Q.1 You identify “[s]treamlining the request for proposal (RFP) and the EVSP qualification process” as a “lesson learned” from the Power Your Drive (PYD) program. (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-7) How does SDG&E intend to “streamline” the RFP and EVSP qualification process for the proposed School Pilot?

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E intends to streamline the RFP and EVSP process in the following ways:

* No Request For Information (RFI) process will be necessary since SDG&E is familiar with EVSP product offerings relevant to the School Pilot.
* SDG&E has already conducted RFP processes and qualified EVSPs with recent programs such as Power Your Drive and the SB350 Priority Review Projects for similar equipment and services, which will help to simplify the RFP processes for the School Pilot

Q.2 You identify “[i]mplementing a more streamlined agreement strategy” as a “lesson learned” from the PYD program. (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-7, RLS-20) Please describe this “more streamlined agreement strategy” and explain how SDG&E proposes to apply it in the School Pilot.

**SDG&E Response:**

For the School Pilot, SDG&E envisions allowing a license agreement with site hosts; rather than only allowing an easement. When this change was made in the PYD program, it simplified the process and reduced the time to obtain approval from the site host, therefore, reducing costs resulting from such delays.

Q.3 You identify “[i]mproving metering testing” as a “lesson learned” from the PYD program. (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-7). Please describe how SDG&E will improve metering testing in the School Pilot.

**SDG&E Response:**

Since the PYD program, and the recent SB350 Priority Review Programs, SDG&E has learned lessons that will help to improve the meter testing process for the School Pilot, as follows:

* SDG&E has purchased Level 2 EVSE metering test equipment that can be used for future projects to help verify the accuracy of third party EVSE metering;
* If a vendor is proposing to submit the same model EVSE in the RFP for this Pilot that has already been meter tested and approved in a previous SDG&E program, then SDG&E will consider that equipment as “passed” for this Pilot’s metering test;
* Vendors are free to engage third party meter testing services (such as Quanta as used in the PYD program) to independently test the metering in their EVSE before the official SDG&E RFP process. If the third party EVSE meter test passes, SDG&E will recognize those results.

Q.4 You identify making site designs “more flexible to encourage higher participation” as a “lesson learned” from the PYD program. (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-7) Please describe how site design in the School Pilot will be more flexible than the PYD program.

**SDG&E Response:**

The PYD program (and the corresponding budget) was originally envisioned to have an average of ten Level 2 EVSE per site for MuDs and Workplaces. There is limited flexibility to accommodate customers in the PYD program that may have smaller charging needs, since that would raise average costs. In PYD, we have experienced MuDs requesting fewer than 10 ports for their facilities and Workplaces requesting more than 10. Flexibility will allow us to better provide cost efficient installations that match customer needs.

With the School Pilot, SDG&E has learned that there is a wider variety of venue sizes and needs than PYD. Because of this, SDG&E designed the School Pilot with 30 specific charging / site scenarios (Page A-4 in Chapter 1 testimony) that range from two to 10 charging stations, with a mixture of Level 2 charging, DC Fast charging, or some combination thereof.

Because of the different site scenarios available in the School Pilot, SDG&E believes this will provide flexible options to site hosts. SDG&E will work with potential site hosts to choose an appropriate site scenario that meets their needs.

Q.5 With respect to SDG&E’s intent to “work with EVSPs via a RFP process to purchase the EVSE and associated network services” for SDG&E’s School and Parks Pilots (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-13, RLS-27):

 a. Please describe this proposed “RFP process” and specify how it would be different or the same as the PYD program RFP.

**SDG&E Response:**

For the School and Parks Pilots, SDG&E intends to issue an RFP for the EVSE hardware and associated network services using the same online system to disseminate materials to interested bidders and collect their responses. The RFP for these Pilots will be similar to the PYD RFP. But there will be some differences, including:

* DC Fast charging equipment will be included in this RFP;
* The rates for these Pilots is proposed to be EV-TOU, unlike the PYD hourly VGI rate;
* There are no plans at this time to offer the PYD “Rate-to-Host” and “Rate-to-Driver” billing scenarios for these Pilots; and
* SDG&E will not be billing drivers for the charging energy on their home bills.

 b. Would vendors already qualified through the PYD program be obliged to re-submit applications for the School and/or Parks Pilots? If so, why?

**SDG&E Response:**

Yes, vendors that are already qualified through the PYD program will be required to submit a response for the School and/or Parks Pilots RFP. The reasons why include the following:

* There could be slightly different requirements for the charging stations (although these specifications haven’t been written yet);
* Vendors may be bidding different Level 2 equipment solutions into the Pilots;
* DC Fast charging equipment solutions may now be offered;
* Billing requirements will be different; and
* Equipment and service prices from vendors may have changed since the PYD bid submittal was evaluated.

Q.6 Will schools and educational institutions participating in the proposed School and Parks Pilots be allowed to choose their EVSE and network service provider from vendors qualified through the proposed “RFP process”?

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E has not yet determined the answer to this question.

Q.7 SDG&E proposes to use the “EV-TOU rate” for the School and Parks Pilots. (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-13, RLS-27, RLS-30) With respect to this proposal:

 a. Does this mean that pricing to driver for charging at every charging station in the Schools and Parks Pilots will be on current Residential Schedule EV-TOU rates? If not, please explain.

**SDG&E Response:**

Yes, the EV-TOU proposed rate will apply to all drivers for all charging stations under the School and Parks Pilots.

 b. For what period of time would the proposed EV-TOU pricing to driver apply?

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E is proposing to offer the EV-TOU rate for as long as the charging stations are in service.

 c. Does SDG&E expect the Commission to approve the rate in its decision on this proposal, or will SDG&E submit a tariff filing detailing the proposed rate?

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E expects the Commission to approve the EV-TOU rate as proposed in its decision. The tariff for EV-TOU is located at the following link:

<http://regarchive.sdge.com/tm2/pdf/ELEC_ELEC-SCHEDS_EV-TOU.pdf>

 d. If the participating school or educational institution has an on-site solar system, could the School Pilot EVSE be integrated into campus load served by on-site solar?

**SDG&E Response:**

Integrating charging load at a school with their solar PV system might be possible, but SDG&E is not proposing that for these Pilots for the following reasons:

* The school property would need a robust electrical source fed from their existing electric service that can feed the charging stations (which isn’t always available);
* The school’s existing electric service / electric rate would need to be used (most likely a commercial rate with demand charges). This rate most likely won’t send proper pricing signals to drivers; and
* This scenario could add to demand charges for the customer in certain situations (in cases of low solar production or during evenings with a high charging load)

 e. Does this EV-TOU rate requirement mean that the School and Parks Pilots will not be available to sites located within a CCA? Please explain.

**SDG&E Response:**

The program will be available to install charging stations at CCA School or Parks locations, because:

* A new electric service will be installed to power the charging stations;
* The site host will not be responsible for paying the bill for the charging stations;
* The site host will not be the customer of record for the electric service;
* Drivers will pay for their own charging sessions at the charging station on the EV-TOU rate; and
* Drivers will not be billed on their home SDG&E bills.

Q.8 You state that: “Each charger will allow EV drivers a variety of payment options, including credit/debit card, fob, and mobile device.” (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-14, RLS-30) With respect to this statement, please confirm that using Tap-to-Pay, Apple Pay, or customer support via a 1-800 number will satisfy the credit/debit card payment option.

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E has attempted to design a program with a wide range of payment options, but hasn’t yet determined the precise detailed program design and criteria.

Q.9 Do any EV charging stations currently owned and operated by SDG&E at its own facilities or elsewhere incorporate the payment options proposed for the School and Parks Pilots? If yes, please identify location and (if relevant) program.

**SDG&E Response:**

Yes, it is our intent to have multiple payment options available in our Electrify Local Highways program. Those will begin in early 2019.

Q.10 You state that SDG&E will ensure that the charging facilities are “reliably operated and maintained” (Testimony, Ch.1 at RLS-15). Under the School Pilot proposal, would operation and maintenance services for EVSE be provided by SDG&E employees or by contractors procured through the RFP?

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E is currently looking at both options and hasn’t decided which approach might be used.

Q.11 The Application (at page 2) refers to, and you attach as Appendix A to the Application, letters of support for SDG&E’s proposal from various individual public officials, governmental entities, and organizations.

a. Please provide a copy of all correspondence from SDG&E to the entities providing letters in Appendix A soliciting or discussing the letters of support.

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E objects to the extent that the question requests documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, attorney work product, or other privilege, or if the question requests materials that no longer exist due to SDG&E’s document-retention policies. Without waiving these objections, SDG&E conducted both verbal and written communications with potential partners to gauge interest, support, and potential parameters for the Schools and Parks Pilots. These were fluid conversations based upon the working knowledge of the company representatives and partners at that time and do not necessarily represent accurate information about the Pilots as applied for or final Pilot details. The relevant documentation is attached in file ChargePoint DR 01 Q11.pdf.

b. If any or all of the letters were solicited through verbal communications during the consultative process described in Testimony (see Ch.1 RSL-9, RSL-25), please provide a copy of any written materials regarding SDG&E’s proposal provided at the consultative meetings.

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E objects to the extent that the question requests documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, attorney work product, or other privilege, or if the question requests materials that no longer exist due to SDG&E’s document-retention policies. Without waiving these objections, SDG&E conducted both verbal and written communications with potential partners to gauge interest, support, and potential parameters for the Schools and Parks Pilots. These were fluid conversations based upon the working knowledge of the company representatives and partners at that time and do not necessarily represent accurate information about the Pilots as applied for or final Pilot details. The relevant documentation is attached in file ChargePoint DR 01 Q11.pdf.

Q.12 Table ADW-2 (EV Charging Infrastructure O&M Costs) on page ADW-4 of Testimony, Ch.3 shows $0 for network communication fees in 2022 for the School and Parks Pilots. Please explain why you identify forecasted costs for maintenance but not network communications in 2022.

**SDG&E Response:**

The total budgeted amounts are correct for both categories. The difference is how the funds were split across years.

The total budget for the Network communication fees for schools through 2022 is $114K, so the $57K listed for two years adds up to the total budget amount. Sometime in 2022, SDG&E expects these ongoing costs to be placed into the General Rate Case (GRC) to receive ongoing funding.

The Network communication fees were front loaded in 2020 and 2021 at full value to ensure that funding was collected, not knowing what the actual install rate would be for the Schools and Parks Pilots.

The funding for Maintenance was treated differently because of warranty considerations that will address some of the initial equipment issues. The total Maintenance budget of $51K was split over 3 years through 2022. It will then become part of the GRC to receive ongoing funding.

