



# HINGHAM MUNICIPAL LIGHTING PLANT

31 Bare Cove Park Drive  
Hingham, MA 02043-1585  
(781) 749-0134 FAX (781) 749-1396  
[www.hmlp.com](http://www.hmlp.com)

General Manager  
Thomas Morahan  
tmorahan@hmlp.com

Laura Burns, Chair  
Michael Reive, Vice Chair

## REGULAR MEETING HINGHAM MUNICIPAL LIGHT BOARD

**June 28, 2022**

Zoom Meeting

[https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/D6HwSqogq2rkvp4upWEMZxTrQjx3Z91MYeTRSn32X2yyddsuz9LrfXpxC0Lzh5Sx.bp-yK\\_htuDAZZkIf?startTime=1656459076000](https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/D6HwSqogq2rkvp4upWEMZxTrQjx3Z91MYeTRSn32X2yyddsuz9LrfXpxC0Lzh5Sx.bp-yK_htuDAZZkIf?startTime=1656459076000)

### Meeting Called to Order

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners of the Hingham Municipal Light Plant (HMLP) was called to order at approximately 0730 on Tuesday, June 28, 2022, via Zoom. The following persons were present:

Board Members: Laura Burns, Chair  
Michael Reive, Vice chair

HMLP: Thomas Morahan, General Manager  
Mark Fahey, Assistant General Manager  
Stephen Giardi, Engineering Manager  
Brianna Bennett, Sustainability Coordinator

Other: John McDonough, Principal, Omni Navitas Holdings LLC  
Members of the Public

Ms. Burns read the following statement regarding the meeting:

*This meeting is being held remotely as an alternative means of public access pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Act of 2021 temporarily amending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law. You are hereby advised that this meeting and all communications during this meeting may be recorded by the Hingham Municipal Light Plant in accordance with the Open Meeting Law. If any participant wishes to record this meeting, please notify the chair at the state of the meeting in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20(f) so that the chair may inform other participants of said meeting.*

The Chair noted that for purposes of drafting minutes, the HMLP's notetaker's recordings fall within the Light Plant's disclaimer and does not require a separate public notice each meeting.

**Approve Meeting Minutes: Board Meetings a) May 31, 2022, b) June 6, 2022, c) June 13, 2022 d) June 15, 2022.**

Ms. Burns requested any comments or changes from Mr. Reive after he had the opportunity to review the minutes. Mr. Reive provided the following comments:

- 1) Need to reconcile format inconsistencies, need a set format for a consistent record. (Mr. Reive volunteered to provide a formatting template)
- 2) Change language like “cheap” hydro power to “low cost” or “inexpensive” for better connotations and instead of “putting solar” using “installing solar.”
- 3) Using Kilowatt-hour (kWh) in financials where applicable for consistency.

Ms. Burns previously requested Mr. Morahan make changes to incorporate more gender-neutral language.

**Ms. Burns requested a motion, Mr. Reive moved to adopt the minutes with the aforementioned changes. Ms. Burns seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously.**

### **Landfill Solar Presentation – John McDonough – Omni Navitas Holding LLC**

The Board requested Mr. McDonough come before it to provide an update since the project has been pending for some time now. Ms. Burns and Mr. Reive were not on the board when the project began and asked for a detailed timeline. Mr. McDonough acknowledged the lengthy process and began a brief Powerpoint presentation. Mr. McDonough proceeded to share the following timeline:

April 2018 – Initial license agreement in place, Omni sublicensed the same month

September 2018 – Omni hires Tighe & Bond to file for post-closing use permit

Ms. Burns clarified post landfill closing, MassDEP has jurisdiction. Mr. McDonough listed a series of factors the MassDEP monitors with solar projects of this nature including vegetation cover and anchor depths to ensure the cap is not compromised. Ms. Burns further asked whether Tighe & Bond was preparing to submit an application from September 2018 all the way through December 2019, inquiring whether the process normally take a full year? Mr. McDonough described a series of delays related to preliminary soil information and PCBs delaying closing the landfill.

December 2019 – Omni submittal to MassDEP for post-closing use permit

December 2020 – Omni submits application to Hingham Planning Board

Mr. McDonough noted that COVID-19 impacts began shortly thereafter when MassDEP went fully remote.

March 2021 – Hingham Planning Board issues Approval Decision

August 2021 – MassDEP issues Post Closing Use Permit

February 2022 – Module Order Placed

March 2022 – Commerce Department Tariff Investigation Announced  
Module Order Cancelled

June 2022 – Executive Order suspending Tariff enforcement for 2 years

Mr. McDonough elaborated on the delays due to COVID and need for test kits along with general issues in the supply chain for transformers and other equipment. The window for building is narrow— limited to July, August, September— in order to minimize disruptions to the landfill and vegetation on it. Restoration work is still required but ground cover is easier to maintain during the late summer. Dry weather is a major necessity and consideration during construction.

Mr. McDonough spoke of the initial design utilizing a 360-watt module. To counteract the marginal financial return due to the small nature of the project and the extra expenses associated with building on a landfill, Mr. McDonough suggested moving up the module to reduce costs. Presently, the plan is to move forward on a 640-watt module.

Ms. Burns inquired how that would change the ballast and nameplate? Mr. McDonough answered: it would be longer, a little bit wider, and changes the spacing making it a bit taller but more efficient ratio of output to ballast. It could be bigger, however spacing has changed, in that there are fewer rows, but output should be comparable. The calculation needs to be finalized.

Mr. Reive expressed particular interest in the wind loading and taller ballast calculation.

Mr. McDonough responded that there will need to be some re-engineering; the ballasts are oversized with a higher wind load to accommodate the proximity to the coast. The final calculations are not available yet but work on those will continue during the module order process and will be submitted to MassDEP when the calculations are complete.

The prospective project timeline is as follows:

Module Procurement – Currently Underway

Upon work through re-engineering, revised one line electrical drawing – July 2022

Revise structural drawing, reprice project – July/August 2022

Design Drawings – August 2022

Resubmit to DEP – August/September 2022

Construction Start – June 2023

Ms. Burns requested more information regarding construction on landfills. Could work proceed in January when the ground is frozen? Mr. McDonough responded if everything is frozen it is possible. However, frost cycles or rain can be disruptive, it is more expensive to build in winter, and snow cover creates problems in placing ballasts and achieving optimal layouts. On landfills there is the danger of slopes thawing and shifting.

Mr. Reive and Mr. McDonough then discussed the possibility of splitting the project into separate stages e.g. installing ballasts separately, timing, and the specific inverter to be used. The cost of remobilizing disincentivizes splitting the project up; it is more cost effective and provides better accountability to keep all subcontractors on site for about 3 to 4 months. A string inverter will be used on this project instead of a centralized unit. At best, looking operational by Fall 2023 with a lead time of at least a year on some transformers.

Ms. Burns solicited comments or questions from the public. There were none.

### **HMLP Incentive Programs – Heat Pumps, Solar, Weatherization Recommendations – Brianna Bennett**

Ms. Burns proceeded, looking next to incentive program proposals as a follow up to last meeting when overarching policy and goals were articulated.

Ms. Bennett began her presentation on the incentive program specifics—

Incentive programs need to fit cohesively within management and electrical policy. Three possible incentive areas are up for discussion: weatherization, heat pumps, solar and batteries.

Weatherization creates tighter heat envelopes thereby reducing grid demand in the movement toward heating electrification. Incentives halve the cost by up to \$1000 but we want to raise the cap to up to \$4000. To better address ratepayer needs we also want to increase project size. The current budget is \$50,000 and we anticipate at least 25 customers. Eight (8) weatherization rebates were issued in 2021, three (3) so far in 2022.

Heat pumps are electric and thus advantageous if more people are switching onto our systems. Furthermore, Hingham has net zero goals and heat pumps help as traditional fuels are emitting sources. Cuts in operations costs should be achievable by running electric systems. Heat pumps effectively partner with weather systems. Currently we offer \$500 per ton new and propose an incentive bump to \$750 per ton capping at \$4500. The average installation is 2.5 tons thus an average person would collect about \$2000. In 2021, thirteen (13) rebates were issued. In 2022, nineteen (19) rebates were issued. Adders, like weatherization, are available as well. A \$1,000 whole home adder option is now available.

Batteries provide backup generation as a carbon free alternative to generators. Outages are typically short and few in Hingham but batteries can also be used during peak hours to reduce demand. Hingham does not currently offer a 1 to 1 net metering rate. A battery can empower customers to control flow from the grid and avoid costliest times. The cost of a home battery is somewhere between \$6,000 - \$10,000. An all-in, complete home battery system can cost somewhere between \$10,000 - \$20,000K. By comparison, a traditional generator is \$3,000 - \$5,000 but fuel costs add up over time. We are looking at a proposal lowering the Solar rebate cap to about 5kW which would be around \$3,000. Currently offering a rebate of \$0.60 per Watt up to \$6,000. The idea is to move those funds toward incentivizing battery systems. We are proposing \$0.30 per Watt for batteries up to \$3,000 which translates to 10kW, the approximate excess that could be stored from an average system. Batteries like the Tesla Power Wall tend to range from 7-10 kw. There is generally insufficient roof space in Hingham for the larger end of the spectrum.

Ms. Burns and Mr. Reive began discussing the presentation—

Mr. Reive commented on the low adoption rate around all incentives programs and believes they need a boost. Are the dollar amounts sufficient to match increased prices and labor costs in the market? Ms. Burns responded by offering a potential higher per watt reimbursement. Mr. Reive voiced concerns that to reduce the rebate on solar is to discourage solar so he is reluctant to reduce it. Recently, module size has increased, watt per unit area has increased, and people can enlarge their systems. While we are still in the early adoption stage, we are not seeing the uptick we want yet and we should be encouraging it. We should identify our long-term targets, rapidly accelerate incentives to achieve those targets, then consider reducing once those targets are met.

Ms. Burns clarified that Electrify Hingham is the campaign to raise public awareness of incentives and hopefully will increase public uptake. Is ENE (Energy New England) still managing our incentive programs? Ms. Bennett responded that the Light Plant will be managing the solar program but would like to take over all programs eventually.

Ms. Burns suggested moving through each program one by one—

## **Weatherization**

Mr. Reive stated he believes weatherization incentives needs to be more of a progressive rebate. Smaller levels should be available for smaller jobs. That way, lower income homes that need it the most can be sealed. For moderate income homes, a strong weatherization rebate that will cover a substantial amount of costs should be available. For larger homes, we need a cut off— proposing a sliding scale from 100% decreasing to 25% cap. Ms. Burns would like to have the programs in place by July 1, 2022 as that marks the halfway point through the fiscal year.

Mr. Reive stated he would be working with Ms. Bennett this week to adjust the program proposals slightly. Weatherization is the most available and most achievable due to competition in the market. If the Light Plant over-incentivizes weatherization, targets should be attainable in a short amount of time. It benefits the Light Plant, consumer, and reduces carbon footprints.

Ms. Burns expressed concern that frequent changes have confused the public in the past. The Light Plant wants stability from the onset of the program. Mr. Reive highlighted the responsibility to treat all ratepayers equally and would not want early adopters regretting putting money into weatherization. All homeowners should be able to take advantage of the programs being put in place. Someone who insulated 5 years ago may not get the maximum funds but some proration could be made available.

Ms. Burns distinguished that sort of program from what is being discussed here. Retroactive incentives are different in that, if the behavior already happened, it does not need to be incentivized and thus it is not best way to spend ratepayer money. Mr. Morahan suggested adopting the program on a longer time scale basis and that it was better to delay one month to work out the details, adding that incentives come from ratepayer money and those resources are limited.

Ms. Burns recommended Mr. Reive continue to work with Ms. Bennett to find a proposal matching Mr. Reive's vision. In discussions with Mr. Morahan, it was suggested that there could be potential for a program comparable to Wellesley's with an opt out rate incorporated into bills that directs money toward this type of program or projects. It could be an effective mechanism for voluntarily funding this type of project. In the meantime, it would be prudent to postpone the weatherization discussion to allow for a third member to join the board.

Ms. Burns solicited public comments but hearing none, moved on to the heat pump proposal.

### **Heat Pumps**

The incentive would be raised to reimburse \$750 per ton up to \$4500 with the weatherization adder at \$500 and the whole-home adder at \$1000. The budget for this program this fiscal year is \$50,000. Mr. Reive concurred, and Ms. Burns requested a motion seeing no public comments or questions.

**Seeing no public comments or questions Mr. Reive put forth a motion to approve the new heat pump incentive and Ms. Burns seconded. The vote passed unanimously.**

### **Solar**

Ms. Burns requested Ms. Bennett elaborate on solar incentives. Ms. Bennett stated the average system size in Hingham is around 8kW.

Mr. Girardi joined the conversation to share his observations. From 2019 to 2021 the Light plant was in the SMART program during which eighteen (18) people adopted rooftop solar generation. In 2022, there have already been seventeen (17) applications in less than 6 months. Two (2) of those applications are for system size increases while fifteen (15) are new install applicants. On Thursday alone three (3) inspections are scheduled. With a higher turnaround time, more applications are coming in. Once a home goes through the rapid shut down test, rebates process quickly. Ms. Burns confirmed that means people are using this rebate? Mr. Girardi confirmed as much listing several battery projects currently processing as examples.

Ms. Burns asked if people are sizing their solar arrays based on future plans to move to heat pumps? Mr. Girardi responded that some already have heat pumps, many have electric vehicles, and many are trying to get to 100% output.

Ms. Burns then asked for questions or comments from staff or members of the public.

John Borger described his vision of making residential solar arrays affordable to the average person. Mr. Borger continued by drawing attention to how the current incentive system is skewed to favor wealthier ratepayers and would like to see how this particular rebate would fit into the larger financial picture. What impact will changing the incentives environment have compared to the state and federal level rebates?

Ms. Bennett interjected to clarify that people can still offset loads up to 5kW, just not all the way up to the larger 10kW systems.

Ms. Burns emphasized that Concord and Belmont are in markedly different positions. Concord has distribution issues related to solar adoption saturation, but Hingham is not there yet and need not lower incentives.

Mr. Girardi added that demographics are different around town in that 10kW system can cost \$30,000, in many situations paid for with loans. Both smaller and larger homes are adopting solar, mostly equally. Depending on the continuing level of adoption it is essential to monitor winding ratios and the risk of back feeding. Need to work with everyone on these topics to maintain 240 volts +/- 5% consistently to customers.

Mr. Morahan recommended caution in incentivizing people to effectively reduce the Light Plant's revenue, particularly without reducing maintenance and operational costs.

Ms. Burns raised the need for continuing ratio analysis: how do heat pump, battery, and solar incentives net out in terms of revenue to the Light Plant? Projections largely depend on the adoption levels observed by each program. Mr. Morahan added that even with the battery incentive there is an operational need for some control over batteries for better managing peak loads.

## **Batteries**

Mr. Borger reoriented the conversation on batteries. The prospect of paying \$10,000- \$20,000 for capturing full solar production is not ideal. An ideal incentive would encourage houses to lower their carbon footprint. Is there a way to reward early adopters perhaps with a portfolio approach that optimizes electrification? For each applicant perhaps there is an effective sliding scale that recognizes the value of further electrification.

Ms. Burns noted it is an interesting idea. The Board should have a working meeting with Ms. Bennett sometime in the next week or two to further develop these ideas. Also allows for the opportunity to include a third board member. For now, it means leaving the current solar incentive in place. It is a generous incentive compared to any other light plant. The battery incentive will need to incorporate some means by which the Light Plant has sufficient control to manage peak loads. At the moment there is no agreed upon system for doing so yet. Mr. Morahan expressed his agreement.

Ms. Burns stated the working meeting will be a good opportunity to resolve the intricacies of the weatherization, solar, and battery incentive proposals.

## **Municipal Solar – Draft Plan – Laura Burns**

**Ms. Burns requested, and Mr. Reive put forth a motion to advance the Municipal Solar discussion up on the agenda, Ms. Burns seconded. The vote passed unanimously.**

Ms. Burns provided an update on the report analyzing the possibility of putting solar panels on municipal buildings. Key factors included layout and the pros and cons of various ownership options: the Town, the Light Plant, and/or third-party ownership. It does not appear a "one size fits all" option is available. Each project may require a different answer. For instance, school ownership with a bond from the Town makes sense whereas public safety is not presently interested in adding this type of project to their bonding. Numbers for current capacity will need to be calculated and incorporated prior to report endorsement. Third party ownership has advantages where mandated system upgrades would be paid by the third party rather than tax or ratepayers. Maintenance costs are another comparable, important consideration.

Funding will likely be different with every project based upon speaking with a sample of five to six developers. The low net metering rate in the Town may be an obstacle to creating deals. Though difficult, it would not be impossible as at least one company has investors who will take lower returns on investment in order to promote solar adoption by non-profit organizations. Solar infrastructure does not experience transmission losses that need to be addressed.

Ms. Burns provided the report recommendations as follows: the Light Board should appoint a task force of three (3) citizen volunteers for promoting solar on municipal buildings. Some tasks the group would take on could

include establishing a scope of work for a project manager, developing a request for proposal, exploring a comprehensive solution via town meeting (school committee or town meeting property assignments like with the landfill requires town meeting approval), and gathering estimates for municipal solar while setting interim goals.

Ms. Burns continued generally that a short-term committee could get the project moving forward. Preliminary conversations were politically favorable but resources are limited. We might recommend adjusting the net metering policy to incentivize larger projects. Packaging several projects together may be more cost effective.

Ms. Burns solicited comments from Mr. Reive who responded that a large amount of work has been put into this, it's a good idea, and he's very supportive.

Mr. Morahan also agreed and promoted the concept of economies of scale on larger projects.

**Seeing no public comments or questions, Ms. Burns requested, and Mr. Reive put forth a motion to endorse the report's recommendation to establish a three (3) citizen task force, including a member of the Light Board staff, for promoting solar projects on municipal buildings. Ms. Burns seconded. The vote passed unanimously.**

### **Overview of PSNY Credit and Power Cost Adjustment (PCA)**

Ms. Burns raised the matter of the Power Cost Adjustment, an item on the Light Plant's bill adjusted quarterly responsive to energy costs. How would a power cost adjustment line-item work? It is not a rate, it is a statute, legislatively provided to the Light Plant in order to have the ability to adjust to absorb higher energy production costs.

*The Massachusetts General Laws Section, Chapter 164, Section 94(G) outlines how fuel related electric utility expenses may be recovered through the use of a Fuel Charge. The following is an excerpt from Chapter 164, Section 94G.*

(b) The department may approve an itemized fuel charge in rates filed by electric companies to reflect changes in prudently incurred reasonable costs of fuels and power purchased by such companies. Such fuel charge may be based on reasonable estimates of the total costs of fuel to be used in generating or supplying electricity to customers and power purchased for resale to customers, as appropriate in accordance with the company's fuel charge rate schedule, during the quarter in which the charge shall apply. The burden of proof shall be upon the utility company to demonstrate the reasonableness of energy expenses sought to be recovered through the fuel charge. The fuel charge shall be billed to all customers of the company at uniform per kilowatt-hour rates and the total amount of such costs to a customer shall be itemized on the customer's bill. Such rates may be time-differentiated but shall not otherwise differ among classes of customers or by the amount of a customer's usage.

*Section 94 allows electric utilities to recover the cost of fuel related expenses without the need to file a cost of service study or new rates when the fuel expenses change from time to time. This law was enacted to enable electric utilities to pass on fuel cost price fluctuations to their customers without the need for a rate filing. Some municipal electric utilities choose to adjust their PCAs or Fuel Charge monthly while others make the adjustment less frequently.*

Mr. Morahan displayed a graph showing energy costs over the past four (4) years. Prices are much higher now than in previous years around May or June. Ms. Burns requested cost projections. Mr. Morahan explained the projected pricing is based on higher demand during the summer months. The current plan is to adjust quarterly going forward.

Ms. Burns thanked Mr. Morahan, the graph was interesting to see and should be placed on the website. Ms. Burns solicited comments or thoughts, hearing none, proceeded to the next agenda item.

### **Net Metering – Michael Reive**

Ms. Burns began the metering policy discussion having previously discussed the matter extensively with Mr. Reive.

Mr. Reive wanted to explore the specific methodology for incentivizing household plans to get to net zero, particularly those who adopt solar without the assumption of using a battery to smooth peaks and valleys of annual heating and cooling costs. The industry standard is to offer a 1:1 net metering policy. Our current policy is a disincentive to adopting solar.

Ms. Burns explained the reason why 1:1 net metering is not offered is because the current arrangement necessarily places some of the costs of distribution back on the distributed generators. This is particularly crucial for a small company. Investor-owned utilities are required to net-meter under state law. Different light plants adjust using different strategies to address these factors. For example, one possibility would be a specified distribution cost but the Light Plant previously reconsidered that type of policy as it made little logical sense during periods where electricity was not being distributed.

Mr. Reive responded that people with solar arrays want to generate their own power for their own consumption, not act as wider scale producers. The grid is already in place and it does not represent an additional cost to put excess power back on the grid. A 1:1 net metering program would cost the Light Plant next to nothing in order to incentivize distributed solar. Without reactive power, voltage goes down. At the residential level, the Light Plant needs a 1:1 net metering policy. The most power is produced during the summer months. The Light Plant wants people to move to electric and wants people to get as close to net zero as possible.

Ms. Burns stated that offering lower net metering to larger projects would not have the desired result and asked Mr. Girardi what role distributed solar fills on the Hingham grid in terms of management and reliability?

Mr. Girardi began by acknowledging reactive power is good but the Light Plant has a relatively fixed income per year and just to deploy one truck with two linemen is expensive for the Town. There are costs to maintain the plant and general distribution systems. Using solar at the high school as an example, the thermal loading issue is expensive in wiring and labor. Additionally, the billing system is presently only set up for receive and deliver. A true net metering policy would require changes to that system.

Ms. Burns listed various costs, including those related to connection that are easy to define, but also more ambiguous ones related to system improvements. What other categories of costs are notable?

Mr. Girardi continued by stating that substation upgrades, costing at least \$100,000, would become necessary at close to saturation. While there are benefits, even deploying a singular truck is expensive. Ms. Burns clarified that there are benefits that are harder to quantify that should be included as part of a holistic rate study. Mr. Reive expressed his agreement adding the price to replacing wires and adjusting the portfolio but those are small costs compared to promoting residential solar.

Ms. Burns asked Mr. Girardi about swapping meters. Mr. Girardi responded that each one represents a high, definable cost. Using Hershey Street as example, there were no complaints regarding the net metering policy. Ms. Burns and Mr. Reive emphasized the general importance of incentivizing and the need to study and quantify costs and benefits. Could that be incorporated into the rate study?

Mr. Morahan said the rate study typically starts in the Fall or later depending on other factors and takes about three (3) months to accomplish. Rate studies must be cost based because of Chapter 164 so a separate study would probably be a better option for incorporating benefits.

Ms. Burns noted that Municipal Light Plants are inconsistent on this type of policy. Mr. Morahan described Hull's policy with zero incentives but Hull does offer net metering at the retail rate less a charge of \$20 per month on a 10kW system. Mr. Morahan suggested reaching out to an Analysis Group for pricing on a cost versus benefits analysis that could work cohesively with the normal rate study. Mr. Morahan stated that the cost of this type of study would be substantial. Ms. Burns expressed that the Board would support expending the cost of doing such a study. Ms. Burns stated that she had some additional contacts that might be able to help with such a study.



## **Resilience of HMLP Distribution System – Michael Reive**

Mr. Reive advocated for a broad scale look at resiliency. The Light Plant needs to maintain a reliable flow of electricity even as our supply shifts. Surging energy prices need to be weighed against energy security. Some important resiliency questions relevant to us include: how resilient is our transmission and distribution infrastructure? How should we manage our underground powerline network? How will sea level rise and other environmental factors impact us? Should we follow the example of Texas and California where many transformer stations have been moved to higher ground? Should we plan for greater distance between transformers? Do we have sufficient redundancy if one circuit goes down? Catastrophic events and supply chain issues all fall under the category of resiliency and we need to study it, discuss it, and implement it into a comprehensive plan.

Ms. Burns recommended a working meeting to further discuss which Mr. Reive agreed to.

## **Update On Process to Fill Board Vacancy – Michael Reive**

Ms. Burns provided an update on the process for filling the vacant position on board. There are currently three applications submitted to Town Hall with at least one more likely to be added.

## **Financials**

### **i) 3 year summary and YTD – April 2022**

#### **[Financials]**

Mr. Morahan led the financials discussion.

April was in line with past years, 14 million kWh sold, revenue down and expenses up. The net income was \$190,000, kWh sold were a little less than last year. Year to date kWh sold are up, revenue slightly down, expenses are up. Year to date revenue is down 1%, operating costs up 4%, expenses up 5%.

Budgeted for about \$576,000 net operating income by this point in the year but the current figure is about \$32,000. The PCA will be increased to make up the shortfall.

Overall energy expenses are up by 17%. Some recent unanticipated expenses were discovered. Inspection of insulators on the transmission line in April and May revealed deterioration so those will need to be replaced. Three wooden structures on Hobart Street are compromised by Woodpeckers and will need to be replaced at an estimated cost around \$500,000 next year.

Ms. Burns noted those expenses are not presently on the capital plan.

Mr. Morahan stated that those expenses will be added as figures are adjusted on the capital budget.

## **Updates: Battery Storage, Additional Transmission Line and New Substation, EV Chargers, HMLP Solar**

Ms. Burns requested updates regarding the battery storage system. Mr. Morahan acknowledged the ongoing issues with the battery storage system however, it did save \$30,000 through avoided charges on transmission by peak shaving over the year. A breaker tripped in the battery; the part will be replaced in the coming weeks but unfortunately it has inhibited participation in the regulation market in the meantime. If the system operates at the peak in July, we will have a better idea of financial benefit of the battery system on an annual basis.

Ms. Burns moved on to the topic of the transmission station. Mr. Morahan noted there are public meetings coming up in Late August and September in Weymouth and costs from Eversource for the Weymouth station should be available by the end of July or August.

Ms. Burns requested a status update on electric vehicle chargers. Mr. Morahan noted the Attorney General issue with bidding that was resolved last week. A contract will be awarded soon and we are looking to hire a contractor by the end of July. Ms. Burns also requested an updated about the solar at the light plant. Mr. Morahan said he is working on a bid package that should be ready in late July or August.

### **Motion to Adjourn**

**Ms. Burns asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Reive moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Burns seconded the motion. All were in favor.**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 0927.

### **List of Documents Provided to Board Members for the Meeting**

- Hingham Solar Assesment
- HMLP Board Meeting Agenda 6-28-22
- HMLP Board Meeting Minutes 6-06-22
- HMLP Board Meeting Minutes 6-01-22
- HMLP Board Meeting Minutes 6-13-22
- HMLP Board Meeting Minutes 6-15-22
- HMLP Incentive Policy 6.01.22
- HMLP Incentive Program – Solar & Batteries
- HMLP Incentive Program – Heat Pumps
- HMLP Incentive Program – Weatherization
- HMLP’s Energy Charge represents HMLP
- kWh cost from 2019 to present with graph
- PCA Explanation
- PSNY Credit

### **Documents Shared During Meeting**

- John McDonough — Powerpoint Presentation
- Tom Morahan — 4-year retrospective energy pricing graph
- Tom Morahan — Financials Spreadsheet