Logan, Lyndy (DLI)

From: Curtis Johnson <Curtis.Johnson@PulteGroup.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 4:32 PM
To: Logan, Lyndy (DLI)
Subject: Opposition to Mandatory Electrical Service for EV Charging in Residential Construction

Good afternoon Lyndy,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed amendment to the Minnesota Residential Building Code that would mandate electrical service for electric vehicle (EV) charging in all new homes. As a member of the Residential Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and as Vice President of Construction Operations for a major home builder, I strongly urge you to reject this amendment for the following reasons:

1. Affordability and Housing Accessibility

Minnesota faces a growing housing affordability crisis. Every additional mandate increases construction costs, which directly impacts homebuyers—especially first-time buyers and working families. Installing dedicated electrical infrastructure for EV charging adds thousands of dollars to the cost of a new home, regardless of whether the homeowner owns or plans to own an EV. This requirement disproportionately burdens those who may never use the feature.

2. TAG Recommendations and Due Process

The Residential TAG, after thorough review and multiple votes, recommended against this amendment. Our decision was based on data, stakeholder input, and alignment with Minnesota's housing priorities. Overriding these recommendations undermines the integrity of the code development process and disregards the expertise of industry professionals tasked with balancing safety, sustainability, and affordability. The TAG group also discussed that this code change proposal was out of scope for the Residential TAG and likely belonged with the Electrical TAG.

3. Market-Driven Solutions Are Already Working

Builders and homeowners are responding to EV adoption through voluntary measures. Many builders already offer EV-ready options for those who request them. Mandating this infrastructure for every home is unnecessary and premature, given current EV ownership rates and the rapid evolution of charging technology.

4. Equity and Consumer Choice

This mandate forces all homeowners to pay for a feature that benefits a minority of buyers today. It limits consumer choice and imposes costs on those who may prioritize other investments, such as energy-efficient appliances or insulation upgrades that deliver broader environmental benefits. My Company offered this option to 640 customers the first year it was introduced. Only 3 of those customers selected this option. We have removed it as a standard option for that reason and moved it over to out custom electrical program.

Conclusion

Minnesota's building codes should reflect a balanced approach that promotes innovation without sacrificing affordability. I respectfully urge you to uphold the TAG's recommendation and reject this amendment. Doing so will protect housing affordability, maintain fairness in the code process, and allow market-driven solutions to continue meeting consumer needs.

Thank you for your consideration. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further and provide additional data on cost impacts and consumer trends.

Sincerely,
CJ

PULTE GROUP

CURTIS (CJ) JOHNSON
Vice President of
Construction Operations
+512-230-5927
curtis.johnson@pultegroup.com
1650 W. 82nd Street, Suite 300
Bloomington, MN 55431