**1. Please provide all workpapers used to develop the cost estimates in SDG&E’s Prepared Testimony Tables A-1, A-2, and A-3.**

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E’s cost estimate spreadsheet is attached. Filename: SDGE Parks Beaches Cost Estimate.xlsx

**2. Please provide all workpapers, communications, and survey responses SDG&E used to size its AB 1082 and AB 1083 proposals. Please also include: a. The assumed number of ports per station. b. A breakdown of the anticipated user of each port (e.g. park fleets, park visitors, etc.). c. The charging speeds (kW) of the proposed Direct Current Fast Chargers (DCFCs).**

**SDG&E Response:**

Page RLS-25 in SDG&E’s Randy Schimka’s (chapter 1) direct testimony lists the Statewide meetings and phone calls and local meetings that were held to brief stakeholders about the proposed program. Many of the statewide meetings were held in conjunction with PG&E and SCE to brief as many stakeholders as possible. A sample presentation is attached from one of the Statewide meetings (filename: SDGE Sample Presentation.pdf).

The responses received from the stakeholders during the meetings were positive. Several stakeholders wrote letters of support that were included with the application. There are limited charging facilities currently at schools and parks, and there was expressed desire by stakeholders to install vehicle chargers in these locations that will be serviced by the program. SDG&E learned from these meetings and calls was that the demand for charging stations by the stakeholders was larger than what the program could fulfill within the limits of the ACR.

In addition to the demand, another takeaway from the presentations was that the amount of charging equipment desired by stakeholders at different sites varies, based onthe size of the parking area, the number of drivers, the presence of fleet vehicles, and whether DC Fast charging makes sense for the venue. Incorporating that feedback into the program design, SDG&E has created a flexible program proposal with different charging equipment scenarios (pages A4 and A5 in Schimka’s Chapter 1 testimony) as the basis for designing the program. SDG&E feels that most site hosts needs can be accommodated with this flexible design.

a. The number of proposed ports per site is listed in the Cost Estimate spreadsheet in the assumptions tab for each project. Since many of the installation sites are different sizes and have different quantities of drivers and charging needs, SDG&E assembled an assortment of different station counts listed per site that can be installed based on the needs of each participating site. SDG&E believes this program design will provide the necessary flexibility to size the charging infrastructure to site host needs.

b. The anticipated users at each port vary according to the type of site. A Park or Beach site can accommodate public charging, as well as the State Parks department fleet charging. A school site can accommodate staff, students, parents, or greater participation – depending on the school’s authorization decisions – and fleet vehicles, if the site has them.

c. The charging speed capabilities of the initial equipment installed will be:

* Level 2: 6.6 kW (32 amps @ 208 volts)
* DC Fast Charge: 50 kW

To help prepare for future charging station improvements (to charge cars at faster speeds when the industry sells such cars and charging equipment), SDG&E has designed the sites with the capacity to handle the eventual installation of higher power charging equipment without re-trenching. In other words, there is a 25% adder built into the cost estimate specifically for larger conduit, wire, meter pedestals, and transformers to allow for the future installation of higher powered charging equipment. This higher-powered charging equipment is not part of the project budget as proposed and would be installed at a later date.

**3. Please provide SDG&E’s assumptions behind the number and type of vehicles electrified per port installed. Provide sufficient granularity to differentiate vehicles electrified per port based on different end users (e.g. school parking lot, park fleets, etc.) and type of charger (i.e. Level 1, Level 2, and DCFC).**

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E’s assumptions used for the projects included the following:

* Light duty vehicles in all programs
* For Level 2 charging, assume 1 vehicle charged per day, 28.3 vehicle miles traveled (eVMT), 250 charging days per year for schools, 350 charging days per year for Parks and Beaches
* For DC Fast charging, assume 2 vehicles charge per day, 172.6 vehicle miles traveled (eVMT), 250 charging days per year for schools, 350 charging days per year for Parks and Beaches

**4. Please provide the percentage of schools in SDG&E’s service territory that are located in Disadvantaged Communities (DACs), and identify the schools located in DACs. A DAC is defined as the top 25 percent statewide census tracts as identified by the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool.**

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E objects to the extent the request is unduly burdensome, given the short time for completion. Without waiving that objection, SDG&E reasonably approximates that 6.2% of schools in SDG&E’s service territory are located in DACs, per the Statewide definition. The file attachment “SDGE DAC School Names.xlsx” contains a list of schools located in SDG&E’s territory that are in DACs. Note that SDG&E does not use the statewide definition, but instead defines DACs consistent with Decision (“D.”) D.16-01-045 and SDG&E Advice Letter (“AL”) 2876-E, approved April 28, 2016 and effective March 31, 2016.

**5. Please provide the percentage of customers in SDG&E’s service territory that are located in DACs. A DAC is defined as the top 25 percent statewide census tracts as identified by the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool.**

**SDG&E Response:**

SDG&E objects to the extent the request is unduly burdensome, given the short time for completion. Without waiving that objection, SDG&E reasonably approximates that 4.5% of customers in SDG&E’s service territory are located in DACs, per the Statewide definition. Note that SDG&E does not use the statewide definition, but instead defines DACs consistent with Decision (“D.”) D.16-01-045 and SDG&E Advice Letter (“AL”) 2876-E, approved April 28, 2016 and effective March 31, 2016.

**6.** **Please provide the charging behavior data, as requested by Commissioner Peterman’s “Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling Providing Guidance To Utilities Electing To Submit Applications Pursuant to Assembly Bills 1082 and 1083,” that was collected by SDG&E as part of its assessment of the appropriateness of its programs.**

**SDG&E Response:**

Prior to Power Your Drive, SDG&E did not have any charging behavior data related to Parks or Beach sites. There are very few charging stations installed at those type of locations, and the few that are installed are owned by private EVSPs that don’t typically share charging data.

With the Power Your Drive program, SDG&E has installed a small amount of charging equipment at schools prior to filing the Application. It had not installed any stations at parks or beach sites.

Of the applicable Power Your Drive chargers at schools – where the program limited charging to workplace faculty– the charging behavior data that was gathered before the Application filing aligned with what would be expected from the program at a workplace (drivers plugged in at a workplace site and charging upon arrival at work when pricing is favorable).

While the charging equipment proposed for the proposed pilots is not entirely aligned with the type of sites and usage as Power Your Drive, SDG&E would expect similar behavior by drivers at the charging equipment for the pilots in this Application, with some additional nuances revolving around the differences in this program.