

## Meeting Notes

### Integrated Resource Planning Technical Working Group (EB-2021-0246)

#### Working Group Meeting #5

Meeting Date: May 24, 2022                      Time: 2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.  
Location: MS Teams

#### Attendees

IRPTWG Members	Role
Michael Parkes	OEB staff representative (Working Group chair)
Stephanie Cheng	OEB staff representative
Chris Ripley	Enbridge Gas representative
Whitney Wong (Replacing Amrit Kuner)	Enbridge Gas representative
Amber Crawford, Association of Municipalities of Ontario	Non-utility member
Jay Shepherd, Shepherd Rubenstein Professional Corporation	Non-utility member
John Dikeos, ICF Consulting Canada Inc.	Non-utility member
Cameron Leitch, EnWave Energy Corporation	Non-utility member
Dwayne Quinn, DR Quinn & Associates Ltd.	Non-utility member
Kenneth Poon, EPCOR Natural Gas LP	Observer
Steven Norrie, Independent Electricity System Operator	Observer

Additional Attendees	Role
Valerie Bennett	OEB staff
Lynn Ramsay	OEB staff
Malini Giridhar	Enbridge Gas guest
Craig Fernandes	Enbridge Gas guest
Cara-Lynne Wade	Enbridge Gas guest

#### Regrets

IRPTWG Members	Role
Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group	Non-utility member
Tamara Kuiken, DNV	Non-utility member

## Purpose

These notes summarize the information discussed during the working group (WG) meeting on each of the key points presented in the published materials.

## Meeting Agenda

1. Preliminary Matters (OEB staff, no time allotment)
2. Enbridge Gas Annual IRP Report and Working Group Report (Enbridge/OEB staff, 40 minutes)
3. IRP Pilots – Enhanced Targeted Energy Efficiency (Enbridge, 20 minutes)
4. IRP Pilots – AMP Update and Geographical IRPA Plan (Enbridge, 40 minutes)
5. Working Group Scheduling/ Workplan and Next Steps (OEB staff, 20 minutes)

### 1. Preliminary Matters

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Meeting #4 Notes</p> <p>OEB staff asked if there were any comments on draft meeting #4 notes</p>	<p>There were no comments on meeting #4 notes. Therefore, the notes are accepted by working group members.</p>	<p>OEB staff to post meeting #4 notes on IRP webpage</p>
<p>Posterity Model / Sharing of Information/ Confidentiality Agreement</p> <p>OEB staff provided an update on the opinion received from their legal counsel on the grounds OEB and/or the working group has in compelling Enbridge to share information like the Posterity model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OEB staff indicated that their legal counsel is of the view that the working group (or chair of the working group) does not have the authority to compel Enbridge to provide information. Under certain circumstances, the OEB as an organization could do so, as could a Panel of Commissioners in the case of a hearing. OEB staff indicated that WG members who believe access to information is a key concern could document this as part of their individual comments to the working group report.</li> <li>• Enbridge indicated that they want to share information where they can with the Working Group. Specific to the Posterity model, Enbridge confirmed that Posterity prefers for the model not to be shared. Enbridge also notes that changes are being made to the model to improve its accuracy in assessing the impact of energy efficiency IRPAs. However, given the level of interest expressed by WG members on gaining more insight to the model, Enbridge will</li> </ul>	<p>Enbridge to follow up with Posterity and legal counsel and to report back to the working group via e-mail on whether the Posterity model can be shared (and to what extent) and if a confidentiality agreement will need to be drafted and signed by WG members.</p>

	<p>consider what details of the model can be shared at future meetings in the context of discussion on energy efficiency IRPAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on the discussion, WG member questioned whether a confidentiality agreement would facilitate better information sharing between members and Enbridge; and if so, whether drafting of the agreement is underway. WG member also noted that if any IRPAs reference the Posterity model in Enbridge's AMP and rebasing application, the model will need to be shared or it will not be approved since it is currently a "black box" – as such, WG members prefer to have the model sooner since it needs to be shared eventually</li> <li>• OEB staff indicated that drafting of the confidentiality agreement had been put on hold, as Enbridge had not indicated a need to declare any materials confidential or make use of such an agreement, and asked Enbridge to request OEB staff to develop such an agreement if it believed this would be helpful.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

## 2. Enbridge Gas Annual IRP Report and Working Group Report

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Enbridge's Annual IRP Report</p> <p>Enbridge provides an update on next steps based on WG member comments and the current draft of Enbridge's annual IRP report</p>	<p>Enbridge will circulate an updated draft IRP report (including appendix of IRP alternatives) to the working group which will include the following new content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of what IRPAs have been scoped in/out of consideration</li> <li>• Details on the process for developing pilots</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing and Filing Approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enbridge will circulate an updated draft IRP annual report to the working group by <u>Wednesday, May 25, 2022*</u></li> <li>• The plan is to file the working group report as an appendix to Enbridge's</li> </ul>	<p>Enbridge to provide the following items by Wed, May 25, 2022:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an updated draft annual IRP report</li> <li>• an update on the timeline and how the IRP annual report and WG report will be filed*</li> </ul> <p>*Enbridge and OEB staff confirmed via e-mail the following timeline changes: <b>May 26, 2022 – updated</b></p>

	<p>annual IRP report. However, if Enbridge plans to file their annual IRP report on <u>Tuesday, May 31, 2022</u>, along with it's annual DVA application, WG members are concerned there will be insufficient time for members to review the updated IRP annual report, provide comments to Enbridge for potential updates to their report, and to review the working group report while drafting any potential individual comments by the May 31, 2022 deadline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WG members proposed for Enbridge to proceed with filing their DVA application on May 31, 2022. However, Enbridge should include a note in their cover letter stating that Enbridge's annual IRP report along with the appendices (including the working group report) will be filed as a single package one week later (<u>June 7, 2022*</u>). This will give WG members more time to review and compile comments.</li> <li>• Enbridge agrees with member concerns of tight deadlines and will verify with regulatory on the proposed approach and timelines in filing the IRP annual report.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Website</a> Enbridge is in the process of updating and resolving matters associated with the website that were identified in meeting #4.</p>	<p>draft annual IRP report <b>May 31, 2022</b> – filing of DVA application noting in cover letter IRP annual report and appendices (including WG report) will be filed a week later <b>June 8, 2022</b> – filing of Enbridge's annual IRP report and appendices (including WG report)</p>
<p>Working Group Report</p>	<p>WG members recognize that the individual comments section will likely be the heart of the matter for the working group report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One WG member indicated general support for the draft OEB staff comments that are currently in the draft working group report. Some other WG members indicated they are in the process of drafting individual comments.</li> <li>• OEB staff encouraged members to start adding their comments in the draft WG report ASAP, so that all other members are aware of their perspective. Members will have the opportunity to update and finalize their comments after Enbridge has finalized its updated IRP annual report.</li> </ul>	<p>WG members are encouraged to comment on the draft working group report on the sharepoint site and to draft any individual comments since the deadline for member comments has been confirmed for June 2, 2022, and submission has been confirmed for June 8, 2022.</p>

### 3. IRP Pilots – Enhanced Targeted Energy Efficiency

This agenda item of the WG meeting was presented by Enbridge Staff, Craig Fernandes.

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Pilot #1: Enhanced Targeted Energy Efficiency (ETEE)</p> <p>Enbridge provided more insight on their measures of focus and input assumptions on ETEE measures for peak hour shaving. WG members shared their input.</p>	<p>Enbridge noted that the premise of the pilot is for the ETEE measures to be geotargeted to reduce peak system demand.</p> <p><u>Customer Mix</u> Enbridge identified 4 classes of customers (residential/ commercial/ multi-residential/ industrial) and potential conservation measures of focus based on space heating energy use (heating system advancement, air infiltration prevention measures like ventilation, and building envelope improvement) where the objective is to make each measure of focus as similar as possible between customer groups.</p> <p>WG members generally supported the focus on space heating measures (due to their high correlation with peak demand) and noted a few items for Enbridge to consider based on the materials presented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommissioning</u> – WG member proposed for recommissioning to be a fourth category in Enbridge’s table of measures of focus. Enbridge is encouraged to give customers the ability to change their operation approach since one of the WG members notes that this appears to be of interest in previous proceedings.</li> <li>• <u>New equipment requirements</u> – WG member expressed concerns about including heating system advancement for that would lock in new gas-fired equipment, particularly for measures with long lifetimes.</li> <li>• <u>Uptake by Customers</u> – WG members noted that ETEE program design strategy and marketing are just as important as the type of pilot/ measures chosen, and emphasized the need for Enbridge to consider how they will package these measures to encourage uptake by customers in the geotargeted areas. Enbridge acknowledged the importance of this step but clarified that they have yet to refine their approach since it is a function of first determining the specific area being</li> </ul>	<p>Enbridge to consider WG comments as it continues to refine its proposal for an ETEE IRPA</p>

	<p>targeted and its customer mix.</p> <p><b>ETEE Input Assumptions</b> WG members noted the following concerns and recommendations based on input assumptions presented by Enbridge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enbridge and WG members noted that the Technical Resource Manual of energy efficiency measures is not 100% applicable since the pilot focuses on peak savings as opposed to annual savings</li> <li>• Enbridge proposed that only gross impact would need to be measured. WG members agreed that the primary metric of interest might be gross peak demand reduction in the area being targeted. However, WG members thought there were subtleties (e.g. cost-effectiveness testing, impacts on program design, aligning impacts with broader demand forecasts and avoiding double-counting) that likely warranted Enbridge measuring both net and gross impacts, to assess incremental program impact.</li> <li>• Regarding Enbridge's proposal to use an in-situ baseline for measure impact, WG member noted the importance of clearly defining the duration of the program impact (e.g. expected life of existing equipment) instead of using a blanket statement.</li> <li>• WG members noted the importance of gathering any required baseline data during the next (2022/2023) winter heating season.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

#### 4. IRP Pilots – AMP Update and Geographical IRPA Plan

<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Discussion Comments/Outcome</b>	<b>Action Items</b>
Asset Management Plan (AMP) update	Enbridge provided an update on where its asset management plan stands and how the AMP projects will be assessed. Enbridge Gas indicates that the status of IRP assessment for system needs will be included as an appendix to the AMP. There will be 3 phases of IRP assessment. At the time of filing the rebasing application, only the first phase (binary	Enbridge to bring forward materials on screening criteria for June WG meeting and confirm what information from the draft AMP will

	<p>screening) will be complete, but updates addressing phases 2 and 3 will be provided in 2023 through interrogatories/evidence updates.</p> <p>Enbridge noted it will provide its interpretation and operationalization as to the IRP Framework's screening criteria, and how system needs were screened in/out of the AMP at the next WG meeting in June 2022. The purpose is for WG members to understand the process Enbridge takes as opposed to seeking WG approval.</p> <p>WG member requested to see the complete draft AMP. Enbridge indicated it would confirm what information can be shared with the WG in advance of filing the rebasing application.</p> <p>WG member inquired as to why storage was listed in the asset classes being considered for IRP alternatives, noting that storage was typically an asset owned by Enbridge's parent company, not its distribution business, and that these assets were large and lumpy, such that it would be difficult to design an IRP alternative to avoid such a project.</p>	<p>be shared</p>
<p><b>Pilot Strategy Discussion</b></p> <p>Enbridge discussed a new proposal for a broader geographical IRPA that could address multiple system needs, and include a suite of technologies.</p>	<p><b>Geographical IRPA Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WG members expressed general support for the concept of a geographical IRPA plan, or other options noted by Enbridge of trying to group system needs into project portfolios in determining the appropriate role for IRPAs. WG member noted that this had the potential for improved economy of scale in using IRPAs.</li> <li>Several WG members suggested that the City of Ottawa is an ideal location for a geographical IRPA since the OEB rejected Enbridge's proposal to replace a pipeline in Ottawa so alternatives will need to be considered. Another WG member cautioned that the large amount of peak demand reduction that would be needed might make this a challenging system need to address through IRP</li> </ul>	<p>Enbridge to return to the June WG meeting with 4-5 potential geographical pilots for discussion</p>

## 5. Working Group Scheduling/ Workplan and Next Steps

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p><b>Frequency of WG Meetings</b></p> <p>Enbridge provided an update on items for future meetings and requested an opportunity for more frequent meetings</p>	<p>Enbridge anticipates an increase in workload with the ramp up of pilot projects and a related WG item of exploring DCF+ enhancements. As such, Enbridge proposed bi-weekly WG meetings to get timely feedback from members.</p> <p>WG members were supportive of a more frequent meeting schedule if needed.</p> <p><b>Proposed Schedule:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bi-weekly WG meetings starting July 2022</li> <li>• Of the 2 meetings scheduled per month, one will be a “general meeting” and the second will be focused primarily on the DCF+</li> <li>• WG members are expected to attend the general meetings (when they can), but have the option to attend the DCF+ meeting as well.</li> </ul>	<p>OEB to set up and send out bi-weekly meeting invites July 2022 onwards <i>{done for July and August}</i></p>
<p><b>DCF+ Subgroup</b></p> <p>Enbridge/OEB staff proposed the formation of an informal subgroup to discuss DCF+ test enhancements</p>	<p>Enbridge and OEB staff mentioned the option of a DCF+ subgroup to be formed by leveraging voluntary participation from WG members with expertise on benefit cost analysis. Cost awards would be available for this work, in line with the OEB’s policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cameron L. and John D. expressed interest in being on this group. Various WG members nominated Chris N. and Tamara K. (who were unable to attend meeting #5) as potential candidates for the DCF+ subgroup given their expertise on BCA analysis.</li> <li>• WG members agreed that all members will have the option to attend these meetings if interested, e.g. to learn more about the topic.</li> <li>• Enbridge shared that they have made a lot of progress on DCF+ test enhancements, and expect to be able to provide their DCF+ study and recommendations in July. WG members expressed an interest in getting an update from Enbridge on these DCF+ enhancements at the next meeting, prior to detailed subgroup discussion. Enbridge will try to provide a quick update since the priority of discussion will be on pilots at the next meeting.</li> </ul>	<p>Membership of the DCF+ subgroup to be determined as soon as possible</p> <p>Enbridge to potentially provide an update on DCF+ enhancements at June WG meeting</p>



## List of Action Items

Action Item	Assignment/ Owner	Due Date
Post meeting #4 notes	OEB staff	As soon as possible
Circulate summary of meeting #5 outcomes	OEB staff	As soon as possible
Verify with Posterity and legal counsel on what information on the Posterity model can be shared with working group and whether a confidentiality agreement needs to be drafted to facilitate	Enbridge Gas	As soon as possible
Work to finalizing annual IRP report and WG report per agreed-upon schedule	All Working Group members	June 8, 2022
Return with more detailed materials on pilots and AMP screening criteria for WG consideration	Enbridge Gas	Meeting # 6 (June 2022)
Provide information on AMP screening criteria and confirm what information from the draft AMP will be shared	Enbridge Gas	Meeting #6 (June 2022)
Further discuss DCF+ test enhancements and formation of the DCF+ subgroup	All WG members	Future working group meeting(s). Update & subgroup formation potentially June 2022
Establish agenda for meeting #6	OEB staff (with input from Enbridge Gas)	Prior to meeting #6