

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF PUBLIC
SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY FOR
APPROVAL OF ITS CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE –
ELECTRIC VEHICLE AND ELECTRIC STORAGE
PROGRAM ON A REGULATED BASIS**

BPU Docket No. EO18101111

**PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
STEPHEN SWETZ
SENIOR DIRECTOR – CORPORATE RATES AND
REVENUE REQUIREMENTS**

October 16, 2020

Contents

INTRODUCTION	- 1 -
RESPONSE TO RATE COUNSEL’S WITNESSES.....	- 3 -
RESPONSE TO OTHER WITNESSES.....	- 8 -

**PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
STEPHEN SWETZ
SENIOR DIRECTOR – CORPORATE RATES AND REVENUE REQUIREMENTS**

INTRODUCTION

1 **Q. Please state your name, affiliation and business address.**

2 A. My name is Stephen Swetz, and I am the Senior Director – Corporate Rates and
3 Revenue Requirements for PSEG Services Corporation. My principal place of business is 80
4 Park Plaza, Newark, New Jersey 07102. My professional experience and responsibilities are
5 described in Schedule SS-CEF-1, which was submitted along with my direct testimony.

6 **Q. Have you previously submitted direct testimony in this proceeding?**

7 A. Yes. On October 11, 2018, I submitted direct testimony on behalf of Public Service
8 Electric & Gas Company (“PSE&G” or the “Company”) in support of PSE&G’s Petition
9 requesting the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (“BPU” or “Board”) approve PSE&G’s
10 proposed Clean Energy Future – Electric Vehicle and Energy Storage Program (“CEF-EVES”
11 or the “Program”). The defined terms in my direct testimony have the same meanings here.

12 **Q. What was the purpose of your direct testimony in this proceeding?**

13 A. In my direct testimony, I provided the details for the calculations of the Program’s
14 revenue requirements, the associated cost recovery methodology, and rate design for the CEF-
15 EVES Petition filed with the Board. Specifically, I recommended that the Company establish
16 a Technology Innovation Charge (“TIC”) to be assessed to all customer classes on an equal
17 cents per kilowatt hour (“kWh”) basis to recover the costs of its Electric Vehicle (“CEF-EV”)

1 program. My direct testimony also provided detailed schedules setting forth the projected
2 revenue requirements, rates, and bill impacts over the Program's life.

3 **Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

4 A. In my rebuttal testimony, I respond to certain assertions in the direct testimonies of
5 witnesses on behalf of other parties concerning the Company's cost recovery and rate design
6 proposals. Specifically, I respond to the testimony of:

7 (i) Ezra D. Hausman, David E. Peterson and Dante Mugrace on behalf of the New
8 Jersey Division of Rate Counsel ("Rate Counsel");

9 (ii) William Erlich on behalf of Tesla, Inc. ("Tesla");

10 (iii) Kathleen Harris of Environment New Jersey, the Environmental Defense Fund,
11 Natural Resources Defense Counsel and Sierra Club ("collectively the "Environmental
12 Intervenors");

13 (iv) Jinga J. Shah on behalf of Electrify America, LLC ("Electrify America");

14 (v) R. Thomas Beach on behalf of EVGO Services, LLC ("EVGO"); and

15 (vi) Kevin George Miller on behalf of ChargePoint.

16 **Q. Please summarize your rebuttal testimony.**

17 A. As discussed more fully below, while Rate Counsel's witnesses broadly oppose the
18 Company's proposals in these proceedings, the remaining witnesses generally support the
19 goals of the Company's filing but propose changes to the rate mechanism that the Company
20 proposes to effectuate the expansion of electric vehicles ("EVs") in the Company's service
21 territory. In response, I first explain why Rate Counsel's witnesses' claims and
22 recommendations are unfounded or unreasonable and should be rejected. I then address

1 various recommendations by other witnesses and explain why the Company's proposals
2 represent a reasonable and balanced approach to encouraging the expansion of the EV market.
3 As more fully discussed below, none of the witnesses presenting rate design recommendations
4 in this proceeding has presented a persuasive basis for the Board to reject the Company's
5 proposals in this case.

RESPONSE TO RATE COUNSEL'S WITNESSES

6 **Q. What arguments do Dr. Hausman and Mr. Mugrace advance in support of their**
7 **position that PSEG Shareholders should contribute to the funding of Electric**
8 **Vehicle Sub-Program?**

9 A. Dr. Hausman claims that increased adoption of EVs will lead to increases in kWh sales
10 which would lead to greater revenues and profits, which would classify the proposed program
11 as market development activities. He further states that in competitive markets, the costs for
12 market development activities are typically absorbed by shareholders in anticipation of future
13 profits. Mr. Mugrace reiterates and agrees with Dr. Hausman's claims that shareholders should
14 fund some or all of the CEF-EV program.

15 **Q. Do you agree that it would be reasonable to require shareholders to absorb a**
16 **portion of the cost of funding the CEF-EV Program?**

17 A. No I do not. Dr. Hausman fails to recognize that increases in distribution kW demand
18 and kWh energy sales arising from the expanded use of electric vehicles will likely lead to a
19 need for additional investments in distribution system infrastructure, such as adding capacity
20 to sub-stations. This will impose costs on the Company that are incremental to the costs that
21 will be recovered in the rates to be charged for this Program.

22 In addition, under the Company's new Conservation Incentive Program approved

1 recently by the Board in the settlement of PSE&G's CEF-Energy Efficiency Program ("CEF-
2 EE"), revenue from increased usage per customer by existing customers above the levels set
3 for each rate schedule in PSE&G's prior base rate case will be credited back to customers.¹
4 Therefore, only EV revenue from new customers will be incremental. This minor amount of
5 incremental revenue from new customers between base rate cases would likely be offset by the
6 capital costs associated with those required infrastructure investments noted above until new
7 base rates are set in subsequent base rate cases.

8 Finally, over the long term, as a regulated company, PSE&G's return is set by the BPU
9 and rates are reset in each base rate case on a cost-of-service basis so that the Company has an
10 opportunity to earn its allowed return. Thus, over the long term, rather than creating a source
11 for incremental profits, the revenues from service to electric vehicle customers, like all other
12 revenues, will be used to offset the Company's overall cost of service, eliminating the
13 Company's ability to realize increased profits from increased sales after each subsequent base
14 rate case. Therefore, all other things being equal, the only result that would be achieved by
15 adopting Rate Counsel's witnesses' recommendation that shareholders should be required to
16 fund a portion the CEF-EV program is that the Company would not have a reasonable
17 opportunity to earn its allowed return.

18 **Q. How does Mr. Mugrace propose PSE&G recover the CEF-EVES investments?**

19 A. Mr. Mugrace has proposed to have the Company recover all the proposed investments
20 over ten years, similar to the recently approved CEF-EE Program. As indicated in my direct

¹ See I/M/O the Petition of PSE&G for Approval of its Clean Energy Future/Energy Efficiency Program on a Regulated Basis, Docket No. GO18101112 and EO10121113, Order Adopting Stipulation (September 23, 2020), at 16-17.

1 testimony the Company has proposed to recover the costs associated with utility depreciable
2 assets over their respective book depreciation lives, which vary from 5 years to 40 years.² The
3 costs associated with EV chargers, which will be owned by program participants, would be
4 treated as a regulatory asset and amortized over ten years, in line with expected charger lives
5 and consistent with Mr. Mugrace's recommendation.

6 **Q. Why do you disagree with Mr. Mugrace's proposed single recovery period of 10**
7 **years?**

8 A. Consistent with fundamental regulatory cost recovery principals, the Company
9 proposes recovering investments in depreciable assets in accordance with the depreciation rates
10 approved in the Company's last base rate case. The regulatory asset related to EV chargers
11 owned by program participants, which is not directly covered under the Company's approved
12 current depreciation rates, is proposed to be amortized over ten years which is consistent with
13 the expected lives of the chargers.

14 **Q. Rate Counsel witnesses Hausman (at 29) and Mugrace (at 9-11) assert that the**
15 **costs of the EV program should be recovered solely from EV customers. Do you**
16 **agree?**

17 A. No. As explained by Company witness Karen Reif, adoption of this recommendation
18 would result in rates to EV customers that are unlikely to encourage widespread participation
19 in the EV market. As discussed by Ms. Reif, this result would unreasonably deprive the
20 Company's customers and all other New Jersey residents of the benefits of improved air quality
21 resulting from increased use of EVs.

² Swetz Direct Testimony, at pg 4. See also Schedule SS-CEF-EVES-1; RCR-RD-0009, which sets forth the current depreciation rates.

1 **Q. In your experience, is it unusual for the Board to set a single rate across all**
2 **customer usage for activities that promote societal benefits such as energy**
3 **efficiency?**

4 A. No. Both the legislature and the BPU have recognized that it is appropriate to assess
5 the costs of activities that have the potential to create broad societal benefits to all customer
6 classes. Indeed, the Board has specifically recognized in the recent Clean Energy Program
7 proceeding that programs to promote the increased use of EVs should be funded through the
8 broad-based Clean Energy Fund.³

9 **Q. If the Company were to design rates that recovered the costs to serve electric**
10 **vehicles solely from the EV owners/drivers, what would be the likely impact of the**
11 **rates?**

12 A. The likely impact would be that the State would be unable to achieve the goals for
13 expansion of the electric utility market that are shared by the State of New Jersey and most of
14 the participants in this proceeding. The main purpose of the CEF-EV program is to “jump
15 start” EV adoption and help achieve the New Jersey Energy Master Plan “Net Zero” carbon
16 emission goal by 2050. If all the costs for the EV program were collected from EV
17 owners/drivers, including the high costs that would be incurred due to low utilization in the
18 early stages of market penetration, the resulting rate would provide a greater barrier than
19 current rates to EV adoption.

20 **Q. Rate Counsel witness Peterson (at 7) asserts that PSE&G proposes to retain all**
21 **revenues derived from EVES service until its next base rate case. Do you agree?**

22 A. No I do not. Mr. Peterson misinterprets my testimony, which is that revenues that
23 PSE&G receives from customers using Company-owned CEF-EV charging stations and from

³ See I/M/O The Clean Energy Programs and Budget For Fiscal Year 2021, BPU Docket QO 20080539 (September 23, 2020).

1 participation in the PJM frequency market would be reflected in the calculation of the TIC as
2 a cost offset for the CEF-EV Program.

3 **Q. Rate Counsel witness Mugrace (at 18-19) recommends that PSE&G's**
4 **administrative costs should be capped. Do you agree?**

5 A. No. Given the uniqueness of these programs the administrative costs are uncertain at
6 this time. Having administrative costs reviewed as part of an annual filing for prudence will
7 ensure that only costs that are deemed prudent and reasonable by the BPU will be recovered
8 by the Company.

9 **Q. Rate Counsel witness Mugrace (at 20-21) recommends that PSE&G's weighted**
10 **average cost of capital should be updated in future rate cases. Do you agree?**

11 A. Yes. That is consistent with the Company's standard ratemaking practice.

12 **Q. Rate Counsel witness Peterson (at 9) recommends that the Company should**
13 **establish a separate tariff for EV service. Do you agree?**

14 A. No. The cost of delivering electricity is primarily driven by the quantity and time of
15 day it is consumed, not what the end use is. This is evident in the Company's non-residential
16 rate design; all non-residential customers are treated the same, and only the maximum size and
17 voltage at which they are served provides a basis to segregate them into separate rate classes.
18 That is why the Company has proposed demand charge rebates to help overcome cost barriers
19 to adoption of EVs while also showing customers the true cost of electricity.

RESPONSE TO OTHER WITNESSES

1 **Q. Electrify America, LLC witness Jigar Shah (at 6) asserts that public charging**
2 **stations should be exempt from paying the Technology Innovation Charge**
3 **("TIC"). Do you agree?**

4 A. No. Similar to the Company's existing Societal Benefits Charge and Green Programs
5 Recovery Charge, TIC charges should be generally non-bypassable, and should apply to every
6 kWh consumed, as they benefit the entire State, not just specific customers. In addition, the
7 participants in the programs funded by the SBC and PSE&G's Green Program Recovery
8 Charge pay those charges as well. The TIC should apply to all kWh consumed.

9 **Q. Chargepoint witness Miller asserts (at 32) that the Company's proposed "set**
10 **point" subsidy ignores the root causes of unsustainable demand charges in**
11 **PSE&G's Commercial and Industrial ("C&I") rates for DC fast charging**
12 **customers. Do you agree?**

13 A. No. Demand charges in PSE&G's C&I rates are cost-based and fairly allocate costs to
14 customers based on how much they use and when they use it. The fact that low capacity factors
15 that may be realized during the early implementation of DC fast charging service could result
16 in electric bills with high \$/kWh average rates is the reason the Company has proposed
17 Demand Charge Rebates. The Company's proposal will help overcome this barrier to EV
18 adoption and give DC fast charging customers time to increase their utilization factors to assist
19 in lowering their average \$/kWh electric rates without unreasonably modifying the Company's
20 longstanding cost-based rate design.

21 **Q. Mr. Miller further asserts (at 32) that PSE&G is inappropriately seeking to**
22 **regulate the price of DC fast charging services. Do you agree?**

23 A. No. PSE&G is not trying to regulate the price of DC fast charging service. PSE&G is
24 rather trying to reduce cost barriers to early adoption of DC fast charging services. As

1 previously described, demand charge rebates will reduce customers' "dollars per kWh" cost
2 during the initial 5 years of the EV program. As the customers' utilization increases, the
3 demand charge rebate is a "self adjusting" subsidy that phases out once the customer's electric
4 bill average rate is less than \$0.40/kWh.

5 **Q. Mr. Miller also claims (at 32) that PSE&G's proposal provides discriminatory**
6 **relief from demand charges. Do you agree?**

7 A. No. The purpose of the demand charge rebate is to incent new charging stations to be
8 built to help facilitate EV adoption. As Mr. Reif stated in her response to discovery question
9 DE-PSEG-0001⁴, at current EV adoption rates, the goal of 1,400 public charging stations being
10 available for public use by the end of 2025 as required in the Plug In Vehicle ("PIV") Act
11 would likely be unattainable. While Mr. Miller appears to assert that it would be unduly
12 discriminatory for PSE&G to fail to provide rebates to all program participants, I disagree.
13 The Company's proposal is consistent with the goal of adding new program participants and
14 reasonably designed to achieve that goal without providing benefits to customers who have not
15 demonstrated a need for them.

16 **Q. Mr. Miller recommends (at 36) that PSE&G should develop and file one or more**
17 **C&I rate options that provide alternatives to traditional demand-based C&I**
18 **rates. Do you agree?**

19 A. No. The demand charge rebate is a non-discriminatory, self-adjusting mechanism to
20 help reduce high \$/kWh rate during periods of low utilization, which has been a significant
21 barrier to EV adoption. Neither Mr. Miller nor any other witness has either provided a
22 persuasive reason to require PSE&G to modify its demand rate structure or any meaningful

⁴ See Schedule SS-CEF-EVES-1.

1 evidence that the proposed demand rebates will not accomplish the goal of assisting the electric
2 vehicle market.

3 **Q. Mr. Shah asserts (at 25) that the BPU should approve rates for investments in**
4 **public electric vehicle charging infrastructure that are commensurate with, if not**
5 **lower than, those for residential charging in order to create what he characterized**
6 **as “equitable incentive for adopting electric transportation amongst those that**
7 **have access to charging at home and those that do not.” Do you agree?**

8 A. No. I do not. The rates charged to residential customers (kWh energy only) and those
9 assessed to commercial and industrial customers (kWh energy and kW demand) are
10 significantly different for reasons that have nothing to do with EV charging. This case is not
11 the proper forum to address these issues, which should be addressed in base rate cases. In this
12 case the Company has proposed demand charge rebates for DC fast charging services to help
13 mitigate cost barriers that will result from low load factor utilization of EV charging during
14 the early stages of EV market development. The Company selected a proposed rebate set point
15 that balances the interests in removing barriers to EV adoption with the interests of all
16 customers who fund the rebate. The Company does not believe it is in the best interest of any
17 market participant for the Company to arbitrarily reduce rates to levels that may not reflect the
18 Company’s cost of service to equalize rates that may be paid for EV charging among different
19 classes of customers, as Mr. Shah appears to be suggesting.

20 **Q. Tesla witness William Erlich (at 6) recommends that any target rate for the Public**
21 **DC Fast Charging Program be set at the commercial customers’ class average**
22 **price of electricity or the commercial class average cost per kilowatt hour. Do you**
23 **agree?**

24 A. No. As described in my response regarding Mr. Shah’s assertions, the Company
25 selected a proposed rebate set point that balances the interests of removing barriers to EV

1 adoption with the interests of the customers who fund the rebates by holding them to the
2 minimum level necessary to attract new EV customers. For instance, if the class average rate,
3 which is currently about \$0.13 per kWh, was used as the set point for the DC fast charger third
4 party owned sites sub-program versus the proposed set point of \$0.40 per kWh, the
5 corresponding rebate funded from customers for the life of the Program would increase by
6 \$111 million, from \$39 million to \$150 million, or 290%.

7 **Q. Mr. Erlich (at 7) recommends that a term-limited pilot mechanism should be**
8 **adopted in this proceeding and that PSE&G should commit to designing a**
9 **permanent EV rate after a six year pilot program period. Do you agree?**

10 A. The Company has proposed a limit of five years on the demand charge rebate. This
11 will provide time to increase utilization of charging stations and expand the use of electric
12 vehicles. The main tenet of proper rate design is that rates should not discriminate based upon
13 the customer's end use, but be based upon cost causation, which is mainly based upon quantity
14 and when it is consumed. The Company will be monitoring the results of its EV program over
15 the next five years and as the Company approaches the end of the program, it will determine,
16 based on the results, whether and how to continue and/or modify the program.

17 **Q. EVGO witness R. Thomas Beach (at 6) expresses a variety of concerns about the**
18 **utility making judgments necessary to establishing a set point rate. Do you agree**
19 **with his concerns?**

20 A. The Company has proposed a demand charge rebate with a set point of a maximum
21 electric bill rate of \$0.40/kWh for five years. While the Company has suggested that it could
22 change the set point rate, any such changes would be dictated by market conditions and directed
23 at achieving the goal of expanding the use of electric vehicles.

1 **Q. Mr. Beach recommends (at 10) a waiver or reduction of demand charges for five**
2 **to ten years. Do you agree?**

3 A. As I have stated previously, the Company has proposed a demand charge rebate with a
4 set point of a maximum electric bill rate of \$0.40/kWh for five years. Mr. Beach has provided
5 no reason why ten years is necessarily more appropriate.

6 **Q. Mr. Beach recommends (at 17) that the adopted rate structure should be available**
7 **to all Electric Vehicle customers. Do you agree?**

8 A. No. There are many factors that go into rate design, which include existing rate
9 structures and metering technology as well as voltage served. The Company believes that its
10 proposed program of demand charge rebates, off-peak rebates and the existing Residential
11 Load Management (“RLM”) rate schedule, which has time of use (“TOU”) rates, are
12 appropriate at this time to spark the development of the EV market in a reasonable manner. At
13 the same time, it is not in any party’s best interests for the Company to provide rebates or
14 discounts to EV market participants that have not required them in the past or demonstrated
15 any need for them in this proceeding.

16 **Q. Environmental Intervenor’s witness Kathleen Harris recommends (at 32) that**
17 **PSE&G should be required to develop revised cost-based rates for C&I EV**
18 **customers in lieu of short-term rebates. Do you agree?**

19 A. No. Currently the Company’s C&I rates are reasonably accurate in aligning rates to
20 cost causation, especially for the Large Power and Light (“LPL”) rate schedules that use kWh
21 TOU rates to recover energy based costs, kW demand rates to recover local and system
22 distribution delivery cost, and kW obligation rates to recover generation capacity and
23 transmission costs. One of the main challenges currently facing EV adoption is during initial
24 periods low utilization results in high electric \$/kWh average rates. That is why the Company

1 has proposed demand charge rebates. From the Company's perspective, it is more appropriate
2 to address the rate issue with rebates than to develop a new set of rates, which could result in
3 higher rates than we have proposed with the rebate.

4 **Q. Ms. Harris also recommends (at 31, 33) that PSE&G should look at other options**
5 **for time of use ("TOU") rates. Do you agree?**

6 A. Not currently. The Company currently has a number of TOU rate options available.
7 As previously stated, a residential customer can select to be served under our TOU RLM rate
8 schedule. Also, smaller C&I customers served under the Company's General Light and Power
9 ("GLP") rate schedule can opt to be served under the "Night Use" special provision that can
10 lower the cost of off-peak charging because it eliminates summer demand charges during "Off-
11 Peak" hours (Weekdays 8PM to 8AM and all weekend). In addition all C&I customers can
12 choose Basic Generation Service – Commercial and Industrial Energy Pricing ("CIEP") where
13 they could possibly reduce their capacity, transmission and energy charges by avoiding
14 charging during certain peak periods.

15 Notwithstanding the Company's current service offerings, if PSE&G's pending CEF-
16 Energy Cloud ("CEF-EC") filing is approved, the Company may be able to implement rate
17 design alternatives in future base rate cases.

18 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony at this time?**

19 A. Yes, it does.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company
Case Name: CEF-EVES
Docket No(s): EO18101111

Response to Discovery Request: RCR-RD-0009
Date of Response: 7/21/2020
Witness: Swetz, Stephen
Book Recovery

Question:

Refer to the tables shown in Mr. Swetz's Direct Testimony, pages 4 and 9. Please provide the source documents or analyses supporting the "Book Recovery" amounts shown on the schedule. In all cases do the Book Recovery amounts shown in the tables reflect currently authorized depreciation/amortization amounts approved by the Board? If not, please explain how the amounts were determined.

Attachments Provided Herewith: 0

Response:

The book recovery of the Make-Ready Infrastructure Investment, which includes distribution circuits, service drops, transformers, conductors, conduits, electric meters and breaker panels, were based on the composite book recovery period for all utility property at the time of the Company's filing. The Company's book recovery period for utility property has changed since the original CEF-EVES filing was submitted as a result of the conclusion of the 2018 base rate case. As a result, the book recovery used to calculate revenue requirements would use the latest authorized depreciation/amortization rates for the appropriate asset classes. The asset classes and approved depreciation rates are shown below.

FERC Asset Class Name	Depreciation Rate
LINE TRANSFORMERS	3.40%
METERS	9.90%
POLES, TOWERS AND FIXTURES	3.70%
UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES	1.70%

The Chargers and Battery are utilizing 10-year and 15-year lives, respectively, based upon the manufacturers estimated life. IT software is set to a 5 year life based upon expected obsolescence.

Inverters and Communication Equipment book recovery lives are equal to the manufacturers recommended life, consistent with the Company's experience in its existing Solar Programs. Solar Panels are equal to 20 years based upon the Board's decision in EO16050412 and Meter book recovery life is equal to 20 years to set equal to the Solar panel book life as in the decision in EO16050412.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company
Case Name: CEF-EVES
Docket No(s): EO18101111

Response to Discovery Request: DE-PSEG-0001
Date of Response: 7/21/2020
Witness: Reif, Karen
Residential Private Market Competition

Question:

Refer to Karen Reif's Direct Testimony, page 3.

- (a) Why does PSE&G propose to subsidize and provide rebates to residential and other sector locations for EV charging infrastructure when a competitive market already exists to provide such solutions to consumers?
- (b) What market data or other indicia of interest does PSE&G possess that supports PSE&G, a public utility, providing a competitive service that is currently being offered by non-utility third parties?
- (c) Does PSE&G propose to provide financial support or incentives to residential homeowners whose BTM electrical systems does not support a Level 2 charger?

Attachments Provided Herewith: 0

Response:

- a. PSE&G objects to the assumption in this request that a competitive market already exists to provide the level of EV infrastructure build-out that is required to help timely meet New Jersey's aggressive electrification of transportation goals. Notwithstanding and subject to this objection, PSE&G is proposing a public utility program to help support and accelerate electrification of transportation. To meet the PIV Act goals for EV adoption, the charging infrastructure in New Jersey needs to be increased substantially versus the current level. There has been no significant progress to date in the development of EV charging infrastructure in New Jersey, which continues to rank lowest in the density of public chargers relative to population among states participating in California's Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) partnership.¹
- b. Please see answer to (a.) above.
- c. Yes, PSE&G proposes to support the cost of the EV charger and the installation thereof. This would include behind the meter (BTM) installation costs. The Company proposes to cap the rebate at \$2,000 per installation, but retain the flexibility to adjust the cap in response to market trends on notice to Board Staff and Division of Rate Counsel.

¹ Data obtained from United States Department of Energy, Alternative Fuels Data Center, available at https://www.afdc.energy.gov/data_download and United States Census Bureau, State Population Totals and Components of Change: 2010-2019, available at <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-state-total.html>. Data obtained on April 22, 2020.