

**RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK  
BELMONT, MA**

DATE: November 10, 2021  
TIME: 2:57 PM

## **Light Board Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

Minutes of Meeting held on March 5, 2020  
Belmont Light Conference Room  
7:30am

Attending LBAC members: Chair Steve Klionsky, Vice Chair Travis Franck, David Beavers, Bob Forrester, Michael Macrae, Shirley Wang

Belmont Light (BL) attending: General Manager Christopher Roy, Aidan Leary, Ben Thivierge

Light Board Chair Roy Epstein was present

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Steve Klionsky called a meeting of the Light Board Advisory Committee to order at 7:33 a.m.

### **II. DISCUSSION OF EV CHARGING STATIONS/RATES**

Epstein said the issue of electric vehicle (EV) charging rates arose from a Light Board discussion on how the Claflin Street Parking Lot EV chargers should be used. Epstein had done an analysis of these chargers and had a few findings: 1) the principle use of the chargers (when the chargers are more likely to be full) is weekends and nights; 2) there were 1,200 charging sessions in Q4 of 2019, for a total cost of \$1,500 in energy charges; 3) most people using the chargers are from Belmont. Epstein said there is also a business case for the EV chargers; some people utilize the chargers during normal business hours.

Epstein reviewed EV charger rates from surrounding cities and towns. Ipswich, another town with a municipal light plant, charges \$1 per hour for EV charging. Epstein said it was reasonable to charge a fee and to assume that charges will rise, so a structure should be in place. He suggested 75 cents per hour, which was 60 cents for the power cost plus a little extra for the capital costs of equipment.

Roy said Belmont Light pays \$543 per port per year to ChargePoint, and that charge has gone up significantly over the years. He said Belmont Light has looked at leading utilities to see what they do and had looked at time of use rates as well. The general cost for a new charger site was \$10,000.

Franck said he thought the memo prepared was excellent. He asked if the next charger installation would be in Cushing Square. He also asked about how much control Belmont Light has on the charging schemes. Thivierge said they have control down to turning the charger on and off and that the pricing tool on ChargePoint was robust. Franck asked about doing different rates after a session ended. Thivierge said there are many options for that.

Wang asked what the reason would be to start charging – to cover costs or to make sure more users have access. Epstein said it was both – to ensure efficient use of the chargers.

Forrester agreed with Epstein that there was no compelling reason not to charge for use of EV chargers and that looking around the area, \$1 seemed like the standard rate.

Beavers asked, if Belmont Light starts charging, would ChargePoint take a fee. Roy said he hadn't looked recently, but believed it was similar to a credit card fee.

Klionsky laid out two points: 1) Belmont Light should facilitate EV charging throughout town, but 2) there is an equity issue with people using the Claflin Lot chargers as their home chargers while others must pay to charge at home.

Franck said there should be a proper incentive for people to unplug their cars when they're done charging, but if cars are finishing charging in public lots at 2 a.m., there shouldn't be a penalty.

There was a discussion about home EV charging.

Resident Brian Kopperl said Belmont Light should encourage direct current (DC) fast charging but asked what the capital cost would be. Roy said the last quote received for DC fast chargers was \$30,000 plus the infrastructure buildout. He agreed that DC fast charging was the future.

Resident Phil Thayer presented a slide from Senator Will Brownsberger and said Belmont Light should encourage the full utilization of the EV chargers.

### **III. EVALUATION OF APPROACH TO TOU RATES**

Klionsky reviewed an analysis on time of use (TOU) rates prepared by Utility Financial Services (UFS). Roy said the philosophy that went into the analysis was based on industry trends and that Belmont Light was looking to have a data point using Belmont data. He asked what Belmont Light was trying to accomplish through TOU rates. Keane followed up that what is needed from the Light Board and LBAC were goals for a rate structure.

Franck noted that Beavers had done a lot of work with TOU and asked whether UFS has the expertise and experience in performing TOU analysis. Roy said the knowledge is there with UFS but whether they had enough time was a question.

Beavers said a strategic consultant was needed and that once the strategy is in place, they could bring it to UFS to run the numbers.

Beavers then presented his analysis, which included the goals of saving money for both customers and Belmont Light, passing on the true costs of energy procurement to customers, supporting strategic electrification, revenue sufficiency, and ease of understanding.

Klionsky asked how the on-peak periods should be determined. Beavers advised to think of the timing as buckets and throw charges into it. Klionsky also said that right now, transmission costs are higher than capacity, which are spread over twelve months. He asked if the TOU scenario would be catching those peaks. Beavers said it would catch the summer peaks, which Keane confirmed were the coincidental peaks with Eversource.

Beavers said the question was whether the group could figure out the impact, cost-wise, of TOU rate scenarios on different customers.

There was discussion on the mechanisms of TOU rates.

Beavers said there were financial impacts of TOU rates (cheaper energy off-peak, so savings are passed on to customers) and environmental impacts (on-peak energy is supplied by dirty peaker plants).

Klionsky pointed out that traditionally, TOU rates have been designed to peak shave, not to conserve energy.

Wang asked if Belmont Light had talked with Eversource about the change to TOU rates, as it might affect the Eversource grid overall. She said peak shaving can create a new peak. A discussion on transmission peaks ensued.

Beavers asked for comments on the goals that he had put forth, the customer scenarios that Members wanted to see, and the rate scenarios to study for the next meeting.

## **V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

[None.]

## **VI. FUTURE MEETINGS**

- **Wednesday, March 11**
- **Thursday, March 26**

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

- Adjourned at 9:21am.