

**NATIONAL DIVERSITY COALITION (NDC) DATA REQUEST  
NDC-SDG&E DR-01  
POWER YOUR DRIVE 2.0 (A.19-10-012)  
SDG&E RESPONSE  
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 3, 2020  
DATE RESPONDED: JANUARY 17, 2020  
RESPONSE UPDATED: MAY 13, 2020**

**NDC DATA REQUEST**

**Question 1**

Please provide copies of all the semi-annual reports on the Electric Vehicle-Grid Integration Pilot Program (“Power Your Drive”) developed pursuant to D.16-01-045.

**SDG&E Response**

SDG&E’ Power Your Drive Semi-Annual Reports can be viewed at:

<https://www.sdge.com/regulatory-filing/10676/sdge-electric-vehicle-grid-integration-pilot-program>

**NATIONAL DIVERSITY COALITION (NDC) DATA REQUEST  
NDC-SDG&E DR-01  
POWER YOUR DRIVE 2.0 (A.19-10-012)  
SDG&E RESPONSE  
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 3, 2020  
DATE RESPONDED: JANUARY 17, 2020  
RESPONSE UPDATED: MAY 13, 2020**

**Question 2**

The following questions are based on the scores assigned in the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool:

- a. Which of the census tracts that score within the top 25% on a Statewide DAC definition basis are located within SDGE's service territory?
- b. Which census tracts score within the top 25% on a SDGE Service Territory DAC definition basis?

**SDG&E Response**

The attached file (NDC DR-01 Q2.xlsx) provides the answers to the above questions.

**NATIONAL DIVERSITY COALITION (NDC) DATA REQUEST  
NDC-SDG&E DR-01  
POWER YOUR DRIVE 2.0 (A.19-10-012)  
SDG&E RESPONSE  
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 3, 2020  
DATE RESPONDED: JANUARY 17, 2020  
RESPONSE UPDATED: MAY 13, 2020**

**Question 3**

Testimony Chapter 2 at BAS-8 states that the PYD Pilot achieved over 30% deployment in DAC. What percent of the PYD Pilot deployments would still qualify as DACs under the statewide DAC definition?

**SDG&E Response**

Approximately 7%, or 19 sites, of the PYD Pilot deployments would still qualify as a DAC under the statewide CalEnviroScreen 3.0 definition.

**NATIONAL DIVERSITY COALITION (NDC) DATA REQUEST**  
**NDC-SDG&E DR-01**  
**POWER YOUR DRIVE 2.0 (A.19-10-012)**  
**SDG&E RESPONSE**  
**DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 3, 2020**  
**DATE RESPONDED: JANUARY 17, 2020**  
**RESPONSE UPDATED: MAY 13, 2020**

**Question 4**

In Testimony, chapter 2 at RS-5, SDGE states that keeping the service territory DAC definition from the PYD Pilot will help “maintain continuity” and “minimize confusion caused by changing DAC definitions”.

- a. Please explain what type of confusion SDGE believes will be minimized by maintaining the service territory DAC definition?
- b. Other than minimizing confusion as discussed in response to question 2(a), what is the benefit of “maintaining continuity” with the service territory DAC definition?

**SDG&E Response**

- a. As stated in Testimony, Chapter 2 at RS-5, SDG&E is proposing to keep the same service territory DAC definition in the PYD Extension Program to minimize confusion caused by changing DAC definitions. DAC status affects participation payment criteria and could have a material impact on a customer’s ability to adopt EV charging. There are several hundred site hosts on the PYD interest list and many of those would be affected if the statewide DAC definition were to be applied to the Extension Program (e.g. some customers on the interest list may believe they are located in a DAC and eligible for a discount to the participation fee, however, under the new definition, such a customer may no longer be eligible; such customer may not understand why their neighbor qualified by they did not).
- b. SDG&E believes that maintaining continuity with the service territory DAC definition will make it easier to recruit site hosts to participate in the Extension Program. Potential participants already have knowledge of the PYD Pilot and have signed up to be on the interest list. Maintaining customer expectations and consistency is beneficial and will allow them to take advantage of the same participation payment criteria once approval for the Extension Program is received.

**NATIONAL DIVERSITY COALITION (NDC) DATA REQUEST**  
**NDC-SDG&E DR-01**  
**POWER YOUR DRIVE 2.0 (A.19-10-012)**  
**SDG&E RESPONSE**  
**DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 3, 2020**  
**DATE RESPONDED: JANUARY 17, 2020**  
**RESPONSE UPDATED: MAY 13, 2020**

**Question 5**

In Testimony chapter 1 at BAS-11, SDGE explains that using the same service territory DAC definition in PYD2 “will avoid confusion among potential site hosts on the PYD Pilot interest list” as well as “not frustrate customer expectations by disqualifying them from important provisions of the PYD Pilot”.

- a. How many potential site hosts are currently on the PYD Pilot interest list? How many of them are in DACs as defined by the service territory definition? How many would qualify as DACs under the statewide definition?
- b. Are potential site hosts on the PYD Pilot interest list given any guarantees or assurances regarding their ability to participate in the program?
- c. Do potential site hosts pay any fees in order to be placed on the PYD Pilot interest list?
- d. Are potential site hosts required to agree that they will not pursue getting EVSE from third-party providers or forego other opportunities to obtain EVSE in order to be placed on the PYD Pilot interest list?
- e. What steps would be necessary for SDGE to notify potential site hosts on the PYD Pilot interest list if their area no longer qualified as a DAC in PYD2?

**SDG&E Response**

- a. There are several hundred potential site hosts on the interest list. As described in the testimony of Randy Schimka on RS-14, the interest list has grown over time and been modified over time. As a best estimate there is approximately 470 sites on the interest list. 44 sites are located in Statewide DACs. An additional 120 sites are located only in service territory DACs bringing the total number of interest list sites that are located in service territory DACs to 164. **[Response updated on May 12, 2020]**
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. SDG&E would identify customers on the interest list located in the territory-wide DAC that do not meet the statewide definition. SDG&E may then reach out to those potential

**NATIONAL DIVERSITY COALITION (NDC) DATA REQUEST  
NDC-SDG&E DR-01  
POWER YOUR DRIVE 2.0 (A.19-10-012)  
SDG&E RESPONSE  
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 3, 2020  
DATE RESPONDED: JANUARY 17, 2020  
RESPONSE UPDATED: MAY 13, 2020**

program participants to inform them that they no longer qualify for the DAC criteria. In addition, the updated program requirements and costs would be communicated. SDG&E would then have to refine the interest list to assess which customers would still be interested in moving forward.

**NATIONAL DIVERSITY COALITION (NDC) DATA REQUEST**  
**NDC-SDG&E DR-01**  
**POWER YOUR DRIVE 2.0 (A.19-10-012)**  
**SDG&E RESPONSE**  
**DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 3, 2020**  
**DATE RESPONDED: JANUARY 17, 2020**  
**RESPONSE UPDATED: MAY 13, 2020**

**Question 6**

In Testimony chapter 1 at BAS-11, SDGE proposes a minimum target of 10% PYD2 deployment in DACs and hopes “to significantly exceed this threshold as it did in the PYD Pilot.”

- a. If SDGE believes it can significantly exceed the 10% DAC deployment threshold as it did in the PYD Pilot, why did SDGE not set a significantly higher target?
- b. What specific factors does SDGE anticipate will prevent achieving 30% DAC deployment in PYD2?

**SDG&E Response**

- a. SDG&E’s proposed target was set to allow for program flexibility while still encouraging targeted infrastructure investments in the communities disproportionately affected by pollution. As evidenced by SDG&E’s initial pilot, SDG&E strives to exceed its DAC deployment targets as much as practicable.
- b. Specific factors that could prevent SDG&E from achieving 30% DAC deployment in the PYD Extension Program could be, but are not limited to: the DAC definition approved for the program, customer interest, elimination of state and federal benefits to reduce costs of vehicles, site availability, and site suitability.

**END OF RESPONSES**