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A snapshot of rate design activity

CA IOUs: Increased minimum bill, flattened tiered rate

APS: Capacity charge of $0.70/kW; considering three-part rates for all customers; value of solar study underway

MN Utilities: Legislation allows utilities to offer value of solar tariff as alternative to net metering

SRP: Approval for three-part rate with time-varying energy charge for DG customers, followed by SolarCity lawsuit

We Energies: Capacity charge of $3.80/kW for rooftop PV, increase in fixed monthly charge for all customers

Westar: Proposed optional three-part rate and/or higher fixed charge for all DG customers and optional for other customers; withdrawn through settlement; will be revisited through generic proceeding

Pepco (DC): Increased fixed monthly charge from $9.25 to $13/month

Illinois: Proposed legislation for mandatory demand charges

NY REV: Aspiring to convert power system to a two-way supply with market mechanisms for DER adoption
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Bonbright’s Ten Commandments

1. Effectiveness in yielding total revenue requirements under the fair-return standard
2. Revenue stability and predictability
3. Stability and predictability of the rates themselves
4. Static efficiency, *i.e.*, discouraging wasteful use of electricity in the aggregate as well as by time of use
5. Reflect all present and future private and social costs in the provision of electricity (*i.e.*, the internalization of all externalities)
6. Fairness in the allocation of costs among customers so that equals are treated equally
7. Avoidance of undue discrimination in rate relationships so as to be, if possible, compensatory (free of subsidies)
8. Dynamic efficiency in promoting innovation and responding to changing demand-supply patterns
9. Simplicity, certainty, convenience of payment, economy in collection, understandability, public acceptability, and feasibility of application
10. Freedom from controversies as to proper interpretation
The “ideal” rate design

Distribution-only utilities should use a three-part rate

- Monthly service charge
- Charge for connected load (or maximum customer demand)
- Maximum demand charge (coincident with the distribution peak)

Utilities that also supply energy should use a five-part rate

- Monthly service charge
- Charge for connected load (or maximum customer demand)
- Maximum demand charge (coincident with the distribution peak)
- Charge for generation capacity
- Time-varying energy charge
Can Fixed Charges be a proxy for Demand Charges?
Many utilities have proposed to increase the fixed charge, with varying degrees of success.

### Recent Proposals to Increase Fixed Charge
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- **Rejected**: 20 proposals
- **Approved**: 31 proposals
- **Pending**: 35 proposals

Average increase = $2.71 (35%)

### Amount of Approved Increase

- Originally Proposed
- Approved Increase
- Previous Fixed Charge

Fixed charges can help to address the “cost shift” problem

In the absence of AMI, rate design options for addressing the cost-shift issues associated with DG adoption and volumetric rates are somewhat limited

Fixed charges are one option for addressing the cost-shift issue that does not require metering upgrades

Some costs, such as metering, billing, and general overhead are clearly fixed and vary with the number of customers, not with the amount of electricity consumed
But increasing the fixed charge is difficult

Change in Bill with Revenue Neutral Increase in Fixed Charge

Notes:
Old rate assumes $10/month fixed charge and 11.2 cents/kWh volumetric charge.
New rate assumes $40/month fixed charge and 8.3 cents/kWh volumetric charge.

Smaller customers
Stakeholders are strongly opposing an increase in fixed charges

“Utilities don’t need higher fixed charges when they have decoupling”

“An increase in the fixed charge will automatically penalize low income customers, because they are small customers”

“Long-run marginal costs are almost all variable, so fixed charges are not cost-based”

“Fixed charges do not appear in competitive markets, so utilities should not be allowed to offer them”

“Fixed charges will reduce the incentive for energy efficiency”
Stakeholder opposition to fixed charges (concluded)

“Fixed charges are a ‘tax on the sun’; utility scale generators are not charged for distribution costs, so neither should we charge owners of distributed generation”

“Increasing fixed charges only for DG customers is discrimination and an unfair exercise of the utility’s monopoly power”

“The DG subsidy provided through net metering is just one of many embedded in today’s rates and should not be addressed in isolation”

“Fixed charges are a short-sighted fix; in the long-run they will just encourage customers to disconnect from the grid entirely”
The Case for Demand Charges
Some utilities already offer residential demand charges

19 utilities offer residential demand charges, 10 of which are IOUs

They were proposed by Westar, NV Energy, ComEd and are being considered by other utilities.
Demand charges do not automatically increase bills for small customers

- Correlation between bill impact and customer size is stronger with increased fixed charge
- Whether small customers are low income customers is another question entirely...

Note: The three-part rate includes a monthly fixed charge of $10, an energy charge of $0.077/kWh, and a demand charge of $6/kW. The revenue-neutral two-part rate includes a monthly fixed charge of $40 and an energy charge of $0.083/kWh.
Can residential customers understand demand charges?

Anyone who has purchased a light bulb has encountered watts; ditto for anyone who has purchased a hair dryer or an electric iron

Customers often introduced to kWh’s by way of kWs; e.g., if you leave on a 100 watt bulb for 10 hours, it will use 1,000 watt-hours, or one kWh

Similarly, if you run your hair dryer at the same time that someone else is ironing their clothes and lights are on in both bathrooms, the circuit breaker may trip on you since you have exceeded its capacity, expressed in kVA’s or kW’s
Making the Transition
The rate change will affect each customer’s bill differently

Good news: A major cross-subsidy has been removed

Bad news: Some customers will experience bill increases

More good news: Transition plans help facilitate the change for these customers
Stakeholder concerns can be addressed through some new initiatives - 1

Codify and learn from the experience of utilities that have deployed new rates in the US and in Europe

Quantify bill impacts, particularly for low- and moderate income customers

Assess customer understanding of the new rates through market research (interviews, focus groups and surveys) and identify the best way to communicate the concept and to design the rates
Stakeholder concerns can be addressed through some new initiatives - II

Assess customer response to new rates through a new generation of experiments whose design builds on insights gleaned from prior work on time-of-use pricing experiments.

Study ways in which to mitigate financial impact on vulnerable customers, maybe by excluding them initially from the new rates, or by phasing in the rates, or by providing them financial assistance for installing energy efficiency measures.
The transition to new rates will take time and require careful planning.
Further readings


Further readings (continued)


Snook, Leland and Meghan Grabel, “There and back again: Why a residential demand rate developed forty years ago is relevant again,” Public Utilities Fortnightly, November 2015, forthcoming.

Further readings (concluded)


Appendix
Customers don’t need to be electricity experts to understand a demand charge

Responding to a demand charge does not require that the customers know exactly when their maximum demand will occur.

If customers know to avoid the simultaneous use of electricity-intensive appliances, they could easily reduce their maximum demand without ever knowing when it occurs.

This simple message should be stressed in customer marketing and outreach initiatives associated with the demand rate.

Examples from utility websites

- APS: “Limit the number of appliances you use at once during on-peak hours”
- Georgia Power: “Avoid simultaneous use of major appliances. If you can avoid running appliances at the same time, then your peak demand would be lower. This translates to less demand on Georgia Power Company, and savings for you!”
Staggering the use of a few key appliances could lead to significant demand reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appliance</th>
<th>Avg. Demand (kW)</th>
<th>Flexible Load (7.5 kW)</th>
<th>Inflexible Load (1 kW)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dryer</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of some of the appliances is inflexible (1 kW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oven</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of other appliances could be easily staggered to reduce demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simply delaying use of the dryer until after the oven, stove, and hand iron had been turned off would reduce the customer’s maximum demand by 3.5 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand iron</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This would bring the customer’s maximum demand down to 5 kW, a roughly 40% reduction in demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. plug loads</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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