



Meeting Summary

Regional Planning Process Advisory Group

Meeting Date: February 10, 2016 **Time:** 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Location: 2300 Yonge Street, 25th Floor, West Hearing Room

Attendees:

RPPAG Members: Irv Klajman (Powerstream) (Chair), Iain Angus (City of Thunder Bay), Jake Brooks (APPrO), Kathy Brown (AMO), Dan Charron (Entegrus), Bob Chow (IESO), Edith Chin (Enbridge), Wade Morris (Innisfil Hydro), Bruno Pereira (Milton Hydro), Ray E. Quinn (Northern Region), Bing Young (Hydro One)

OEB Staff: Chris Cincar, Emay Cowx (Consultant), Andres Mand, Azalyn Manzano

Meeting Agenda:

1. Review of Last Meeting Notes
2. Meeting Items
 - a) Hydro One's Revised Local Planning Document
 - b) Revising Terms of Reference to Broaden Scope of RPPAG
 - c) Develop Survey Tool to Measure Effectiveness of Regional Planning Process
3. Other Business
4. Next Meeting

1. Review of Last Meeting Minutes

The group reviewed the previous Meeting Summary notes (December 3, 2015).

RPPAG Members approved the final document for posting on the OEB website without changes.

2. Meeting Items

a) Hydro One's Revised Local Planning Document

Hydro One's revised document identified several key considerations with which local study teams could decide whether or not to proceed to the Scoping Assessment phase.

The following revisions were suggested to further clarify the document:

- Spell out DG and CDM (no acronyms).
- Combine paragraph 2 and 4 as they are almost identical.
- Move paragraph 3 down to just before the last paragraph.
- Emphasize that if the study team had any doubts, the project would proceed to Scoping Assessment phase.

A few points were noted in the group discussion:

- It is up to the local study team, with their knowledge of local area and the data available to them, to decide what would make the most sense/be the most efficient way to meet identified needs.
- The key considerations listed, without any particular order of priority, function as decision criteria.
- Every area is different.
- Some needs can be addressed between a limited number of partners, or even just one LDC.
- If there is any doubt at all about which course of action to take, or if there is additional information needed, then it should proceed to a full scoping process; it can still go to Local Planning after the scoping process.
- There is an assumption that the decision is made by consensus.
- Even if the solution is a wires approach, the scoping assessment may come up with a different/more efficient wires approach.
- Even simple wires solutions may have other considerations such as the need for stakeholder consultations, possible upstream impact (with cost elements) and, government policies that may be at play (e.g. the Northwest).
- Early stakeholder consultation, with the opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback (especially municipal stakeholders) helps to facilitate understanding and acceptance.
- Engagement is done as part of the IRRP, not the RIP. The needs assessment process assumes that load forecasts (as input) have been developed with some knowledge of regional growth plans, and in consultation with municipalities. It is further backstopped by the development of the asset management plans in DSPs.

- Some LDCs and municipalities have good relationships, and some don't. Highly dense communities differ from smaller communities (e.g. size of loads, impact on the system, uncertainties happening in the community).
- In Northwestern Ontario, most projects are step change load driven by the mines on Crown lands; projects also tend to default automatically to IRRP. In the Northeast, there is no energy task force like the Northwest does.

It was reiterated that the OEB set up the regional planning process to streamline rate cases, by making sure that any investments made by the utility already had the benefit of a review and coordination between different components.

The group confirmed that the document will be added to the PPWG report as an appendix.

Action Item:

- **Hydro One will revise the document and circulate the draft among group members for review.**

b) Revising Terms of Reference to Broaden Scope of RPPAG

At the previous meeting, the group decided to draft a letter to Peter Fraser, the Executive Sponsor of the RPPAG, requesting the expansion of the group's mandate and scope to include the IRRP process. The RPPAG was originally established to monitor and make recommendations about the regional planning process. It was understood that the group's scope was limited to "wires" solutions only (RIP), but that the group reserved the right to review its scope later on. The group has previously refrained from commenting on applications that were on IRRP, but given that the IRRP feeds into the RIP process, the group determined that it would be logical to include the IRRP in its mandate.

OEB Staff reported that minor recommendations to the RPPAG Terms of Reference would be approved by OEB Staff. Process recommendations however, would have to be a recommendation to the Board, regardless of the magnitude of the change.

There was some discussion as to whom the draft letter should be sent to first, Peter Fraser (OEB) or Bruce Campbell (IESO). OEB Staff reminded the group that the IRRP process is not under the OEB's jurisdiction and would have to be a joint decision between the OEB and the IESO at the executive level. The group referred to examples where there is regulatory ambiguity and where different bodies had shared responsibilities.

It was suggested that the draft be revised to reflect this, and then have the letter sent to the OEB and let the Board advise the group as to whether or not the proposal was acceptable.

OEB Staff also suggested looking into the adequacy of the IRRP report as an input into the RIP process, and evaluating the process that went into the IRRP, rather than the outcomes. This is again taking into account the original purpose of the regional planning process from the Board's point of view: to assure the Board that certain requirements, which are outside the Board's jurisdiction (e.g. CDM, DG, siting of major generation, etc.), had been satisfied. This frees the OEB to focus on deciding on an optimal wires solution.

One member observed that discussions on having a group evaluate all the components of the regional planning process have been brought up many times in different venues, but that no one has yet made a committee to fill the gap. Given that the RPPAG is already established and has the capacity and experience to fill the gap, perhaps the group's mandate can be expanded. Another member observed that given the 35-month timeline for the whole end-to-end regional planning process, it would be worth it to find some way to make the process more efficient.

There were several points of contention during the discussion:

- Whether or not the content of the letter should be a straight request to expand the group's scope and mandate, or if the letter should ask the Board to clarify the group's mandate before requesting it to be expanded.
- Whether or not the letter should be revised to put forward the rationale that the mandate should be expanded due to overlapping processes between the RIP and IRRP, and effect of the various components of the IRRP process on the RIP (e.g. engagement process).
- Whether the group was looking to get into the IRRP process, or was simply trying to make plain the understanding that the IRRP process touches on the RIP, and that the RPPAG would make their recommendations accordingly.

The group voted seven to four, with the majority in favour of sending the letter to request an expansion of RPPAG's scope, prefaced by a statement asking for clarification on the RPPAG's ability to go beyond the RIP and examine areas where the RIP and IRRP overlap.

Action Item:

- **The Chair will revise the document and circulate the draft among group members for review.**

c) Develop Survey Tool to Measure Effectiveness of Regional Planning Process

The surveys were revised based on the comments from the previous meeting.

Suggestions for this round of drafts included:

- Adding a separate button in the participant identification/demographic section specifically for municipal representatives approached for input during the Needs/Scoping Assessment process.
- Change the wording in the Scoping Assessment survey:
 - Question 5A: from “was the study area appropriately sized” to “were the geographic boundaries of the study area appropriate?”
 - Question 5B: from “were the sub-regions properly identified” to “were the boundaries of the sub-regions appropriate?”
- Have each set of questions on a separate page, with a visible progress bar to make the Scoping Assessment survey less overwhelming.
- There will also be a tracking mechanism (e.g. drop-down list of regions) in the survey to make it clear to the survey participant which region/sub-region they are answering the survey for (in case the person answering participates in the Assessment of more than one region/sub-region). The list of regions will be refreshed periodically.

There was some discussion as to the role of municipal representatives in providing information for the DSP, which is then used as input into the Needs Assessment process.

There was also some discussion regarding the geographic boundaries of the 21 Regions identified by the Scoping Assessments. The Regions were established on the electrical level, which some stakeholders may feel are inappropriate (e.g. the possibility that some municipalities could have been cut in half by some boundaries).

The surveys will be rendered with SurveyMonkey, and beta-tested with volunteers from the Northwest Region and the AMO (to represent the municipalities) and Milton Hydro (to represent the LDCs).

In terms of logistics, the surveys will be issued by the lead author of the reports (e.g. Lead Transmitter for the Needs Assessment, IESO for the Scoping Assessment).

Hydro One also proposed that the OEB Consultant also draft a survey for the RIP, given that there are now several completed and published RIPs.

Action Item:

- **The OEB Consultant will revise both surveys, render them into Survey Monkey, beta-test and then report back at the next meeting.**

3. Other Business

a) Internal Rules and Procedures

The group debated internal rules and procedures for decision-making. The group agreed to have two-thirds of the membership (eight out of 12 RPPAG members listed in the Terms of Reference) present and voting to carry a motion, and to table any dissenting comments.

A quorum of 2/3 of the membership would need to be present for voting to transpire.

Action Item:

- **OEB Staff to issue the current member list and confirm at next meeting.**

b) Length of Meetings

In response to a query by a group member, OEB Staff clarified that there is an intent to always close the meeting by 3:00 p.m.

Action Items:

- **At the next meeting:**
 - **The group will review status updates for the Activity Table listed in Appendix 1 of the RPPAG Terms of Reference.**
 - **Hydro One will present an update on the RIPs that are planned, currently on-going, and completed.**
 - **IESO will present an update on their experience and learnings to date with LACs.**
 - **Review of member list**

4. Next Meeting

The next RPPAG meeting will be on April 26, 2016.