

**BEFORE THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Electric Distribution Utilities

Electric Vehicle Time of Use Rates

Docket No. DE 20-170

CLOSING ARGUMENT OF CHARGEPOINT INC.

ChargePoint, Inc. (ChargePoint) takes no position on the partial settlement agreement entered into by the New Hampshire Department of Energy (DOE); Liberty Utilities (Granite State Electric) Corp. d/b/a Liberty (Liberty); Unitil Energy Systems (Unitil); the Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA); and the Department of Environmental Services (DES) and filed with the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission on January 14, 2022. As ChargePoint witness Mr. Deal explained during hearing, the partial settlement agreement may present an incremental improvement on existing rate options available to Unitil's and Liberty's customers and it is possible that certain site hosts may opt to take service under the Commercial Customer Electric Vehicle (EV) Time-of Use (TOU) rates described in the partial settlement agreement, assuming that agreement is approved by the Commission. However, ChargePoint urges the Commission to view this docket as a "starting point" and continue to encourage the utilities to

develop additional EV rate options for their customers, including commercial **non-TOU rates**¹ that allow EV site hosts to operate economically and sustainably in New Hampshire.

ChargePoint submits this closing argument to address two issues that were raised through witness direct examination and cross examination during the evidentiary hearing in Docket No. DE 20-170. First, ChargePoint emphasizes Clean Energy New Hampshire (CENH) and Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) witness Mr. Villarreal's sound reasoning explaining that time-of-use rates are not a good fit for public DC Fast Charging (DCFC). Second, ChargePoint addresses certain inaccurate statements made by DOE witness Sergici regarding Tesla, Inc. and TOU rates.

I. TOU rates are not a good fit for public DCFC.

During the evidentiary hearing, CENH/CLF witness Mr. Villarreal explained that TOU rates may not be a helpful rate option for certain EV charging use cases, such as public DC Fast Charging. ChargePoint agrees. TOU rates are predicated on the understanding that a customer may change her consumption behavior based on price signals that vary by time period; however, in the case of public DCFC stations, customer demand tends to be inelastic. As ChargePoint witness Mr. Deal explained in his testimony, "DCFC stations are often used by EV drivers that cannot adjust their usage to avoid the impact of higher priced TOU time periods. This user group may include drivers traveling longer distances on highways unable to schedule their stops to align with changes in pricing or charger availability caused by higher priced TOU time

¹ ChargePoint notes that Eversource has proposed a commercial EV rate that does not include a TOU component in its currently pending Petition for Electric Vehicle Make-Ready and Demand Charge Alternative Proposals, DE 21-078. *See* Docket DE 21-078, Testimony of Edward A. Davis, Brian J. Rice and Kevin M. Boughan (Apr. 15, 2021).

periods.”² As Mr. Villarreal suggested in testimony³, moving forward, the Commission should separate its consideration of DC Fast Charging stations from other charging use cases, and evaluate alternatives to TOU rates for those stations.⁴

II. DOE witness Ms. Sergici’s comments regarding Tesla and time-of-use rates are inaccurate.

During the evidentiary hearing, DOE witness Ms. Sergici made certain statements regarding Tesla Inc.’s use of TOU rates. Those statements were inaccurate. Tesla has not generally implemented a TOU rate structure. Tesla has begun a limited pilot program with TOU pricing in specific regions; however, the TOU pricing presented to EV drivers as a part of that pilot is not a pass through of the utilities’ TOU rates.⁵ The objective of Tesla’s limited TOU pilot is to spread utilization on the DC Fast Charging network to mitigate potential congestion at charging stations and reduce driver queueing at busy urban DCFC sites.⁶ Unlike utility TOU rates, Tesla’s TOU pilot is not intended to address congestion on the utility grid.

III. Conclusion

ChargePoint appreciates this opportunity to provide the Commission its written closing argument. ChargePoint looks forward to working with New Hampshire stakeholders and the

² Direct Testimony of Matthew Deal on behalf of ChargePoint at 7 (Oct. 13, 2021).

³ Direct Testimony of Christopher R. Villarreal for CENH and CLF at 16 (Oct. 13, 2021).

⁴ See also Eversource Energy Petition for Electric Vehicle Make-Ready and Demand Charge Alternative Proposals, Docket 21-078, Testimony of Edward A. Davis, Brian J. Rice and Kevin M. Boughan at 22 (Apr. 15, 2021) (explaining that customers who charge their EVs at public stations are not generally in a position to defer or otherwise schedule charging to a different time).

⁵ See New Mexico Public Regulation Commission, Case No. 20-00237-UT, Comments of Tesla Inc. (June 28, 2021).

⁶ *Id.*

Commission to develop new, robust rate and program offerings to help catalyze the state's electric vehicle market.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Nikhil Vijaykar

Nikhil Vijaykar

Attorney to ChargePoint, Inc.

Keyes & Fox LLP

580 California St., 12th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

Phone: (408) 621-3256

Email: nvijaykar@keyesfox.com

Matthew Deal

Manager, Utility Policy, ChargePoint Inc.

Phone: (202) 528-5008

Email: matthew.deal@chargepoint.com

February 4, 2022