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I.

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public
Utilities Commission (“CPUC” or “Commission”), Southern California Edison Company
(“SCE”) hereby submits its opposition to Marin Clean Energy’s (“MCE’s”) Motion to
Consolidate Proceedings, filed and served in this proceeding on March 2, 2015 (“Motion”). MCE
re-served the Motion on March 10, 2015, so Administrative Law Judge Hieta instructed parties
to file responses by March 25, 2015.1

In summary, SCE opposes the proposed consolidation of the three investor-owned
utilities’ (“IOUs’”) electric vehicle (“EV”) charging infrastructure applications (“Applications”).
A consolidated proceeding reviewing the Applications would not be as effective as case-by-case
deliberation because the Applications are materially different from one another. Instead, any

1 See March 17, 2015 email ruling of Administrative Law Judge Karin Hieta.
common issues can be coordinated across the proceedings, allowing for more expeditious review of the Applications.

II.

DISCUSSION

A. The IOUs’ Applications Have Unique Issues That Should be Reviewed with a Case-Specific Approach

The recent Phase 1 Decision in the Alternative Fueled Vehicle Order Instituting Rulemaking (“AFV OIR”) requires the Commission to take “a more detailed, tailored approach to assessing any proposed utility program based upon the facts of specific requests.”² Like the majority of parties that filed comments in support of the Proposed Decision,³ SCE supports the Commission’s case-specific approach. Because the Commission must independently evaluate the unique merits of each utility electric vehicle (“EV”) infrastructure application and consider the varying conditions in the markets in each of the IOU’s service areas, consolidation of A.14-10-014 with this proceeding is not appropriate. Consolidation of the many different issues into a single proceeding is likely to complicate the adjudication of the various program applications, requiring more time to reach resolutions.

While SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E have all proposed programs for utility-owned EV charging infrastructure, the programs differ significantly in a number of ways. SDG&E’s Vehicle-Grid Integration (“VGI”) Pilot Program is unique from the other proposals in that it focuses on grid integration and includes new rate design components. PG&E’s EV Program is

² D.14-12-079, p. 8.
³ In opening comments, 15 of 19 parties filing supported the Proposed Decision Establishing Policy to Expand the Utilities’ Role in Development of Electric Vehicle Infrastructure. See comments filed by California Energy Storage Alliance; Charge Ahead California Campaign; ChargePoint, Inc.; Coalition of California Utility Employees; Environmental Defense Fund; Green Power Institute/Community Environmental Council; Joint Automakers; Joint Minority Parties; NRG Energy, Inc.; Office of Ratepayer Advocates; Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Recargo, Inc.; San Diego Gas & Electric Company; Southern California Edison Company; and The Vote Solar Initiative.
unique in that it supports DC fast chargers and uses third-party service providers to operate the EVSE owned by the utility. Finally, SCE’s Charge Ready Program is unique in that it requires third-party ownership of the EVSE. Each of these differences, along with any unique circumstances in the markets in each of the IOU’s service areas, requires the development of a distinct record. Adjudicating all of these separate issues within one proceeding would result in a broad scope and a prolonged proceeding, which would undermine the need for prompt action by the Commission to support this market and the state’s environmental goals that depend on facilitating the rapid growth of this market.

B. Concerns with Competitive Procurement Services Have Already Been Addressed by the Commission and Can be Reiterated without Consolidating the Proceedings

Based on MCE’s Motion for Consolidation, it seems that the primary reason that MCE believes the three IOUs’ Application should be combined is due to concerns related to the competitive procurement services amongst Load-Serving Entities (“LSEs”). MCE states “there is potential for these programs to (i) preclude other LSEs from serving EVSE with generation services; (ii) site the EVSE exclusively in locations other LSEs are unable to serve, and (iii) use the EVSE to manipulate customer choice to maintain bundled service.”⁴ SCE would like to clarify that pursuant to its tariffs and Commission decisions, SCE cannot and will not preclude Direct Access providers, Community Choice Aggregation providers or other LSEs authorized to serve load in SCE’s service area from serving load at the EVSE; SCE cannot and will not give preference to sites that take procurement service from SCE; and SCE cannot and will not use the program to hinder customers from exercising choices they may have for competitive procurement services. SCE trusts that the Commission will reiterate these requirements in its decisions in this proceeding and the respective program applications.

⁴ Marin Clean Energy Motion to Consolidate Proceedings, March 2, 2015, at p. 2.
C. **The Commission Can Coordinate Issues Across the IOUs’ EV Applications As Needed**

In the March 6, 2015 Scoping Rule on A.14-10-014, the Joint Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge ruled that “[a]t this time this proceeding will not be consolidated with R.13-11-007/A.14-04-014… the assigned ALJs for the proceeding will coordinate closely and resolve any overlapping issues congruently as needed.”\(^5\) SCE believes that coordination of any common issues across the proceedings is the best approach given the numerous application-specific issues that should be resolved on a case-by-case basis.

MCE also raises cost-effectiveness and carve-outs for disadvantaged communities as issues that warrant deliberation in a consolidated proceeding.\(^6\) These issues, to the extent they are applicable to each Application, can be debated consistently across the three proceedings without consolidation. The discussion in each proceeding will address the specific facts of that proposal, but can inform the other proceedings, to the extent relevant.

Moreover, the temporary nature of the IOUs’ proposed involvement in the EV charging infrastructure market and the different types of programs proposed in the Applications limits the need for standardization of most issues. To the extent the Commission determines, at some point in the future, that the IOUs should have a longer-term role in this market, the Commission should then invest the time and resources necessary to consider standardization of these issues.

D. **If the Commission Consolidates the IOUs’ EV Applications, then the Commission Should Adjudicate SCE’s Pilot Program Independently**

While SCE opposes consolidating the IOUs’ EV Applications for the reasons explained above, if the Commission decides that consolidation is appropriate, then the Commission should rule on SCE’s Charge Ready Pilot independently from the consolidated proceeding. SCE’s

\(^5\) A.14-10-014, Joint Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge’s Scoping Ruling, issued March 6, 2015, p. 4.

\(^6\) Marin Clean Energy Motion to Consolidate Proceedings, March 2, 2015, at p. 2.
proposed Charge Ready Pilot is small relative to Phase 2 of SCE’s Charge Ready Program and the other IOUs’ programs. If the Commission allows SCE to move forward with its small pilot expeditiously, the information collected from the pilot is expected to be useful for informing Commission decisions on the larger EV infrastructure programs.

III.

CONCLUSION

SCE appreciates the opportunity to provide this response to MCE’s Motion to Consolidate Proceedings. Given the guidance in both the A.14-10-014 Scoping Ruling and D.14-12-079, the different issues raised in each Application and varying conditions in the markets across the IOUs’ service areas, and that consolidation of the Applications may cause a delay in the implementation of these time-sensitive programs, the Commission should decline to consolidate the Applications and, instead, evaluate the Applications on their individual merits.

---

2 SCE’s proposed Ready Pilot costs $22 million compared to $333 million for Phase 2 of SCE’s Charge Ready Program, $103 million for SDG&E’s Vehicle Grid Integration Pilot, and $654 million for PG&E’s EV Program.
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