

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA



**FILED**

5-31-16  
04:59 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider  
Alternative-Fueled Vehicle Programs,  
Tariffs, and Policies.

Rulemaking 13-11-007  
(Filed November 14, 2013)

**THE OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES'  
REPLY COMMENTS ON THE SB 350  
TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION WORKSHOP**

**IRYNA A. KWASNY**  
Attorney  
Office of Ratepayer Advocates

California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 703-1477  
Facsimile: (415) 703-2262  
Email: [iryna.kwasny@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:iryna.kwasny@cpuc.ca.gov)

**THOMAS GARIFFO**  
Analyst  
Office of Ratepayer Advocates

California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 703-1619  
Email: [Thomas.Gariffo@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Thomas.Gariffo@cpuc.ca.gov)

May 31, 2016

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to consider  
Alternative-Fueled Vehicle Programs,  
Tariffs, and Policies.

Rulemaking 13-11-007  
(Filed November 14, 2013)

**THE OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES’  
REPLY COMMENTS ON THE SB 350  
TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION WORKSHOP**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to the Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling of the Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge issued on March 30, 2016,<sup>1</sup> the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) submits these reply comments on issues discussed at the April 29, 2016 Commission workshop on transportation electrification issues raised by Senate Bill (SB) 350 and the Workshop Questions identified in Appendix B of the Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling.

**II. DISCUSSION**

**A. Proposed Utility Applications Should Benefit Ratepayers**

The Application Guidance Straw Proposal (Straw Proposal) states that utility transportation electrification applications must “[a]ccount for ratepayer interest as defined in Section 740.8.”<sup>2</sup> ORA agrees with parties who suggest the Commission should revise this guiding principle to ensure that any utility transportation electrification application does more than just nominally account for ratepayer interests.<sup>3</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling of the Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge, March 30, 2016, p.8.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at Appendix A. p.1.

<sup>3</sup> Opening Comments of The Utility Reform Network (TURN), May 18, 2016, p. 1-2; Opening Comments of Chargepoint, Inc, May 18, 2016, p. 2-3.

applications should be predicated on explicitly defined ratepayer benefits that would accrue from the proposed programs. The Commission should require each utility application to demonstrate exactly how implementing the proposed program would result in the claimed ratepayer benefit.

**B. Proposed Utility Applications Should Minimize the Risk of Stranded Assets**

The Straw Proposal also states that utility transportation electrification applications must, “[m]inimize cost and maximize benefit...[by] [c]onsider[ing] [the] potential for technology maturation and market transformation.”<sup>4</sup> ORA agrees with parties who state that this guiding principle is of paramount importance.<sup>5</sup> However, the Commission should revise this principle to more explicitly address the issues specifically facing the developments in this market and technology. Ratepayer funds for utility transportation electrification programs should be prudently invested to produce used and useful assets.

Applications funded by ratepayers should account for the impact of rapidly improving technology on the transportation electrification market and vice versa. Thus ORA recommends a measured approach towards investments that may become obsolete or functionally irrelevant in the near future. Utility transportation electrification programs funded by ratepayers should prioritize flexible technology that has a low risk of being rendered obsolete. Furthermore, utility transportation electrification programs should be sized to reflect the risk that evolving technology or business models may render the assets obsolete and stranded. The Commission should require each utility application to demonstrate that the proposed program will minimize the risk of stranded assets and ensure that ratepayer funds are invested as judiciously as possible.

---

<sup>4</sup> Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling of the Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge, March 30, 2016, Appendix A. p.1.

<sup>5</sup> Opening Comments of Consumer Federation of California, May 18, 2016, p. 4; Opening Comments of Chargepoint, Inc, May 18, 2016, p. 6;

### III. CONCLUSION

ORA supports efforts to promote transportation electrification in a manner that benefits ratepayer interests and minimizes the risk of stranded costs. ORA looks forward to collaborating further in this proceeding with the Commission and other stakeholders in order to achieve the goals of SB 350.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ IRYNA A. KWASNY  
IRYNA A. KWASNY

Attorney for  
Office of Ratepayer Advocates

California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 703-1477  
Facsimile: (415) 703-2262  
Email: [Iryna.Kwasny@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Iryna.Kwasny@cpuc.ca.gov)

May 31, 2016