City of Seattle
Racial Equity Toolkit (RET) Summary Sheet
Cover Sheet and Questions

Department/Office: SDCI & OSE
Name of policy, program, etc. analyzed: Electric Vehicle Readiness Ordinance
Names and titles of key staff that led this RET process: Christina Ghan, SDCI Senior Planner /
Andrea Pratt, OSE Climate & Transportation Policy Advisor
Dates of RET process (e.g., 8/2016 – 10/2016)**:** 7/2018 - 12/2018

> This Summary Sheet should be completed by those who worked on this RET with input from Change
> Team members and department leadership. Representatives from these different groups should
> review the final version so that there is consensus on content before it is shared with the Mayor's
> Office. Please fill out a separate Summary Sheet for each of the 4 required RETs that your department
> named in your director's Performance Plan with the Mayor.
> For questions about using this Summary Sheet, please contact your OCR RSJI liaison.

Please respond to the following questions in a separate document (no more than 2.5 pages)
and include this page as the cover sheet along with your response.

1. Describe the project, program, policy or budgetary decision that you assessed using the Racial Equity Toolkit.

2. List the racial equity outcome(s) that you set in Step 1 of the RET process.

3. Which stakeholders (groups and/or key individuals) did you engage in this RET? In what ways did you engage them?

4. Please describe up to five key benefits and/or burdens for people of color of this policy, program, project, or other decision, which the RET process helped you to identify or confirm.

5. Please describe up to five key actions – things that you will do differently or begin to do now – of this policy, program, project, or other decision, which will increase opportunity and/or minimize harm for people of color.

6. How will leadership ensure implementation of the actions described in question 4?

7. How have/will you report back to your stakeholders? (This includes the people who were directly engaged in this RET process, those who will be affected by decisions made, and other departments or divisions impacted by the RET findings and the actions described in question 4.)

8. What additional racial equity issues did this RET reveal? Consider how these unresolved issues present opportunities for structural transformation (i.e. working across departments, and with other institutions and sectors to achieve racial equity).

1. Describe the project, program, policy or budgetary decision that you assessed using the Racial Equity Toolkit.

Amend the Land Use Code to require parking in new construction to include charging infrastructure to accommodate electric vehicle (EV) charging and make it easier for someone to install charging equipment/stations in the future. The number of "EV-ready" parking spaces required would depend on the type of land use (both residential and non-residential) and the type and size of parking facilities provided. The requirements would apply to all off-street parking provided -- whether or not it is required by the Land Use Code. It does not modify parking requirements in the Land Use Code.

This legislation is a component of the Drive Clean Seattle Initiative. Drive Clean Seattle is framed within City's Environmental Equity Agenda/Equity and Environment Initiative, which provides goals and strategies which serve as a roadmap for sectors to work together to advance environmental equity in Seattle. A separate Racial Equity Toolkit (RET) was completed on the Drive Clean Seattle Initiative in the fall of 2016. Where relevant, information from the Drive Clean Seattle RET is included in this analysis to provide supporting information and additional context.

2. List the racial equity outcome(s) that you set in Step 1 of the RET process.

- Communities most affected should have equal access to EV charging and not be disenfranchised from clean, green, cost effective transportation fuel based on where they live or what type of housing they live in.

The Drive Clean Seattle RET previously identified the following outcomes related to this proposal:
- Improve air quality in the places where communities of color, immigrants, refugees, people with low-incomes, youth and limited-English proficiency individuals live, learn, work and play
- Bring economic benefit to such communities through… a decrease in transportation costs

3. Which stakeholders (groups and/or key individuals) did you engage in this RET? In what ways did you engage them?

We discussed the proposal with the Environmental Justice Committee (EJC) in November of 2016. The EJC was briefed on the EVRO concept draft and subsequently directed the city to use existing feedback on Drive Clean Seattle as guidance for this legislation including mitigating displacement factors and increasing access to EVs. We also sought input from the Seattle Housing Authority, King County Housing Authority, Puget Sound Sage, the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle (ECOSS), and the Emerald Cities Collaborative during the spring and summer of 2018.

We had in person conversations with other stakeholders, including EV manufacturers and charging companies (Telsa, Proterra, Reach Now, National Car Charging, Volta Charging, Cyan Strategies, SemaConnect, Electrify America, Clipper Creek, Chargepoint, Powerflex Systems, and Greenlots), environmental organizations (Forth Mobility, Climate Solutions, Environment WA, Western WA Clean Cities, and Seattle 2030 District, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency), and extensive conversations with the development community (Master Builders Association, Built Green, Vulcan, Clise Properties, Unico Properties, Barrientos Ryan, Gamut 360, Dwell Development, Evergreen Certified, Capitol Hill Housing/Eco District). City Stakeholders involved included Seattle City Light, Office of Housing, SDOT, and Parks.

4. Please describe up to five key benefits and/or burdens for people of color of this policy, program, project, or other decision, which the RET process helped you to identify or confirm.

1. Equitable access to charging infrastructure would increase EV adoption rates throughout Seattle, leading to reduced transportation costs (in the form of operation and maintenance) and improved local air quality and long-term climate benefits.
2. People who live in multifamily housing face greater barriers to installing a charging station at their residence when there is inadequate electrical infrastructure in place. Access to plugs would increase the likelihood of EV ownership in these communities.
3. Better access to EV charging for residents of subsidized affordable housing could help residents who are drivers for taxi's and transportation network companies adopt EVs.
4. More EV infrastructure could incrementally increase the cost of building parking, and thus the cost of building housing that includes parking. Some marginal costs could be passed down to renters living on the margin of affordability, including renters who do not own an EV so would not benefit from the additional cost burden.

5. Please describe up to five key actions – things that you will do differently or begin to do now – of this policy, program, project, or other decision, which will increase opportunity and/or minimize harm for people of color.

1. We added a pathway for small-scale residential development to request flexibility from the requirements if they would have to make expensive infrastructure upgrades.
2. We decided not to exempt affordable housing development from the rules to ensure that the future residents of those buildings will have access to EV charging. Parking is not mandatory in affordable housing development so developers could also opt to reduce the amount of parking built overall to defray marginal costs as a result of the ordinance.

6. How will leadership ensure implementation of the actions described in question 4?

The actions were incorporated into the ordinance that was transmitted to City Council. If the ordinance is adopted and becomes law, SDCI will incorporate the rules into the permit process for new development.

7. How have/will you report back to your stakeholders? (This includes the people who were directly engaged in this RET process, those who will be affected by decisions made, and other departments or divisions impacted by the RET findings and the actions described in question 4.)

Stakeholder participation and partnership is an important, on-going part of the process to develop this proposal and complete the RET. We have notified stakeholders of major project milestones and will continue to do so until the legislation is adopted and implemented through SDCI's permit process.

8. What additional racial equity issues did this RET reveal? Consider how these unresolved issues present opportunities for structural transformation (i.e. working across departments, and with other institutions and sectors to achieve racial equity).

- Residents of existing buildings that do not have EV-ready parking will still face significant barriers to EV adoption. OSE is reaching out to private sector companies and local housing

authorities to explore opportunities for public private partnerships to provide EV charging infrastructure and/or EV car share vehicles to reduce these barriers.

- Other financial barriers to EV adoption remain. OSE is also looking for ways to increase access to EVs by identifying funding sources for vehicle rebates, charging station installation incentives, low interest non-predatory auto loans from community banks, and subsidized rates for public charging infrastructure.