



86 Bridge Street, P.O. Box 20, Baldwinville, MA 01436-0020

TEL: 978-939-5323

FAX: 978-939-4309

John M. Driscoll, *General Manager*

Light Commissioners' Meeting June 14, 2016

Members present were: Dana Blais, Gregg Edwards, Chris Stewart

Employees present were: John Driscoll, Tom Berry

The meeting was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by Dana.

The agenda was approved on a motion by Chris, seconded by Gregg, 3-0 in favor.

The minutes of May 10, 2016 were approved on a motion by Chris, seconded by Gregg, 3-0 in favor.

Old Business:

The Manager and the Superintendent had been informally looking into acquiring a full-blown AMI System for Templeton's roughly 3,600 electric meters. The cost of the system could be justified by the elimination of another full-time meter technician to work at the Light Plant for 32 years. The Manager had done some analysis on the Light Plant's cost to employ such an individual until 2048 and offer this individual health, dental, life, short-term disability and workers' compensation insurance along with other benefits such as clothing, education, license renewal, etc. He had put this 32-year cost around **\$5M** against an AMI System that would like cost around **\$800K**.

The Superintendent had been in contact with a consultant named David Scott, who had done most of the preliminary work for the Braintree Electric Light Department (BELD) when they put their Elster AMI System into place. He had heard great things from BELD about their dealings with David Scott and because of this had gotten some estimates for David to perform similar services for Templeton:

Phase I	Business Case Development	\$12,910
Phase II	RFP and Vendor Selection	\$42,190
Phase III	Vendor Contract Negotiations & Award	\$9,010
Phase IV	Deployment Support A, On-Call	\$2,850
	Deployment Support B, Scheduled	\$12,010

The Manager and the Superintendent both agreed that to utilize David's services for Phases I and II would be beneficial to the Light Plant. These two phases would involve a lot of information gathering up front by both John and Tom, but more importantly it would have David Scott preparing the actual RFP as had done for BELD. It was not known at this point whether David's services would be necessary at a later date for

Phases III and IV, so the Manager felt that, if the Board were pleased, that they could vote to authorize a Not-to-Exceed level of funding equal to the first two phases' cost. At this time a vote took place as follows:

"On a motion made by Gregg, seconded by Chris, 3-0 in favor the Board voted to authorize the Manager and the Superintendent to retain the consulting services of David Scott for (his) designated Phases I and II, for an amount not to exceed \$55,100."

Dana – Aye

Gregg – Aye

Chris - Aye

The Manager had been in contact with Todd Olinsky-Paul from the CESA about getting the process started for large-scale battery storage in Templeton. Todd said that because of the unique situation in Templeton with both solar and wind generation behind-the-meter that there could be multiple grant funding sources available; resiliency & micro-grid thru DOER, clean energy thru Mass CEC to be specific. The Manager had also been in contact with Jason Viadero from MMWEC about exploring some of the grant opportunities that would present themselves in the Fall of 2016. He felt that a 1.5-MW system would be a good fit based on the critical loads needed that are served by the 1303 circuit, mostly consisting of elderly housing, both private and public.

The Manager informed the Board about other ancillary benefits of such a system that could be dispatched at the Light Plant's discretion. Depending on the summer cloud cover and the solar generation's diminished output during the transmission peak, this new battery storage system could be used as a load-shedding means to reduce the Light Plant's Capacity Supply Obligations (CSOs) in coming Forward Capacity Auctions (FCAs). The manager will utilize these entities at his disposal and other ones if need be in order to secure the maximum amount of grant funding for such a battery storage project, likely to cost roughly \$2.2M.

The Manager had approached Rubin & Rudman, LLP (R&R), on some proposed changes to the Light Plant's Terms & Conditions as it related to limited electric service. He had informed the Board that due to the rising number of electric customers protected from service termination by Physician's notes (now numbering 10) the Light Plant needed to somehow protect itself from excessive use of free electricity, especially during the winter moratorium on termination of electric service. The Manager was proposing that current-limiting devices be installed at select customer sites between the meter and the meter socket, which would limit that customer's load to just 5, 10, 15 or 20 amps. While there are no DPU Regulations or MA General Laws preventing these types of installations, they are not provided for in the Light Plant's most recent Terms & Conditions revised in 2013.

The Manager distributed copies of some proposed language by R&R to be added to the existing which would allow the Light Plant to install, at the customer's expense, a 3.6-KW load limiter. If the amp load on either 120-volt leg were to exceed 15 then the limiter would trip to open and disconnect electric service thru the meter socket. A pushbutton on the unit would allow the electric customer to turn themselves back on, thereby eliminating the need for multiple trips to the location by line personnel. Eventually the device would alter the electric customer's usage behavior to the Light

Plant's favor when they realize that they just cannot turn on whatever they want to whenever they want to.

The Manager added that the typical electric customer in Templeton averages around 700 KWH monthly, or \$98. But the typical electric customer protected from service termination by a physician's note averages around 1,300 KWH monthly, or \$182. The Board took some time to review this newly proposed language for consideration in the next version of the Light Plant's Terms & Conditions. At this time a vote took place as follows:

"On a motion made by Gregg, seconded by Chris, 3-0 in favor the Board voted to adopt the new proposed language drafted by Rubin & Rudman, LLP in limited electric service and incorporate it into the current Light Plant Terms and Conditions."

Dana – Aye

Gregg – Aye

Chris - Aye

The Manager and Superintendent informed the Board that they would be placing an ad for a new Electric Utility Groundman, since there had been an opening created with the retirement of Bob Whitney in May 2016. They thought that the Light Plant would be better served by bringing in another line person at the bottom level who could progress to the top level in 4-5 years' time. The Manager added that this would still leave the Light Plant technically on employee short from 2010 with the promotion of both John and Tom to their current positions. But this was certainly not financially the time to be considering a line force of 7 again; 6 would be adequate for the foreseeable future. The Board had no objections to their plan to acquire a new Electric Utility Groundman at this time.

The Manager and the Superintendent felt that they and the Board needed to re-address the personal cell phone policy issue again. In mid-May the Superintendent had distributed copies of the newer personal cell phone policy to LU104 that the Board had voted into place in April. LU104 had communicated concerns to the Manager in an e-mail about line personnel working alone or after-hours or during extended storm outages without the use of their own personal cell phones. After speaking with Doucette & LaRose, LLC (D&L), the Manager felt that their concerns were legitimate and provided a new draft personal cell phone policy for the Board's review tonight. Also, since the line personnel take most or all of their designated break times on their respective job sites, the Manager felt that use of their personal cell phones at these times was acceptable. At all other times, however, the phones were to remain powered off as to not be a distraction to line personnel in general, whether in the air or on the ground.

The Board felt comfortable with these changes and felt it reasonable to allow up to 50 minutes in any 8-hour day for personal phone calls, especially since each lineman and partner take breaks concurrently. At this point a vote took place as follows:

"On a motion made by Gregg, seconded by Chris, 3-0 in favor the Board voted to adopt the second draft of the personal cell phone policy to allow the line personnel exemptions in the cases of after-hours work, extended storm restoration work or during designated break times; this policy to take effect upon passage."

Dana – Aye

Gregg – Aye

Chris - Aye

New Business:

There were four (4) hand-outs that the Manager had prepared for the Board that did not particularly require any specific discussion:

- April 2016 Power Supply
- May 2016 Wind Generation
- May 2016 KWH Sales/Revenues
- June 2016 Residential Rate Comparisons

At this time a roll call vote was taken as follows (8:00 p.m.):

"A motion was made by Dana, seconded by Chris, 3-0 in favor for the Board to enter into Executive Session to conduct strategy sessions in preparation for negotiations with union personnel. The Light Commission believed that if it were to have such discussions and/or conduct such strategy sessions in Open Session it would have a detrimental effect on the Light Plant's collective bargaining position. It was announced that the Board would later reconvene in Open Session but only for the purpose of Adjournment."

Dana – Aye

Gregg – Aye

Chris – Aye

There being no other Open Session business to discuss, on a motion by Gregg, seconded by Chris, 3-0 in favor the Light Commissioners' Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

John M. Driscoll



General Manager