

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

UM 1810

IN THE MATTER OF PACIFICORP,)	
dba PACIFIC POWER)	
APPLICATION FOR)	SIEMENS’S REPLY BRIEF
TRANSPORTATION)	
ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAMS)	

In accordance with the Prehearing Conference Memorandum and Ruling by ALJ Ruth Harper on September 13, 2017, in the above-captioned proceeding, eMeter, a Siemens Company (“Siemens”), hereby submits its reply brief. While not a formal signatory to the Stipulation, Siemens fully supports all elements of the Stipulation and, if given the opportunity, would become a signatory to it.

I. Introduction

Siemens is a global leader in transportation electrification, providing a variety of technologies, as well as manufacturing and delivering tens of thousands of charging devices, including technology and technical support for a multi-country electric vehicle (“EV”) charging network. Based on our experience and expertise, we believe the proposed Stipulation would significantly advance Oregon’s goal, as articulated in SB 1547, of accelerating transportation electrification.

All of the Parties are in agreement with the major elements of the Stipulation, except for utility participation in the EV charging market via the purchase and ownership of chargers. ChargePoint argues against utility ownership.¹ Therefore, we focus on this issue.

There has been much debate over whether the Stipulation will “stimulate innovation, competition and customer choice in EV charging and related infrastructure and services.”² No party has provided evidence of a case in which utility investment in charging infrastructure has limited innovation, competition or customer choice. In our opinion, what does stifle innovation, competition and customer choice is the use of public funding for deployment of charging infrastructure that has proprietary communications protocols and non-transparent pricing. Moreover, SB 1547 does not require a definitive Commission finding that a utility proposal will stimulate innovation, competition and customer choice, only that the Commission “consider” whether the investment is “reasonably expected” to do so. In fact, Siemens believes that the Stipulation, including its utility ownership provisions, will stimulate innovation, competition and customer choice in EV charging, for the many reasons given in our testimony.³

We respectfully urge the Commission to adopt the Stipulation.

II. The threshold issue in this proceeding is whether the Stipulation will accelerate transportation electrification

SB 1547 makes clear that the point of utilities making investment proposals is to accelerate transportation electrification. The Stipulation clearly advances this goal by providing additional public charging stations and conducting a pilot program of utility ownership that will provide essential information on the utility’s role in accelerating transportation electrification.

¹ - ChargePoint, Inc.’s Post-Hearing Reply Brief, p. 13.

² - SB 1547, § 20(4)(f).

³ - Siemens/100.

In essence, only one argument has been raised that the Stipulation would not meet SB 1547's goal of accelerating transportation electrification. ChargePoint has argued that utility ownership could be detrimental to the charging market. That argument should be rejected for at least three reasons.

First, ChargePoint has not provided evidence of any case in which utility participation has been detrimental to the charging markets.

Second, ChargePoint agrees utility funding is needed, though they want the funding to be provided in accordance with their preferred business model, namely as rebates to site owners.⁴ ChargePoint argues that site hosts should be selecting charging equipment, not the utility.⁵ Utilities have deep expertise in testing and selecting electrical and electronic technologies. They certainly have far more expertise than site hosts who are primarily operating an office building, shopping mall, or other business and have little or no expertise in selecting, deploying and operating charging hardware or pricing electricity. It is in the public interest that the selection of charging infrastructure be done by technology experts rather than people for whom electrical technology deployment is not their core skill.

Third, while the Legislature in SB 1547 found that utility participation is essential to accelerating transportation electrification, the Legislature did not conclude *how* that participation should occur.

III. The Stipulation is a well-designed pilot and should be approved in that light

The Commission should approve the Stipulation, because it is a well-designed proposal that meets the threshold goal of accelerating transportation electrification and otherwise meets the Commission's requirements for prudence and reasonableness. The point of the pilot proposed in

⁴ - Ibid at 32.

⁵ - Ibid at 7.

the Stipulation is to test a utility participation approach that the Stipulating Parties – as well as Siemens – believe to be prudent and reasonable and likely to succeed. While ChargePoint make the unsubstantiated claim that the pilot will “actively discourage competition”⁶, the pilot is acknowledged by the Stipulating Parties as not being precedential. Instead, the pilot is designed to test and provide experiential data for one reasonable approach. It is based on sound evidence and rationale as explained in the opening and testimony of the Stipulating Parties and in Siemens’s Reply Testimony. The Stipulating Parties do not claim it to be the only approach, merely an approach supported by the evidence and one likely to succeed. The Commission need not find the pilot to be the best approach, only that the pilot is consistent with Commission policy for utility investments and is reasonable in consideration of the language of SB 1547.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons give above, we respectfully urge the Commission to adopt the Stipulation.

Respectfully submitted this 24th day of January,
2018,



CHRIS KING
Siemens
4000 E. Third Ave., Suite 400
Foster City, CA 94404

⁶ - Ibid at 34.