

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF OREGON

UM 1811

IN THE MATTER OF PORTLAND)	
GENERAL ELECTRIC’S)	
APPLICATION FOR)	SIEMENS’S REPLY BRIEF
TRANSPORTATION)	
ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAMS)	

eMeter, a Siemens Company (“Siemens”), hereby submits its reply brief in the above-captioned proceeding. 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 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 the element of utility purchase and ownership of charging stations. Therefore, we focus on this issue.

There has been much debate over whether the Stipulation will “stimulate innovation, competition and customer choice in electric vehicle charging and related infrastructure and

services.”¹ 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.²

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Commission to adopt the Stipulation. In doing so, we also support EVCA’s suggestion that Non-Stipulating Parties be included in ongoing participation in the ensuing program.³

II. The threshold issue in this proceeding is whether the Stipulation will accelerate transportation electrification; it is *not* whether the Stipulation will stimulate innovation, competition and competition

The Stipulation clearly advances the Legislature’s goal of accelerating transportation electrification, the initial test for whether the Commission should approve the Stipulation. SB 1547 makes clear that the point of utilities making investment proposals is to accelerate transportation electrification. The Stipulation achieves 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 - SB 1547, § 20(4)(f).

² - Siemens/100.

³ - EVCA’s Response Brief at 2, November 17, 2017.

A single argument has been raised that the Stipulation would not meet SB 1547's goal of accelerating transportation electrification. Two of the parties – EVCA and ChargePoint, collectively the “Opposing Parties” – have argued that utility ownership could be detrimental to the charging market. That argument should be rejected for at least four reasons. First, the Opposing Parties have not provided evidence of a case in which utility participation has had this result. Second, the Opposing Parties agree 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 The Opposing Parties argue that site hosts should be selecting charging equipment, not the utility. 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, the Opposing Parties themselves provide evidence of the need for utility participation, citing the California Public Utility Commission's decision that found that the lack of utility participation appears to be a reason the charging market has *not* developed quickly enough.⁵ Fourth, 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

⁴ - Ibid at 1 and ChargePoint Inc.s Post-Hearing Reply Brief at 10, November 17, 2017.

⁵ - Ibid at 10.

Commission’s requirements for prudence and reasonableness. The point of the pilot proposed in 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 the Opposing Parties 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 it is consistent with Commission policy for utility investments and is reasonable in consideration of the language of SB 1547.

IV. The Commission should reject the recommendation of the Opposing Parties to change the pilot program design

Siemens opposes the Opposing Parties’ recommendation that a new pilot program be design based on the concept of rebates rather than utility ownership.⁷ This would incur a delay of likely a year – perhaps more, depending on the success of the Parties in reaching agreement through either a new Stipulation (unlikely to be agreement) or a Commission-adjudicated dispute (the more likely situation). Such a delay would obviously be in direct contradiction to the Legislature’s goal of accelerating transportation electrification.

⁶ - ChargePoint Post-Hearing Reply Brief at 33.

⁷ - EVCA’s Response Brief at 1 and ChargePoint Post-Hearing Reply Brief at 33.

V. The Commission should find that future implementation activities be open to all market participants

Siemens supports EVCA's suggestion that Non-Stipulating Parties be included in ongoing participation in the ensuing program.

VI. Conclusion

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

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of November, 2017,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Chris S. King". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C".

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