

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
OF OREGON  
UM 1811**

In the Matter of )  
 )  
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC )  
COMPANY, )  
 )  
Application for Transportation )  
Electrification Programs. )

REPLY TESTIMONY  
OF THE  
OREGON CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD

September 19, 2017



**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**  
**OF OREGON**  
**UM 1811**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC	)	REPLY TESTIMONY OF THE
COMPANY,	)	OREGON CITIZENS' UTILITY
	)	BOARD
Application for Transportation	)	
Electrification Programs.	)	

---

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1 My name is Bob Jenks, and my witness qualifications have been provided as CUB  
2 Exhibit 101.

3 In this Reply Testimony, the Oregon Citizens' Utility Board ("CUB") responds to  
4 the testimony of ChargePoint and the Electric Vehicle Charging Association ("EVCA")  
5 opposing the stipulation in this docket. Eight parties to this docket supported the  
6 stipulation, and ChargePoint was the only initial party that did not.<sup>1</sup> EVCA intervened to  
7 challenge the stipulation after it had been signed by other parties. Many of the arguments  
8 made by the opponents of the stipulation relate to a legal analysis of the requirements  
9 given to the Public Utility Commission of Oregon ("the Commission") and, by virtue, the  
10 utilities from the Oregon Legislature resulting from SB 1547. CUB will appropriately  
11 address those issues in briefing. Generally, both opponents of the stipulation oppose

---

<sup>1</sup> See *in re Portland General Electric Company, Application for Transportation Electrification Programs*, OPUC Docket No. UM 1811, Stipulation at 1 (June 27, 2017) (The stipulation is between PGE, OPUC Staff, CUB, ICNU, ODOE, Tesla, TriMet, Forth, and Greenlots).

1 allowing Portland General Electric Company (“PGE”) to own charging stations (Electric  
2 Avenue expansion), and would prefer a model in which PGE offers rebates to subsidize  
3 to “site hosts” to offset some or all of the costs of installing charging equipment.

## 4 II. PGE’S LIMITED ROLE IN PUBLIC CHARGING

5 The opposition to the stipulation focuses on PGE’s investment in up to six  
6 additional Electric Avenue charging pods. While ChargePoint points out that PGE would  
7 like to invest in an additional thirteen charging pods,<sup>2</sup> the stipulation actually prevents  
8 such investment. The stipulation is for a ten year pilot and clearly limits PGE to six  
9 additional charging pods beyond what it has already deployed.

10 The opposing parties are concerned that PGE’s charging pods do not offer site  
11 hosts the ability to choose their own technology, fees, payment collection methods, data  
12 management processes or allow site hosts to control the number of charging stations per  
13 site.<sup>3</sup> They define site hosts as:

14 workplaces, governments, hotels, colleges and universities, hospitals,  
15 electric utilities and other energy companies, parking garages, airports,  
16 multifamily housing, auto dealerships and other businesses.<sup>4</sup>

17 In the opposing parties’ own definition, there are twice as many types of site hosts  
18 listed as the number of charging pods PGE is allowed under the stipulation. PGE’s six  
19 charging pods will have a limited effect on the bulk of these potential site hosts. PGE has  
20 fourteen cities in its territory with populations greater than 20,000 people. PGE’s limited  
21 program won’t even place pods in half of these cities.

---

<sup>2</sup> UM 1811 – ChargePoint/200/Packard/17.

<sup>3</sup> UM 1811 – EVCA/100/Cherkaoui/8.

<sup>4</sup> UM 1811 – EVCA/100/Cherkaoui/5.

1 Owners of multi-family housing, parking garages, hotels, and workplaces will  
2 have to look somewhere other than PGE’s charging pods if they want to host an EV  
3 charging site. In fact, the stipulation recognizes this. Stipulated Condition 31 identifies a  
4 future pilot related to workplaces and/or fleets, and the need to address multi-family  
5 housing separately. There is nothing in the stipulation that would suggest how those  
6 programs would be designed – they may even be designed following the rebate model  
7 that the opposing parties desire.

8 III. THE STIPULATION ENHANCES CUSTOMER CHOICE

9 Both opposing parties claim the stipulation limits customer choices for charging  
10 equipment and services. CUB disagrees.

11 ChargePoint identifies site hosts as the “customer:”

12 In my opinion, the “customer” intended by the statute is the entity that  
13 hosts a charging station and allows drivers to charge their vehicles at the  
14 station. I provided many examples of such customers in my Reply  
15 Testimony, including big-box retailers, municipal governments, and the  
16 owners of multi-unit dwellings (MUDs). These entities may offer a  
17 charging station to their shoppers, their constituents, or their tenants, but  
18 they are the ones paying the electric bill, so they are the customer-of-  
19 record. As I also explained in my Reply Testimony, it is crucial to allow  
20 charging station site-hosts to choose the charging station infrastructure and  
21 services that best meet the needs of the drivers they expect will use the  
22 charging station because the site-host – and not PGE – is best equipped to  
23 understand those drivers’ needs and preferences.

24 The problem with this argument is these identified site hosts are not the customer  
25 of record for PGE charging pods. PGE will not be asking big-box retailers, or owners of  
26 multi-unit dwellings to pay for the electricity that flows through the charging pods. And  
27 as CUB pointed out above, PGE’s charging pods will serve few of these customers.

28 CUB believes that the primary customers served by PGE’s charging pods are  
29 electric customers who own EVs. The vast majority of these customers charge their

1 vehicles at home. Having an additional six charging pods within PGE’s service territory  
2 will give these customers six more choices as to where they charge their vehicle. This  
3 clearly increases customer choices for charging services.

4 IV. THE ROLE OF PILOTS

5 ChargePoint is critical of the signers of the stipulation, including CUB, for  
6 agreeing to pilot programs:

7 Frankly, I am disturbed that certain parties, particularly PGE, Staff, and  
8 CUB, would recommend that the Commission approve programs that they  
9 acknowledge do not meet the statutory criteria that the programs are  
10 supposed to meet. I am also concerned that the Stipulating Parties seem to  
11 believe that because the programs are “time-limited, cost- limited, and ...  
12 designed to produce specific learnings,” that SB 1547’s criteria somehow  
13 do not apply or are not relevant.<sup>5</sup>

14 First, it is incorrect to state that CUB and other parties acknowledge that the  
15 programs “do not meet the statutory criteria that programs are supposed to meet.” The  
16 stipulation states that the parties have not agreed that they meet the statutory criteria,  
17 which is not the same as saying that the parties agree that they do not meet the statutory  
18 requirements. In fact, CUB believes that they do meet the statutory requirements.

19 Further, as will be expounded upon in briefing, CUB does not necessarily believe  
20 that the criteria delineated in SB 1547 § 20(4)(a)-(f) are meant to be dispositive or that all  
21 must necessarily be met in order for the Commission to approve a transportation  
22 electrification program application. SB 1547 § 20(3) directs the Commission to “direct  
23 each electric company to file applications, *in a form and manner prescribed by the*  
24 *commission*, for programs to accelerate transportation electrification.”<sup>6</sup> The Commission  
25 already conducted a robust, stakeholder-intensive rulemaking process to prescribe rules

---

<sup>5</sup> UM 1811 – ChargePoint/200/Packard/14.

<sup>6</sup> SB 1547 § 20(3) (emphasis added).

1 to govern transportation electrification program applications in docket AR 599. Part of  
2 those rules require the utility to include a “[d]escription of the electric company’s role  
3 and, if applicable, a discussion of how the electric company *proposes to own* or support  
4 charging infrastructure.”<sup>7</sup> Contrary to the positions taken by EVCA and ChargePoint  
5 regarding utility ownership of charging infrastructure running contrary to SB 1547, the  
6 Commission clearly determined that it was a distinct and feasible possibility.

7 CUB’s primary concern with PGE’s EV programs and the statutory criteria is the  
8 criteria that these programs be prudent. A prudency determination normally includes a  
9 cost effectiveness test, and these programs – if they were not pilots -- would not pass a  
10 traditional cost effectiveness test. CUB believes, however, that by recognizing these as  
11 time-limited pilots with concrete takeaways, the programs are prudent, and can be  
12 considered cost effective. The reason is that part of what customers are paying for with  
13 pilot programs is the knowledge and experience gained from these pilots. PGE will have  
14 more than 100,000 EVs in its system within a few years and the Company needs to  
15 understand more about how these vehicles impact the grid. Even though the revenue  
16 generated from these programs will not equal their costs, the revenue generated plus the  
17 value of what is learned from these pilots will be greater than their costs. From CUB’s  
18 perspective, this makes the programs cost effective and prudent. It also means that they  
19 are consistent with the statutory criteria.

## 20 V. CONCLUSION

21 CUB supports the stipulation. Allowing PGE to own six charging pods will not  
22 prevent site hosts who wish to install charging equipment from doing so. For PGE

---

<sup>7</sup> OAR 860-087-0030(1)(a)(G) (emphasis added).

1 customers who own EVs, these additional charging pods will create additional choices  
2 for charging services that do not exist today. While these programs are not cost effective,  
3 they will be helpful in gaining the knowledge and experience that will be necessary as  
4 thousands of EVs are added to PGE service territory. Due to the knowledge gained, CUB  
5 believes these can be considered prudent. CUB respectfully urges the Commission to  
6 approve the stipulation.