied back to other existing city code that impacts these uses and their parking or traffic patterns?

We would like to better understand the goal of this policy? Is it simply to provide EV spaces, or is it to have those spaces be utilized? As it stands, there is no mention of tracking or enforcing these spaces to actually be utilized by EVs. There should then, we propose, be a re-evaluation date of this policy within one or two calendar years to ensure its effectiveness.

Thank you for your time, we look forward to continuing to be a part of this conversation and draft text amendments.

Allyson Solomon
Executive Director
2 East Congress, 6th floor
Tucson, Az. 85701



