Q. Schedule B – North American Electrification Initiatives

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

Schedule B, Table B-1, provides information on the jurisdictions that offer vehicle incentives and EV charger incentives for commercial and residential rate payers. Of the 43 provinces/states listed in the table, 11 provide vehicle incentives, however 3 of the 11 (British Columbia, Quebec and New York) indicate that the incentive is funded by the province/state. Is Newfoundland Power aware of utilities in any provinces or states that provide vehicle and charger incentives and if so, is the cost of the incentive program recovered in rates for all ratepayers?

9 10 11

12

13

A. Ratepayer recovery was identified as the primary source of funding for electric vehicle initiatives in a 2019 utility survey. Approximately 60% of utilities funded electric vehicle initiatives solely from ratepayers or from a combination of ratepayer recovery and government funding. 2

14 15 16

17

Table 1 provides examples of utilities providing vehicle or charger incentives and recovering the incentive program costs from ratepayers.

Table 1: Examples of Utility Incentive Programs

Jurisdiction	Utility	Program	Rate Recovery
Colorado	Xcel Energy	Charger Incentives	The Colorado Public Utilities Commission approved recovery of costs through an extra charge on electric rates for charger incentives and other electrification initiatives. ³
North Carolina	Duke Energy	Vehicle Incentives	The North Carolina Utilities Commission approved ratepayer recovery for transportation electrification, including vehicle incentives for electric school buses. ⁴
Maryland	Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, Potomac Edison and Potomac Electric Power Company	Charger Incentives	The Maryland Public Service Commission approved recovery of the cost of charger incentives from ratepayers. ⁵

As part of the 2019 E Source Utility DER and Electrification Benchmark research, 28 utilities were asked to identify the source of funding for their electric vehicle activities. Nine respondents funded activities solely through ratepayer recovery. Eight utilities funded electric vehicle initiatives through a combination of ratepayer recovery and government funding.

Newfoundland Power Inc.

 $^{(9 + 8 = 17) \}div 28 = 0.607$, or approximately 60%.

³ See https://www.denverpost.com/2020/12/24/colorado-puc-xcel-energy-electric-transportation-plan.

⁴ See https://cleanenergy.org/blog/duke-energys-electric-transportation-pilot-gets-green-light-in-nc.

See https://www.psc.state.md.us/wp-content/uploads/MD-PSC-Approves-Modified-Utility-EV-Charging-Portfolio 01142019-1.pdf.

Table 1: Examples of Utility Incentive Programs

Jurisdiction	Utility	Program	Rate Recovery
Missouri	Ameren Missouri	Charger Incentives	The Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri approved ratepayer recovery of commercial charger incentives. ⁶
New York	Central Hudson Gas and Electric Corporation, Consolidated Edison Company of New York Inc., New York State Electric & Gas Corporation, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, National Grid, Orange and Rockland Utilities Inc., and Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation.	Charging Incentives	The State of New York Public Service Commission approved recovery of rebates paid to commercial customers for charging as a regulatory asset, to be collected via a surcharge mechanism over a period of 15 years. ⁷
Michigan	Consumers Energy and DTE Energy	Charging Incentives	The Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) approved ratepayer recovery of \$10 million in electric vehicle investment, which included commercial and residential charging incentives, by Consumers Energy. The MPSC approved rate recovery of \$13 million in EV investment by DTE Energy, which included residential and commercial charging incentives. 9
Texas	Austin Energy	Vehicle Incentives	EV programs are partially funded through rates. However, since Austin Energy is not a public power utility, the utility does not do direct rate basing for EV programs or individual initiatives. An annual budgeting process each year for all proposed utility expenses includes dedicating a portion to customer programs.

See *Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri file number ET-2018-0132*, February 16 and October 17, 2019.

⁷ See State of New York Public Service Commission file 18-E-0138, July 16, 2020.

⁸ See https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mpsc/EV_Pilot_Issue_Brief_05-02-2019_653974_7.pdf.

⁹ See https://www.michigan.gov/mpsc/0,9535,7-395-93307 93313 17280-496392--,00.html.

Table 1: Examples of Utility Incentive Programs

Jurisdiction	Utility	Program	Rate Recovery
Ohio	American Electric Power	Charging Incentives	The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio gave American Electric Power approval to spend up to \$10 million to encourage electric vehicle adoption including charger incentives. ¹⁰ The investment will be funded via customer bills.
Virginia	Virginia Electric and Power Company	Charging Incentives	The Commonwealth of Virginia State Corporation Commission approved ratepayer recovery of charging incentives as part of a smart charging pilot. ¹¹
Georgia	Georgia Power	Charging Incentives	The Georgia Public Service Commission approved Georgia Power's 2019 rate case which included \$6 million in electric vehicle investment over a 3-year period, including charger incentives. ¹²

_

See https://www.dispatch.com/business/20180425/push-toward-electric-vehicles-gets-boost-from-ohio-regulators.

See Commonwealth of Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUR-2019-00154, March 26, 2020.

See Georgia Public Service Commission Case No. 42516, December 17, 2019.