

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
1	Jonathan C Goldsmith	2012 Gainsboro Road Rockville MD 20851	<p>This is an excellent and very well prepared and researched report. As an EV owner for 10+ years, I have two comments about the operation of commercial E charging stations.</p> <p>1. Charging prices at commercial sites vary markedly. For new stations, perhaps Rockville can set a reasonable per kWh charge range.</p> <p>2. Maintenance of commercial charging stations is not reliable currently. Some oversight of commercial charging stations repair and maintenance policies and procedures would create a more available and reliable network.</p>	<p>While the City does not have authority over charging prices from private commercial charging stations, staff recognizes the importance of this issue and will be seeking guidance from the Mayor and Council at the work session for a rate setting philosophy for potential future city owned and operated stations.</p> <p>Staff also recognizes the importance of charging station maintenance and reliability across the network. This is included in Action 1.3.1 to advocate for state and federal EV charging reliability/uptime standards. Such standard best practices include potentially requiring station operators to report on uptime, and to include a phone number in the signage to call in case of an outage.</p>
2	Basilio Teixeira	1702 Lorre Dr Rockville, MD 20852	I suggest partnering with the only successful company on the implementation of EV charge stations that work on the long term across the country. That is Tesla. They are so successful that other car competitors are begging to use their network and are being accepted more and more. The only car company and charge network that offers a no range anxiety feeling is Tesla. period. all other companies either charge exorbitant rates, don't have capacity with only level 2 chargers and when they are working. Tesla makes their own chargers and can also install solar panels and batteries on the roof of the facility to reduce grid demand. I have had EV for 10+ years. Only Tesla has resolved the access and charge rate needs to date. No other charge company comes close.	Thank you for your feedback regarding Tesla's charging business model. Some Tesla chargers are available to all EVs or certain models, but the charging bank in Rockville is Tesla-only. Staff will continue to monitor the market for changes and when Tesla chargers are open to other types of vehicles in the future. City-hosted chargers have varied considerations. As the EV charging infrastructure markets evolve, factors that play a role in the selection of city-hosted public charging technology; include but are not limited to compliance with grant and incentive specifications, fleet compatibility, technology selection by outside partners, and government procurement rules.
3	Christine Bozarth	1214 Allison Dr. Rockville, MD 20851	Please continue to help Rockville be more EV friendly. We definitely need more DC fast chargers, especially near 270. I recently had to drive to three locations in Rockville to find an available fast charger. There are more EVs than chargers available.	Staff recognizes the importance of developing fast charging infrastructure near I-270 and has sought grants and partnerships for installations on nearby public properties. The city has agreements to add stations to Thomas Farm Community Center (1 port) and the Swim and Fitness Center (4 ports, pending federal funding). Other stations may depend on

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
				private property owners. The Plan's goals to streamline permitting are aimed at supporting network expansion.
4	Gerald R. Cichy	1 Halifax Court Rockville, MD 20850	Have read all pages of EV Readiness Plan. Questions follow: 1. Can a solar panel be included on a single home recharging station? 2. Can a solar panel be installed on top of a rechargeable vehicle? 3. Can 4 devices be attached to vehicle 4 wheels to recharge vehicle as rolling?? 4. Can City of Rockville provide Solar Farms on city property to meet needs of those residents that do not have room for a recharging facility or regenerating solar panels? Happy to discuss further	Solar EV charging technologies and markets are evolving and in various stages of development and application. Solar charging was added to Section 2.5 EV Charging Equipment, Action 2.1.1, Action 2.1.2 and Action 4.1.2. Regenerative braking is a system that converts a vehicle's kinetic energy into electrical energy and recharges the battery while the vehicle is slowing down. It's used in hybrid and all-electric vehicles. The city does not operate a solar farm; however, the community solar program allows customers to subscribe to or own a portion of a solar array that generates electricity. Customers receive credits on their electric bills for their share of the solar system. For more information on community solar in Maryland's Pepco service area: https://www.pepco.com/smart-energy/my-green-power-connection/developers-contractors/community-solar-resources/community-solar-resources-md/program-overview
5	Dick Stoner	2891 Balmoral Drive Rockville, MD 20850	I fully support the stated goals in section 1.1-1.31 and Section 2 of the report is helpful for residents to understand the terms and charging apparatus. It should be noted in the introduction that the goal is not to convert every household to having an electric car, but that having this option for local trips and commuting will make sense for many but not all residents of the city, as well as local contractors and businesses.	The Executive Summary and Section 1.3 were revised to reference guiding principle #1 from page 19 that notes that EVs are only one element of a sustainable transportation network that emphasizes biking, walking, rolling, public transportation and other low-emission travel options. The fleet policies in section 6.5 recognize that the 24-hour duty cycles for police vehicle and snow/ice operations currently do not align with electrification.

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>Vehicles which must serve long hours in cold weather are not suitable and should not be encouraged but should be acknowledged in this presentation.</p> <p>I do not agree that taxpayer funds should be employed to a greater degree to fuel electric vehicles, which most owners charge at home or work. The vehicles do not pay road taxes as it now stands in Maryland, and it is unfair for the general public to pay for the fuel for one type of vehicle over another.</p> <p>The charging stations should be created by the private sector and utilities to the greatest possible degree, and with proper code changes, shopping centers and office buildings may install chargers as an incentive to attract electric car owners. Please provide incentive to install chargers, and change codes accordingly, but do not proceed to use taxpayer money to make one form of transportation subsidized more than another. It is very risky to make the population feel that fuel is FREE to one type of vehicle as they will soon feel that local government providing fuel or recharging stations is a right and not a privilege.</p> <p>The City of Rockville should focus on surveying PEPCO's capacity to determine where it is feasible to add charging stations and project future capacity needs so that chargers can be added in all types of housing in the future and retrofitted to some degree in existing neighborhoods.</p>	<p>The plan encourages private and utility investment in EV infrastructure by reducing barriers for permitting and construction. The discussions under Goal 2 in the Executive Summary and Action 2.1.5 are revised to clarify that City sponsored chargers are not intended to supplant private investment, only to supplement and fill gaps when opportunities exist to leverage outside funding.</p> <p>While the City does not have authority over charging prices from private commercial charging stations, staff recognizes the importance of this issue and will be seeking guidance from the Mayor and Council at the work session for a rate setting philosophy for city owned and operated stations.</p> <p>The city coordinates with Pepco on charging capacity needs on a site-by-site basis. Pepco has not offered general community or neighborhood electric capacity guidance, but that would be welcomed. The EV Plan is designed to support further coordination.</p>
6	Jack Thirolf	100 Forest Avenue Rockville, MD 20850	<p>EVs are great. Thank you to Rockville for working to support EV deployments.</p> <p>A few comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EV charger providers go through many challenges and some go out of business. A public charger is effectively useless if the software provider stops providing services. 	<p>Station outages are a continual source of difficulty and frustration for EV drivers in Rockville and elsewhere. Staff recognizes this importance of interoperability, station maintenance and reliability across the network. While interoperability, or open-source software, is a requirement of federal funding and included in city-sponsored chargers, the City</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>This happened recently to many public chargers with the Enel X Way North America market abandonment. I recommend the City require any EV charger providers to use open-source software and include specific plans for if the company goes out of business.</p> <p>2. In my experience (as an EV advocate) is that public chargers at municipal facilities are generally underutilized and more prone to breaking down. Public chargers are businesses and other high-traffic areas generally do better. To the extent possible, the City should prioritize facilitating chargers in these kinds of publicly accessible private properties over providing City-owned chargers on City property.</p> <p>3. Even better, the City should focus on facilitating installation of chargers at apartments, homes, and workplaces where the vast majority of charging takes place. Even if not strictly "public chargers," these chargers can have the greatest public benefit. Ways to facilitate chargers like these include personal incentives, clearer permitting guidelines, reduced inspection fees, and incentives for apartments and other multifamily dwellings. A few dollars in incentives/clearer permitting will help get many more kWh into vehicles instead of installing a few public chargers that have a high risk of downtime and under-usage.</p>	<p>does not have authority over private commercial charging stations. Our main tool to address this at this time is advocacy. This concept is included in Action 1.3.1 to advocate for state and federal EV charging reliability/uptime standards and interoperability requirements, such as Open Charge Point Protocol (OCPP).</p> <p>The plan encourages private and utility investment in EV infrastructure by reducing barriers for permitting and construction. The discussions under Goal 2 in the Executive Summary and Action 2.1.5 are revised to clarify that City sponsored chargers are not intended to supplant private investment, only to supplement and fill gaps when opportunities exist to leverage outside funding.</p> <p>All the actions in Goal 1 seek to reduce barriers and Actions 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 4.1.1 seek to facility installation of charges at apartments, homes and workplaces.</p>
7	David Stinchcomb	1983 Lancashire Drive Rockville, MD 20854	<p>Overall: a very strong plan – well-thought-out and very important.</p> <p>Major comments: P. 30, Challenges to EV Adoption, High Upfront Purchase Prices. The text here perpetuates the myth that there is a “significant price gap”. Inexpensive EVs and plug-in hybrids have been available since 2012 (e.g., the Nissan Leaf, Chevy Volt, Chevy Bolt, etc.). And the example of the Ford F-150 shows that the upfront cost can be the same and the overall cost of ownership significantly less</p>	<p>Staff incorporated the following edits into the revised draft plan.</p> <p>Page 30: Incorporated edits for purchase pricing and added context for some uncertainty in federal tax credit and rebates.</p> <p>P. 37-38 and Goal 2: Solar charging is not a standard stand-alone affordable business model as this time; however, there are opportunities to promote emerging technologies. Solar charging was added to</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>for EV vehicles. I suggest rewriting the text to: “Historically, there has been a perception that there is a significant price gap between EVs and comparable gas vehicles. Currently, however, the actual price difference is small. Gas-fueled Ford F-150s sells for \$39,600, while the electric Ford F-150 Lightning sells for \$39,974. In addition, EV tax credits and rebates, cheaper fueling costs, and lower maintenance costs can all reduce the price gap between EVs and gas vehicles even further.”</p> <p>P. 37-38, Utility Upgrade Costs, and P. 39-41, Charging Infrastructure Ownership and Business Models. These sections should include the option to install local solar panels with new charging stations to offset the load on the grid.</p> <p>Goal 2 (in Executive Summary and Chapter 7): actions should be reorganized and a new action defined: 2.1 Coordinate with partners to meet charging demands 2.1.1 Engage with residential properties to expand access to home charging 2.1.2 Engage with commercial properties to expand access for workplace, fleet, and destination charging 2.1.3 Coordinate with Montgomery County to expand public charging 2.1.4 Coordinate with Pepco to expand public charging and ensure grid capacity for charging 2.1.5 Identify City-owned properties and rights-of-way in gap areas and leverage outside funding and partnerships to expand public charging infrastructure 2.2 Encourage best practices in expanding the charging network 2.2.1 [previously Action 2.1.6] Promote EV infrastructure to support other e-mobility</p>	<p>Section 2.5 EV Charging Equipment, Action 2.1.1 , Action 2.1.2 and Action 4.1.2.</p> <p>Instead of creating new strategies and actions in Goal 2 that would be difficult to measure or implement, the best practices are incorporated into existing actions. The concept of creating safe pedestrian access is now specified into Action 1.2.3 (design standards) and solar charging was added to Section 2.5 EV Charging Equipment, Action 2.1.1, Action 2.1.2 and Action 4.1.2.</p> <p>P. 10-11: Added ICF, the technical consultant, to the acronym list.</p> <p>Page 12: Incorporated edits.</p> <p>P. 27/28: Added reference to Figure 3 in text</p> <p>P. 30: This is a good suggestion; however, Figure 4 was generated by an outside agency and cannot be edited.</p> <p>P. 30-31: Incorporated edits.</p> <p>P. 56: Incorporated edits.</p> <p>P. 67: Solar and battery storage is not currently a standard, stand-alone, affordable business model for 24-hour charging. Grid capacity will still be important factor for most installations.</p> <p>P. 68: Incorporated edits.</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>opportunities, such as e-bikes, e-scooters, EV ride-hailing, or EV car-sharing services</p> <p>2.2.2 [new action] Work to ensure new EV charging infrastructure has good pedestrian access to allow EV drivers to walk safely to nearby amenities while charging.</p> <p>2.2.3 [new action] Promote the installation of solar panels with new EV chargers to reduce energy costs, reduce the load on the grid, and provide shade and protection from rain for EV drivers when charging. [See https://www.energy.gov/eere/solar/articles/benefits-powering-your-ev-solar-energy]</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>P. 10-11: the acronym “ICF” is missing from the table of acronyms.</p> <p>P. 12, Executive Summary. Maryland Route 200 is not an interstate. Also, the 3rd sentence should be changed to read, “One corridor, Interstate 270, currently meets the federal minimum station and mileage requirements for electric vehicle charging infrastructure; the Maryland Route 200 corridor requires additional charging infrastructure.”</p> <p>P. 28, Figure 3. There is no reference to this figure in the text. In this figure, and/or in any discussion of electricity sources in the text, it should be noted that EV owners are more likely to use clean energy sources (have solar panels on their homes, purchase electricity from clean energy providers) than the average electricity consumer.</p> <p>P. 30, Figure 4. For readability, the order of the car makes in the legend should match the order in the bars of the graph. For example, BMW is at the top of the legend but at the bottom of the bars in the graph.</p>	

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>P. 30-31, Challenges to EV Adoption, Inadequate Charging Infrastructure. This section combines several topics. I suggest splitting it into two sections, one discussing battery range, range anxiety, and charging speeds (the newer batteries only take about 15 minutes to recharge), and the other discussion the availability of chargers (“Inadequate Charging Infrastructure”).</p> <p>P. 56, Alternative Electric Mobility Opportunities. This section should include a discussion of the importance of good pedestrian access and micro mobility transportation options for charging station users. It should be easy for people to park their car at a charger and then walk to or hop on an electric scooter or a bicycle to ride to their home, hotel, or a nearby restaurant for a bite to eat.</p> <p>P. 67, Electrical capacity: should mention the option to install local solar panels with new charging stations to offset the load on the grid.</p> <p>P. 68, end of the “Best Practices for Siting EV Charging” section: add a bullet that sites should have good pedestrian access and micro mobility options (electric scooters, bicycle share, etc.) for use while the vehicle is charging.</p>	
8	Ilsabe Urban	1108 Grand Champion Dr Rockville, MD 20850	I thought it looked good.	Thank you for reviewing the plan.
9	Kathleen Kleinmann	209 Monroe St Apt 205 Rockville, MD 20850	Your statements regarding the ADA in section 4.4 Accessible EV Charging on page 54 are inaccurate and explains why other portions of the document do not include goals and enforcement efforts regarding the ADA. Please contact the Mid Atlantic ADA Center in Rockville for more information. https://www.access-	<p>Staff clarified the first statement in section 4.4 with the following revisions:</p> <p>Original Text: The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) do not currently include specific accessibility</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>board.gov/tad/ev/#types-of-ev-charging-stations-that-must-be-accessible The ADA requires accessibility, and the Access Board writes the regulation and requirement. You need to do more homework on this topic. You also need to be more proactive on equity for disabled drivers of electric vehicles. Rockville should be early adopters so that equity is taken seriously and not just theoretical.</p>	<p>requirements for EV parking spaces, although the U.S. Access Board included the following recommendations for two aspects of accessibility...</p> <p>Revised Text: The Maryland Accessibility Code (MAC) includes many accessibility requirements applicable to electric vehicle charging stations, among which are provisions regarding access to sites, facilities, buildings, and elements, as well as specific requirements for operable parts and accessible routes. Though specific scoping provisions for EV-Parking Spaces are absent from the MAC, regulated entities must still ensure that they are accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. The U.S. Access Board included the following recommendations for two aspects of accessibility...</p> <p>While the plan does not include an individual accessibility goal, the intent was to integrate this value throughout the entire plan. The Plan's Guiding Principle #3 is the equitable expansion of charging access for all in Rockville, especially for underrepresented groups and people with disabilities (Section 1.2, page 19). Each of the 26 actions includes an equity consideration for action implementation.</p> <p>The EV Plan's role is to serve as a high-level road map to set forth actions to focus resources and time on activities that can help increase the number of charging stations available to all Rockville residents, including drivers with disabilities. While the technical requirements and enforcement are not included in this high-level policy document; the U.S. Access Board's accessible electric vehicle charging station</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
				guidelines are referenced throughout the plan and are intended to be included in the implementation of Actions 1.1.1 (Building Codes), 1.1.5 (Zoning Ordinance), and 1.2.3 (design standards) to be more proactive on equity for disabled drivers of electric vehicles. There is much more to the scoping and technical requirements surrounding accessible EV-Parking and EV-Charging Spaces that will be part of the implementation process for these actions.
10	Gerald R. Cichy	1 Halifax Court	<p>1. Can solar panels be placed on charging devices to reduce need of electrical supply??</p> <p>2. Install Solar panels on EV Cars to regenerate while standing or traveling ??</p> <p>3. Can Rockville generate power with solar panels on Public Property and on new private development projects??</p> <p>4. Can vehicles be built or retro-fitted with wheels fitted with devices that generate electric power to drive vehicle??</p>	Please see responses to similar questions submitted in #4.
11	Clark Reed	5913 Crawford Dr., Rockville, MD 20851	<p>Pg 30 High Upfront Purchase Prices There is no mention of buying used EVs which can be substantially more affordable than new ones. See here. Suggested edit: "However, <buying used EVs>, EV tax credits and rebates, cheaper fueling costs,..."</p> <p>Pg 44 Projected EV Registrations by Benchmark Years As titled, the table is hard to understand. Suggest changing Table 7 title to something like "Estimated Rockville Share of State EV Registrations Needed to Meet State Goals".</p> <p>Pg 94 Action 1.2.3 Establish design standards for EV charging stations The Draft Plan states that Model 3 'Charging Cord Guidelines' applies only to Level 1 charging. In fact, Level 2 charging can be done safely across the pavement using a new technology that is being widely adopted by local jurisdictions across the UK --</p>	<p>P. 30: Incorporated edits.</p> <p>P. 44: Incorporated edits.</p> <p>P. 93/94: The comment focuses on ROW charging; therefore, Action 1.2.2 (instead of the broader Action 1.2.3) was revised to include a new option for a resident installed channel duct system in the sidewalk to house the charging cord cables flush with the sidewalk or pavement (See Table 13 - Model 3). There are a variety of proprietary designs for channels/ducts to cross flush with sidewalks; including but not limited to: Kerbo Charge, Pavecross, Gul-e, Charge Gully, Electric Vehicle Charge Channel, etc. Therefore, the plan identifies the model for the channel/duct system but does recommend a single proprietary technology. Given</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>including London, Cornwall, and Bedford – as well as Australia and Belgium. The new technology uses a channel duct under the brand name Kerbocharge© to safely bring Level 2 charging to EVs at the curb. Owners lift the polymer flap at one end, insert a charging cable and the flap closes up behind like a zip, as demonstrated in multiple videos. When finished charging, the cable can be pulled out, and again it closes up automatically behind so that it can't accidentally be left open.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered safe for all foot and vehicle traffic because it mounts flush to the sidewalk. • Duct takes any cable up to 20mm diameter, including standard EV charging cables. • Can be installed in one-hour. • Meets EU safety, health and environmental protection requirements by earning a UK Conformity Assessment mark and European CE safety certificate. • No maintenance required. 10-year product guarantee. • It has a life expectancy of over 25 years, and the hinge mechanism is rated to open and close at least 25 million times. 25 cities and counties in the UK have already adopted it while another 13 jurisdictions will start trials soon. <p>Proposal: I respectfully urge the City to allow residents to pilot the Kerbocharge© technology. The company will sell to the U.S. and it can be installed by hiring a qualified local vendor. Adopting a channel duct solution is better than public ROW charging: Following the Montgomery County right-of-way (ROW) policy is an onerous process that would discourage curbside charging and widespread adoption of EVs in low-income and historically excluded communities for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Time-consuming: ROW application reviews will take weeks to process, require owner to coordinate on-site visits with city staff, and a special appeals process to the mayor and council (or DPW) for an exception. 	<p>that a channel duct solution would be a permanent change to the ROW that would require a licensed contractor, a Public Works permit would be required, similar to Model 2. However, should this option be supported, one advantage is that developing and implementing permit requirements for this model may be accomplished in a shorter timeframe.</p> <p>Page 124: Incorporated edits.</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No cost predictability or transparency: City could deny ROW application or require expensive parking apron. Being able to confidently predict costs is essential to determining if switching to an EV is viable. ○ Putting chargers in ROW puts assets at risk. Charger at risk of being hit by vehicles or damaged by snow piles pushed across the curb by street plows. ○ Putting chargers in the ROW fails the City's Robust and Equitable Charging Network (Goal 2) because it puts a higher time and cost burden on those who don't have access to driveways or garages. ○ It also violates the City's FAST (Faster, Accountable, Smarter, and Transparent) project to improve the permitting process because the proposed policy will not be FAST for the applicant. Adopting a channel duct solution would: ○ Put low-to-moderate income neighborhoods on equal footing with wealthier ones in terms of enabling faster Level 2 charging at the curbside. ○ Allows low-to-moderate income neighborhoods to charge EVs at home (@13 cents/kWh) compared to public chargers (@56 cents/kWh), saving over 75% from home charging. ○ Increase adoption of EVs by lowering the burden of permitting costs and physical risks to Level 2 EV chargers. ○ Preclude the City from having to write specific code provisions for EV chargers in the residential ROW, saving staff time in writing new code or implementing it. Proposed timeline states creation of this policy within 3-5 years. This is not acceptable. It needs to be at the highest level of priority, 0-1 year. <p>Pg 124 Appendix C: Electric Utility Capacity. Some readers may mistakenly believe that residential chargers could overload a neighborhood and trigger a capacity upgrade.</p>	

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			Specifically, "Areas served by magenta, would more likely require system upgrades for load demands greater than 100 kW". ⁷⁹ I suggest this sentence be qualified by adding at the end <such as potentially required by some Level 3 DC Fast Chargers. Residential Level 1 and 2 chargers would not likely trigger capacity upgrades.	
12	Matthew Sushinsky	1028 Gilbert Road, Rockville, MD 20851	<p>1) Table 9 Priority 8 seems low on the priority level compared with the other items. While I agree they are all good things that need to be done, Priority 8 should be higher on the list. Many people in Priority 8 are ready to get an EV but won't because they don't have the means to charge at home. While I understand trying to be equitable, the people in Priority 8 are ready now to get an EV which will help climate goals sooner rather than later. The other priorities will need to have other government funded initiatives in place so chargers installed in these locations will go unused for years. I started talking to the city 4 years ago about my options for my garage orphan house and still don't have clear directions.</p> <p>2) Garage orphans who can install a driveway or pad on their property should have access to the rain scape program rebate for permeable pavements. Currently that rebate is only available for people removing an existing non-permeable driveway. If this is not available then most of the new driveways will be installed using non-permeable materials due to cost reasons.</p> <p>3) Public charging is very variable and often more expensive than gas. This is a very big issue for garage orphans. I want to get a full EV but trying to find a reasonable price to publicly charge my PHEV has prevented me from doing so. I understand some of these businesses are trying to recover costs associated with</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The text for Table 9 was clarified to note that these are factors to be considered for equitable charging and that the list is not intended to be interpreted as the order of prioritization. Appendix I identifies Action 1.2.2 (ROW charging guidelines) as a high priority action that is anticipated to be phased over time, depending on the complexity of the model(s) selected in Table 13 for implementation. • Staff shared the suggestion for permeable pavement incentives for EV related parking pads with the Rainscapes Rebate program for consideration to balance different environmental goals. • While the City does not have authority over charging prices from private commercial charging stations, staff recognizes the importance of this issue and will be seeking guidance from the Mayor and Council at the work session for a rate setting philosophy for potential future city owned and operated stations. • The city will continue to monitor light post charging technologies. An initial assessment identified some limitations with the power availability. Streetlights are most commonly 120V, which would require additional power to support Level 2 charging equipment. Additionally, streetlight ownership varies by location. In Rockville, Pepco owns approximately

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<p>installing the charger but a lot of those high-cost chargers go unused unless the driver is desperate.</p> <p>4) Something to consider. Can Level 1 capabilities or Level 2 chargers be installed on existing light posts? They already have electricity running to them. I understand there are limitations in electrical load requirements but if the street light posts in my neighborhood had the capability to charge then it would solve some of the issues presented in the report.</p>	<p>2,925 streetlights while the city owns approximately 3,200 streetlights.</p>
13	Meng Sun	604 E Lynfield Dr., Rockville, MD 20852	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support other e-mobility (personal mobility), dockless e-bike or just bike sharing program. Promote EV infrastructure to support other e-mobility opportunities, such as e-bikes, e-scooters, EV ride-hailing, or EV car-sharing services. How do we resolve the situation where the e-bikes and e-scooters are abandoned at a location for days, and nobody returns them to the correct station? • Needs future proofing infrastructure, since the technology and standards can change very fast • Educate and indicate some detailed explanation on "USE LAST" Sign, it can be confusing without explanation. • Develop an app/available spot tracking system, so people can access live data to access available public charging stations. The same app should also include publicly available parking space as well. • Support more education events and media to share the findings, benefits, as well as permit procedures for homeowners • Support the idea of public parking lots with solar canopies with EV chargers. Provide charging stations as many as possible, based on the future trend prediction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action 9C in the Pedestrian Master Plan addresses parking for dockless e-scooters and e-bikes. Additional parking and removal requirements for e-bike and e-scooter companies participating in Montgomery County are available at: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dir/commuter/bikesharingCSS.html • Whenever possible, future proofing infrastructure is encouraged. Action 1.1.1 includes requirements for EV-ready and EV-capable spaces in new construction to allow for charging capability to be increased to adapt to varying levels of demand. One opportunity is included in Action 1.3.1 to advocate for an open protocol approach, such Open Charge Point Protocol (OCPP) which may enable charging station owners to switch between network providers without needing to purchase new equipment. Action • Action 4.1.1 was updated to include accessibility and "use last" sign education. It indicates an EV charging space is accessible and can be used by drivers when accessibility features are needed; it also directs drivers without disability placards to

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
				<p>use this space only when other charging spaces are occupied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a variety of tools currently available for EV charging; however, the reliability of the data for station availability, charging speed and current rates may vary. Tools include the car's onboard navigation system (such as Tesla), apps specific to the vehicle or manufacturer lineup, or third-party charging apps such as, but not limited to PlugShare, Electrify America, Chargepoint, EVgo, Volta, Blink, etc. • Actions 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 involve public education and engagement. • Solar charging was added to Section 2.5 EV Charging Equipment, Action 2.1.1, Action 2.1.2 and Action 4.1.2.
14	Basilio Teixeira	1702 Lorre Dr., Rockville, MD 20852	It seems that the Tesla supercharger stations in Rockville city and vicinity (i.e. Pike and Rose) are not included. Your charge station connection diagrams are about 10 years obsolete. They lack the use of solar panels and batteries to reduce the grid peak demand. Try seeking design help from industry leaders such as Tesla who has already electrified the whole US so that its car owners can travel anywhere without range anxiety experienced by EV owners of other brands. They may even be interested to expand their charge networks for free as done at the public buildings parking spaces in Pike and Rose, Tysons Mall, city center parking. your model of re-purposing existing floor level parking spaces with concerns against existing code requirements on the number of parking spaces per development is not going to go very far. The design of the current tesla parking charging facilities is such that there is no impact to the number of parking spots .	<p>The Tesla chargers located in Rockville Town Square, Falls Grove, Rollins Av., are included in the plan; however, Pike and Rose is outside of Rockville's jurisdiction boundaries and was not individually listed in the plan.</p> <p>Solar EV charging technologies and markets are evolving and in various stages of development. Solar charging was added to Section 2.5 EV Charging Equipment, Action 2.1.1, Action 2.1.2 and Action 4.1.2.</p> <p>Section 4.4 describes the requirement to create a 60" access aisle, per the U.S. Access Board illustration in Figure 14, to allow physical access along the full length of the parking space for people who use mobility devices. This requirement may cause impacts to the number of a parking spaces in retrofits of existing parking lots, regardless of the station manufacturer.</p>

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
15	Nirmal Ravi	1108 Agnew Dr., Rockville, MD 20851	<p>Well written plan.</p> <p>The city should consider the fact that a home charger costs \$500 to buy and another \$2000 for installation by an electrician, not including the permit fee. That is very expensive even for a middle-class Rockville resident. Whatever the city can do to make charging more affordable will help with uptake.</p> <p>Consider installing fast chargers at parks and libraries within the city that will bring residents to use those facilities while simultaneously allowing residents to access to affordable charging.</p> <p>Here are some suggestions based on how Norway has facilitated one of the highest EV ownership rates in the world.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Widespread Public Charging Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norway has deployed ubiquitous public chargers, ensuring that urban residents without private parking have access. • Rockville can mandate EV-ready parking in new buildings and retrofit existing parking lots with charging. 2. Fast-Charging Infrastructure Along Major Routes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norway strategically placed fast chargers along highways and key transit routes. • Rockville should expand DC fast chargers at key transit hubs, retail areas, and highways. 3. Charging Equity for Apartment Dwellers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norway provides incentives to install chargers in shared residential buildings. • Rockville can offer grants or tax breaks for multi-unit dwellings to install charging stations. 4. Smart Pricing & Incentives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norway employs dynamic pricing and incentives for off-peak charging to prevent grid overload. 	<p>Cost is a factor for many residents. Action 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 involve educating the public about federal and state rebates for chargers and new and used vehicles which help offset upfront costs. EV permit fees are sometimes waived for April for Earth Month in Rockville. The Montgomery County Green Bank may offer financing to offset upfront costs, and EV co-op discounts also help. Fuel and maintenance are lower which helps to make them more cost-effective. See p. 28 and p. 30 for more info and Appendix F for incentives.</p> <p>Table 14 includes a summary of the public chargers planned at Montgomery County libraries and facilities. Appendix H includes a list of planned city-hosted public sites.</p> <p>Thank you for sharing the recommendations from Norway's successful case study. Several of the examples from Norway align with the actions included in the EV Plan. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Changes to building codes (Action 1.1.1) mandates EV charging to be installed in new buildings. 2. Rockville is working with federal and state grants to implement DC fast charging along the Interstate 270 corridor and Maryland 200. Properties within 1 mile of these corridors are highlighted in Figure 21. 3. The plan includes various measures to support charging at multi-unit dwellings. Appendix I includes a column that identifies the 20 actions that target/benefit multi-unit housing residents. 4. While the City does not have authority over charging prices from private commercial charging stations, staff recognizes the

Number	Name	Address	Comment	Staff Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rockville could offer discounted charging rates at night and subsidized chargers in lower-income areas. <p>5. Integration With Renewable Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norway integrates EV charging with renewable energy sources. • Rockville can prioritize solar-powered and grid-friendly charging stations. <p>6. Public-Private Partnerships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norway works with businesses and municipalities to co-fund and deploy chargers. • Rockville can partner with utilities and private firms to accelerate deployment. By adopting these strategies, Rockville can build a comprehensive, equitable, and future-ready EV charging network that supports all residents. 	<p>importance of this issue and will be seeking guidance from the Mayor and Council at the work session for a rate setting philosophy for city owned and operated stations.</p> <p>5. Solar EV charging technologies and markets are evolving and in various stages of development. Solar charging was added to Section 2.5 EV Charging Equipment, Action 2.1.1, Action 2.1.2 and Action 4.1.2.</p> <p>6. Appendix H includes a summary of funding sources and partnerships currently being pursued to expand the charging network.</p>