



**Mark C. Krausse**  
Senior Director  
State Agency Relations

1415 L Street, Suite 280  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 386-5709  
Fax: (916) 386-5720  
mark.krausse@pge.com

June 9, 2014

Jim McGowan, Executive Director  
California Building Standards Commission  
2525 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 130  
Sacramento, CA 95833

**Re: Proposed Revision to California Green Building Standards Code Residential Mandatory Measures Planning and Design Site Development/Electric Vehicles (Section 4.106.4)**

Dear Mr. McGowan:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to the proposed revision to California Green Building Standards ("Building Standards") for electric vehicles. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) supports the advanced adoption of electric vehicles (EV) statewide and is working to enhance the EV charging infrastructure through a variety of utility-sponsored measures. We applaud the California Building Standards Commission and the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for its effort to propose a mid-cycle change to the Building Standards to facilitate EV adoption, and urge the Building Standards Commission to make the changes suggested below.

**Background**

There are tariffs developed by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), such as Rules 15 and 16, which govern the cost responsibilities for the installation of electric facilities for new and upgraded buildings. Depending on the expected revenues from the services connected to the new electric facilities, some of the extension costs are borne by PG&E customers generally, while others are charged to the developer and/or building owner. When a new housing development is proposed, PG&E will determine the design for the new line extension for the development.

Additionally, at the request of the developer or other building owner, PG&E will provide the needed infrastructure for the development which includes electrical lines, transformers, and switches. Based on the CPUC-approved tariffs, there are some costs on the "utility side of the meter" that may be borne broadly by utility customers, and other costs that the developer will fund directly. The cost per building or housing unit to the developer / owner may depend on the size of the development, but all developers / homeowners are provided an allowance by utilities of approximately \$2,000 per home for electric service facility installations. [NOTE: PG&E's allowance is \$1,918, SCE's allowance is \$3,038, SDG&E's allowance is \$2,841]

**Comments and Proposed Amendments**

"\$400 Cost Exemption"

Language at 4.106.4 provides an exemption to a developer where the marginal cost of installing electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) exceeds \$400 per unit. The \$400 exemption is too broad and should exclude the phrase "utility side of the meter."

PG&E is concerned that the proposed exemption for costs that exceed \$400 is vague and overly broad and may be interpreted to include all costs incurred by both the building owner and the utility ratepayers generally. As a result, it may be the case that the practical application of the exemption during the transition period will effectively ban nearly all EV-supportive installations in new residential buildings. PG&E recommends the replacement of the proposed language that the mandatory electric vehicle charging measures for new residential construction be waived where there is evidence “substantiating that the local utility infrastructure design requirements on the utility side of the meter will increase the cost by more than \$400 per dwelling unit.” (Proposed revision to Section 4.106.4).

The costs of electric infrastructure upgrades on the utility side of the meter that are assigned to the utility and utility ratepayers generally should not be the basis of an exemption in the building code. Those utility costs are recovered generally from all customers through rates, tariffs and terms of service established by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) or the governing board of the relevant publicly owned utility, not from the individual builder or its customers. The CPUC and the relevant governing boards of the local publicly owned utilities determine the reasonableness and the appropriate method for recovery of those utility costs. Thus, utility costs on the utility side of the meter are not a matter that is within the scope or responsibility of the California Green Building Standards Code or electric vehicle costs incurred by developers of new residential construction.

However, to the extent that costs of upgrading a particular customer’s utility infrastructure on the utility side of the meter in order to comply with the new EV standard may be assigned directly to that individual utility customer or to the developer of the new construction, those individual costs are relevant to determining the reasonableness of the new EV standard and the transition period for implementing the standard.

Accordingly, PG&E respectfully requests that the proposed “\$400 cost” exemption language relating to “utility infrastructure design requirements on the utility side of the meter” be revised or clarified to solely apply to costs that the individual customer or the developer directly incurs in order to comply with the new standard.

#### Impracticality Exemption

PG&E is similarly concerned that the language of 4.106.4(b) could also operate to exempt builders from complying with the EVSE requirements of the regulation in many if not most cases. The language provides for an exception to the requirements where a local building official determines that compliance would be impractical “based on EV range or distances to known public charging facilities.” The first clause of this exception seems to ignore the great variability of EV ranges (ranging from dozens of miles to 260 miles for the Tesla Model S) and the very existence of PHEVs that can be deployed as all electric for commute distances, but operate as a conventional internal combustion vehicle as needed. The second clause seems to assume that a home charging station *must* be complemented by public charging infrastructure, an assumption disproven by both longer-range EVs and PHEVs. PG&E recommends that this exception be removed from the regulation, or rewritten to narrow its application.

#### Exemptions Should Be Sunset

The new building codes are designed to promote EV adoption statewide and move California closer to its climate goals. As we look toward reaching our 2020 and 2030 statewide greenhouse gas reduction goals, decarbonizing the transportation sector, similar to the decarbonization of the electric sector through alternative generation sources, is critical. Each measure that is put in place to support the reduction of greenhouse gases in the transportation sector is important to making progress toward this goal. In HCD staff’s Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR), the rationale for including the exemption is to provide transitional assistance to the residential housing market, thus balancing economic impacts with statewide environmental goals. PG&E appreciates these dual goals and the transition period offered through the exemption. PG&E looks forward to working with HCD staff and stakeholders to determine the actual costs incurred and whether the \$400 exemption, narrowed to costs borne by the developer or homeowner, is

appropriate.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to the California Green Building Standards Electric Vehicle Section. PG&E applauds your efforts to promote EV adoption and looks forward to working with you on a balanced approach for the new residential mandatory measures.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark C. Krausse", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mark C. Krausse  
Senior Director, State Agency Relations

Cc: Emily Withers, Department of Housing & Community Development  
Kyle Krause, Department of Housing & Community Development