



Flexible Load Management Working Group

Friday, June 13, 2025

10:00 am – 11:00 am

Attendees

Alek Antczak (PSD), Zach Casey (GMP), Lou Cecere (PSD), Brian Cotterill (PSD), David Westman (EVT), Garth Dunkel (VPPSA), Hantz Presume (VELCO), Jasmine Rivest (EVT), Jonathan Dowds (REV), Morgan Casella (Dynamic Organics), Philip Picotte (PSD), Jeremy Ravenelle (GMP), Shana Louiselle (VELCO), Tom Lyle (BED), Lucas Looman (VELCO), Melinda Humphrey (GMP), Michael Lazorchak (SED), Jeremy Ravenelle (GMP), Brian Evans-Mongeon (HPE), John Abbott (VPPSA), Louis Porter (WEC), TJ Poor (PSD), Marc Allen (VELCO), Kamran Hassan (GMP)

Meeting Notes

Philip introduced the today's conversation as a continuation of the last meeting, which ended with a request to understand Efficiency Vermont's "status quo" role in flexible load management (FLM). There was some disagreement of what the status quo is, and Efficiency Vermont (EVT) circulated a list of EVT and distribution utility (DU) roles earlier in the week.

Philip showed a slide of takeaways from May's meeting, with general agreement that EVT should pursue "enablement" of flexible loads that DUs can "activate," and, that EVT's focuses should be market transformation and supply chain interactions. He noted that Scott Johnstone brought up DU equity, and Sarah Braese warned about the cost of maintaining programs in the long run.

Dave Westman said EVT does support statewide efforts and also specific DU programs, such as large C&I projects. For example, a large-scale electric water heater's FLM capability was incentivized with EVT's electric efficiency charge (EEC) designated for FLM. Lessons from one category—such as HVAC flexing—can be applied to other categories. EVT is also supporting WEC with residential-sector FLM.

Dave Westman sought to describe the boundary between EVT and DU roles. DUs develop rates and create the benefits for activation and participation, including how to balance carrots and sticks for participation. EVT's mandate is to support customers doing load controls, and controls have been common in the efficiency field for 20 years. EVT supports the customer with investments that will allow a seamless handoff into the utility program.

Mike Lazorchak requested that EVT involve DUs at the front-end of customer-initiated projects. This would allow the DU involvement and hand-off to be smoother. Mike also said that customers notice when other DUs offer programs that Stowe Electric cannot because smaller DUs lack the infrastructure for it. Mike emphasized that all DUs want to feel in control when programs roll out.

Dave Westman offered two examples of statewide programs where EVT could help. EVT could bring statewide consistency to tricky measures, such as flexible water heaters, or support new areas, such as EV charging. He noted that budgets are approved by the Public Utility Commission (PUC), and unspent FLM funds are returned to ratepayers or reassigned for future FLM spending.

List of Current Roles (Status Quo Document)

Kamran Hassan said the EVT list of current roles provides EVT's perspective, but not DUs' views of the status quo. He suggested that each DU comment on the roles as laid out in the status quo document because each DU has a different relationship with EVT. In addition, each DU can say whether or not changes are desired. This is a step before conserving regional or DU-specific equity.

Dave Westman said that the operating procedures agreed to with VPPSA in a past MOU are broadly applicable to all DU relationships. Alek Antczak asked if DUs agree with EVT's take on how the relationship is working, and if there are places where the relationship does not exist but want it to in the future.

Brian Evans-Mongeon said that the Village of Hyde Park Electric (HPE) Department is willing to be part of conversations once HPE is able to deploy relevant technologies and services, but that ability is still in the future.

Michael Lazorchak said that, similarly, Stowe would be interested in being able to make use of EVT's FLM offerings once it makes sense for Stowe, but that it's incumbent on the DUs to trigger EVT at that time. Michael is not interested in changing that dynamic.

Questions for DUs

TJ Poor said that it's ideal to answer these questions before EVT submits its filings for the Demand Resources Plan proceeding. Written comments are needed from DUs about:

1. Are DU and EVT roles accurately described in the Status Quo document?
2. Does the DU currently use each FLM identified in the Status Quo document?
3. Does the DU believe the roles should change going forward?

TJ said the Department of Public Service is going to summarize responses and written comments are necessary to draw upon. Dave Westman added a fourth question:

4. What FLM roles and responsibilities for DUs should be documented on the second page of the Status Quo document?

Brian Evans-Mongeon cautioned against HPE customers paying for statewide programs that do not benefit them. HPE customers should not pay until HPE is ready to activate flexible load. TJ Poor said he's trying to think of a mechanism to influence that and suggested participating in the DRP proceeding. Doing nothing will lead to a Demand Resources Plan that repeats the current setup.

Zach Casey asked about what it means for FLM funds to be restricted to FLM efforts in EVT's budget. Dave Westman said that unspent funds get credited to customers on an annual basis through rate credits. (The EEC rate calculation is done every year, so funds can be carried over or returned through lower rates.) Dave said that EVT already has equity requirements for regional or county-level benefits.