



# Meeting Summary

## Regional Planning Process Advisory Group

**Meeting Date:** December 2, 2016      **Time:** 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

**Location:** 2300 Yonge Street, 25<sup>th</sup> Floor, ADR Room

### Attendees:

*RPPAG Members:* Irv Klajman (Powerstream) (Chair), Iain Angus (City of Thunder Bay), Bob Chow (IESO), Edith Chin (Enbridge), Wayne Dyce (Centre Wellington Hydro/CHEC), Ajay Garg (HONI), Ray E. Quinn (Northern Region), Ismail Sheikh (London Hydro/EDA), Jamie Skimming (City of London/AMO), Michael Whittemund (Guelph Hydro)

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

*Guests:* Sacha Constantinescu (HONI), Luisa Da Rocha (IESO), Joe Toneguzzo (IESO)

### Meeting Agenda:

1. Review of Last Meeting Notes
2. Meeting Items
  - a) Discussion of Revised Draft Terms of Reference (ToR)
  - b) Potential RPPAG Activities for 2017
  - c) Discussion of Additional Appendix on Local Planning
3. Other Business
4. Next Meeting

## 1. Review of Last Meeting Notes

RPPAG members approved the Meeting Notes for posting on the OEB website without changes.

## 2. Meeting Items

### a) Discussion of Revised Draft Terms of Reference (ToR)

The Group agreed that OEB staff did a great job revising the RPPAG ToR.

A Group member commented on the need to add a timeline for RPPAG's activities and products to be issued by the Group.

Group members and guests had the following comments and suggestions for further revising the ToR (the page numbers referenced below are in the “clean” version):

- Page 1:
  - One member suggested tweaking the first paragraph to refer to the PPWG’s role involved looking at the overall planning process and the RPPAG’s role is to look specifically at the Regional Infrastructure Plan (RIP).
  - Footnote on page 1:
    - Change “consultation” to “engagement”, as the term consultation implies a “formal duty to consult” by the Crown.
    - Change “First Nations and Metis” to “Indigenous groups”.
    - Change “stakeholder” to “community members”.
- Page 2:
  - The Long Term Energy Plan (LTEP) will be released sometime next year and will need to be taken into account in revising the ToR.
  - Change “RIP” in bullet number 1 to “planning process”; RIP is too specific.
  - Fourth bullet under *Executive Sponsor and OEB Staff Support*:
    - Add the term “team” to the sentence to read: “Any issues that the OEB Executive team wants addressed”.
  - Change bullet styles under *Purpose of the RPPAG* to better differentiate sub-bullets from sub-sub-bullets.
- Page 3:
  - Expand TSC and DSC and include those acronyms in brackets
  - Under *RPPAG Scope of Work*:
    - The second and third bullet mention a survey after an application is approved – this product still needs to be created. This would also be a new addition to the Scope of Work.
      - The Group discussed the issue of implementing a survey if an application is not approved.

- There was also discussion regarding surveying intervenors on the effectiveness of the RIPs in relation to application proceedings and whether or not a survey is even required, given the input that intervenors already provide within hearings.
  - A survey may not be necessary at all. Decisions can just be reviewed or feedback could be obtained from the OEB Executive and/or the Case Manager involved in the application. A discussion about the practical implementation of this approach ensued; e.g., reviewing all decisions. OEB staff noted feedback directly from OEB panel members was unlikely and it would be best to focus on the OEB Case Manager (who could get feedback from the OEB panel).
  - There was also some concern about duplication in the various surveys.
- The Group concluded to change the language in the first and second bullets to state “review survey results” and combine the two bullets to state *“Provide input to and review relevant surveys conducted by the Transmitter and IESO and review feedback received from OEB case managers on the impact of regional plans on the outcome”*.
- It was noted that, while the RPPAG provides input on the *development* of surveys, IESO and HONI *implement* the survey.
  - HONI noted that there may not be another survey until 2018.
  - The OEB Consultant suggested that the Group add some language on when the Group would review the information received.
- Some Group members expressed the view that the survey results may not provide much information related to gaps and lessons learned that could be applied to the next planning cycle.
  - A member suggested it would be beneficial if HONI and IESO provided a presentation to the Group on lessons learned at the April meeting.
- Page 4:
  - Under *Recommendations requiring OEB support*.
    - A question was raised regarding who makes the determination that a RPPAG participant is creating inefficiencies.
      - The discussion resulted in the deletion of the second bullet.
    - A member commented on how it would be good for LDCs to rotate in terms of RPPAG membership to provide experience in looking at

issues more holistically. The member suggested rotating two of the five LDCs on the RPPAG membership every two years.

- It was noted this was occurring naturally, with only one of the initial five LDC members still a member of the RPPAG.
- Another member commented on how there is some value in retaining members who have been in the Group since the beginning.
- For the paragraph beginning with “For the initial scope of work”:
  - Add the words “When the RPPAG was formed,” at the beginning of the paragraph.
  - Also delete the ten bullets that followed since they are already in Appendix 1 and a number of those process elements have been addressed.
- Page 6:
  - Under *RPPAG Member Support*:
    - Add “where possible” to the first sentence in bullet number one.
    - A Group member suggested that the provision for the alternate be limited to formal organizations. Another member raised the concern that the clause “for review and approval” contradicts the clause in Appendix 3B which does not state alternates need to be vetted by the OEB.
    - Delete the last sentence in bullet number one, as the alternate informing the appointed member of the meeting discussion should be expected out of professional courtesy.
  - Under *Stakeholder Chair/Vice-Chair/Secretary of the RPPAG*:
    - Delete “future” in “The Chair will take on the role of moderator of future meetings...”
    - Add “non-OEB” to the first sentence of the third paragraph so it reads “RPPAG members will also select an individual, from among the non-OEB members...”
    - Delete the last sentence related to replacing members.
  - Under *Annual Review*:
    - Add a paragraph on “Reviewing the work plan in either the first meeting of every year or the last meeting of every year”.
    - For the first sub-bullet under “*Composition of members and fulfillment of duties*”, the RPPAG cannot add members on its own; add “...propose additions to the membership to the OEB...”

- Under the bullet for the composition section, a RPPAG guest raised the issue of the role of guests.
  - Under “Issues identification and management process”, use the present tense to read “Demonstrate use of the template” (i.e., take out the “d”).
- Page 7:
  - Under *Term*:
    - There was discussion regarding the length of the term of the RPPAG member appointments.
      - One member suggested increasing the term to three (3) years for all members to take a full cycle into account, except for the Chair and Vice-Chair’s terms which would remain at two (2) years.
      - Another member commented that it was difficult to expect that a particular member would still be in the Group for three (3) years, but that two (2) years was a reasonable expectation (if the member left the Group, their company / organization would have the obligation to replace them).
      - Another member suggested that the system allow for staggering membership, with new members that come in to replace a member reset the term of their appointment, as opposed to taking over the rest of the term of the member they replaced.
      - It was noted that the IESO (responsible for all IRRPs) and HONI (as lead transmitter responsible for almost all RIPs) would need to remain
      - The OEB Consultant noted they would check the length of the terms of members for other OEB committees
    - In the last paragraph of the page, delete everything after “...that individual is deemed to no longer meet all the necessary qualifications...”

- Page 8:
  - For the first sentence at the top of the page related to withdrawing membership prior to completion of their term, delete the words “setting out the reasons”.
  - Under *Role of OEB Staff and Reporting*:
    - Change “prepared by the Secretary” to “prepared by OEB Staff”. At this point in the meeting, the Group concluded that all other references to “Secretary” should also be removed from the document and replaced with “OEB staff”, since OEB staff had been carrying out the Secretary roles for every meeting to date and the Group wanted it to remain that way (i.e., eliminate Secretary position)
  - For the section discussing *Participant Costs*, a member reiterated a concern regarding the cost for LDCs to cut a cheque for cost awards exceeding the amount that the cheque is written for. OEB Staff noted that the issue had been raised internally, but has not been resolved.

Other comments discussed during the meeting included the following:

- HONI indicated that there is no standing licence for the Survey Tool they are currently using.
- HONI also observed that LDCs get frustrated when they are sent multiple surveys related to regional planning. The timeliness and frequency of the surveys were therefore discussed, as well as the difference in survey questions/format for different community members.
  - The OEB Consultant remarked that despite the difference in the format and wording of the questions, the questions could be rolled up into similar categories to obtain results that could be compared across the board
- There was a suggestion to add a preamble about aligning with the regional planning cycle to drive the timetable for some of the RPPAG activities, and for some of the RPPAG activities to focus on refining process issues in the second cycle for regional planning (e.g. does the Needs Assessment need to be re-done for the next cycle?).
- A couple of Group members noted that, in the past year, the RPPAG has not been able to address some activities that fulfill its mandate, given the uncertainty related to its purpose and objectives. It was also noted that this issue had since been settled as a result of the response letter from the OEB Sponsor which clarified the Group’s mandate, particularly in terms of scope.

**Action Items:**

1. IESO and HONI will prepare presentation on “lessons learned” during the first cycle to provide to the Group at the April meeting.
2. The OEB Consultant will check with the Stakeholder Relations team at the OEB regarding terms of other OEB committees (e.g., IASC, etc.)
3. OEB staff will further revise the draft ToR based on the Group’s instructions and circulate it to the Group for review and comments.

**b) Potential RPPAG Activities for 2017**

The Group decided to add a discussion of the RPPAG’s potential activities for 2017 as an additional item to the agenda for the next meeting, given the Group meets only quarterly and it is the end of 2016.

The Group suggested the following to begin with:

- Create Appendix 1-2017 and record the RPPAG’s planned activities.
- Prioritize the list of those activities.
- Include “process improvement items” on the activity list.
  - Have a **workshop** to identify the process improvement items and requirements to streamline the regional/local planning process.
    - If a region already has a RIP or an IRRP, consider whether a restart to a Needs Assessment is necessary or if there is a more efficient way to address the region’s needs. What value-added activities can be done as opposed to just stepping through the whole process again? What can be streamlined?
    - Consider sustainment plans. For example, end-of-life planning for load growth and improved reliability need(s) to be better integrated, with an outlook for the next 10 years.
    - Demand forecasting. Planning should never stop and should be refreshed annually (e.g., DVRs with respect to new GHG targets, summer peaking to winter peaking)
    - The OEB Consultant suggested that the Group go through the *Issue Identification Template* while reviewing the issues to be discussed in the potential workshop.

- Undertake a review to determine if the information that HONI and IESO are requesting from LDCs can be streamlined.
  - One member raised a concern regarding timelines and how to plan for the workshop if the Group does not meet in the next three months.
    - The OEB Consultant volunteered to help prepare the Group for the workshop to address that concern.
- The need for more time in the regional planning process was also discussed
  - IESO may need more time for engagement; e.g., for the Scoping Assessment, the turnaround time for feedback from municipalities after the draft SA report is issued is too short at only two weeks.
  - It was suggested that, as more municipalities develop Community Energy Plans, it would be good to have more iterative discussions between municipalities and the province to mitigate friction between municipal aspirations and provincial plans. There is a difference between aspirations related to new growth and those related to historical load.
  - IESO reported that it has recently been doing a lot of detailed analyses on GHG emissions if stock gas-fired and electric heating were replaced (e.g., by ground source heat pumps) as well as what would happen in C & D scenarios (from the 4 scenarios on growth)<sup>1</sup> and the complexity of relating it to the work done by the LDCs.
  - OEB staff advised that any process timing changes, such as those for a Scoping Assessment, would require a recommendation to the OEB to amend the IESO's licence or a code.
- Discuss LTEP implications for the RPPAG.
- Deal with the terms and appointments of RPPAG members, including the Vice-Chair position which is currently vacant.
- Decide what approach to use in cases where there is not consensus in relation to a Group recommendation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scenarios referenced during the meeting are in the IESO's [Ontario Planning Outlook \(OPO\) document \(Sept 2016\)](#). Table 1 on page 3 provides a high level comparison of the four scenarios (A to D) that were assessed by the IESO.

### **c) Discussion of Additional Appendix on Local Planning**

The Group also discussed the following proposed revisions to a draft document prepared by HONI (and OEB) staff which included an additional appendix and changes to the body of the PPWG report to further describe Local Planning (given its extensive use and brief discussion in the report):

- In point number 1, for the Regional Planning Process Diagram (page 13):
  - Remove reference to Appendix 13.
  - Change “Coordinate localized planning” to “Coordinate Local Planning”.
- In point number 3, for the first bullet, define IRRP and RIP before using the acronyms in the rest of the document.

#### **Action Items:**

1. Change the term “needs screening” to “needs assessment” in the PPWG Report
2. Finalize changes related to Local Planning including the additional Appendix to the PPWG Report
3. Add a page with all the acronyms used as another additional Appendix or at the beginning of the PPWG Report

### **3. Other Business**

IESO provided a report on their regional community engagement activities, with the pending release of their final four regional plans.

### **4. Next Meeting**

The next RPPAG meeting was tentatively set for Tuesday, February 14, 2017 (with Friday, February 10<sup>th</sup> as the alternate date).