

APPROVED

12/20/22

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

WALLINGFORD TOWN HALL

ROOM 315

45 SOUTH MAIN STREET

WALLINGFORD, CT 06492

Tuesday, December 6, 2022

6:30 P.M.

MINUTES

PRESENT: Chairman Robert Beaumont; Commissioners Patrick Birney (via teleconference) and Joel Rinebold; Director Richard Hendershot; Electric Division General Manager Tony Buccheri; Water and Sewer Divisions General Manager Neil Amwake; Water and Sewer Divisions Business Manager Donald Langenauer and Recording Secretary Bernadette Sorbo

Absent – Electric Division Business Office Manager Marianne Dill

Members of the public – Roger Norke, Brian Feldman (via teleconference), Larry Zabrowski, Donald Mauritz (Energy Efficiency Specialist - WED)

Mr. Beaumont called the Meeting to order at 6:30 P.M., and the pledge of Allegiance was recited.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Consent Agenda

- a. Consider and approve Meeting Minutes of November 15, 2022
- b. Consider and approve Budget Transfer – Electric- General Plant – Office Furniture & Equipment

Motion to Approve the Consent Agenda

Made by: Mr. Rinebold

Seconded by: Mr. Beaumont

Votes: 2 ayes

42 **3. Items Removed from Consent Agenda – None**

43
44
45
46 **4. Discussion and Possible Action: Intermunicipal Agreement - Sanitary Sewer and**
47 **Water Connection - 77 Midland Drive**

48
49 Mr. Amwake stated that at the July 19, 2022 Public Utilities Commission meeting, the
50 Commission voted to approve an Intermunicipal Agreement between the City of Meriden, the
51 Town of Wallingford, Nancy M. Norke of 77 Midland Drive, and Brian and Brenda Monroe of
52 75 Midland Drive. Since the approval, the owners at 75 Midland Drive removed themselves
53 from the agreement before it was signed by all parties. Therefore, in order for the owner of 77
54 Midland Drive to connect to the sanitary sewer system, a new Intermunicipal Agreement has
55 been drawn up by an attorney working for Mrs. Norke. The proposed Intermunicipal Agreement
56 is between the City of Meriden, the Town of Wallingford and Nancy M. Norke. The
57 Intermunicipal Agreement has been reviewed by the City of Meriden, Wallingford Water and
58 Sewer Division staff and the Wallingford Department of Law. All comments from each party
59 involved have been addressed. The Agreement is similar to the one previously approved, with
60 the only changes being removal of the owners of 75 Midland Drive from the Agreement. In
61 general, the Intermunicipal Agreement allows Mrs. Norke to connect to the private sanitary
62 sewer lateral and become customers of the Meriden municipal sanitary sewer systems. The
63 Intermunicipal Agreement also allows for the property to be connected to the Meriden municipal
64 water system at some future time. There is no plan to connect the residence to the Meriden
65 municipal water system at this time.

66
67 **Motion to Approve the revised Intermunicipal Agreement**

68
69 **Made by: Mr. Rinebold**

70 **Seconded by: Mr. Beaumont**

71 **Votes: 2 ayes**

72
73
74
75 **5. Discussion and Possible Action: Customer Appeal – Farids & Co. LLC – El**
76 **Rate**

77
78 Mr. Buccheri referenced the memo dated November 23, 2022 and stated that this item on the
79 agenda is in regards to the way rates are structured and written. Mr. Buccheri stated that Farids
80 & Co. LLC is currently a Rate 4 Commercial customer and is requesting a rate change to Rate 3
81 Commercial based on the fact the building became vacant in May, 2022. Farids & Co. LLC has
82 done a lot to reduce the consumption of power. Mr. Buccheri referenced the applicable sections
83 of the Rate Sheet for Rate No. 4 Large General Service:

84
85 *This rate is applicable to customers served through a single metering installation and*
86 *whose monthly kilowatt demand exceeds 25 kW in any two of the billing months within the most*
87 *current twelve-month period, but is not in excess of 400 kW for any two consecutive months.*

88 **DETERMINATION OF BILLING DEMAND**

89 *Billing demand shall be the maximum fifteen (15) minute measured integrated kilowatt demand*
90 *in the month. For determining the kilowatt demand in any month, the kilowatt billing demand*
91 *shall be the maximum demand in the month but not less than seventy percent (70%) of the*
92 *highest kilowatt demand occurring during the immediate preceding May, June, July, August,*
93 *September and October months. Minimum Billing Demand shall be 17.5 kW.*

94
95 The rate payer's monthly kilowatt demand has exceeded 25 kW in at least two of the last twelve
96 billing months. Currently 70% of the maximum demand in the immediate preceding May, June,
97 July, August, September and October months is 44.24 kW (70% of 63.2 kW). The most recent
98 demand reading was 8.80 kW (0.22 * 40 (multiplier). The Wallingford Electric Division does
99 not have the authority to operate outside of the set rate schedules.

100
101 Mr. Hendershot pointed out that the Wallingford Division cannot revise the set rate schedules
102 yet. Mr. Hendershot questioned what is the most recent month that the customer exceeded 25
103 kW?

104
105 Mr. Buccheri stated September or October.

106
107 Mr. Hendershot stated that if September was the most recent month that the customer exceeded
108 25 kW and the demand does not exceed 25 kW, the customer would be able to ratchet down to a
109 Rate 3 Commercial in September 2023 and this would happen automatically.

110
111 Mr. Rinebold stated that he would like to avoid setting precedence in that the rates can just keep
112 changing every time there is an adjustment in use.

113
114 Mr. Rinebold questioned why has the consumption dropped?

115
116 Mr. Feldman thanked the PUC for giving him the opportunity to explain the situation and stated
117 that the building has been vacant for several months. After reviewing all of the expenses for the
118 property the company realized the extra demand charge which is significantly more than the
119 energy charge. Mr. Feldman stated he understands the rationale for this and appreciates the
120 explanation for the need to provide for the demand charge. The company does not see a use for
121 the building in the immediate future and this is the reason for the request.

122
123 Mr. Beaumont stated that he empathizes with Mr. Feldman in regards to the situation but the
124 demand is set and runs for 12 months.

125
126 Mr. Birney stated that one of the benefits of having a local utility is being able to be flexible at
127 times in order to address unique circumstances which are not covered in our rate/rate making
128 process. After reading through the documentation, Mr. Birney's view is that this is something
129 that the PUC should consider because of the local nature of the Wallingford's Utility and the
130 ability to address this unique situation.

131
132 Mr. Beaumont stated his concerns are for the customer rate base and for setting a precedent
133 therefore he would not be in favor of a motion.

134 Mr. Feldman stated that changing to a Rate 3 would provide relief to his company as the property
135 is vacant and pointed out that if for some reason the demand increased then the rate would
136 automatically change back to a Rate 4.

137
138 Mr. Birney stated that he is not persuaded by the concept of precedence. Mr. Birney believes that
139 this is a unique fact situation that the PUC has discretion to modify and would support a motion.

140
141 **No Action Taken**

142
143
144
145 **Public Question and Answer Period**

146
147 Mr. Zabrowski inquired on the existing status of the Pierce plant.

148
149 Mr. Hendershot stated that the plant was repowered and CMEEC owned that project. About a
150 year ago, CMEEC sold the project to another entity. The lease transferred to the new entity, Hull
151 Street Energy LLC and WED still collects lease payments on the site.

152
153 There was further discussion in regards to energy and the upcoming rates.

154
155 **Public Question and Answer Period Closed**

156
157
158
159 **6. Discussion and Possible Action: Changes to 2023 Residential Energy Efficiency**
160 **Programs**

161
162 Mr. Buccheri stated that Mr. Mauritz has taken a close look on the unspent RGGI funds and put
163 together a brief description along with recommendations on what is being spent and where the
164 funds are being spent. Mr. Buccheri referenced the memo dated November 10, 2022 and stated in
165 2021 WED received \$485,449.61 and spent \$466,278.03 (96%) in RGGI funding. In 2022 it is
166 anticipated that WED's RGGI funding will exceed \$600,000.00.

167
168 Mr. Mauritz stated that a big part of this is to bring the WED in line with the other utility
169 companies. The rebate for insulation and electric heating & cooling system increased as
170 insulation during Covid went up due to inflation and the supply chain cost impacts. It is
171 estimated that these changes will increase program spending by approximately \$100,000.00 per
172 year. There are sufficient RGGI funds available to cover this cost increase. In addition, due to
173 increasing RGGI funding WED will probably need to expand its residential energy efficiency
174 program again in 2024.

175
176 Mr. Beaumont stated that the WED has the money and understands that the money needs to be
177 spent.

178

179 Mr. Rinebold had some concerns on the programmable thermostats as to how and if they are
180 being used and the rebates for the Heating and Cooling System. Mr. Rinebold would support
181 technology that can be installed, programed and used in public buildings (schools, libraries).

182
183 Mr. Birney thanked Mr. Mauritz for the detailed report and for recalibrating what is being spent
184 and how WED should be spending the funds. Mr. Birney stated that he would support a motion.

185
186 Mr. Rinebold questioned on the rebate for the Heating and Cooling System. Why is the
187 efficiency rating lower for the \$500.00 rebate on the 18 SEER/12.5 EER/9.0 HSPF? Why does
188 the single indoor unit receive less of a rebate, \$300.00?

189
190 Mr. Mauritz stated that he is unsure and will look into the numbers, as well as if the RGGI funds
191 can be applied to the public's buildings and not just the residential sector and get back to Mr.
192 Rinebold.

193
194 **No Action Taken**

195
196
197
198 **7. Discussion and Possible Action: Utility-Sponsored Electric Vehicle Charging**
199 **Programs in Connecticut**

200
201 Mr. Buccheri referenced the memo dated November 21, 2022 and stated that the memo was an
202 outline to show what others are doing and why they are doing it.

203
204 Mr. Hendershot stated that there is no recommendation for a motion on this item and that it is
205 just an informational sheet.

206
207 Mr. Mauritz stated that he is also trying to find out if the fees for the EV chargers can be covered
208 under the RGGI funds.

209
210 Mr. Rinebold had some concerns in regards to subsidizing funds for the EV chargers as the
211 program only had 25 cars in the program.

212
213 Mr. Hendershot stated that this may create load building.

214
215 Mr. Birney stated that he looks at this as another mechanism to conserve energy.

216
217 **No Action Taken**

218
219
220
221 **Correspondence**

222
223
224

225 **ADJOURNMENT**

226

227 **Motion to Adjourn**

228

229 **Made by: Mr. Rinebold**

230 **Seconded by: Mr. Birney**

231 **Votes: 3 ayes**

232

233 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:14 p.m.

234

235 Respectfully submitted,

236

237 *Michelle Bracale for*

238

239 Bernadette Sorbo

240

241 Recording Secretary

Respectfully submitted,

Joel Rinebold /mb

Joel Rinebold

Secretary