



Meeting Summary

Regional Planning Process Advisory Group

Meeting Date: April 26, 2016 **Time:** 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Location: 2300 Yonge Street, 25th Floor, ADR Room

Attendees:

RPPAG Members: Irv Klajman (Powerstream) (Chair), Iain Angus (City of Thunder Bay), Jake Brooks (APPRO), Bob Chow (IESO), Edith Chin (Enbridge), Ajay Garg (Hydro One), Bruno Pereira (Milton Hydro), Ray E. Quinn (Northern Region), Jamie Skimming (City of London/AMO), Bing Young (Hydro One)

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

Guests: Luisa Da Rocha (IESO), Joe Toneguzzo (IESO)

Meeting Agenda:

1. Review of Last Meeting Notes
2. Meeting Items
 - a) Review of Hydro One's Local Planning Document
 - b) IESO Presentation on Integrated Regional Resource Plan (IRRP) Local Advisory Committee (LAC) Engagement
 - c) Hydro One Status Update of Regional Planning Process
 - d) Review of Feedback on Survey Tool Testing Results
 - Transitioning Ownership of the Surveys
 - e) Review Status Updates for Activity Table Listed in Appendix 1 of the RPPAG Terms of Reference (ToR)
 - f) Review of Members List
3. Other Business
4. Next Meeting

1. Review of Last Meeting Notes

The group reviewed the previous Meeting Summary notes (February 10, 2016).¹

RPPAG Members did not raise any concerns related to the February 10th draft version. It will therefore be posted on the OEB website without changes.

2. Meeting Items

a) Review of Hydro One's Local Planning Document

Prior to the presentation, the Group discussed several considerations for the study team. For example, study team consensus should be required to go directly to Local Planning from the Needs Assessment stage. Also discussed were what steps would be taken if there was not study team consensus.

Hydro One stated that they believed it would be no different than regional planning and, if there is any doubt, it would move on to the Scoping Assessment process to determine the appropriate planning approach.

Hydro One also noted that so far there have been no situations where a dissenting opinion has been tabled; i.e., study teams ultimately achieves consensus.

The Group suggested that Hydro One add that the study team should need to achieve consensus and, where that was not achieved, the planning approach should be determined through a Scoping Assessment process.

Action Item:

- **Hydro One will go over examples of Local Planning with OEB staff before coming back to the Group to present them.**

b) Presentation on IRRP Local Advisory Committee (LAC) Engagement

Luisa Da Rocha gave a presentation on IESO's work on regional planning, with a focus on their engagement approach and IESO's experience with the initial LACs (i.e., lessons learned).

Eight IRRPs have been posted on the IESO website, with an additional eight in process, straddled between Group 1, Group 1B and Group 2. Planning has started for the final group (Group 3), with Hydro One and Five Nations Energy Inc. (FNEI) having started

¹ It was noted that notes from Sept 15, 2015 and Dec 3, 2015 RPPAG meetings had been reviewed and approved but still needed to be posted.

their Needs Assessment processes. Luisa clarified that the IESO does not lead the Needs Assessment process.

In terms of engagement, IESO has set up a dedicated webpage for each region on their website, and also does e-blasts when there is a development. If the Needs Assessment indicates that a Scoping Assessment is needed, it moves into the Scoping process. With the Scoping Assessment process limited to 90 days, IESO calls the First Nations and the municipal planners involved to give them a heads up that the draft documents are coming.

LACs have 3 meetings in 18 months:

- the first meeting is to look at needs and the forecast;
- the second meeting is to look at options and local priorities; and
- the third meeting involves the LAC drafting recommendations. In some, LACs may recommend requesting public input, in which case the study team does broader public engagement.

For some regions, there are two separate LACs:

- one dedicated to First Nations & Metis, and
- a general LAC with broad representation.

Information from both LACs is integrated by way of appointees from the First Nations & Metis LAC, who attend the general LAC and report back. The two LACs have the same agendas, but the First Nation & Metis LAC meetings are private/closed. However, transmitters and LDCs are still included in the private meetings.

IESO reports that the First Nations LACs have provided value in terms of identifying alternative solutions. LAC members, in general, are very engaged and desire detailed discussions. IESO staff believes they are learning a lot from participating. While conversations can turn to different types of issues, IESO staff strive to steer the conversations back to regional planning. Each LAC has also been very unique, with different priorities.

For groups where the regional plans have been completed, IESO is trying a different approach to meetings - having a portion (i.e., 50%) of the agenda for study team priorities, and having the other half for local priorities. This approach is being contemplated for all LACs in the future.

The Group also discussed how to connect the regional planning process with the official Provincial planning process, and how the Community Energy Plans could be incorporated as part of the solution. One Group member identified that the *Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act* could be taken into consideration.

Luisa went over the different engagement approaches that IESO takes, including outreach to different professional groups (i.e. AMO, OPPI², EDCO³), and how they are funding QUEST⁴ to look at how municipal energy planning is related to IRRP, as well as municipal outreach on how to develop a municipal energy plan.

IESO also holds an annual Northwest forum, which covers all electricity topics and invites all stakeholders. This meeting usually ends up becoming a networking event, especially for LAC members.

Luisa was asked about how the IESO uses social media. IESO tweets updates and has a Facebook page where they do call-outs for LAC members. IESO noted it is in the process of developing a more robust social media platform.

OEB staff also asked if IESO could make note of any “systemic” lessons learned from the process that the RPPAG group could consider for the purpose of making recommendations (e.g., perhaps the Needs Assessment process should incorporate additional elements, such as early notifications, so local communities and municipal planners would be informed).

Group members had other suggestions for IESO:

- Other than NOMA, to reach out to other groups in AMO;
- Use “planning area” rather than “constituency”; and
- There should be a good news story about the work that is being done together with First Nations & Metis in the electricity sector.

OEB staff asked for clarification as to whether there was any municipal consultation during the Needs Assessment process, given that the OEB’s goal in initiating a more structured approach to regional planning was to ensure that municipal and electricity planning became more integrated. Hydro One stated that, with the 60-day time constraint, input from municipal input comes mostly from the LDCs which would bring in issues from discussions that the LDCs had with municipal planners. However, Hydro One is open to further discussing this issue.

The Group discussed that there would likely be some value in having a LAC in a region even when the region was not experiencing much growth, and had no IRRP. This way, there is education about broader issues in the region, and a forum to discuss the community’s aspirational goals, on top of the community energy plans to be developed by the municipalities. It can also develop into a two-way conversation that informs people what can’t be addressed at the moment, but can be used in future planning. This

² Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI).

³ Economic Developers Council of Ontario (EDCO).

⁴ Quality Urban Energy Systems of Tomorrow (QUEST).

will allow municipalities to have a leadership role in the planning process (i.e., not limited to electric utilities).

c) Hydro One Status Update - Regional Planning Process

Hydro One provided a handout for their Regional Planning Status Summary. Cells in solid black were deemed complete; yellow cells depicted stages in process.

Five IRRPs are still underway for Group 1, and are on track for completion in Q2 of 2016. Once completed, the RIP will begin, with an estimated completion date of Q1 2017.

Three IRRPs are in progress for Group 2, with anticipated completion at the end of this year in Q4. The RIPs for this group are expected to be complete in Q2 of 2017.

For Group 3, there are four regions in the Needs Assessment phase, and Hydro One expects that only two or three regions may go to the next step in the regional planning process.

Hydro One stated that all of the dates planned just meet the mandated August 2017 deadline.

A Group member asked why the remote region - north of Dryden – was not listed. IESO explained that this was still in negotiation, and that it involved the RRRP. As a result, while it was still a regional planning initiative, it was a special case. The Group member strongly suggested that the region still be listed, with an asterisk to say “special process”. Hydro One stated that this region was still part of the Northwest region, and while there was no active IRRP for the region, it was still part of the RIP process.

d) Review of Feedback on Testing the Survey Tool

Following the discussion on municipal involvement in regional planning, the decision was made to add two questions about the Community Energy Plan in the Survey Tool, as this would help to indicate a problem (e.g. if a major stakeholder was not aware of the local Community Energy Plan):

- 1) Are you aware of a Community Energy Plan (CEP) in your area?
- 2) If you are aware of a CEP, what is your understanding of it?

The OEB Consultant that is facilitating development of the Survey Tool also presented the design of the survey to the Group – one question per page, and following the design that the Group had collaboratively discussed.

The survey links were sent to team members for testing to see if the questions made sense and flowed logically. The test group included four participants from the Northwest. For the purposes of this test, it was noted that the Northwest participants' results were not separated from the rest of the testers.

Since separate Survey Tools had been developed for the Needs Assessment and Scoping Assessment stages, Hydro One and the IESO will utilize these surveys, and get feedback to bring back to the RPPAG. The surveys will be good for ongoing measurement of effectiveness of the processes in regional planning. Hydro One will provide contact information for the OEB Consultant to transfer ownership of the survey.

Hydro One currently does a survey for the RIP, which was what the OEB Consultant used as a base to expand on and create this Survey Tool to better capture the process aspect of the Needs Assessment and the Scoping Assessment phases. Hydro One noted it will decide if it prefers to use its own survey or if it would like to use the survey developed by the OEB Consultant.

In general, the feedback for the surveys was positive; testers found the survey robust and logistically speaking, just long enough to get good feedback. One member who tested the surveys said that they liked how the survey didn't just accept negative comments, but had a pop up box asking the survey participant to explain why.

Action Items:

- **The OEB Consultant will add the two questions regarding the local Community Energy Plan (CEP) to the surveys, and send the open comments from the survey feedback to OEB staff, who will then distribute it to the Group.**
- **Hydro One to provide contact information for the OEB Consultant to transfer ownership of the survey.**
- **The OEB Consultant will send the survey to Luisa at IESO, and to the Hydro One contact to transfer ownership of the surveys.**

e) Review Status Updates for Activity Table Listed in Appendix 1 of the RPPAG Terms of Reference

PPWG Identified Process Issue	Status/Comments
1. Review regional boundaries and criteria used to establish them	
2. Review: Establishing form in which broader engagement should take place before Regional Infrastructure Plan is finalized	Complete - IRRP and Scoping Assessment processes have formal consultation processes before the RIP process - No consultation within RIP process, however, consultation always precedes it - No consultation before or within local planning (LP) process. Added to RIP after any pre-RIP consultations
3. Review Municipal Planning process and how it informs regional infrastructure planning	- Will revisit to talk about details - Jamie will talk to Cathie Brown about her contacts - Will invite someone from AMO and someone senior from MMAH to deal with coordination between them and IESO (potentially for morning 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.)
4. Identifying information distributors should be required to provide to transmitter and frequency it should be updated	Complete - No Issues - Addressed through OEB code changes
5. Identify appropriate evaluative criteria to compare potential solutions to address regional needs	- Surveys created are more about participant experience (i.e., subjective), not about objective criteria to assess decision-making or potential solutions
6. The approach to increase transparency in the regional planning process	- With information presented by IESO, it appears to have come a long way - Local planning process has to be broadened for more input opportunities, and allow others (external to Study Team) to contribute - Will need more examples of this in local planning document (e.g., Enersource, etc.)
7. Proposed changes to OEB's regulatory instruments needed to support process for OEB's consideration	- Reconfigure filing guidelines for local planning along the lines of what was included for regional planning
Issues Added by RPPAG	
8. Confirm the ToR	Complete
9. First Nations and Metis to have a representative in RPPAG. RPPAG	Complete - OEB VP & RPPAG sponsor (P. Fraser)

to develop a process to ensure proper representation and engagement with this group	confirmed via letter that the IESO Executive Steering Committee is the appropriate place for First Nations and Metis representatives
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Action Item:

- **Jamie / Cathie to invite someone from AMO and senior staff from MMAH to discuss coordination between them and the IESO (potentially for morning 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.)**

f) Review of Members List

Wade Morris (Innisfil Hydro/CHEC) and Dan Charron (Entegrus/EDA) have left their respective utilities, leaving two spots open in the RPPAG.

There was a “quota” for the original members of the RPPAG, and since the two former members were from LDCs, the Group decided to recommend to the OEB that two new members from LDCs be added to the Group, specifically targeting representatives from CHEC and the EDA, perhaps a member from the smaller Northeastern LDCs.

Bruno Pereira (Milton Hydro) also identified that he would no longer be able to participate as a member of the RPPAG. As such, there would be a third vacancy on the RPPAG and all were LDCs. Aside from the Chair (Irv) and the Vice Chair (Kazi), there were no LDCs remaining on the RPPAG.

There was not a discussion related to filling Bruno’s vacancy such as the one discussed above related to Wade and Dan.

3. Other Business

a) Continuation of RPPAG?

Following the issues list above, the Group and discussed / debated the rationale for why the Group would keep meeting.

OEB staff suggested that the Group should continue to meet, in support of one of the original reasons why the Group was formed – to make changes based on lessons learned and the focus to date where the interim stages (Needs and Scoping Assessment) before the actual planning stages (IRRP and RIP). For example, the Board wants the RIPs to support applications. A review of completed RIPs will therefore be an important role of the Group (i.e., whether or not the RIP provided enough evidence (i.e., detail) to support Leave to Construct (LTC) and Rate applications. It could meet intermittently to go over what went well and what did not.

Staff also noted the Group would be receiving a response from Peter to their letter related to scope. If the scope was broadened, it would likely effect their decision.

Based on OEB staff's comments above, the members further discussed RIPs not yet being utilized / included in applications currently being submitted to the Board.

OEB staff also suggested that the Group provide an interim report to Peter Fraser.

b) Interim Report to the Board

The Group discussed preparing an Interim Report to send to Peter, and potentially have Irv make a presentation to the OEB shortly after September.

c) Agenda for the Next Meeting

The Group developed a preliminary list of items to address at the next meeting:

- Discussion with AMO and the MMAH representatives;
- Go over local planning examples and recommendations;
- Discuss OEB response to RPPAG letter related to scope of RPPAG;
- Discuss survey results of Scoping and Needs Assessments to be done by IESO/Hydro One; and
- Provide input on any refinements to versions of Needs Assessment and Scoping Assessment Survey Tool templates that Hydro One and IESO used.

4. Next Meeting

The next RPPAG meeting will be on **Tuesday, September 13, 2016.**