

Energy+Environmental Economics

CPUC ZEV Rate Design Forum Rate Structures Supporting Electrified Transit

08 June 2018

Michele Chait



- Engaged by California Transit Association to examine electric rate structures that are most economic for electrified transit (mainly buses)
- Defined several "bookend" revenue-neutral rate structure scenarios for a medium-sized customer
- Data collected from CTA members to define key technical dimensions for buses, for example:
 - Route profile: daytime vs. commuter.
 - Charging location: overnight vs. two depot commuter
 - Charging: Un-managed vs. 'Smart'
 - **Buses per EVSE: Single** vs. Multiple



 The flexibility of each charging profile determines the extent to which a bus can respond to rate signals

• Flexibility is defined by route length, bus battery size, EVSE power and availability

There is no single rate design that is optimal across all electric bus operations

- With certain charging profiles and smart charging technology, a rate with a demand charge can be the most economic structure
- With other charging profiles, rates with no demand charges can be most economic
- Implies that several rate options for electric transit could be offered

Smart' charging of buses (sequencing + ability to throttle power) leads to lower bills





Default rate structure (blue bars)

- Demand charge (\$/kW-mo max monthly)
- Seasonal and TOU energy (\$/kWh)

Rate Scenario #1 (gold bars)

- No demand charge
- Transmission & distribution costs collected in seasonal and TOU energy rates

Unmanaged Charging Single Bus, Summer Day

+ Daytime Route

- Drives 170 miles
 - 6 am to 8pm
- Charges overnight

+ Commuter Route

- Operates morning and evening but not midday
- Charges midday and overnight (two depots)

60 kW EVSE, 350 kWh bus battery



+ Rate Scenario #1 is most economic for both routes

5





Default rate structure (blue bars)

- Demand charge (maximum monthly)
- Seasonal and TOU energy

Rate Scenario #2 (gold bars)

- No change to demand charge
- TOU energy rates
- Distribution costs collected in energy only during Summer onpeak and Winter mid-peak periods



Unmanaged



Managed

60 kW EVSE, 350 kWh bus battery

Daytime Route can charge over a 10-hour period making rate structure #2 more economic

- 10-hour charging period reduces the <u>demand charge</u> impact
- Rate design reduces energy rates during mid- and off-peak hours
- Daytime route charges during mid- and off-peak periods when energy charges are lower, further improving economics

Rate Scenario #3 No Demand Charge + "Peakier" Energy



Default rate structure (blue bars)

- Demand charge (maximum monthly)
- Seasonal and TOU energy

+ Rate Scenario #3 (gold bars)

- No demand charge
- Transmission and distribution costs collected in TOU energy rates

"Peakier" TOU energy ratios



Unmanaged

Managed



60 kW EVSE, 350 kWh bus battery

+ Commuter Route can charge twice for short periods, yielding best economics under Rate #3

- "Peakier" design reduces energy rates during off-peak hours
- Managed charging enables all charging to occur during off-peak periods with low energy charges



+ Under "smart" scenario, single & multiple Commuter buses can avoid charging during on-peak periods

- No demand charge
- Managed charging enables all charging to occur during mid- and off-peak periods

+ Rate structure #3 remains most economic for this route



	1 Bus Unmanaged charging	1 Bus Smart charging	3 Buses Smart charging
Daytime One Depot	Rate #1	Rate #2	n/a
Commuter Two Depots	Rate #1	Rate #3	Rate #3

- The flexibility of each charging profile determines the extent to which a bus can respond to rate signals
- + There is no single rate design that is optimal across all electric bus operations
 - Implies that several rate options for electric transit could be offered
- Advances in 'Smart' charging technologies could unlock other economic rate designs