

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison
Company (U338E) for Approval of Its Charge
Ready and Market Education Programs

Application 14-10-014
(Filed October 30, 2014)

**REPLY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) IN SUPPORT
OF ITS PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF DECISION 16-01-023 REGARDING
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR CHARGE
READY AND MARKET EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

FADIA RAFEEDIE KHOURY
ANDREA L. TOZER

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6713
Facsimile: (626) 302-6693
E-mail: Andrea.Tozer@sce.com

Dated: **April 16, 2018**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DISCUSSION	3
A. SCE’s Requested Bridge Funding is Supported by Most Parties and Will Prevent Detrimental Interruptions to the Charge Ready Pilot While the Commission Considers the Design and Scope of Charge Ready Phase 2.	3
B. TURN’s Proposed Reduction in Bridge-Funding Would Risk Creating a Program Gap That Most Parties Seek to Prevent for Compelling Reasons.....	5
C. ORA’s Opposition to Bridge Funding Is Belied by the Commission’s Stated Intention in the Decision to Limit Any Gap in Deployment between Phases 1 and 2.	6
D. Shell’s Request for New EVSE Technologies Will Be Addressed in SCE’s Charge Ready Phase 2 Application.....	7
E. SCE Invites Lancaster Customers to Participate in SCE’s Charge Ready Pilot without Modification.	8
III. CONCLUSION.....	9

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison
Company (U338E) for Approval of Its Charge
Ready and Market Education Programs

Application 14-10-014
(Filed October 30, 2014)

**REPLY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) IN SUPPORT
OF ITS PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF DECISION 16-01-023 REGARDING
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY’S APPLICATION FOR CHARGE
READY AND MARKET EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

I.

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the permission granted by assigned Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Sasha Goldberg¹ and Rule 16.4(g) of the California Public Utilities Commission’s (“Commission’s”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”) respectfully replies to certain responses to SCE’s Petition (“Petition”) for Modification of Decision (D.) 16-01-023 (“the Decision”).

SCE’s Petition seeks authorization for bridge funding that would extend the Charge Ready Pilot until the Commission issues a decision on SCE’s Charge Ready Phase 2 application. The majority of parties who responded to SCE’s Petition, including many parties to the Phase 1 settlement agreement, fully support SCE’s request in recognition of the fact that modest bridge funding would prevent a detrimental program gap that neither they nor the Commission intended when the Decision was issued. Parties that support SCE’s Petition as proposed represent a broad

¹ ALJ Goldberg granted SCE’s request for leave to file a reply to responses regarding SCE’s Petition by e-mail on April 5, 2018.

diversity of stakeholders, including Natural Resources Defense Council, the Coalition of California Utility Employees, Plug In America, Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund, The Greenlining Institute, eMeter, a Siemens Business, Greenlots, American Honda Motor Co. Inc., General Motors LLC, the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Electric Motor Werks, Inc. (collectively, “NRDC et al.”); Tesla, Inc.; ChargePoint, Inc. (“ChargePoint”); and California Energy Storage Alliance (“CESA”).

The Utility Reform Network (“TURN”) also agrees that bridge funding is consistent with the Commission’s Decision and expresses support for the program to continue without interruption, but recommends approving only \$4 million (instead of \$22 million) to complete installation of the 1,500 charge ports originally forecast.² The Commission should decline TURN’s invitation to reduce the requested bridge funding amount because the arbitrary \$4 million is not sufficient to prevent a lengthy, detrimental interruption to the Charge Ready Pilot while the Commission considers the design and scope of Charge Ready Phase 2. Such interruptions will jeopardize the Pilot’s momentum, impeding progress supporting California’s environmental goals and creating operational inefficiency.

The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (“ORA”) stands alone in recommending that the Commission deny the Petition. As an alternative, ORA states that if the Commission is inclined to grant the Petition, it should authorize only \$4 million in bridge funding and require that all costs to be tracked in a memorandum account. The Commission should reject ORA’s request to deny the Petition because it is contrary to the Decision’s stated intention to minimize any gap between Phase 1 and Phase 2. For all the reasons discussed above, the Commission should also reject ORA’s alternative request to reduce the requested bridge funding necessary to continue the Pilot until the Commission issues a decision on SCE’s Phase 2 application.

² TURN also raises a legitimate point that the Commission should review the results of SCE’s Pilot Report, which was not yet available at the time the Petition was filed. TURN Response, p. 5. The Report’s contents, made available on April 2, 2018, offer no reason to deny the Petition.

Shell Energy North America (US), L.P. (“Shell”) and the City of Lancaster (“Lancaster”) also support SCE’s Petition, but propose additional modifications to the Pilot as it winds down. Shell’s request to qualify additional EVSE technologies is inappropriate during a limited bridge period to continue the Pilot as approved. Lancaster’s requests for coordination, outreach, and exemptions from the requirement to participate in a demand response program are unnecessary because Lancaster’s customers are eligible to participate in the Pilot and are included in SCE’s outreach efforts. Further, Lancaster’s recommendations about coordination and changes to program requirements are not appropriate within the targeted scope of SCE’s Petition.

For these reasons, the Commission should grant SCE’s Petition without modification.

II.

DISCUSSION

A. SCE’s Requested Bridge Funding is Supported by Most Parties and Will Prevent Detrimental Interruptions to the Charge Ready Pilot While the Commission Considers the Design and Scope of Charge Ready Phase 2.

Bridge funding minimizes the risks posed by the gap between phases by continuing to provide infrastructure and rebates to support charging stations in long-dwell locations.³ As responses from NRDC et al., CESA, and ChargePoint state, the Charge Ready program is just beginning to gain momentum and the Commission should approve SCE’s Petition.⁴ Even TURN “appreciates that complete ‘starts and stops’ can negatively impact program management and performance.”⁵ As stated in SCE’s Petition, the Commission made clear in the Decision that it had every intention of sustaining a meaningful program pilot—one that afforded an opportunity to obtain meaningful lessons about pilot designs and costs—without creating a gap between that

³ SCE Petition, p. 7.

⁴ NRDC et al. Response, p. 3; CESA Response, p. 3; ChargePoint Response, p. 2.

⁵ TURN Response, p. 5.

initial phase and Charge Ready Phase 2.⁶ The declarations in support of SCE’s Petition show why new facts support a modest increase to the Pilot funding to permit it to accomplish that goal.

Most stakeholders support SCE’s Petition because sufficient bridge funding facilitates steadier market transformation (rather than start-and-stop deployment) from Phase 1 to Phase 2 of the Charge Ready and Market Education Program. As CESA notes, “SCE appears to balance the objectives of maintaining market momentum under a successful Phase 1 pilot framework while still reserving the majority of Phase 2 funding to make improvements based on pilot-phase learnings for a full-scale program. Furthermore, SCE does not introduce any changes to the Phase 1 framework that would have necessitated additional regulatory and stakeholder processes. Instead, the Phase 1 framework, which was settled and approved after an extensive stakeholder process, is maintained and SCE simply seeks to continue to support EV charging deployments without overly impacting the goals of Phase 2. CESA finds the request to be non-controversial and reasonable in light of the goals of this program as well as the state’s overall transportation electrification goals.”⁷

Program continuity will also provide substantial operational benefits. Over the past few years, SCE has built internal capabilities in the outreach, assessment, and deployment of charging infrastructure.⁸ With sufficient bridge-funding, SCE will be able to keep this momentum to efficiently install charging infrastructure rather than create unnecessary delays and potential expense to retrain employees after significant gaps in time and remobilize resources that were moved to other projects. By approving the requested bridge funding, the Commission will enable SCE to provide greater certainty in the charging infrastructure market for its customers and vendors, allow for the seamless transition to Phase 2 envisioned by the Decision, and encourage the growth of EV charging stations to support California’s ambitious goals.

⁶ SCE Petition, p. 5; D.16-01-023, pp. 29-30.

⁷ CESA Response, pp. 3-4.

⁸ SCE Petition, p. 8.

B. TURN's Proposed Reduction in Bridge-Funding Would Risk Creating a Program Gap That Most Parties Seek to Prevent for Compelling Reasons.

TURN recommends that the Commission authorize SCE to spend only an additional \$4 million to complete installation of the 1,500 ports originally forecast.⁹ Unfortunately, this reduced funding level would not be sufficient to bridge the anticipated gap or promote market certainty. Responses from parties highlight that an extensive program gap would undermine the state's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emission and accelerate transportation electrification. TURN's recommended \$4 million in bridge funding is insufficient to address this problem. Without bridge funding, there may be a 12- to 18-month gap¹⁰ without any SCE infrastructure program to support light-duty EV charging station deployment. An additional \$4 million to reach 1,500 ports in the Pilot is insufficient to mitigate the effect of this large gap. Furthermore, TURN's proposed \$4 million budget is arbitrary and not grounded in the facts set forth in SCE's Petition and accompanying declarations. Accordingly, SCE recommends that the Commission approve its Petition for \$22 million to support a minimum of 1,000 additional charge ports during the period between approval of this Petition and the implementation of the Charge Ready Phase 2 program as approved by the Commission.

As highlighted by NRDC et al., the Commission reduces the authorized budget for SCE's upcoming Phase 2 program by the amount of approved bridge funding, there would ultimately be no net-cost associated with approving the Petition.¹¹ Conversely, ceasing operations could result in the "loss of would-be participants who have already indicated their interest in the program, and the loss of expertise of the utility staff, vendors, contractors, and workers who are implementing the program."¹² If the Commission denies the Petition or substantially reduces the

⁹ TURN Response, p. 2.

¹⁰ The exact timing of the Phase 2 launch depends on the Commission's regulatory process and approval of SCE's Charge Ready Phase 2 application.

¹¹ NRDC et al. Response, p. 3.

¹² *Id.*

requested bridge funding, SCE will be at risk of losing personnel, expertise, and efficiency that can facilitate a cost-effective transition to Phase 2. The \$4 million bridge funding proposed by TURN would only extend the Pilot for a brief period, leaving a substantial, detrimental gap and preventing the seamless transition from the Pilot to Phase 2 envisioned by the Decision.

As illustrated in Declarations from ChargePoint and Kitu Systems, bridge funding sufficient to provide market certainty will promote the needed increase in EV adoption.¹³ General contractors are not currently dedicating resources to Charge Ready because they cannot rely on a continuous stream of work from SCE projects, which adds additional time to implementation. For example, there may be delay of a few weeks to get general contractor resources because they have to finish existing work prior to deploying resources to work on Charge Ready. TURN provides no evidence that the reduced level of bridge funding it proposes would send this necessary market signal. Approving SCE's Petition to continue the Pilot will provide additional certainty to external resources and allow them to quickly execute on customer projects. Accepting TURN's proposed reduction would create a significant gap that would jeopardize the momentum of the Pilot and stall progress to support California's climate goals.

C. ORA's Opposition to Bridge Funding Is Belied by the Commission's Stated Intention in the Decision to Limit Any Gap in Deployment between Phases 1 and 2.

ORA argues that additional expenditures of customer funds is not warranted because the Phase 1 decision recognizes the potential for some gap between Phase 1 and Phase 2.¹⁴ ORA states that "although the Commission envisioned some overlap of program implementation between Phase 1 and Phase 2, it did not mandate or anticipate there would be no gap. Instead, the Commission sought to minimize the gap, if possible."¹⁵ Similarly, TURN cites to language in the Decision, which infers that additional funds from lower rebate levels and

¹³ SCE Petition, Appendices C and D.

¹⁴ ORA Response, pp. 2-3.

¹⁵ *Id.*, p. 3.

contingencies should contribute to limiting a gap in deployment between Phase 1 and Phase 2.¹⁶ SCE agrees with TURN that the Decision articulates ways by which a potential gap could be reduced, however, the Decision explicitly contemplates a potential gap and focuses on *minimizing the gap* in deployment between Phase 1 and Phase 2.¹⁷ The Commission agreed with SCE that “certain efficiencies may exist in moving seamlessly from a pilot to full-scale deployment” and that it is “reasonable to minimize regulatory delay to the extent feasible.”¹⁸ ORA’s argument that the Commission acknowledged the potential for a gap between phases does not contradict the Commission’s stated desire to minimize any such gap or the support from all other respondents to SCE’s Petition, who recognize the importance of bridge funding to maintain the Pilot’s momentum. For all the reasons discussed above, the Commission should reject ORA’s recommendation to deny SCE’s Petition or reduce SCE’s requested bridge funding.

Further, the Commission should reject ORA’s recommendation to record any approved bridge funding in a separate memorandum account.¹⁹ SCE has already established the Charge Ready Program Balancing Account to record costs associated with the Pilot,²⁰ and there is no reason to open a separate memorandum account. A separate memorandum account is not necessary to review the reasonableness of these costs because, as required by D.16-01-023, the entries recorded in the Charge Ready Program Balancing Account are reviewed in SCE’s annual ERRR Review proceeding and ORA is an active party in these proceedings.

D. Shell’s Request for New EVSE Technologies Will Be Addressed in SCE’s Charge Ready Phase 2 Application.

In its Response, Shell urges the Commission to grant SCE’s Petition for Modification, but also requests that the Commission condition its approval of SCE’s requested

¹⁶ D.16-01-023, p. 30; TURN Response, p. 3.

¹⁷ D.16-01-023, p. 29.

¹⁸ *Id.*, pp. 29-30.

¹⁹ ORA Response, p. 10.

²⁰ SCE Tariff Book, Preliminary Statement, Part I.

bridge funding by requiring SCE to open a Quarterly Technical Evaluation process so that new EVSE models can be offered by program vendors.²¹ While SCE appreciates Shell's support of continuing the Pilot, any programmatic or operational changes are not appropriate during the bridge period. SCE will support appropriate evaluation processes in its Charge Ready Phase 2 application.

E. SCE Invites Lancaster Customers to Participate in SCE's Charge Ready Pilot without Modification.

Lancaster supports SCE's proposal with several proposed modifications. First, Lancaster requests that SCE recognize Community Choice Aggregators ("CCAs") as key stakeholders and implementers of the Charge Ready Program and that the generation supply for new EV charging stations will be provided by CCAs if the location is a CCA customer.²² Second, Lancaster requests that SCE coordinate with CCA programs, distribute funding to those programs, and include CCAs in market education and outreach ("ME&O") plans.²³ Additionally, Lancaster requests that "additional Charge Ready funds should not be coupled with a requirement to participate in SCE's DR program."²⁴

SCE's targeted Petition is not a forum best suited to address these broader collaboration issues. Rather, SCE invites Lancaster to join SCE's TE advisory panel, which is an important and more appropriate forum for Lancaster to work with SCE on coordination and implementation of TE programs. SCE appreciates all stakeholder participation in this process, including from CCAs, regardless of who procures the generation to supply EV charging stations. Moreover, participation in SCE's Pilot is and always has been open to all eligible CCA customers, who are not required to opt out of their respective CCAs to participate. Consequently, SCE's ME&O plans broadly incorporate all eligible SCE customers, including

²¹ Shell Response, p. 1.

²² Lancaster Response, p. 3.

²³ *Id.*, pp. 5-6.

²⁴ *Id.*, pp. 6-7.

CCA customers. Lastly, SCE requires all customer participants with Level 2 charging stations to participate in a demand response program designed in connection with the Pilot and approved by the Commission. There is no justification for exempting CCA customers from this broadly-applicable requirement, which arose from a virtual all-party settlement and was approved by the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission should reject Lancaster's requests to modify the bridge funding request.

III.

CONCLUSION

SCE is committed to the growth and innovation of its TE portfolio in the light-duty sector. By approving the requested bridge funding, the Commission will enable SCE to provide greater certainty for customers and vendors interested in electrification, allow for the seamless transition to Phase 2 envisioned by the Decision, and encourage the growth of EV charging opportunities to support California's ambitious environmental goals. Prompt Commission action will allow SCE to satisfy customer interest and continue installing this important infrastructure. Therefore, SCE respectfully requests that the Commission grant SCE's Petition without modification.

Respectfully submitted,

FADIA RAFEEDIE KHOURY
ANDREA L. TOZER

/s/ Andrea L. Tozer

By: Andrea L. Tozer

Attorney for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-6713
Facsimile: (626) 302-6693
E-mail: Andrea.Tozer@sce.com

DATE: April 16, 2018

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Southern California Edison Company
(U 338-E) for Approval of its Charge Ready and
Market Education Programs.

A.14-10-014
(Filed October 30, 2014)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have this day served a true copy of **REPLY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) IN SUPPORT OF ITS PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF DECISION 16-01-023 REGARDING SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR CHARGE READY AND MARKET EDUCATION PROGRAMS** on all parties identified on the attached service list(s) for **A.14-10-014**. Service was effected by one or more means indicated below:

- Transmitting the copies via e-mail to all parties who have provided an e-mail address.
- Placing the copies in sealed envelopes and causing such envelopes to be delivered by US Mail to the offices of the Commissioners(s) or other addresses(s).

**ALJ Sasha Goldberg
CPUC
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102**

Executed this day **April 16, 2018**, at Rosemead, California.

/s/ Sandra Sedano

Sandra Sedano
Legal Administrative Assistant
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770



California
Public Utilities
Commission



[CPUC Home](#)

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Service Lists

PROCEEDING: A1410014 - EDISON - FOR APPROVA
FILER: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
LIST NAME: LIST
LAST CHANGED: APRIL 16, 2018

[Download the Comma-delimited File](#)
[About Comma-delimited Files](#)

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

Parties

C. C. SONG
 SR. POLICY ANALYST
 MARIN CLEAN ENERGY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: MARIN CLEAN ENERGY

CHRISTOPHER WARNER
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

JAMES HALL
 MGR.- ADVANCED VEHICLE AND INFRA. POLICY
 GENERAL MOTORS LLC
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: GENERAL MOTORS LLC

JAY FRIEDLAND
 ZERO MOTORCYCLES
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: PLUG IN AMERICA

JOHN BOESEL
 CALSTART
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: CALSTART

KEVIN LEE
 ATTORNEY
 NRG ENERGY, INC.
 11390 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., STE. 250
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90064
 FOR: NRG ENERGY, INC.

FORREST NORTH
 CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
 RECARGO, INC.
 1015 ABBOT KINNEY BLVD.
 VENICE, CA 90291
 FOR: RECARGO, INC.

JESSALYN ISHIGO
 ENVIRONMENTAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT OFF.
 AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC.
 1919 TORRANCE BLVD.
 TORRANCE, CA 90501
 FOR: AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC.

MAX BAUMHEFNER
ATTORNEY
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER ST., 21ST FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 91404
FOR: THE CHARGE AHEAD CALIFORNIA
CAMPAIGN (MEMBERS: NRDC, COMMUNITIES
FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENT
CALIFORNIA RESEARCH & POLICY CENTER,
COALITION FO CLEAN AIR, AND THE
GREENLINING INSTITUTE)

JOHN W. LESLIE, ESQ
ATTORNEY
DENTONS US LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 92121
FOR: SHELL ENERGY NORTH AMERICA (US),
L.P.

SACHU CONSTANTINE
DIR. OF POLICY
CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
9325 SKY PARK COURT, SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
FOR: CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY

MARC D JOSEPH
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO, PC
601 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
FOR: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY
EMPLOYESS (CCUE)

ELISE TORRES
STAFF ATTORNEY
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
785 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)

JIM BAAK
PROGRAM DIR - GRID INTEGRATION
VOTE SOLAR
360 22ND FLOOR, SUITE 730
OAKLAND, CA 94612
FOR: VOTE SOLAR

GREGORY MORRIS
DIRECTOR
GREEN POWER INSTITUTE
2039 SHATTUCK AVE., SUITE 402
BERKELEY, CA 94704

ANDREA L. TOZER
ATTORNEY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. / PO BOX 800
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

E. GREGORY BARNES
ATTORNEY
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, BLDG 3. CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

MICHAEL CHIACOS
ENERGY PROGRAM DIR.
COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
26 W. ANAPAMU ST., 2ND FLR.
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93101
FOR: COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

IRYNA KWASNY
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4107
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: ORA

LARISSA KOEHLER
SENIOR ATTORNEY
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND
123 MISSION STREET, 28TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND

ALEX MORRIS
SR. DIR., POLICY & REGULATORY AFFAIRS
CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE
2150 ALLSTON WAY, SUITE 210
BERKELEY, CA 94704
FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE
(CESA)

COLLEEN C. QUINN
VP - GOV'T. RELATIONS AND PUBLIC POLICY
CHARGEPOINT, INC.
254 EAST HACIENDA AVENUE
CAMPBELL, CA 95008

FOR: GREEN POWER INSTITUTE

FOR: CHARGEPOINT

Information Only

ABEGAIL TINKER
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ANGIE BOAKES
 ELECTRIC MOBILITY GENERAL MGR.
 SHELL INT'L. PETROLEUM CO., LIMITED
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ANNE SMART
 CHARGEPOINT, INC.
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CASE COORDINATION
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CATHERINE BUCKLEY
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAVE PACKARD
 CHARGEPOINT, INC.
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DESPINA NIEHAUS
 CALIFORNIA REGULATORY AFFAIRS
 SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JAMES ELLIS
 DIR. - ELECTRIFICATION & EVS
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JORDAN RAMER
 EV CONNECT, INC.
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: EV CONNECT, INC.

LAUREN DUKE
 DEUTSCHE BANK SECURITIES INC.
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

PAUL D. HERNANDEZ
 ENERGY & TRANSPORTATION POLICY MANAGER
 CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SARAH VAN CLEVE
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SEPHRA A. NINOW, J.D.
 REGULATORY AFFAIRS MGR.
 CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SUBID WAGLEY
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CROWELL & MORING
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

TAM HUNT
 COMMUNITY RENEWABLES SOLUTIONS, LLC
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

MICHAEL DANDURAND
 LN2 CAPTIAL, LP
 411 LAFAYETTE STREET
 NEW YORK, NY 10003

CONSTANTINE LEDNEV
ASSOCIATE-US UTILITIES & POWER RESEARCH
DEUTSCHE BANK SECURITIES INC.
60 WALL STREET
NEW YORK CITY, NY 10005

ARMAN TABATABAI
RESEARCH
MORGAN STANLEY
1585 BROADWAY, 38TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10036

JERIMIAH BOOREAM
POWER, UTILITIES, & ALT ENERGY RESEARCH
BANK OF AMERICA MERRILL LYNCH
ONE BRYANT PARK
NEW YORK, NY 10036

JIM KOBUS
RESEARCH
MORGAN STANLEY
1585 BROADWAY, 38TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036

JOSEPHINE MOORE
POWER AND UTILITIES RESEARCH
BANK OF AMERICA MERRILL LYNCH
ONE BRYANT PARK
NEW YORK, NY 10036

JULIEN DUMOULIN-SMITH
HEAD OF US PWR, UTILITIES & ALT ENERGY
BANK OF AMERICA MERRILL LYNCH
ONE BRYANT PARK
NEW YORK, NY 10036

NICHOLAS CAMPANELLA
POWER AND UTILITIES RESEARCH
BANK OF AMERICA MERRILL LYNCH
ONE BRYANT PARK
NEW YORK, NY 10036

JOSEPH HALSO
LEGAL FELOW
SIERRA CLUB
50 F STREET, NW, 8TH FLR.
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

STEVE STUBITZ, CFA
GLOBAL EQUITIES
CITADEL
131 SOUTH DEARBORN STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60603

THOMAS ASHLEY
SR. DIR - GOVN'T AFFAIRS & PUBLIC POLICY
GREENLOTS
925 N. LA BREA AVENUE, 6TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90038

ALEXANDER KEROS
ADVANCED VEHICLE & INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY
GENERAL MOTORS, LLC
3050 LOMITA BLVD.
TORRANCE, CA 90505

ALEC BROOKS
AEROVIRONMENT, INC.
181 W. HUNTINGTON DRIVE, SUITE 202
MONROVIA, CA 91016
FOR: AEROVIRONMENT, INC.

CASE ADMINISTRATION
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 370
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

DONALD C. LIDDELL
ATTORNEY
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
2928 SECOND AVE.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE
(CESA)

HANNON RASOOL
ADMIN. - CALIF. REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK CT. CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

JENNIFER WRIGHT
REGULATORY CASE MGR.
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32F
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

PARINA P. PARIKH
REGULATORY CASE MGR.

CENTRAL FILES
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP 32F
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

8330 CENTURY PARK CT, CP31-E
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530

ERIC BORDEN
ENERGY POLICY ANALYST
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
785 MARKET STREET, STE. 1400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

MARCEL HAWIGER
STAFF ATTORNEY
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
785 MARKET ST., STE. 1400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

SHIRLEY WOO
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

FRANCESCA WAHL
SR. ASSOCIATE, BUS. DEVELOPMENT
TESLA, INC.
444 DE HARO STREET, STE. 101
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

NICOLE JOHNSON
REGULATORY ATTORNEY
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA
150 POST ST., STE. 442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

LISA QI, ESQ.
ATTORNEY
CROWELL & MORING, LLP
3 EMBARCADERO CENTER, STE. 2600
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
425 DIVISADERO ST. STE 303
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117-2242

RYAN SCHUCHARD
POLICY DIR.
CALSTART
501 CANAL BLVD., NO. G
RICHMOND, CA 94804

MCE REGULATORY
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY
1125 TAMALPAIS AVENUE
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901

SHALINI SWAROOP
REGULATORY & LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY
1125 TAMALPAIS AVENUE
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901

PHILLIP MULLER
PRESIDENT
SCD ENERGY SOLUTIONS
436 NOVA ALBION WAY
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903

DAVID PETERSON
CHARGEPOINT, INC.
254 EAST HACIENDA AVENUE
CAMPBELL, CA 95008

NEWONDA NICHOLS
PROGRAM MGR., UTILITY SOLUTIONS
CHARGEPOINT, INC.
254 EAST HACIENDA AVE.
CAMPBELL, CA 95008

RENEE SAMSON
DIR - UTILITY SOLUTIONS
CHARGEPOINT, INC.
245 HACIENDA AVENUE
CAMPBELL, CA 95008

CAMILLE STOUGH, ESQ.
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH PC
915 L STREET, STE. 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

JIM HAWLEY
PRINCIPAL
DEWEY SQUARE GROUP, LLC
1020 16TH STREET, SUITE 20
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

JIM HAWLEY

JOHN SHEARS

ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING ASSN.
455 CAPITOL MALL, STE. 600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING
ASSOCIATION

CEERT
1100 11TH STREET, SUITE 311
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

SCOTT BLAISING
COUNSEL
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

LYNN HAUG
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5931

State Service

CHLOE LUKINS
ORA DIV.
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JOSE ALIAGA-CARO
UTILITIES ENGINEER
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SANDY GOLDBERG
SR. COUNSEL
GOVERNOR'S OFF. OF PLANING & RESEARCH
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ALAN BACH
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY SAFETY & INFRASTRUCTURE BRANCH
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: ORA

AMY E. MESROBIAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ANA M. GONZALEZ
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 2106
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ANAND DURVASULA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4107
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

AUDREY NEUMAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC
ROOM 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JENNIFER KALAFUT
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER PETERMAN
ROOM 5303
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JOSEPH A. ABHULIMEN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY SAFETY & INFRASTRUCTURE BRANCH
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

LIAM WEAVER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY SAFETY & INFRASTRUCTURE BRANCH
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

MELICIA CHARLES
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SARAH R. THOMAS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5033
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

THOMAS GARIFFO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NOEL CRISOSTOMO
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SASHA GOLDBERG
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 5021
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TOVAH TRIMMING
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4107
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

[TOP OF PAGE](#)
[BACK TO INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)