



**FILED**  
9-07-16  
04:59 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of Pacific Gas  
and Electric Company for Approval of its  
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure and Education  
Program.

(U39E)

Application 15-02-009  
(Filed February 9, 2015)

**LATE-FILED JOINT PARTIES  
NOTICE OF *EX PARTE* COMMUNICATION**

Pursuant to Rule 8.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) hereby gives notice of two separate joint parties' *ex parte* communications. The two communications occurred on Monday, August 29, 2016, at 2:30 PM, and 3:30 PM at the offices of California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The communications were oral, and included a handout, which is attached.

Sidney Dietz, Director, Regulatory Relations, PG&E, initiated the first communication with Sean Simon, Energy Advisor to Commissioner Liane Randolph; and the second communication with Matthew Tisdale, Energy Advisor to Commissioner Michel Florio. Also present at both meetings were: Jana Corey, Director, Electrification and Alternative Fuels, PG&E; Marc Joseph, Attorney for California Utility Employees (CUE); Jamie Hall, Manager, General Motors; and Max Baumhefner, Attorney, NRDC.

Ms. Corey described the settlement and its wide array of parties, and highlighted the settlement's similarity to the SDG&E decision, the inclusion of DC fast charging, the IOU charger ownership model, the settlement's mechanism to prevent price gouging, and the large amount of deployment in disadvantaged communities. Ms. Corey further stated that the

settlement follows the model of a turnkey system for the ease of site hosts. Mr. Baumhefner stated that the settling parties included, verbatim, the SDG&E decision's guidance to address competitive issues. Mr. Baumhefner further stated that the deployment in disadvantaged communities is designed to be in concert with other state-wide electric-vehicle adoption programs in the state. Mr. Baumhefner stated that the IOUs can provide reliable service with cost-based rates. Mr. Hall noted that the DC fast charging is key to support the market and the adoption of cars, especially the newer cars with longer ranges. Mr. Joseph stated that CUE supports the settlement because it has the potential to lower rates from increased sales from EVs. Mr. Joseph further stated that the settlement represents only a small fraction of the effort needed to provide for the state's ambition to reduce GHGs and electrify the auto industry.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Erik B. Jacobson

Erik B. Jacobson  
Director, Regulatory Relations  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
P.O. Box 770000, Mail  
San Francisco, CA 94177  
Phone: 415-973-4464  
Fax: 415-973-7226  
E-mail: EBJ1@pge.com

Dated: September 7, 2016



March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016

## **PG&E Files Settlement Agreement with Broad Support for Improved EV Charging Program**

On Monday March 21, PG&E filed a settlement agreement in its Electric Vehicle (EV) infrastructure proceeding at the CPUC. The agreement makes substantial improvements to the utility's proposal to highlight the load-management and fuel savings-benefits the program should enable. PG&E and the settling parties believe that, if approved, the Charge Smart and Save program will significantly increase access to EV charging and encourage greater EV adoption in support of the Governor's Zero-Emission Vehicle goals.

### **The settling parties represent a broad coalition from diverse areas and interests.**

- Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
- Center for Sustainable Energy
- Coalition of California Utility Employees
- General Motors
- The Greenlining Institute
- Greenlots
- Honda
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- Marin Clean Energy
- PG&E
- Plug In America
- Sierra Club
- Sonoma Clean Power Authority

Under the settlement agreement, PG&E would deploy and own 7,500 Level 2 chargers and 100 DC fast chargers throughout its service territory. The utility will partner with EV Service Providers to operate and maintain chargers and networks. The program would run three years, with a budget cap of \$160 million.

**The settlement terms reflect the CPUC's approval of EV infrastructure programs from Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric.** PG&E looked specifically toward the CPUC's decision in SDG&E's proposal, and adopted equivalent criteria to offer greater site host choice and spur innovation in EV charging services. These criteria include:

- Site host choice of pre-qualified equipment and services to encourage innovation and competition among EV service providers
- Site host control over pricing options to drivers, including passing time-of-use prices directly to drivers to encourage charging when there is lower demand on the electric grid
- A modest participation payment from site-hosts to encourage private investment
- A peak bill impact of approximately \$0.22 monthly (\$2.64 annually) for the typical residential customer, less than the approved increase in the SDG&E case.

**PG&E also increases its commitment to deploy 15% of charger sites in Disadvantaged Communities**, with a stretch goal of 20% – and sets aside \$5 million for vehicle equity programs in those areas.

The program will also target 50% of charger sites in multi-unit dwellings, a key segment that requires greater access to EV charging to enable broader adoption of electric vehicles.



# IOU EV Program Comparison



Approved Decision



Settlement Agreement



Approved Decision

Scope	SDGE	PG&E	Southern California Edison
	Up to 3,500 L1 & L2 at 350 sites (60% of original 5,500)	7,500 L2 (30% of original) 100 DCFC (100% of original)	At least 1,250 L1 & L2 (4% of total in Phase 1)
	3 years	3 years	At least 12 months

Budget	SDGE	PG&E	Southern California Edison
	\$45M (40% of original \$103M)	\$160M (24% of original \$654M)	\$22M (6% of total \$355M)

Charger Ownership, O&M	SDGE	PG&E	Southern California Edison
	SDG&E owned	PG&E owned	Site host owned

Equipment & Services Choice	SDGE	PG&E	Southern California Edison
	Site host choice of pre-qualified service providers	Site host choice of pre-qualified service providers	Site host purchase of pre-qualified service providers

Participation Fee	SDGE	PG&E	Southern California Edison
	10% of average EVSE cost for MUDs, 20% for workplaces	10% of EVSE cost for MUDs, 20% for private businesses;	Site host buys equipment
	Fee waived for Disadv. Communities, government, school, non-profit, small business and affordable housing sites	Fee waived for Disadv. Communities, gov't, and non-profit sites	25-50% rebate from SCE
			100% rebate for Disadv. Communities

Rates/Pricing	SDGE	PG&E	Southern California Edison
	Choice of VGI rate to driver or to site host	Choice of commercial TOU rate (e.g. A6) to driver or to site host	Site host pays commercial rate, sets pricing



# IOU EV Program Comparison



Approved Decision



Settlement Agreement



Approved Decision

## Target Markets

Target 50% MUD / 50% Workplace

Workplace, MUD (target 50%), public/retail

Workplace, MUD, Public/Retail (no specific allocation)

## Phasing

Semi-annual progress reports

Phase 2 would be filed separately

Quarterly progress reports for Phase 1,

Separate hearings for Phase 2, with one year "Bridge" funding until decision

After 12-24 months, SCE to serve pilot report and Phase 2 application

## Load Management

VGI rate reflects grid conditions; if site host takes rate, must submit load management tactics

TOU rate reflects grid conditions; if site host takes rate, must submit load management tactics

Evaluate load management strategies in Pilot Phase

Develop DR program within 3 years

## Disadvantaged Communities

10% commitment; CARE customers excused from rate-base of program

15% commitment with 20% stretch goal; \$5M for vehicle equity programs

10% commitment; 100% rebate for charger costs in DACs

## Site Host Recruitment

SDG&E + 3<sup>rd</sup> party partners

PG&E + 3<sup>rd</sup> party partners

SCE + 3<sup>rd</sup> party partners

## Advisory Committee

Yes

Yes

Yes