

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

Docket No. UM 1811

In the Matter of)	RESPONSE OF
Portland General Electric’s Application for)	CHARGEPOINT, INC. TO
Transportation Electrification Programs)	SIEMENS’ PETITION
)	TO INTERVENE

ChargePoint, Inc. (ChargePoint) hereby files this response to the Petition to Intervene in this docket filed by eMeter, a Siemens’ Company (Siemens), on August 30, 2017.

Pursuant to OAR 860-001-0300(6), the Commission must find that a petitioner seeking intervention in a docket “will not unreasonably broaden the issues, burden the record, or delay the proceedings” in order to grant the petitioner’s intervention. ChargePoint does not take a position on whether Siemens has met this standard or not. ChargePoint files this response to point out to the Commission that Siemens’ participation in this docket may require an additional round of testimony.

In its Petition to Intervene, Siemens states, “Siemens intends to file testimony in support of the Stipulation filed June 27, 2017 by the Stipulating Parties in this proceeding.”¹ However, testimony supporting the Stipulation was already filed by the Stipulating Parties contemporaneously with the Stipulation on June 27, 2017. Pursuant to Administrative Law Judge Harper’s August 15, 2017 ruling, ChargePoint and the Electric Vehicle Charging Association (EVCA) filed Response Testimony to the Stipulation on August 25, 2017. As was their right to

¹ Siemens’ Petition to Intervene, ¶ 5.

do, in their Response Testimony both ChargePoint and EVCA addressed the Stipulation itself and the Joint Testimony in Support of Stipulation filed by the Stipulating Parties.

In other words, the opportunity to file testimony *in support* of the Stipulation, as Siemens' seeks to do, has long passed. The next opportunity to file testimony in this docket, on September 19, 2017, is for the Stipulating Parties to file Reply Testimony, and for EVCA to file Cross-Answer Testimony responding to ChargePoint (if it chooses). The purpose of Reply Testimony is to address the Response Testimony of ChargePoint and EVCA. Reply Testimony is not an opportunity for parties to provide fresh arguments in support of the Stipulation as Siemens states it plans to do.

If Siemens were to file direct testimony in support of the Stipulation, due process would require that ChargePoint have the opportunity to respond to Siemens' direct testimony through another round of responsive testimony. As a result, if the Commission grants Siemens' Petition to Intervene and allows Siemens to file direct testimony supporting the Stipulation, ChargePoint requests that the Commission vacate the current procedural schedule and determine a date by which ChargePoint and other parties may file testimony responding to Siemens' direct testimony. To be clear, ChargePoint does not wish to further delay the proceeding through additional rounds of testimony, but additional rounds will be necessary and required by due process if Siemens files testimony in support of the Stipulation without giving ChargePoint the opportunity to respond to such testimony.

For the reasons discussed herein, ChargePoint takes no position on Siemens' Petition to Intervene. However, if the Commission grants Siemens' Petition to Intervene and allows Siemens to file testimony in support of the Stipulation, ChargePoint recommends and requests that the Commission vacate the existing procedural schedule and establish new procedural dates that

include an opportunity for ChargePoint and other parties to respond to Siemens' planned testimony supporting the Stipulation.

Respectfully submitted this 8th day of September, 2017,

BY: /s/ Scott F. Dunbar

Scott F. Dunbar

Keyes & Fox LLP

1580 Lincoln St., Suite 880

Denver, CO 80203

Phone: 720-216-1184

Mobile: 949-525-6016

sdunbar@kfwlaw.com

Counsel for ChargePoint, Inc.