

Meeting Notes

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

Working Group Meeting #6

Meeting Date: June 21, 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)
Chris Ripley	Enbridge Gas representative
Whitney Wong	Enbridge Gas representative
Amber Crawford, Association of Municipalities of Ontario	Non-utility member
John Dikeos, ICF Consulting Canada Inc.	Non-utility member
Tamara Kuiken, DNV	Non-utility member
Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group	Non-utility member
Dwayne Quinn, DR Quinn & Associates Ltd.	Non-utility member
Jay Shepherd, Shepherd Rubenstein Professional Corporation	Non-utility member
Steven Norrie, Independent Electricity System Operator	Observer
Kenneth Poon, EPCOR Natural Gas LP	Observer

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

Regrets

IRPTWG Members	Role
Stephanie Cheng	OEB staff representative
Cameron Leitch, EnWave Energy Corporation	Non-utility member

Purpose

These notes are for the Working Group purposes only and do not represent the view of the OEB

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 - including approach and membership of IRP DCF+ subgroup, WG cost awards (10 min)
2. Debrief/discussion on concerns raised in WG report and options/approach moving forward (30 min)
3. Enhanced targeted energy efficiency IRPA (20 min)
4. IRP Pilots (30 min)
5. CNG as an IRPA (15 min)
6. Miscellaneous (15 min, or as time permits)

1. Preliminary Matters

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Meeting #5 Notes OEB staff asked if there were any comments on draft meeting #5 notes</p>	<p>There were no comments on meeting #5 notes. Therefore, the notes are accepted by working group members.</p>	<p>OEB staff to post meeting #5 notes on IRP webpage</p>
<p>Cost Awards OEB staff indicated that it would initiate a cost awards process in the near future for the first 6 months of IRP WG activities.</p> <p>DCF+ Subgroup OEB staff discussed the DCF+ subgroup.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several members have not previously used OEB cost claims process. • Members noted that there are some challenges using the online cost claims process, and training/extra time for filing would be helpful. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Per previous meeting, a subgroup will look at DCF+ test enhancements. • Non-utility members expressing interest include Tamara Kuiken, Chris Neme, John Dikeos, Cameron Leitch. Other members are welcome to attend as desired. • In general, the intent will be that the first WG meeting of each month will be specific to the DCF+ test, with the second meeting to be more general in nature. However, members are asked to keep the first meeting slot open in their calendars where possible, to provide flexibility to move faster on other IRP topics if needed. However, the July 5 meeting will be 	<p>OEB staff to schedule optional training session for IRP WG members on OEB cost claims process.</p> <p>OEB staff to send IRP WG meeting invites (DCF+ and full group) for fall 2022</p> <p>Enbridge to circulate Guidehouse report on DCF+ recommendations in advance of July 5 meeting</p>

	<p>specific to the DCF+ test.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enbridge included some material on the DCF+ test arising from Guidehouse's review, but this was not discussed due to time constraints. The full Guidehouse report will be shared in advance of the first DCF+ meeting. 	
--	--	--

2. Debrief/discussion on concerns raised in WG report

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Members discussed the concerns raised in the recently filed IRP Working Group report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enbridge confirmed that its annual IRP report (including the Working Group report) has been filed with the OEB, and is expected to be made public in the next few days, once a notice of hearing in Enbridge's DVA applications is issued. OEB staff noted that management had been made aware of concerns raised in WG report, and that the report would be filed on the public record shortly, which provided a marker of the WG's concerns. WG member commented that there did not appear to be a legal avenue for the WG to further advance its concerns, and it would be up to the OEB to take additional action if required. Two concerns raised in the WG report were the pace and quantity of information provided on key topics (including pilots) and the topics the WG could consider. Enbridge indicated that the pace of work and quantity of information would pick up, now that Enbridge had an Asset Management Plan in place. WG members discussed several topics, noting the demand forecast (and sensitivity of system needs to the forecast), the treatment of risk and stranded assets, as issues that would be important to IRP, and would be likely be addressed in the rebasing application, where the group could potentially provide some useful information and where Enbridge's determinations would impact the work of the WG on other IRP topics. 	<p>WG members to further identify what aspects of the rebasing application would be useful to the WG. Enbridge to consider information requests.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enbridge indicated that it would consider the requests received and would attempt to bring forward information from the rebasing application (in advance of filing) that would be useful to the WG. For the demand forecast in particular, Enbridge noted that it would be helpful to have the electricity sector at the table. OEB staff noted that IESO member was an observer and could likely help facilitate this discussion. • WG member noted that it should be up to the WG to determine priorities, not limited based on what Enbridge would agree to bring forward. 	
--	--	--

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>Continuing discussion on the approach to an Enhanced Targeted Energy Efficiency (ETEE) pilot.</p>	<p>Continued discussion on the role gas-fired heating system replacements should or should not play in an ETEE pilot: WG members offered various suggestions, including: protocol prioritizing envelope improvements before heating system replacements, ruling out heating system replacements unless there is no feasible alternative, downsizing or future-proofing (e.g. account for hydrogen blending) any heating system replacements. Enbridge did not commit, but indicated that economics may lead to envelope improvements being prioritized regardless.</p> <p>Discussion on whether low-income housing would be part of residential pilot: WG members generally expressed a preference for including low-income customers, noting potential savings, improvements to affordability, and equity aspect of energy transition, although recognizing the higher upfront costs utilities may have to pay for this sector.</p> <p>Discussion on mix of measures for ETEE pilot: WG supported focus on space heating, but indicated some other measures (e.g. custom industrial, commercial kitchen) may also be</p>	<p>Enbridge to provide additional explanation of ETEE items (slide 4 of deck) and circulate for any written WG comments</p>

	<p>worth considering, and could provide valuable learnings in the pilot. Enbridge agreed to consider, but also indicated that it might not want to cast such a wide net for the pilot, to allow for greater focus on analyzing effectiveness of most important measures.</p> <p>Discussion curtailed due to time – members asked if Enbridge could provide (in writing) a bit of additional context on the items not covered, and allow for WG members to provide written comments. Enbridge agreed to this.</p>	
--	--	--

4. IRP Pilots

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Discussion of 4 specific system needs potentially suitable for IRP, and information required to assess and evaluate potential IRP pilots</p>	<p>Enbridge provided snapshots of 4 potential pilots where the AMP had identified system needs that may be suitable to meet with an IRPA (Sarnia, Ottawa, Parry Sound, Brooklin), with more to come at a future meeting.</p> <p>Enbridge indicated that 2 of the potential pilots could involve multiple IRPAs. WG held initial discussion regarding the type of information needed to assess and compare potential pilots, as well as a few specifics of these 4 pilots.</p> <p>WG agreed that measurement capability was an important consideration, and suggested that a glossary explaining some of the specific measurement technologies described would be helpful.</p> <p>Other information identified by the WG that would be useful: map, timing by when the constraint would need to be met (perhaps with supporting info on rate of load growth and/or amount of demand reduction that would be needed), expected cost of baseline facility solution, considerations regarding ETEE potential (vintage of building stock, customer mix)</p> <p>With regards to the Brooklin project, WG members noted that this was a greenfield area, with great potential for avoiding lost opportunities. Pilot design should consider</p>	<p>Enbridge to consider comments and refine information provided regarding pilot proposals, and bring forward additional pilots for consideration</p>

	<p>aspects such as partnering with electric utilities, and sizing the system in advance to meet a lower level of demand due to EE measures that will be put in place. However, another WG member noted that if the need must be met as soon as 2024, pilot options may be constrained (although a supply-side solution might be possible).</p>	
--	--	--

5. CNG as an IRPA

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Enbridge discussed considerations regarding using compressed natural gas (CNG) as an IRPA</p>	<p>Enbridge indicated that it thought there were good opportunities to use CNG as an IRPA to address short-term or seasonal constraints, and avoid putting in pipelines, and sought the WG's views.</p> <p>WG was generally supportive of CNG solutions of this nature being considered under the IRP Framework. WG members noted the importance of verifying and validating system constraints prior to implementing a solution, and also noted that CNG could allow needs to be met sooner than the 3-year criterion in the IRP Framework. Enbridge agreed with these points.</p>	

6. Miscellaneous and Next Steps

Item Description	Discussion Comments/Outcome	Action Items
<p>Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Time did not allow for discussion of the DCF+ material or Enbridge's on IRP screening criteria. Comments on screening criteria can be provided in writing, while DCF+ material will be discussed at July 5 meeting. Enbridge also indicated that it will bring Posterity in to discuss their DSM model, at the July 19 meeting.</p>	<p>WG members to send any comments on the IRP screening criteria to Enbridge</p> <p>Enbridge to bring Posterity in to discuss DSM model</p>

List of Action Items

Action Item	Assignment/ Owner	Due Date
Post meeting #5 notes	OEB staff	As soon as possible
Circulate summary of meeting #6 outcomes	OEB staff	As soon as possible
Schedule optional training session for IRP WG members on OEB cost claims process.	OEB staff	As soon as possible
Send IRP WG meeting invites (DCF+ and full group) for fall 2022	OEB staff	As soon as possible
Circulate Guidehouse report on DCF+ recommendations	Enbridge Gas	As soon as possible, in advance of July 5 meeting
Identify what aspects of the rebasing application would be useful to the WG.	All Working Group members, Enbridge Gas to consider requests	As soon as possible
Provide additional explanation of ETEE items (slide 4 of deck) and circulate for any written WG comments	Enbridge Gas	As soon as possible
Refine information provided regarding pilot proposals, and bring forward additional pilots for consideration	Enbridge Gas	For July 19 meeting
Send any comments on the IRP screening criteria to Enbridge	All Working Group members	As soon as possible
Bring Posterity in to discuss DSM model	Enbridge Gas	Likely July 19 meeting
Further discuss DCF+ test enhancements	Interested WG members	Beginning July 5, 2022
Establish agenda for meetings #7 (DCF+) and 8 (full WG)	OEB staff (with input from Enbridge Gas)	Prior to meetings #7 and #8