

1 **DRAFT**

2 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3 WALLINGFORD ELECTRIC DIVISION

4 100 JOHN STREET

5 WALLINGFORD, CT

6 TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2018

7 6:30 p.m.

8 **MINUTES**

9
10 **PRESENT:** Chair Robert Beaumont; Commissioners Joel Rinebold & Patrick Birney; Director
11 Richard Hendershot; Electric Division General Manager Tony Buccheri; Water and Sewer
12 Divisions General Manager Neil Amwake; Business Manager William Phelan; Walter Szymanski,
13 Energy Efficiency Specialist; Jeff Franson, Distribution Superintendent; Cynthia Kleist, Recording
14 Secretary; Public – None.

15 1. Chair Beaumont called the Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance
16 was recited.

17 **2. Consent Agenda**

18 a. Consider and Approve the Minutes of November 20, 2018

19 **Mr. Birney made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Rinebold seconded**
20 **the motion**

21 **Vote: 3 ayes**

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

23 **WATER/SEWER**

24 **4. Discussion and Possible Action: Customer Billing Issue – Lipper International**

25 In her letter of November 7, 2018, Amy Lipper McCauley, who was not present at the
26 December 14, 2018 PUC meeting, stated that she was notified that her bill was extremely high.
27 She noted in her letter that two toilets were not working properly for a few weeks but has been
28 corrected and did have the meter read which indicated the water usage was back to normal.

29 Ms. McCauley stated in her letter that usage never goes over 4,000 cubic feet (CF) and the
30 current bill was over 40,000 CF as a result of the leak, which she believed was an excessive

1 amount and was appealing the bill. In his November 27, 2018 memo, Mr. Phelan explained the
2 meter was read on Oct. 22, 2018 and the reading at that time was 48,700. He noted this
3 reading was used to calculate a November 1, 2018 Water/Sewer bill. He noted in his
4 memorandum that the previous reading of 6,700 was taken on July 19, 2018 and consumption
5 for this 95 day period totaled 42,000 cubic feet (48,700-6,700), which calculated to a water
6 service bill of \$1,733.47 and a sewer bill of \$1,676.03 with the total bill amounting to
7 \$3,409.50.

8 Mr. Phelan stated in his memo that based on the high consumption and prior to issuing a bill, a
9 check reading of 57,700 was obtained on November 1, 2018. He pointed out in his memo that
10 once again staff noticed that consumption for the 10-day period (October 22-November 1) was
11 still extremely high and contacted the customer to set up a property inspection as a courtesy to
12 water and sewer customers. On November 1, staff met with the Lipper Realty office manager
13 and a maintenance employee, and at that time, inspectors found a bathroom stall taped off and
14 labeled "Out of Service". Upon entering the stall the inspectors found the toilet constantly
15 running. Division staff discussed this issue with the Lipper Realty employees who revealed the
16 toilet had been in this condition for two or three weeks.

17 Mr. Phelan stated in his memo the toilet was then shut off at the main valve by Water Division
18 staff. Mr. Phelan said in his memo that on November 5, 2018, the office manager indicated the
19 toilet was repaired and requested a reading check be taken to confirm resolution of the issue.
20 Two check readings were taken over the next few days which indicated that consumption had
21 returned to normal. At the customer's request, the Division also performed a meter test which
22 indicated the meter was recording well within the American Water Works Association meter test
23 standards.

24 Mr. Amwake noted the memorandum from Mr. Phelan was "very detailed". He said the
25 Division's Meter personnel also found five additional toilet tanks where the water level was
26 equal to or right at the overflow level. He said once the Meter personnel turned off the valve to
27 the offending toilet, it was repaired a few days later and consumption went back to normal. Mr.
28 Amwake noted the toilet consumed approximately 2.3 gallons per minute for a few weeks which
29 was not addressed by the business owner.

30 **NO ACTION TAKEN**

31 **5. Discussion and Action: Budget Transfer – Pistapaug Water Treatment Plant Capital** 32 **HVAC Component Replacement**

33 Mr. Amwake noted this budget allocation originated in FY 16/17. In his November 28, 2018
34 memo, Mr. Amwake explained the existing 25-year old single boiler system at the Pistapaug
35 Water Treatment Plant (WTP) has over the past six years become more problematic with multi-
36 day failures occurring during periods of colder temperatures resulting in a loss of heat to the
37 WTP interior. He noted in his memo that in order to assure that the WTP has continuous non-

1 interrupted heat; it is recommended that a twin boiler system be properly sized and installed at
2 the Pistapaug WTP to meet the anticipated demand and avoid future loss of heat conditions.
3 The memo goes on to explain that the cost proposal to install the twin boiler system and
4 appurtenances is \$88,621 which exceeds the Division's existing FY 16/17 capital budget of
5 \$70,000 for design and engineering of HVAC components at the Pistapaug WTP.

6 Mr. Amwake stated in his memo that as a result, to complete the project and include a
7 contingency of approximately 5%, a budget transfer increasing Account #43300331 (Structures
8 and Improvements) in the amount of \$23,000 together with a corresponding decrease to
9 Account #43300343 (Transmission and Distribution Mains) is required. He noted in his memo
10 that funds are available for this transfer due to favorable bid pricing received on the Division's
11 water main replacement Contract No. 35.

12 **Mr. Birney made a motion to approve the Budget Transfer based on the Nov. 28,**
13 **2018 memorandum from Mr. Amwake as well as reasons stated on the record. Mr.**
14 **Rinebold seconded the motion.**

15 **Vote: 3 ayes**

16 **PUBLIC QUESTION & ANSWER PERIOD 7: 00 P.M. – NO QUESTIONS FROM THE**
17 **PUBLIC**

18 **6. Discussion: Status of New Truck Storage Facility and Utilization of Additional Space for**
19 **Storage. DISCUSSION ONLY – NO ACTION TAKEN**

20 Mr. Hendershot told the Commission this was a big project that was difficult but was completed.
21 He said Mr. Franson would be providing one last status report. Mr. Franson went over the
22 report and noted the new truck facility is occupied and is being utilized to its fullest. He noted
23 all of the tools from all of the other buildings are now in one location. He said the mezzanine
24 area is also being utilized and everything is being used. He said the facility has worked well for
25 pre-staging many jobs, and we now have the stock handlers loading the trailers. He said time is
26 being saved because the crews don't have to go across the street to load the trucks.

27 Mr. Franson said there has also been a test run of the back door and have installed 50 ft. poles
28 onto the pole trailers and backed them in. He said he anticipates doing this if there is a large
29 snowstorm or ice storm forecast. He noted there are two pole trailers which fit side-by-side. He
30 said most of the poles are 45 ft. and 40 ft. poles and the plan is to put a 40 ft. and 45 ft. pole
31 on each trailer, back them into the barn and will be ready to go. Mr. Rinebold asked how many
32 poles would fit onto a pole trailer. Mr. Franson said the trailers can carry three 40 ft. poles. Mr.
33 Franson said a side benefit to this new truck storage facility is that all annual truck maintenance
34 can be performed inside. He said because of the facility, work can be done on rainy days. He
35 noted before, trucks would be tied up on sunny days. Mr. Franson said that during the storms,
36 the line workers could hang up their outer gear in the heated building to dry. He said with the

1 drainage, the crew can wash the trucks in the garage and the fleet is looking better and is
2 being better maintained and the overall morale of the crews has improved.

3 Mr. Franson spoke about budgeting, noting the PUC funded the full cost of the job with a 10%
4 contingency of which only 4% was used. He pointed out the building was very well designed.
5 Mr. Franson said there were a few issues with building elevation and noted a few catch basins
6 had to be installed in the driveway along with additional paving at an approximate cost of
7 \$70,000 over the total cost of the building bid. He stressed that cost was well within the
8 contingency. He said the Contractor is owed \$25,000 but added not all of the warranty
9 information has been provided. Mr. Franson added the Contractor also has to provide the as-
10 built drawings and each sub-contractor has to provide all the warranty information which he
11 said is in progress and is expected within the next three weeks. He said everything is
12 operational.

13 Chair Beaumont asked about the water used to wash the trucks. He asked if there was any
14 issue with petroleum or residuals going into the drains. Mr. Franson said there are no problems
15 and pointed out there are oil/water separators. Mr. Franson provided photos of the new truck
16 facility in his report. Mr. Franson discussed the former truck garage, noting it was cleared, and
17 all the concrete truck stops were removed and the floor cleaned and swept. He said five bays
18 were used for secure storage. He said a chain link fence was installed to divide the open
19 storage to the secure storage. Mr. Franson pointed out the materials in the secure storage are
20 an extension of what was stored across the street; he noted cables of wire were also moved
21 from across the street.

22 Mr. Franson showed photos of the reels of wire and noted we are starting to pile these reels to
23 the ceiling and are utilizing all the space. Chair Beaumont asked what was being stored outside.
24 Mr. Franson said all of the transformers are still being stored outside. He noted the plan is to
25 move all the reels of wire inside. He said this accomplishes two things: the reels will last longer
26 because of the wood material they are composed of and the inside storage will also eliminate
27 opportunities for theft. He said all of this is a work in progress.

28 Mr. Franson noted page 4 of the report which showed photos of where all the line workers
29 previously stored their tools. Mr. Franson said this was a room across the street in the
30 stockroom area. He said all of the small hand tools that are now in cabinets which take up a lot
31 of space will be moved to lockable storage which will free up space in the stockroom area in the
32 open floor area. He said by the next meeting, there will be shelving installed across the street.
33 He noted there are four different types of shelving across the street; some modular and some
34 fixed. Mr. Franson said he would like to go to all modular racking, so as the Electric Division
35 needs change, the height of the racks can also be changed. Mr. Franson spoke about the
36 upgraded employee entrance. He showed a photo and noted page 5 which showed narrow
37 stairs. Mr. Franson said a pre-cast set of stairs with railings were installed which opened up the
38 area, making it conducive for employees to enter and exit.

1 Mr. Franson noted if the floor ever gets revised, the pre-cast stairs can be brought out to the
2 parking lot and become the permanent stairs coming into the building. Mr. Hendershot noted
3 the old steps were steep and narrow which caused some people to trip. He said this was a low-
4 tech solution to a long-term problem. Mr. Franson said he believes the money provided was
5 used prudently. He said there are still opportunities to improve noting there are opportunities
6 with the metering equipment and will move all the meter stock across the street and track it in
7 the system which will better control the purchase and management of this equipment. He
8 thanked the PUC for giving them the opportunity to do what they have done.

9 Chair Beaumont noted page 6-2 and asked what "CT's" and "PT's" were. Mr. Franson explained
10 that "CT's" stood for current transformers and "PT's" were potential transformers. Chair
11 Beaumont commented favorably on the flag shown in the photo on the bottom of page 1 of the
12 report. Commissioner Rinebold noted this was a great report and Commissioner Birney thanked
13 Mr. Franson for keeping the PUC abreast on this project from literally day one.

14

15 7. Discussion: Energy Efficiency Program Plan – 2019 -2021

16 Mr. Hendershot said this was a three-year plan which doesn't require PUC approval. In his
17 November 27, 2018 memo, Mr. Syzmanski noted that CT General Statute 16-245m requires
18 electric distribution companies to file a triennial Conservation and Load Management Plan. He
19 noted in his memo that the Plan provides an overview of the individual programs to be made
20 available to residential and commercial/industrial and municipal customers along with proposed
21 budgets for each of these programs. In addition, Mr. Syzmanski noted in his memo that the
22 Plan provides an overview of value added energy and conservation initiatives outside the legacy
23 rebate and incentives programs.

24 Mr. Rinebold said he liked the report and was direct, concise and to the point. He asked if the
25 2020 Federal Lightbulb Efficiency Standard has any effect on the
26 commercial/industrial/government programs or is this just residential. Mr. Szymanski said this
27 was only residential because most of the lamps handled through the retail program are targeted
28 for the residential customer.

29 Mr. Rinebold noted the budget on page 7-9; pointing out the funding for the residential lighting
30 program was taken out because it will no longer be necessary. He said this was added to Home
31 Energy Services (HES). Mr. Syzmanski noted in his report that this was not the most cost
32 effective program for return. Mr. Rinebold asked why this \$50,000 wasn't moved to a program
33 that had a better cost benefit. Mr. Syzmanski said one of the reasons this was returned to the
34 HES program, was because this program took a deep cut compared to previous years. Mr.
35 Syzmanski said this is a program the Energy Efficiency Board recognizes as important to
36 residential customers. He said even though there isn't a cost benefit savings from electric
37 savings much of the savings is in MBTU's from heating. He said the residents are always calling

1 and asking to participate and is a very popular program. Mr. Rinebold asked if any of the
2 commercial/industrial programs enjoy the popular support from businesses and industries in
3 town. Mr. Syzmanski said most of the projects seem to be lighting and has found in his year
4 and half tenure, how much old technology still exists. He said there is still opportunity going
5 forward with commercial and industrial businesses. Mr. Rinebold asked if the budget was
6 sufficient. Mr. Syzmanski said he would say yes, based upon historical performance. Mr.
7 Hendershot said the Division could probably spend more, if more was put into these programs,
8 but we only spend what we are required to collect; the 40/60 split between residential and
9 commercial is an approach the Energy Efficiency Board appreciates.

10 Mr. Birney asked how he arrived at the three components: heating/cooling rebate, hot water,
11 and attic insulation. Mr. Syzmanski said this was an historical continuance of these programs
12 which were established some time ago. Mr. Hendershot said there was a time when the Division
13 did more with appliances, but they have become energy efficient so there is no need to
14 incentivize. Mr. Birney asked if something new came out, how quickly would this product be
15 analyzed as to the feasibility of being included in this plan. Mr. Syzmanski pointed out this plan
16 can be revised and isn't necessary set in stone such that no changes can be made.

17 Mr. Birney asked about the ISO-NE Demand Response Program. Mr. Szymanski said
18 approximately a year ago, he had a discussion with Mr. Hendershot regarding the Forward
19 Capacity Market. He noted that once a customer completes the energy efficiency project, this is
20 the end of it. He said doing additional research, he believed there was opportunity to gain
21 additional value and do some revenue streaming. He said he had discussions with CPower Inc.,
22 which led to the signing of the Master Service Agreement in May therefore allowing us to
23 monetize the value of these larger projects. Mr. Hendershot pointed out Mr. Syzmanski
24 mentions this in page 4 of his report (page 7-7).

25 Chair Beaumont asked how long these numbers can last and can we continue to spend this on
26 a regular basis. He also wondered will there be major technology changes. Mr. Syzmanski said
27 he what he has seen with other utilities is there is more of a move towards controls, whether it
28 be lighting or process controls. He said lighting controls in the lighting areas are the next step
29 and the opportunity for additional controls with some of the manufacturing customers. Mr.
30 Syzmanski spoke about renewables and noted there are probably some opportunities. He said
31 he didn't believe Wallingford was as attractive as some of the neighboring towns and didn't see
32 solar as attractive. Mr. Buccheri noted that most of the people who have solar in Wallingford
33 own it and are not leasing it because there is no incentive for them to come into town. Mr.
34 Hendershot spoke about electric vehicles. He said they have the potential to either help or harm
35 us depending upon their number and when the owners choose to charge these vehicles. He
36 said the Division has started educating itself and learning about what other people are doing in
37 this regard. He said our program is an energy conservation and load management program.

1 Mr. Hendershot said there might be discussion in the coming years regarding the load
2 management aspect as programs are crafted to incentivize or cause the charging of electric
3 vehicles to happen at the non-detrimental times of the day. Chair Beaumont asked how many
4 electric vehicles or hybrids were in town.

5 Mr. Syzmanski said he received a year-old grand list of these vehicles registered in town noting
6 there are approximately 130 plug-in hybrid and/or all electric vehicles. Mr. Hendershot said
7 there are no public charging stations in town so these people are charging either at home or
8 other places. He said the concern is that if there are 1,000 or 2,000 of these vehicles, we want
9 them to charge their vehicles in Wallingford for the electric sales, but don't want them all
10 charging up at once especially if there is a heatwave at 4 p.m.

11 Mr. Birney noted the entire concept of public charging stations, and asked if this was an
12 opportunity that should be looked at as a utility, or let someone else handle it and get the
13 benefit of the electric sales. Mr. Hendershot said in his opinion, it should be the latter because
14 someone has to be responsible for the point of payment. He noted the charging station needs
15 to be on the back side of the meter and the meter needs to be in someone's name. He said this
16 is why home charging is the ultimate way to do this. Mr. Birney asked if this plan could be
17 posted on the Town's website. Mr. Hendershot said he would work with Program Planning on
18 this.

19 Chair Beaumont said he believed Braintree, Mass may have its own charging stations. Mr.
20 Hendershot noted that Stowe Vermont has gotten into this, recognizing their electric charging
21 market is visitors. He said Stowe is working with businesses in town to come up with
22 infrastructure and means to provide the fast charging opportunities. He said they have a very
23 different load shape and customer mixes. Mr. Hendershot said Braintree, Mass is a system that
24 has been working on a pilot with a software development firm, a turnkey system for
25 implementing residential chargers that are controlled by this third-party.

26 **DISCUSSION ONLY – NO ACTION TAKEN**

27 **PUC**

28 Correspondence/Committee Reports

29 Mr. Hendershot noted the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission Meeting on Wednesday
30 December 5, 2018 at 7 p.m. The first item of business will be the application for the work at the
31 Wastewater Treatment Plant. He said he will attend with Mr. Amwake and AECOM
32 representatives. Mr. Hendershot said he spoke with the PUC and will confirm his interest in
33 filling the vacancy on the NEPPA (Northeast Public Power Association) Board. Mr. Birney said he
34 had an opportunity to review the by-laws of NEPPA. He said he views the seat as a Wallingford
35 Electric Division seat and noted the by-laws clearly allow for proxies. Chair Beaumont said he

1 would like to see us have a seat at this table and is worthwhile for us to be there and have
2 input.

3 **ADJOURNMENT**

4 Mr. Birney made a motion to adjourn the Meeting at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Rinebold seconded the
5 motion which passed unanimously.

6

7 Respectfully submitted,

Respectfully submitted,

8

9 Cynthia A. Kleist

Joel Rinebold

10 Recording Secretary

Secretary