DRAFT

Light Board Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Minutes of Meeting held on March 11, 2020 Belmont Light Conference Room 7:30am

Attending LBAC members: Chair Steve Klionsky, David Beavers, Travis Franck, Bob Forrester, and Michael Macrae.

Select Board Member Roy Epstein.

Belmont Light (BL) attending: General Manager Christopher Roy, Rebecca Keane, Aidan Leary.

I. CALL TO ORDER

- Convened at 7:33am
- Roy gave a brief update on developments related to the Coronavirus.

II. EVALUATION OF APPROACH TO TOU RATES

- Epstein led a discussion on a set of slides he had circulated showing hourly peak wholesale prices (ISO 2019 at Alewife), broken down by season.
 - Summer pattern differed noticeably from winter peak was more diffuse in the summer and there were actually two peaks in the winter (morning and evening).
 - Average prices were higher in winter vs summer.
 - Key takeaways: 1) Seasonal component of TOU rates are as, if not more, important that hourly. 2) Elasticity is a central question unclear the best way to model.
 - Epstein expressed doubts about the possibility of realizing the full benefits of TOU whilst maintaining BL's profit constraint.
 - Franck suggested overlaying Belmont's local peak demand onto the charts presented by Epstein.
- With respect to the question of elasticity, Beavers pointed out that TOU was not just about saving energy / cutting the peak, but also an issue of fairness, e.g. spreading out the capacity charge over the year to make something like heat pumps more attractive.
- Beavers said that typically weekends are ignored in terms of defining the peak period for TOU rates; however, for Belmont specifically, this may be dangerous thing to do. Recent data suggests that a peak event on a weekend was not out of the question
 - Klionsky commented more broadly about the need to clarify the criteria for definition of the peak period, and determine the probability that such a definition will capture the actual peak.
 - Franck argued the definition of peak time has to be convenient for people to shift their behavior, e.g. would customers wait until 10pm to run a dishwasher?
- Forrester cited the example of Burbank, where TOU rates are limited just to EV chargers.

- This led to discussion about a TOU scenario with just an overnight rate would be simple to implement/understand, promote high-load device usage such as EV charging overnight.
- This was followed by a discussion on the role of Virtual Peaker in accomplishing TOU related goals. Keane confirmed the technology had the ability to shift demand from certain appliances to off-peak hours, in real-time. The tradeoff was that this capacity was limited to smart appliances only, adoption of which may be slow compared with a TOU rate approach, which could take effect immediately. Macrae said that while smart devices may have low penetration, customers using these devices would be highly responsive.
- Epstein requested a review of the goals for TOU rates, which was provided by Beavers based on the framework document he had proposed:
 - 1) align customer savings from reduced energy use with saving for BL; 2) support strategic electrification; 3) protect low income customers; 4) support energy efficiency / solar; 5) ensure BL revenue sufficiency / stability; 6) provide for easy implementation.
 - Roy noted these goals closely aligned with feedback given from the Light Board on what they would want to see from a potential TOU rate scheme.
 - Klionsky thought that the goals may not be compatible with one another.
 - Keane proposed adding a goal specifically addressing emissions reduction. She also questioned whether the goals addressed equity clearly enough.
- In order to move the discussion forward, Franck proposed the Committee should come to general agreement on the framework proposed by Beavers, and pick a handful of scenarios to analyze using real data. There was consensus on this approach. Beavers proposed a few scenarios, and he and Keane would work together on a first draft of the model for discussion at the next TOU dedicated meeting.
- Macrae raised the question of the solar buyback rate and whether it should be revisited within the context of TOU rate design. There was clear need for future discussion on this topic.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

• February 12, 2020: Minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. FUTURE MEETINGS

- March 26, 2020: Regular business.
- April 8, 2020: TOU discussion.

V. ADJOURNMENT

• Adjourned at 9:18am.