

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

Docket No. UE 435

In the Matter of)
)
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC)
COMPANY)
)
Request for a General Rate Revision)

OPENING TESTIMONY OF MAL SKOWRON
ON BEHALF OF CHARGEPOINT, INC.

July 15, 2024

1 **I. Introduction and Summary of Recommendations.**

2 **Q: Please state your name.**

3 A: My name is Mal Skowron.

4 **Q: By whom are you employed and in what position?**

5 A: I am Manager of Regulatory Policy at ChargePoint, Inc. (ChargePoint).

6 **Q: Please describe your current role and your relevant professional experience.**

7 A: In my current role, I manage ChargePoint’s regulatory efforts across the country, including
8 Oregon. I engage on behalf of ChargePoint at utility regulatory commissions and other
9 state agencies to promote public policies that expand electric vehicle infrastructure and
10 advance best practices within the electric vehicle charging industry. My relevant
11 professional experience appears in my CV, which is attached as Attachment MS-1 and
12 provides additional detail.

13 **Q: Please describe ChargePoint.**

14 A: ChargePoint is one of the world’s largest electric vehicle (EV) charging networks, with
15 scalable solutions for charging at home, work, around town, and on the road. With
16 customers that include workplaces, cities, retailers, apartments, utilities, hospitals, and
17 fleets, ChargePoint provides an integrated experience enabling consistent performance,
18 efficiency and reliability at every touchpoint whether one is using a mobile app, plugging
19 into a charger, managing the station or analyzing charging data.

20 ChargePoint delivers scalable solutions that enable businesses to support more
21 drivers, add the latest software features, and expand their electric vehicle and fleet needs

1 with minimal disruption to overall business. Hardware offerings include Level 2 (L2) and
2 DC fast charging (DCFC) products, and ChargePoint provides a range of options across
3 those charging levels for specific use cases including light and medium duty and transit
4 fleets, multi-unit dwellings, residential (multi-family and single family), destination,
5 workplace, and more. ChargePoint's software and cloud services enable site hosts to
6 manage charging onsite with features like Waitlist, access control, charging analytics, and
7 real-time availability. ChargePoint products are UL-listed, ENERGY STAR® and CE
8 (EU) certified, and the modular design minimizes downtime and makes maintenance and
9 repair more seamless.

10 ChargePoint's primary business model consists of selling its smart charging
11 solutions directly to businesses and organizations while offering tools that empower site
12 hosts and station owners to deploy charging designed for their individual application and
13 use case. ChargePoint provides charging network services and data-driven and cloud-
14 enabled capabilities that enable site hosts to better manage their charging assets and
15 optimize services. For example, with those network capabilities, site hosts can view data
16 on charging station utilization, frequency and duration of charging sessions, set access
17 controls to the stations, and set pricing for charging services. These features are designed
18 to maximize utilization and align the EV driver experience with the specific use case
19 associated with the specific site host. Additionally, ChargePoint has designed its network
20 to allow other parties, such as electric utilities, the ability to access charging data and
21 conduct load management to enable efficient EV load integration onto the electric grid.

1 **Q: What is the purpose of your Opening Testimony?**

2 A: The purpose of my Opening Testimony is to provide ChargePoint's recommendations
3 regarding proposed changes to two tariffs in Portland General Electric's (PGE) general rate
4 case related to transportation electrification. Specifically, I address PGE's proposed
5 changes to Schedules 50 and 56.

6 **Q: Please summarize your recommendations to the Commission.**

7 A: I recommend that the Commission:

- 8 • Approve PGE's proposed changes to Schedules 50 and 56; and
- 9 • Direct PGE to continue to monitor the impact of its Schedule 50 rates on the
10 competitive charging market and the deployment rate of non-utility EV chargers.

11 **II. Changes to Schedule 50.**

12 **Q: What will you discuss in this section of your testimony?**

13 A: In this section of my testimony, I will discuss PGE's proposed changes to Schedule 50,
14 which sets forth the prices that PGE charges EV drivers to charge at PGE-owned EV
15 chargers.

16 **Q: How does PGE currently charge for EV charging services at PGE-owned chargers?**

17 A: As set forth in Schedule 50 in its current form, PGE currently charges drivers per-session
18 fees plus a per-kWh rate of \$0.19/kWh for all charging that occurs during the on-peak

1 hours of 3 PM to 8 PM on non-holiday weekdays.¹ The current per-session fees are \$5 per
2 session for charging at a DCFC and \$3 per session for charging at a Level 2 charger.

3 **Q: Are per-session fees common at public EV chargers?**

4 A: No, per-session fees such as those that currently appear in Schedule 50 are becoming
5 increasingly less common in the industry for one simple reason: per-session fees do not
6 accurately measure the value of any particular charging session. All else equal, a driver
7 that charges for an hour will receive substantially more electricity, which is measured in
8 kilowatt-hours, from a charger during a two-hour charging session than a 30-minute
9 charging session. For the same reason, the electricity costs that a charging provider incurs
10 to charge an EV for two hours are substantially higher than the costs the provider incurs to
11 charge the same EV for only 30 minutes. However, under a per-session fee arrangement,
12 the cost of these two charging sessions is the same to the driver. It simply does not make
13 sense for PGE to charge the same per-session fee for charging sessions that result in vastly
14 different amounts of electricity being delivered.

15 **Q: Do different EVs charge at different speeds?**

16 A: Yes. The rate that an EV charges (*i.e.*, the amount of electricity delivered over a certain
17 amount of time), particularly at DCFCs, depends in large part on the EV's battery
18 management system and the maximum charging speed allowed (as well as the EV's current
19 state of charge, ambient temperatures, and other factors). Most newer EV models have

¹ Portland General Electric Company, P.U.C. Oregon No. E-19, Original Sheet Nos. 50-1 and 50-2 (available at: https://assets.ctfassets.net/416ywc1laqmd/2hNjMQ203TEcCmZttyKCTt/420d700a1b3e033aacc3445f5989f7400/Sched_050.pdf)

1 higher maximum charging speeds than older EV models, and many newer budget EV
2 models continue to have lower maximum charging speeds than more expensive models.
3 As a result, a DCFC would likely deliver substantially more electricity to a newer EV
4 during a 30-minute charging session than the same DCFC would deliver to an older EV
5 during the same amount of time. In addition to being simply inaccurate, per-session fees
6 also raise equity concerns because owners of newer, more expensive EVs receive more
7 value than owners of older, less expensive EVs for the same session fee. While this issue
8 is most pronounced with DCFCs, similar issues can occur with Level 2 AC chargers based
9 on the vehicle's dwell time.

10 **Q: With this background, why are per-session fees less common at public EV chargers?**

11 A: For the reasons just discussed, EV chargers can dispense vastly different amounts of
12 electricity during different charging sessions, depending on the length of the session and
13 the vehicle's maximum charging speed, current state of charge, temperature, and other
14 factors. Because a competitive EV charging provider is the utility customer-of-record for
15 a charger, the costs a provider incurs to provide a charging session vary directly with the
16 amount of electricity dispensed. As a rule of thumb, charging drivers on a per-kWh basis
17 is the simplest way for EV charging providers to recover their costs from EV drivers and
18 price their services in a fair and accurate way.

19 Because there are many different business cases for EV charging, there may
20 sometimes be departures from the norm of per-kWh pricing; for example, a pay-to-park
21 garage may choose to levy a parking fee and allow EV drivers to use the charger "behind

1 the gate” for free, an arrangement which somewhat resembles a per-session pricing
2 structure. ChargePoint believes non-regulated entities that offer charging services should
3 continue to be free to set pricing that aligns with their specific business case. However, the
4 vast majority of EV charging providers charge for charging on a \$/kWh basis. It is worth
5 noting that it is now legal for non-utility EV charging providers to charge by the kilowatt-
6 hour in all 50 states.

7 **Q: Do you have any concerns with PGE’s specific per-session fees?**

8 A: Yes, in addition to the concerns just described, PGE’s current per-session fees likely
9 undercut the competitive market in many cases and provide charging services below the
10 cost of electricity, especially outside of peak hours. Because EV drivers pay only a per-
11 session fee during non-peak hours under the current Schedule 50 regardless of how much
12 electricity they use, the effective price-per-kWh for many charging sessions is likely
13 extremely low. For example, the driver of a newer EV with a battery storage size over 100
14 kWh could pay only \$5 at a PGE to fully charge their battery during non-peak hours. If that
15 driver received 100 kWh during such a session, they would be paying only \$0.05/kWh.
16 This effective rate is far below what any competitive EV charging provider could afford to
17 charge for charging services for the simple reason that it is far below the cost of electricity.
18 Such a low effective rate may even be below PGE’s own costs of providing this electricity
19 to PGE-owned chargers.

1 **Q: What has PGE proposed to replace the existing per-session fees in Schedule 50?**

2 A: PGE proposes to replace the existing per-session fees with per-kWh rates, with higher on-
3 peak rates and lower off-peak rates, along with per-minute idle fees that apply after a 10-
4 minute grace period. PGE proposes higher per-kWh rates for charging at PGE-owned
5 DCFCs than PGE-owned Level 2 chargers, as well as discounted per-kWh rates for income-
6 qualified customers.²

7 **Q: Do you support these proposed changes?**

8 A: While I offer commentary below on the proposed level of PGE's per-kWh rates, I
9 wholeheartedly support PGE's proposal to replace its per-session fees with per-kWh rates.
10 For the reasons discussed, the current per-session fee arrangement is a pricing model that
11 does not accurately reflect the value of the service any particular EV driver receives from
12 a charging session. The current Schedule 50 session fees are out of synch with how
13 competitive providers charge for charging services and in many cases undercut the costs
14 that competitive providers face to provide public charging. I applaud PGE for proposing to
15 transition its Schedule 50 session fees to per-kWh pricing and recommend that the
16 Commission approve the new Schedule 50 rates.

² PGE Advice No. 24-06, Proposed First Revision of Sheet No. 50-2.

1 **Q: Do you have any concerns with the level of PGE's proposed per-kWh Schedule 50**
2 **fees?**

3 A: I appreciate that PGE conducted market analysis when designing its new proposed
4 Schedule 50 rates, as described in the Direct Testimony of PGE witnesses Macfarlane and
5 Pleasant.³ PGE and the Commission can best encourage EV charger deployment in PGE's
6 service territory by ensuring that, as much as possible, competitive charging providers are
7 able to compete for EV drivers on a level playing field. If the cost to charge at PGE-owned
8 chargers is far below the prices competitive providers need to charge to recover their own
9 costs, few competitive providers will invest in PGE's service territory. The result will be
10 fewer chargers to support transportation electrification and the need to spend additional
11 ratepayer funds on utility-owned chargers to fill the gaps left by competitive providers that
12 are unable to compete with below-market charging prices at utility-owned chargers.

13 **Q: Has PGE proposed rates that are competitive with the market for PGE-owned**
14 **DCFCs?**

15 A: Largely yes. PGE proposes to charge \$0.30/kWh during off-peak hours and \$0.58/kWh
16 during on-peak hours, with discounted rates for income-qualified customers of \$0.24/kWh
17 during off-peak and \$0.52/kWh during on-peak hours, at PGE-owned DCFCs. According
18 to PGE's market research, local public DCFC providers charge between \$0.17/kWh and
19 \$0.48/kWh. PGE's proposed off-peak rate is right in the middle of this range, while its on-

³ PGE 900, Macfarlane-Pleasant at 37-39.

1 peak rate is slightly higher to encourage drivers to charge during off-peak hours when
2 possible. I appreciate that PGE designed its DCFC rates not to undercut the competitive
3 market while also supporting its load management goals. As a result, I have no concern
4 with PGE's proposed Schedule 50 rates for PGE-owned DCFCs.

5 **Q: Has PGE proposed rates that are competitive with the market for PGE-owned Level**
6 **2 chargers?**

7 A: PGE proposes to charge \$0.12/kWh during off-peak hours and \$0.40/kWh during on peak
8 hours, with discounted rates for income-qualified customers of \$0.10/kWh during off-peak
9 and \$0.32/kWh during on-peak hours, at PGE-owned Level 2 chargers. Unlike its efforts
10 to design DCFC rates that are competitive with market DCFC prices, PGE's primary intent
11 in designing its proposed public Level 2 charging rates was to set them close to *residential*
12 electricity rates. Specifically, PGE witnesses Macfarlane and Pleasant state: "we wanted
13 the price of \$0.12/kWh to be comparable the weighted average of mid- and off-peak
14 schedule 7 TOD [time-of-day] rates plus a small adder to avoid the rate rapidly becoming
15 out of line with residential rates."⁴ Schedule 7 is PGE's residential service tariff.⁵ PGE
16 witnesses Macfarlane and Pleasant further state that PGE's proposed off-peak Level 2 rate
17 of \$0.12/kWh "falls in the middle of the market that ranges from \$0.07/kWh to
18 \$0.49/kWh."⁶ While it is true that \$0.12 is between \$0.07 and \$0.49, PGE's proposed off-
19 peak rate of \$0.12 is clearly at the low end of this range and not "in the middle" of the

⁴ PGE/900, Macfarlane-Pleasant at 38.

⁵ Portland General Electric Company, P.U.C. Oregon No. E-19, Proposed First Revision of Sheet No. 7-1.

⁶ PGE/900, Macfarlane-Pleasant at 38.

1 range. As a result, I am concerned that PGE's proposed Level 2 charging rates in Schedule
2 50 are not competitive and would undercut prices at most public Level 2 chargers operated
3 by competitive charging providers.

4 **Q: Is it appropriate to set public Level 2 charging rates based on residential electricity**
5 **rates?**

6 A: No. As stated above, I appreciate that PGE set its off-peak DCFC rate precisely in the
7 middle of the range of prices that competitive market providers charge at DCFCs in PGE's
8 service territory. PGE's analysis for DCFC pricing appropriately examines market rates for
9 the service it provides through Schedule 50: namely, public DC fast charging. PGE should
10 set its Level 2 pricing in the same way: namely, based on public Level 2 charging prices
11 charged by competitive charging providers. Competitive Level 2 charging providers cannot
12 compete on price with residential electricity rates for the simple reason that they must pay
13 for electricity in order to provide charging services.

14 **Q: How do competitive Level 2 charging providers' electricity costs compare with PGE's**
15 **proposed Level 2 charging rates in Schedule 50?**

16 A: As noted above, PGE proposes to charge \$0.12/kWh during off-peak hours and \$0.40/kWh
17 during on peak hours, with discounted rates for income-qualified customers of \$0.10/kWh
18 during off-peak and \$0.32/kWh during on-peak hours, at PGE-owned Level 2 chargers. A
19 competitive Level 2 charging provider would most likely take service on Schedule 32,

1 which is PGE's small nonresidential standard service rate.⁷ If the Commission approves
2 PGE's proposed changes to Schedule 32, a customer opting for standard service (instead
3 of the time-of-use option) on Schedule 32 would pay an energy charge of over \$0.16/kWh.⁸
4 While many charging providers opt for time-of-use options when they are available, for
5 the sake of analysis this comparison demonstrates that a Level 2 charging provider is likely
6 to face electricity costs that are higher than PGE's proposed off-peak charging rate of
7 \$0.12/kWh in Schedule 50.

8 Even if a Level 2 charging provider opted for the time-of-use option in Schedule
9 32, that provider would pay the on-peak rate of over \$0.22/kWh from 6 AM to 10 PM every
10 day except for Sundays.⁹ While this rate is less than PGE's proposed on-peak rate for Level
11 2 charging of \$0.40/kWh, the proposed on-peak period for Schedule 50 is only four hours
12 per day on non-holiday weekdays (5 PM to 9 PM) compared to the 16-hour on-peak period
13 in Schedule 32. In other words, during most hours of the day and evening, a competitive
14 Level 2 charging provider will pay more just for electricity through Schedule 32 than an
15 EV driver will pay to charge at a PGE-owned Level 2 charger. Simply put, a competitive
16 Level 2 charging provider could not hope to recover its costs of providing charging

⁷ Portland General Electric Company, P.U.C. Oregon No. E-19, Proposed First Revision of Sheet No. 32-1. (Note that a charging provider that offers both DCFCs and Level 2 chargers behind the same utility meter or a large number of Level 2 chargers would not qualify for Schedule 32 and would likely take service on Schedule 38, Schedule 83, or Schedule 85, based on their monthly demand.)

⁸ *Id.* (The sum of the Transmission and Related Services Charge, the Distribution Charge, and the Standard Service Charge in proposed Schedule 32 is \$0.16369.)

⁹ *Id.* (The sum of the Transmission and Related Services Charge, the Distribution Charge, and the Standard Service Charge in proposed Schedule 32 is \$0.22699.)

1 services, which includes the cost of electricity as well as hardware, software, property, and
2 operations costs, by charging the \$0.12/kWh that PGE proposes to charge at PGE-owned
3 Level 2 chargers.

4 **Q: Isn't it important for EV drivers who have limited or no access to home charging to**
5 **have access to public Level 2 charging at residential rates?**

6 A: I recognize that part of PGE's motivation in proposing public Level 2 charging rates at a
7 level that is comparable to residential electricity rates is to provide an inexpensive charging
8 option for drivers who have limited or no access to charging at home. ChargePoint shares
9 PGE's vision for EV drivers in PGE's territory to have access to affordable charging
10 options. However, the most effective way to ensure that all EV drivers have access to
11 affordable charging for their everyday needs is not to offer below-market public charging
12 but to support charger installations at customers' homes, including both single-family and
13 multi-family homes. Most EV drivers prefer the convenience of charging at home, rather
14 than at public chargers. While PGE offers some support for charger installations at single-
15 family and multi-family homes, these programs could be enhanced and expanded to
16 provide customers with access to charging at standard electric rates.

17 Allowing PGE to undercut the competitive market for public Level 2 charging will
18 provide low-cost charging to the handful of customers that find it convenient to charge at
19 a PGE-owned charger but could ultimately lead to fewer Level 2 chargers overall as
20 competitive providers find they cannot compete on price with PGE-owned Level 2
21 chargers. This is especially true because PGE's Transportation Electrification Plan (TEP)

1 proposes continued expansion of utility-owned chargers through 2025 with a \$15.6M
2 budget.¹⁰ A utility's ability to charge below-market rates for EV charging and thereby
3 discourage EV charger deployment in its service territory is a fundamental reason that
4 ChargePoint has cautioned against expansion of utility-owned charger programs in Oregon
5 for years. Utilities can more cost-effectively support charger deployment and EV adoption
6 by offering rebates and make-ready support to competitive market players, which will then
7 compete to offer EV drivers as many affordable and convenient EV charging options as
8 possible.

9 **Q: Putting aside the issue of undercutting competition, doesn't it still make good policy**
10 **sense to offer EV drivers a discount at existing PGE-owned stations to support EV**
11 **adoption?**

12 A: I do not see the sense in providing a below-market discount to all EV drivers, regardless of
13 their income, at PGE-owned Level 2 chargers because of the unfortunate reality that the
14 costs of doing so impacts all customers in the form of higher rates. While I am not a rate
15 design expert, my understanding is that, at the most basic level, rates are calculated by
16 spreading the cost of service across anticipated customer load. The difference between the
17 fee charged at the PGE-owned Level 2 station and the regular commercial rate effectively
18 provides a discount to EV drivers using PGE's chargers. This implies that PGE collects
19 less from EV drivers using its Level 2 chargers than the actual cost to deliver the electricity,

¹⁰ Docket No. UM 2033, PGE's 2023 Final Transportation Electrification Plan at 118, filed on August 25, 2023

1 which means that other ratepayers are effectively paying more to cover the discount that
2 EV drivers receive. It is not clear to me that this tradeoff is fair to other customers who
3 must pay a higher rate, especially because the burden of year-to-year rate increases seems
4 to be a topic of contention in this case. In other words, PGE offers a generous deal to EV
5 drivers using PGE-owned Level 2 public chargers (who may or may not be PGE customers)
6 at the expense of customers who may not yet be EV drivers or may even be undercut from
7 offering their own charging services due to PGE's below-market prices.

8 **Q: How else can PGE ensure equitable access to charging stations, particularly for**
9 **income-qualified customers?**

10 A: I note that PGE proposed a separate income-qualified rate in Schedule 50, which will allow
11 income-qualified customers to pay a lower off-peak, on-peak, and idle fee at PGE-owned
12 stations than other drivers. I strongly support PGE's strategy to target discounts to income-
13 qualified customers.

14 In ChargePoint's experience as a provider of charging solutions, we find that non-
15 utility owner-operators of charging stations select pricing to balance the need to recover
16 operating costs with the desire to keep driver fees sufficiently low to encourage utilization
17 (which is necessary to recover costs). However, the Commission, PGE, and other
18 stakeholders may be interested in ensuring that income-qualified customers have access to
19 the same magnitude of fuel savings associated with driving an EV as other customers with
20 charging accessible at home.

1 To the extent that differences in the cost of charging between single-family homes
2 and MUDs are a concern, targeted interventions that deliver fuel savings to income-
3 qualified customers (without gifting a free ride to all other EV customers), presents a good
4 solution. For example, instead of providing an income-qualified rate that is only applicable
5 at PGE-owned stations, PGE could consider providing a pre-loaded fuel card to income-
6 qualified customers to be used at any public or shared-private charger in or outside of
7 PGE’s service territory. This would not only be a targeted way to ensure that income-
8 qualified customers have access to affordable charging, it would also expand to the use of
9 non-PGE owned stations—without relying price regulation or other anti-competitive
10 strategies that could unintentionally disrupt the growth of the EV charging industry in
11 Oregon. A program like this has been in operation in California to great success.¹¹

12 **Q: What do you recommend?**

13 A: As discussed, I strongly support PGE’s proposal to transition its Schedule 50 rates to
14 \$/kWh pricing and I find that PGE’s proposed DCFC rates in Schedule 50 align with
15 market rates. Despite my concerns that PGE’s proposed Level 2 off-peak rate will undercut
16 competitive providers, I do not oppose PGE’s proposal at this time. PGE’s proposed on-
17 peak rate for PGE-owned Level 2 chargers is at the high end of market Level 2 charging
18 rates and is still a significant improvement from the current per-session fee in Schedule 50.

¹¹ Cal-ITP, Universal Equity Zero Emission Vehicle Charging Card Project Demonstration Report (September 30, 2023), available at: <https://www.calitp.org/assets/Cal-ITP.Universal.Equity.Zero.Emission.Vehicle.Charging.Card.Report.pdf>

1 Instead of opposing PGE’s proposal, I recommend that the Commission direct PGE to
2 continue to monitor the impact of its Schedule 50 rates on the competitive charging market
3 and the deployment rate of non-utility EV chargers. In future rate cases, the Commission
4 should continue to ensure that PGE’s Schedule 50 rates are compatible with a robust
5 competitive charging market in Oregon.

6 **III. Changes to Schedule 56.**

7 **Q: What will you address in this section of your testimony?**

8 A: In this section of my testimony, I will address PGE’s proposed transportation line extension
9 allowance for fleets (Fleet TLEA) in Schedule 56.

10 **Q: Please describe PGE’s Fleet TLEA proposal.**

11 A: As the name implies, the Fleet TLEA is a line extension allowance that will be available to
12 commercial customers electrifying their fleets when available funding is exhausted for
13 PGE’s current Fleet Commercial Make Ready Pilot.¹² The Fleet TLEA will provide an
14 incentive to cover a portion of the cost of make-ready infrastructure and line extensions
15 needed to support fleet electrification based on a formula that ensures the new fleet
16 customer will provide sufficient incremental revenue to PGE to cover these costs over the
17 long-term.¹³

¹² PGE/900, Macfarlane-Pleasant at 40-41.

¹³ Portland General Electric Company, P.U.C. No. E-19, proposed First Revision of Sheet No. 56-4.

1 **Q: Do you support PGE's proposed Fleet TLEA proposal in Schedule 56?**

2 A: Yes. I appreciate PGE's foresight in proposing the Fleet TLEA in this rate case in
3 anticipation of funding running out for the existing Fleet Commercial Make Ready Pilot in
4 the foreseeable future. The Fleet TLEA will provide helpful support for fleet customers
5 looking to electrify their fleets, which will encourage EV adoption. I also appreciate that
6 the Fleet TLEA will support make-ready infrastructure and line extensions, which are
7 utility core competencies, and does not involve unnecessary and anticompetitive utility
8 ownership of chargers.

9 **Q: What do you recommend?**

10 A: I recommend that the Commission approve PGE's Fleet TLEA proposal in Schedule 56.

11 **IV. Conclusion and Recommendations.**

12 **Q: Please summarize your recommendations for the Commission.**

13 A: I recommend that the Commission:

- 14 • Approve PGE's proposed changes to Schedules 50 and 56; and
15 • Direct PGE to continue to monitor the impact of its Schedule 50 rates on the
16 competitive charging market and the deployment rate of non-utility EV chargers.

17 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony at this time?**

18 A: Yes.

MAL SKOWRON

Education

BROWN UNIVERSITY, Providence, RI

Bachelor of Science • Chemical and Biochemical Engineering • 2018

Professional Experience

CHARGEPOINT, INC.

Manager, Regulatory Policy (US)

May 2024 – present

Coordinator, Utility Policy (Western US)

September 2022—May 2024

- Policy analysis and stakeholder engagement to support the development of regulations appropriate for the maturing EV charging industry across 50 states.
- Draft written testimony to shape program design and expand the market for EV charging services, focusing on issues such as commercial rate design and the appropriate role of the utility in transportation electrification.
- Track, analyze, and engage with state rulemakings on policy issues such as incentive program eligibility requirements, payment, reliability, meter accuracy, and communication standards.

GREEN ENERGY CONSUMERS ALLIANCE

Transportation Policy & Program Coordinator

July 2021 – August 2022

- Advocated for changes in state law and policy in Rhode Island and Massachusetts to support electric vehicle (EV) adoption and charging infrastructure buildout.
- Prepared EV fleet transition plan including EV purchase inventory and total cost of ownership (TCO) analysis for two private non-profit vehicle operators.
- Served on the Rhode Island Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) to review multiyear statewide transportation investments.

Drive Green Program Associate

June 2018 – July 2021

- Developed educational materials, including handbooks, social media, website content, and blog posts, to promote understanding of EVs and Drive Green, an EV discount program across four states (NY, VA, MA, RI)
- Tracked and reported program performance metrics for marketing and program development.
- Hosted quarterly webinars on topics of interest to potential EV buyers, including lithium-ion battery technology, charging, and new EV models.

ENVIRONMENT COUNCIL OF RHODE ISLAND

Vice President of Communications

June 2019– August 2022

- Managed social media and initiate website redesign of ECRI, a coalition that advocates for environmental policy.
- Served on Executive Committee to oversee strategic planning, capacity building, and diversity/inclusion efforts.
- Developed messaging for the Climate Crisis Campaign, an effort to enact statewide climate policy by empowering Rhode Islanders to advocate for climate legislation.