Records Management

Electrifying Washington's Transportation Incentive Act Daily Electric Vehicles Charging Initiative UE-160082

Background:

The Avista Electric Transportation beta program has been under evaluated for a number of years now, see additional information at www.utc.wa.gov, search doc number UE-160082. Several recommendations, letters and reports has been filed around the installations of electric vehicle chargers at public, private and work locations throughout Eastern Washington. Supporting this proposal please note: Coalition "Major comments 3." McCoy is addressing the same concern as mine however, no solution provided.

From my personal experience driving electric, for over five years now and until ayear ago, I was the only electric vehicle driver at my company Frencken America. Last year, Avista installed two work charger, and I started to use them, I plugged in everyday, and with just the act of plugging in, witness by my fellow co-workers coming to and from work, has resulted in, the company now have five employees driving electric vehicles. Five of us are now fighting for the two charges installed, a challenge, especially since the mean time between failure has been quite short. For the journey home, three of the five electric vehicle drivers are depended on getting charged during work hours. Currently my company is paying for the five of us. It is great with free transportation to and from work, however, at the same time problematic:

Legislative proposal:

- 1. Provide company tax incentive for the installation and charging of employees electric vehicles.
 - a) More employees will see the benefit of driving electric
 - b) Free driving, to and from work, more money in employees pockets.
 - c) A major employee and company benefit.
 - d) Low income employees would greatly benefit (Today many used electric vehicles are available at a fraction of the cost of new electric vehicles)
 - e) Focus on reliable employee charging, low tech level 1 or 2 charging over 8 hours will be more than sufficient for most drivers. See Link
- Provide Sales Tax relief for, especially used electric vehicle's, this will give low income a
 break getting into electric vehicles for commuting to and from work. Extension of sales
 tax exemptions on new electric vehicles should also be considered.

How to pay for this Legislative proposal:

- 1. Electric vehicles already has higher registrations fees, those funds could be directed to support work charges. (currently the funds are directed to expensive Level 3 chargers)
- 2. Additional registrations fees could be applied to all electric vehicle drivers with the understanding free EV charging will be provided through work chargers. (Already paid for through this registration fee)
- 3. Excessive Net Metering credits from Solar and Wind can be used to offset employer power bills (Part of net metering bill from 2018 session was to help low income families)

Electrifying Washington's Transportation Incentive Act Daily Electric Vehicles Charging Initiative UE-160082

Implementation:

- 1. Install simple level 1 chargers at locations where long time parking is expected. Over an eight hour time frame, level 1 chargers will provide 40 miles driving distance well within normal driving distance to and from work..
- 2. Level 1 chargers are simple, reliable, <u>always on</u>, require no high level hardware or software, no wifi connection, no dependency on internet connections etc.
- 3. More chargers installed at workplace the better. Higher level charges causes shifting around of electric vehicle's during the day and non-employee electric vehicle drivers will use/interfere with employee parking. Installing lower level chargers will keep electric vehicle's in the same spot for 8 hours, employees will focus on work and will have the highest assurance at least 40 miles of driving distance will be available for the commute home
- 4. Power requirements of higher level chargers through existing infrastructures can be problematic. Many electrical panels are maxed out limiting the number of electric vehicle chargers. One Level 2 charger require a larger circuit breaker, where lower Level chargers require less power and can therefore charger more electric vehicles over the full 8 hour work day.



The chargers at Frencken America with room for 16 Level 1 Chargers



Liberty Lake STA park and ride, site ready for additional Level 1 Chargers?

Electrifying Washington's Transportation Incentive Act Daily Electric Vehicles Charging Initiative UE-160082

Amendment "email feedback"

Jay

Thanks for your feedback if it is OK with you I like to add your comment to the <u>Amendment "email feedback"</u> just a note concerning managing L1 chargers, they will be on all the time, no management required to run them, they are simple and therefore a lot less money to install and operate. In addition the down time should be nil, several employees, here at Frencken America, have been stranded due to failure on our charger. (WiFi connection failed) they had to go to town for a charge before they could make it home late at night. They where no happy.

Let me know if you know of others that could provide feedback.

I have received a note from both Sen Mike Padden and Sen Majority leader Andy Billing that they have this proposal under review. After I meet with them I'll file the document with the UTC.

Thanks again for your feedback.

Jørgen Rasmussen (509 542 7740)

On Thu, Nov 29, 2018 at 6:26 PM Jay Donnaway <jray3@aol.com> wrote: Thank you Arvia and Hello Jorgen,

I like the idea of a tax credit for companies who provide employee EVSE, especially if paid for out of the \$150 EV registration surcharge. I've seen the internal company politics around EV charging become insurmountable even if the finances aren't. (Would you believe that the Sumner REI distribution center refused to install EVSE for their middle managers who already drive EVs?) I also agree that L1 workplace charging is usually quite sufficient, though I have found that L2 enables job-related use of my personal EV at significant savings to my employer. (After all, who would file for mileage reimbursement if the boss is juicing your car!) However, I don't get free charging at work, I use the Blink Network and also manage the hosting agreement, so that my employer receives revenue sufficient to substantially offset the cost of electricity. Power-sharing L2 stations are now available from multiple vendors that I think are a nice step up from simply providing 120V outlets. Without some active controls, providing many 120V outlets can be more costly than just a few 40A 240V EVSE, and managing a mixed bag of L1 and L2 hookups could prove difficult.

Feel free to call me at 253-314-3830 to discuss in detail.

Jay Donnaway, CEM
President, Seattle EV Association
10.4 kW of solar on four self-built arrays
www.karmanneclectric.blogspot.com

Electrifying Washington's Transportation Incentive Act Daily Electric Vehicles Charging Initiative UE-160082

Here is an outline of the current Senate Transportation proposal:

Potential Transportation Package Discussions

Discussions around a potential 2019 transportation package continue. Sen. Steve Hobbs recently convened stakeholder meetings with lobbyists representing business, labor, environment, local governments, and tribes to share some conceptual ideas around what a transportation revenue package might include. He indicated that he intends to get feedback from stakeholders between now and the beginning of the legislative session. Early in the legislative session, he will hold a hearing on a draft bill and make further amendments to the bill draft prior to formally introducing it. Concepts for the transportation package include:

- \$15 flat rate carbon fee
- 6 cent gas tax increase
- A statewide transportation impact fee (\$2.50/square foot for commercial buildings; \$1/square foot for residential and manufacturing).
- Sales tax increase on auto part sales
- Sales tax increase on bicycles
- Sales tax increase on rental cars
- Increase in the electric vehicle fee
- Variety of additional fee increases

These revenue mechanisms raise \$10 billion over 10 years. Of the \$10 billion, \$1 billion would be spent on operations and maintenance. Other investments would potentially include:

- \$3.1 billion to replace state-owned culverts, with an additional \$200 million for local culverts, to be administered on a watershed-basis via the Fish Barrier Removal Board. This fully responds to the Supreme Court decision that requires the state to replace culverts.
- Funding for 5 new ferries, and the electrification of ferries
- \$20 million to improve electrical grids to support electric vehicle infrastructure
- \$50 million for the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
- \$70 million for the Transportation Improvement Board
- \$70 million for the County Road Administration Board
- \$375 million directly distributed to cities and counties for local needs
- Funding for bicycle and pedestrian grants, regional mobility grants, safe routes to schools, vanpools, transit, etc.

Some, but not all, specific transportation projects were mentioned:

- I-5 Bridge over the Columbia River Crossing
- US 2 Trestle
- SR 18 Widening (\$285 million for widening SR 18 from Issaquah Hobart Rd to Raging River)
- SR 522 Paradise Ln Interchange
- SR 410 Improvements
- Hood River Bridge
- Olympia SR 101/I-5 Interchange Improvements
- Completing HOV lanes through Tacoma/JBLM
- Completing the projects in the I-405 Master Plan
- SR 395 El Topia Improvements
- Valley Mall extension in Yakima

The package will likely also include tolling authorization for I-405, SR 167 HOT lanes, Puget Sound Gateway (167/509). A bill solely on tolling authorization would be introduced separate from the transportation package in the event that the transportation package does not pass. Additionally, there will be some dialogue around the low carbon fuel standard.