



---

## Regional Infrastructure Planning – Planning Process Working Group

---

**Meeting Date:** December 12, 2012 **Time:** 9:30 am – 4:30 pm

**Location:** 2300 Yonge Street, 25<sup>th</sup> Floor, North Hearing room

**Board Staff:** Chris Cincar, Ashley Hayle, Andres Mand

Board staff explained that the purpose of the fourth Planning Process Working Group (“PPWG”) meeting was to address the following:

1. Discuss and finalize the draft Meeting Notes from the previous meeting;
2. Address items that require further discussion
  - Broader stakeholder consultation process
  - Revisions to flowchart - Regional Infrastructure Planning Process
3. Discuss PPWG Report to the Board and Next Steps

### Discussion of Draft Meeting Summary

Some minor revisions were identified in relation to the draft meeting summary. A transmitter noted that the final paragraph discussing the consultation process needed to be revised and agreed to provide the revised text. Distributors noted that additional text was required in relation to the end of the regional coordination of the smart grid section and they would provide it.

**ACTION: TRANSMITTER AND LDCs TO PROVIDE SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE MEETING SUMMARY.**

## Items that require further discussion

### Broader stakeholder consultation process

Board staff noted different views remained in terms of when broader stakeholder consultation should take place in the regional planning process.

The OPA noted that the appropriate point in the regional planning process where consultation should occur is after the need has been defined and the various options have been identified.

AMO suggested consultation with municipalities should take place before broader stakeholder consultation occurs.

The discussion focused on coordination between utilities and municipalities.

There was general agreement that there already is good coordination between utility staff and municipal planning staff. However, the concern identified was the lack of engagement and support provided at the municipal mayor/councillor level.

A transmitter noted the Official Plan related to land use planning is updated every five years and raised a question to what extent distributors participate in the process as it appears that electrical considerations are not reflected in the Official Plan. A distributor noted that planning electricity infrastructure is generally more reactive at the distribution level and more proactive at the transmission level in relation to municipal land use planning.

A transmitter identified the need for municipalities to inform them of where growth will take place as that informs what and where transmission infrastructure will be needed and allows for more flexibility in terms of long term solutions.

A distributor noted that improved coordination and consultation will likely be facilitated by a more structured approach to regional infrastructure planning in relation to electricity.

### Revisions to flowchart - Regional Infrastructure Planning Process

There were a number of suggestions made in relation to revising the flowchart setting out the regional infrastructure planning process. The PPWG agreed on most of the changes and Board staff agreed to make the changes and a revised version would be circulated by to the PPWG for further review.

There was one suggested change where there was not agreement. The flowchart has a line separating the OPA IRRP process and the Regional Infrastructure Planning process. One of the concerns raised by a transmitter was that two boxes – “Scoping Regional Planning Study” and “Regional Planning Approach” – were identified as being part of the Regional Infrastructure Planning process and the PPWG had

concluded the OPA should take the lead on those two stages. The transmitter therefore suggested those two boxes should be moved over to the IRRP process. However, it was noted that those two boxes were part of the Regional Infrastructure Planning process and should remain where they were.

**ACTION: BOARD STAFF TO MAKE AGREED UPON REVISIONS TO THE FLOWCHART TO REFLECT THE DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING AND CIRCULATE IT TO THE PPWG FOR REVIEW.**

## PPWG Report to the Board and Next Steps

Board staff proposed an outline in relation to the PPWG's report to the Board as follows:

1. Introduction (Board Report expectations, working group process, etc.)
2. Overview of regional infrastructure planning process (flowchart - stages regional infrastructure planning process)
3. Elements of the regional infrastructure planning process (i.e., PPWG decided upon in terms of the elements in Board staff Memorandum)
4. Appendices
  - a. Appendix – Detailed explanation of each stage in the regional infrastructure planning process
  - b. Appendix – OPA Load forecast information document
  - c. Appendix – Description of the Integrated Regional Resource Planning (IRRP) process
  - d. Appendix – Maps setting out regions
  - e. Appendix – Table (Distributors in each region)
  - f. Appendix – List of current and planned regional planning studies
  - g. Appendix – High Level Terms of Reference template
  - h. Appendix – Detailed Terms of Reference template
  - i. Appendix – Screen Summary template
  - j. Appendix – List of PPWG members
  - k. Appendix – Board staff Memorandum

The PPWG agreed with the outline set out above. However, the PPWG also identified the need for an additional section discussing a “Transition Process”. In relation to the transition process, Hydro One raised the challenges related to the management and prioritization of about 20 regional planning processes for distributor rate application purposes (i.e., 7 per year). Questions were also raised regarding when the Board would start requiring regional infrastructure plans to support applications and how the existing regional plans would be dealt with. A further question raised was how often the process set out in the PPWG report should be reviewed and revised.

In terms of the final element in the Board staff Memorandum (“Changes to Board’s regulatory instruments to support process”), the PPWG agreed with Board staff’s suggested approach to address that element once a draft report was completed and that Board staff would undertake to draft this section for review by the PPWG.

The PPWG also agreed to a process whereby Board staff would prepare an initial draft report for review and initial comments would be provided by the PPWG members via e-mail. There would then be at least one more PPWG meeting in January to finalize the report.

The PPWG also expressed its desire to get broader input from the industry and other stakeholders before the report was finalized and provided to the Board. The PPWG also requested use of the OEB website to facilitate that broader stakeholdering process.

While the PPWG understood that the Board would not approve its report to the Board, members of the PPWG raised questions regarding what the Board would do with report once it was finalized and provided to the Board by the PPWG. The PPWG also raised questions regarding how the process in the report would be formally established and rolled out. The PPWG therefore desired clarity.

**ACTION: BOARD STAFF TO INQUIRE INTERNALLY AS TO WHETHER THE PPWG'S REQUEST TO USE THE OEB WEBSITE CAN BE ACCOMMODATED IN RELATION TO FACILITATING THE PPWG GETTING BROADER STAKEHOLDERS INPUT ON THEIR REPORT TO THE BOARD.**

## **Other Matters**

The role of the IESO in the regional infrastructure planning process was also discussed during the meeting. The PPWG agreed that the IESO has a key role at the front end of the process where the Needs Screening assessment is carried out (in determining whether the ORTAC reliability standards have been met by the regional plan, particularly when it involves interpretation issues) and at the back end of the process when System Impact Assessments (SIA) are carried out in assessing whether the regional infrastructure plan would trigger any system reliability issues.

In terms of the regional plans done to date, it was noted the level of IESO involvement in the full regional planning process has differed based on the needs of each regional plan but the IESO is always involved at the Needs Screening stage and from there the IESO essentially has a standing invitation to participate.

The PPWG agreed that the IESO's role in the process needed to be reflected in the PPWG report to the Board.

### *Next Scheduled Meeting*

January 2013 (Specific date to be determined)