

---

Application of Rocky Mountain Power for  
Approval of its Electric Vehicle Infrastructure  
Program

DOCKET NO. 20-035-34  
ORDER APPROVING PROPOSED REPORT

---

ISSUED: June 15, 2022

## **1. BACKGROUND**

On March 21, 2022, Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) submitted a proposed form of report (“Proposed Report”) on its Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program (EVIP) to comply with Paragraph 39<sup>1</sup> of the November 17, 2021 settlement stipulation (“Settlement”), approved by the Public Service Commission (PSC) on December 20, 2021. On April 15, 2022, Western Resources Advocates (WRA) filed comments and recommendations. On April 20, 2022, the Division of Public Utilities (DPU) filed comments recommending the PSC approve the Proposed Report with additional recommendations. The Office of Consumer Services (OCS) filed comments recommending approval the same day. RMP filed reply comments on May 5, 2022.

## **2. THE PROPOSED REPORT**

RMP states the Proposed Report was designed to be comprised of two parts: Attachment A and Attachment B. RMP proposes that Attachment A generally include EVIP accounting information and balancing account entries for the prior year by month, including EVIP revenues from Schedule 198, EVIP revenues from Schedule 60, EVIP expenses (by type and program component), capital expenditures, and a carrying charge. RMP proposes that Attachment B

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 39 of the Stipulation reads: “In addition to the annual reporting requirements required by Utah Code [§] 54-4-41(8), [RMP] will provide an annual report to the [PSC] for the duration of the EVIP. Within 90 days of the [PSC]’s order in this docket, [RMP] will file a proposed reporting template. Interested parties request that the [PSC] establish an opportunity for interested parties to comment on the proposed reporting requirements before they are finalized in an order by the [PSC].”

generally include a written status update divided into four main EVIP categories: Section 1a – Company Owned Charging Stations; Section 1b – Make Ready Infrastructure; Section 1c – Partnerships; and Section 1d – Educational Outreach/Marketing. RMP includes a sample of Attachment A and Attachment B showing the proposed reporting categories and their proposed formatting.

In addition, RMP indicates the Proposed Report will contain updates for EVIP activities from the previous calendar year. RMP expects the annual EVIP Reports will be modified and enhanced as the EVIP progresses. Finally, RMP recommends the annual EVIP Reports be filed on or around April 1 of each year for the duration of the EVIP, with the first report falling due April 1, 2023 to contain calendar year 2022 information.

### **3. PARTY COMMENTS**

DPU argues Attachment A of the Proposed Report “adequately addresses the accounting information needed to evaluate the prudence requirement of the program,” and reiterates the need for RMP to ensure that all support materials filed with the Proposed Report contain “intact formulae, links, and references to the origin of all values and content.”<sup>2</sup> DPU recommends an additional category in Attachment B that demonstrates all RMP-owned chargers’ uptime and downtime, as well as for third-party chargers where possible, including the reason for the downtime and time to repair. DPU supports RMP’s proposed report filing date.

OCS states it supports RMP’s Proposed Report and looks forward to the opportunity to review the EVIP annually.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> DPU Comments at page 2.

<sup>3</sup> OCS Comments at page 2.

WRA recommends Attachment A include spending related to the Partnerships component of the EVIP. WRA recommends RMP include additional information in its Sections 1a, 1c, and 1d of Attachment B. In Section 1a, WRA recommends RMP include a table containing load factor, percentage of RMP vs. non-RMP customer charging sessions, monthly on- and off-peak utilization, and revenue for each RMP-owned charging station. In Section 1b, WRA recommends RMP include documentation of partnership efforts, such as memoranda of understanding (MOUs), contracts, project scoping documents, or other partnership-specific reporting related to the Inland Port Authority, Mountain States Land, Utah Department of Transportation, or other potential partnerships. In Section 1d, WRA recommends RMP include copies of customer-facing communications, links to relevant public-facing websites, and summaries of customer feedback as an addendum to the written update.

In its reply comments, RMP agrees to provide the information relating to proposed charger uptime and downtime as proposed by DPU. In addition, RMP agrees to provide the information requested by WRA on spending related to the Partnerships component of the EVIP within Attachment A and the proposed tabular information on each RMP-owned charging station under Section 1a of Attachment B. RMP further agrees to provide copies of customer-facing communications, links to relevant public-facing websites, and summaries of customer feedback as an addendum to the written update under Section 1d of Attachment B. RMP opposes, however, providing additional information beyond the written updates related to EVIP

Partnerships under Section 1c of Attachment B, arguing that doing so is “inappropriate and would contain confidential customer information.”<sup>4</sup>

#### **4. DISCUSSION, FINDINGS OF FACT, AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Having reviewed RMP’s Proposed Report, and the parties’ comments and reply comments, we find the Proposed Report as modified in RMP’s reply comments is an adequate and reasonable template for the annual EVIP Report. RMP proposes to make substantial modifications to its originally-proposed report at parties’ request. We find that in doing so, RMP adequately balances the interest of delivering information necessary for parties to analyze its EVIP program each year and the interest of avoiding disclosure of confidential customer information. We decline to require RMP to provide the information that it argues will inappropriately contain confidential customer information. We also find RMP’s recommendation for the annual EVIP Report to be filed on or around April 1 of each year adequately provides stakeholders and the public access to timely and useful information related to the EVIP.

#### **5. ORDER**

The PSC approves the Proposed Report as modified in RMP’s reply comments. The annual EVIP Report is due on or around April 1 of each year for the duration of the EVIP, and will report on the EVIP activities for the previous calendar year. The first report is due April 1, 2023.

---

<sup>4</sup> RMP Reply Comments at 2.

DOCKET NO. 20-035-34

- 5 -

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, June 15, 2022.

/s/ Thad LeVar, Chair

/s/ David R. Clark, Commissioner

/s/ Ron Allen, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Gary L. Widerburg  
PSC Secretary  
DW#324518

Notice of Opportunity for Agency Review or Rehearing

Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-4-301 and 54-7-15, a party may seek agency review or rehearing of this written order by filing a request for review or rehearing with the PSC within 30 days after the issuance of the order. Responses to a request for agency review or rehearing must be filed within 15 days of the filing of the request for review or rehearing. If the PSC fails to grant a request for review or rehearing within 30 days after the filing of a request for review or rehearing, it is deemed denied. Judicial review of the PSC's final agency action may be obtained by filing a Petition for Review with the Utah Supreme Court within 30 days after final agency action. Any Petition for Review must comply with the requirements of Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G4-401, 63G-4-403, and the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that on June 15, 2022, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon the following as indicated below:

By Email:

Data Request Response Center ([datareq@pacificorp.com](mailto:datareq@pacificorp.com)), ([utahdockets@pacificorp.com](mailto:utahdockets@pacificorp.com))  
PacifiCorp

Jana Saba ([jana.saba@pacificorp.com](mailto:jana.saba@pacificorp.com))  
Emily Wegener ([emily.wegener@pacificorp.com](mailto:emily.wegener@pacificorp.com))  
*Rocky Mountain Power*

Sophie Hayes ([sophie.hayes@westernresources.org](mailto:sophie.hayes@westernresources.org))  
Aaron Kressig ([aaron.kressig@westernresources.org](mailto:aaron.kressig@westernresources.org))  
*Western Resource Advocates*

Hunter Holman ([hunter@utahcleanenergy.com](mailto:hunter@utahcleanenergy.com))  
Thomas Kessinger ([thomas@utahcleanenergy.com](mailto:thomas@utahcleanenergy.com))  
*Utah Clean Energy*

Scott Dunbar ([sdunbar@keyesfox.com](mailto:sdunbar@keyesfox.com))  
Partner, Keyes & Fox LLP  
Justin Wilson ([justinwilson@chargepoint.com](mailto:justinwilson@chargepoint.com))  
*ChargePoint, Inc.*

Phillip J. Russell ([prussell@jdrsllaw.com](mailto:prussell@jdrsllaw.com))  
JAMES DODGE RUSSELL & STEPHENS PC  
Kevin C. Higgins ([khiggins@energystrat.com](mailto:khiggins@energystrat.com))  
Energy Strategies LLC  
*Utah Association of Energy Users*

Victoria R. Mandell, Esq. ([vmandell@comcast.net](mailto:vmandell@comcast.net))  
Lindsey Stegall ([lindsey.stegall@evgo.com](mailto:lindsey.stegall@evgo.com))  
*EVgo Services, LLC*

Linda M. Bullen ([linda@bullenlaw.com](mailto:linda@bullenlaw.com))  
Erick Karlen ([ekarlen@greenlots.com](mailto:ekarlen@greenlots.com))  
Thomas Ashley ([tom@greenlots.com](mailto:tom@greenlots.com))  
*Greenlots*

DOCKET NO. 20-035-34

- 7 -

Patricia Schmid ([pschmid@agutah.gov](mailto:pschmid@agutah.gov))

Robert Moore ([rmoore@agutah.gov](mailto:rmoore@agutah.gov))

*Assistant Utah Attorneys General*

Madison Galt ([mgalt@utah.gov](mailto:mgalt@utah.gov))

*Division of Public Utilities*

Alyson Anderson ([akanderson@utah.gov](mailto:akanderson@utah.gov))

Bela Vastag ([bvastag@utah.gov](mailto:bvastag@utah.gov))

Alex Ware ([aware@utah.gov](mailto:aware@utah.gov))

([ocs@utah.gov](mailto:ocs@utah.gov))

*Office of Consumer Services*

---

Administrative Assistant