

NOTICE OF COMMENT PERIOD

Issued: May 9, 2018

In the Matter of a Commission Inquiry into Electric Vehicle Charging and Infrastructure

PUC Docket Number(s): E999/CI-17-879

Comment Period: Initial comment period closes June 29, 2018 at 4:30pm

Reply comment period closes July 27, 2018 at 4:30pm

The Commission may determine that it will not consider comments received after the close of the comment period.

Topic(s) Open for Comment: See Attachment A

Background: The Commission opened the present docket on December 28, 2017 to gather information and gain a better understanding of the following:

1. The possible impacts of EVs on the electric system, utilities, and utility customers, including the potential electric system benefits;
2. The degree to which utilities and utility regulatory policy can impact the extent and pace of EV penetration in Minnesota; and
3. Possible EV tariff options to facilitate wider availability of EV charging infrastructure.

On March 16, 2018, the Commission held a workshop with national and local experts to provide an overview of the major considerations surrounding the intersection of EVs and the electric utility industry. Presenters and attendees raised a number of questions which the Commission has included in Attachment A to continue the dialogue on the Commission's role in enabling electric vehicle infrastructure and adoption.

Filing Requirements: Utilities, telecommunications carriers, official parties, and state agencies are **required** to file documents using the Commission's electronic filing system (eFiling). All parties, participants and interested persons are encouraged to use eFiling: mn.gov/puc, select *eFiling*, and follow the prompts.

PUC Docket Number E999/CI-17-879

Submit Public Comments: Visit mn.gov/puc, select *Speak Up!* to find this docket, and add your comments to the discussion or email your comments to consumer.puc@state.mn.us.

Full Case Record: See all documents filed in this docket via the Commission's website at mn.gov/puc, select *Search eDockets*, enter the year (17) and the docket number (879), select *Search*.

Subscribe to receive email notification when new documents are filed in this docket at mn.gov/puc, select *Subscribe*, or click [HERE](#) and follow the prompts.

Questions about this docket or Commission process and procedure? Contact Commission staff.

Hanna Terwilliger hanna.terwilliger@state.mn.us 651-201-2243

Kelly Martone kelly.martone@state.mn.us 651-201-2245

Change your mailing preferences: Email docketing.puc@state.mn.us or call Jamie Eschbach at 651-201-2204.

To request this document in another format such as large print or audio, call 651.296.0406 (voice). Persons with a hearing or speech impairment may call using their preferred Telecommunications Relay Service or email consumer.puc@state.mn.us for assistance.

Attachment A

Barriers to EV Adoption and Guiding Principles for EV Regulatory Policy

1. In her opening address at the Commission's March 16th Workshop, Britta Gross identified two major barriers to increased EV adoption:
 - a. A lack of public charging infrastructure.
 - b. A lack of outreach and education around EVs.

What actions should the Commission or utilities take to address these barriers and to encourage EV adoption in Minnesota? In your answer, consider the following:

- c. Whether utilities should be able to seek recovery of costs associated with electrifying the transportation system;
 - d. The merits of various cost recovery mechanisms for utility investments in EVs and whether those mechanisms should differ depending on type and scale the investments;
 - e. Different roles utilities can or should play in expanding the availability of workplace, in-home, and public charging infrastructure.
2. Is there an existing set of guiding principles around EVs that has been issued by an organization or adopted by other state utility Commissions that this Commission should adopt? Why or why not?
3. How should the Commission consider the effects of increased electrical sales from EV adoption on other electric policies (for example, energy efficiency goals)? Are there already existing regulatory policies or mechanisms that may need to be modified to better align utility interests with the public interest in increased electrification of the transportation system?
4. What other efforts and initiatives should the Commission be aware of relating to EV deployment in Minnesota? What goals or purposes are these other initiatives attempting to accomplish? Please provide a brief description and stakeholders involved (including cooperative or municipal utilities, government and non-governmental organizations).

Evaluation Criteria and Regulatory Treatment of EV Filings

5. At the workshop, two themes to encourage EV adoption emerged:
 - a. Setting a clear regulatory framework (including cost recovery), criteria, and guidelines.
 - i. Should the Commission provide guidance around cost recovery options for EV related investments, and if so, what factors should the Commission consider?
 - b. Encouraging pilots.
 - i. What guidance could the Commission give to facilitate additional pilots?
 - ii. Are there ways to provide flexibility that would allow small changes during a pilot?
 - iii. What types of pilots could provide scalable learnings for expanding EV infrastructure, rate offerings, and broader EV adoption?

6. Is it feasible to assess the systemic benefits of new load in relation to EVs? Should the Commission use any type of cost benefits test or societal benefits test currently used by other states or programs when considering utility EV proposals? In such a benefits test, what considerations should be included? For example:
 - a. Environmental benefits, including reduced emissions
 - b. Economic benefits to customers from reduced operating costs
 - c. ability to improve the electrical grid

Parties citing to tests used elsewhere should include docket numbers, copies of relevant orders, or other citations in their responses.

7. Are there any other clarifications or guidance that the Commission could provide that would be helpful for utilities and stakeholders as they work to develop EV program proposals?
8. To the extent not already identified above, identify any next steps stakeholders believe the Commission should take in this proceeding.