

## Agenda for Aug. 31, 2017 Prehearing Conference (PHC) In A.17-06-031, A.17-06-033, and A.17-06-034

1. Introduction
  - a. Opening remarks.
  - b. Emergency Procedures: In case of an emergency, use appropriate exit doors, cross McAllister Street and assemble at the park on Van Ness Avenue between the War Memorial Building and Opera House (opposite City Hall) until cleared to return.
  - c. Commissioner's Opening Remarks.
2. List of Appearances and Creation of Service List
  - a. See Appendix 1 for list of Protests/Responses to each Application (missing anyone?)
  - b. Fill out a separate appearance form at PHC for each application you want to be a party to.
3. Should the three applications be consolidated?
  - a. Considerations for and against consolidation include unique geographic locations, different proposals, and limited resources of parties.
4. Discuss scope of issues for each application. (See Appendix 2 for proposed scope of issues.)
  - a. Any additional issues to add?
5. Discuss procedural schedule.
  - a. Need for testimony by other parties, and are evidentiary hearings needed (can the need for evidentiary hearings be decided later)?
  - b. Are separate processing times and decisions needed for priority and standard review?
  - c. PacifiCorp.
    - i. Two priority projects: outreach and education, and demonstration and development program. Requests Tier 2 advice letter filing for future priority review projects or extension of existing priority projects.
    - ii. PacifiCorp proposes a proposed decision in November 2017, and adoption in December 2017.
    - iii. ORA proposes intervenor testimony on October 20, 2017, and rebuttal testimony on November 10, 2017. If hearings needed, propose they be held in January 2018, and proposed decision in third quarter of 2018.
  - d. CalPeco Electric.
    - i. Four priority projects, and one standard review (buses not expected for 3 to 4 years).
    - ii. Proposes intervenor testimony on September 25, 2017, and rebuttal testimony on October 31, 2017.
    - iii. For the four priority and the standard review projects, CalPeco proposes a proposed decision in December 2017, and adoption in January 2018.
    - iv. ORA proposes intervenor testimony on October 16, 2017, and rebuttal testimony on November 6, 2017. If hearings needed, propose they be held in January 2018, and proposed decision in third quarter of 2018.
  - e. Bear Valley Electric Service (BVES).
    - i. Destination Make Ready (Priority)
    - ii. EV Time of Use Rate (Standard)
    - iii. Proposes intervenor testimony on September 29, 2017, and rebuttal testimony on October 30, 2017.
    - iv. BVES proposes proposed decision issued in December 2017, and adoption of decision in January 2018.

- v. ORA proposes intervenor testimony on October 16, 2017, and rebuttal testimony on November 6, 2017. If hearings needed, propose they be held in January 2018, and proposed decision in third quarter of 2018.

- 6. Any other issues to discuss?
- 7. Adjournment.

**Appendix 1**

**Protests/Responses to the Applications**

<b>A.17-06-031 (PacifiCorp)</b>	<b>A.17-06-033 (CalPeco)</b>	<b>A.17-06-034 (BVES)</b>
Office of Ratepayer Advocates	Office of Ratepayer Advocates	Office of Ratepayer Advocates
	ChargePoint, Inc.	ChargePoint, Inc.

**Appendix 2**

**Proposed Scope of Issues**

1. Do the proposed projects meet the SB 350 requirements for TE? (See Public Utilities Code [PUC] §§ 740.12, 740.3, and 740.8 – e.g., impact on competition including utility ownership of electric vehicle service equipment; impact on disadvantaged and low and moderate income communities; ratepayer subsidy and equity issues versus leveraging funding by other sources; ratepayer interests; whether objectives of projects will lead to scalability, i.e., widespread transportation electrification; performance accountability measures; and how do these proposed projects align with California’s zero emission vehicles initiatives and the state’s greenhouse gas emissions reduction target? (e.g., See Health and Safety Code § 44258 and following; PUC §740.12; Appendix A in the September 14, 2016 Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling (ACR).)
2. Is there a need to modify the proposed projects as suggested by the protests/responses?
3. Do the proposed projects meet the criteria set forth in the ACR, including the minimum project descriptions included in Appendix A of the ACR?
4. Do the proposed projects address the safety concerns set forth in PUC §§ 740.8(a) and 740.12(b)?
5. Have the projects addressed rate design issues such as demand charges.
6. What specific ratepayer benefits will result from the proposals? (See PUC § 740.8.)
7. Are the proposed projects reasonable and in the ratepayers’ interests? (See PUC §§ 740.3 and 740.8.)
8. What kind of data gathering and reporting requirements should be imposed?
9. What kind of cost recovery mechanisms (e.g., future cost recovery in GRC; treating rebates as a capital addition; balancing account; advice letter tier) should be adopted for these proposals?