

Chair Beyer, Vice-Chair Findley, and members of the committee. We support efforts to transition transportation toward electric vehicles but do not support putting the requirements in the building code as long as there is a local option to expand the number of parking spaces to be EV ready. As now written, with the notwithstanding clause (page 2, line 12) the local option will most likely happen in the building code and some have said can only be done there.

1. Think about out how parking lots are planned and noting that parking often drives development. The parking ratio, the setbacks, the landscaping requirements, the lighting levels, pole heights fixture orientation, parking space width, etc., are set in the local land use. The construction of the parking lot in accordance with the local land use code must comply with the statewide building code. Having differing requirements in the building code adds a level of complexity to the process that complicate the goal of developing EV infrastructure.
2. At the beginning of a development project, when the site is being evaluated, we typically have a predevelopment meeting with local government to understand all of the local requirements so that we can determine if the site is suitable and economically feasible. For budgeting, contractors know that the building code is statewide and look to land use code for local options.
3. This bill would represent the first time that I know of that the legislature has granted local government an option to modify the statewide code without coordinating with the Building Codes Division. This is the beginning of a breakdown of the state preemption and erosion of the statewide code, which is great benefit to consumers and users of the building code due to the same standards being applied across the state.

Nathan Philips

Eugene, Oregon