

Meeting Summary			
<b>Date:</b>	November 23, 2016		
<b>Location:</b>	Toronto, ON		
<b>Subject:</b>	Toronto Local Advisory Committee (LAC) Meeting #3		
<b>Attendees:</b>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; width: 50%;"> <p><b>Committee Members:</b> Jim Baxter Peter Bettle (via teleconference for portion of meeting) Darren Borden Mario Chiarelli Keith Foster Jack Gibbons David Kiguel Julia Langer Rob McMonagle Clare Schulte-Albert Jane Welsh (for portion of meeting)</p> <p><b>Regrets:</b> Fernando Carou Gordon Kaiser John McGrath Andrew Patricio Senator Joseph Poitras Bala Venkatesh</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top; width: 50%;"> <p><b>Toronto Hydro:</b> Angelo Boschetti Andrea Corkum Amanda Klein Michael Marchant Andrew Sasso Jack Simpson</p> <p><b>IESO:</b> Luisa Da Rocha Chuck Farmer Steven Norrie Joe Toneguzzo</p> <p><b>Hydro One:</b> Ajay Garg (for portion of meeting)</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p><b>Committee Members:</b> Jim Baxter Peter Bettle (via teleconference for portion of meeting) Darren Borden Mario Chiarelli Keith Foster Jack Gibbons David Kiguel Julia Langer Rob McMonagle Clare Schulte-Albert Jane Welsh (for portion of meeting)</p> <p><b>Regrets:</b> Fernando Carou Gordon Kaiser John McGrath Andrew Patricio Senator Joseph Poitras Bala Venkatesh</p>	<p><b>Toronto Hydro:</b> Angelo Boschetti Andrea Corkum Amanda Klein Michael Marchant Andrew Sasso Jack Simpson</p> <p><b>IESO:</b> Luisa Da Rocha Chuck Farmer Steven Norrie Joe Toneguzzo</p> <p><b>Hydro One:</b> Ajay Garg (for portion of meeting)</p>
<p><b>Committee Members:</b> Jim Baxter Peter Bettle (via teleconference for portion of meeting) Darren Borden Mario Chiarelli Keith Foster Jack Gibbons David Kiguel Julia Langer Rob McMonagle Clare Schulte-Albert Jane Welsh (for portion of meeting)</p> <p><b>Regrets:</b> Fernando Carou Gordon Kaiser John McGrath Andrew Patricio Senator Joseph Poitras Bala Venkatesh</p>	<p><b>Toronto Hydro:</b> Angelo Boschetti Andrea Corkum Amanda Klein Michael Marchant Andrew Sasso Jack Simpson</p> <p><b>IESO:</b> Luisa Da Rocha Chuck Farmer Steven Norrie Joe Toneguzzo</p> <p><b>Hydro One:</b> Ajay Garg (for portion of meeting)</p>		
<b>LAC Meeting Materials:</b>	<a href="http://www.ieso.ca/Pages/Participate/Regional-Planning/Metro-Toronto/default.aspx">http://www.ieso.ca/Pages/Participate/Regional-Planning/Metro-Toronto/default.aspx</a>		

Key Topics	Follow-up Actions
<p><b>Opening Remarks and Roundtable Introductions</b></p> <p>Luisa Da Rocha, Manager, Regional and Community Engagement, IESO, welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda. Roundtable introductions were made.</p> <p>Amanda Klein, Executive Vice-President, Regulatory Affairs, Toronto Hydro, delivered opening remarks and said it is an exciting, transformational, and unpredictable time for the industry. New evolutions are changing the traditional understanding of the public good and how to serve it. Toronto Hydro's customer base is a mosaic, and the LAC is an important advisory body to provide input on the</p>	

<p>safety and reliability of the electricity supply, population growth, and climate change. A robust and nimble Integrated Regional Resource Plan (IRRP) will allow Toronto Hydro to provide valuable services and tackle challenges.</p> <p>Ms. Da Rocha said enhancements have been made to assist the LAC. Professional note takers have been hired, and committee members can now expect to receive the minutes within a few weeks of each meeting, providing more time for review. As well, updates will be provided between meetings to improve communications between the LAC and the working group, and feedback will be invited. A LAC meeting schedule for 2017 will be posted on the website. The next meeting is scheduled for February 15, 2017, followed by meetings in June and November.</p>	
<p><b>Recap of the June 1 LAC Meeting</b></p> <p>The last meeting included a presentation by the City of Toronto that focused on intensified growth, official plan policies, climate change goals, energy strategies, job creation, and the impacts of extreme weather events. It was decided that a review of the IRRP implementation would appear on the agendas of every meeting. Moreover, half of every meeting agenda will be given to committee priorities and half to working group priorities.</p>	
<p><b>Questions Submitted by LAC Members</b></p> <p>An inquiry was submitted by a LAC member regarding the appointment of a LAC member as the committee's liaison to the Technical Working Group. The LAC nominated committee member David Kiguel, a former Hydro One employee with experience working with the North American Electric Reliability Corporation. Mr. Kiguel agreed to be the interim liaison until the next LAC meeting in February 2017, at which time the role of the liaison will be defined and a vote conducted. He said the role should go beyond mere attendance at working group meetings. The liaison should be able to put communications together on matters of interest.</p> <p>Ms. Da Rocha said the working group will be pleased to work with Mr. Kiguel.</p>	
<p><b>Toronto IRRP Implementation Update</b></p> <p>Steven Norrie, Senior Planner, Transmission Integration, IESO, said the Central Toronto IRRP was published in April 2015. The regional planning cycles last for about two years, and there are three years between cycles to process changes. Planning cycles can be shortened if necessary. An update will be issued to the Toronto IRRP to explain changes that are coming following an announcement from Metrolinx to electrify the Lakeshore West heavy rail corridor. The Metrolinx project will trigger transmission reinforcements currently planned for 2020.</p> <p>Jack Simpson, Director, Generation and Capacity Planning, Toronto Hydro, said the Runnymede expansion is on track with completion expected in early 2019. The</p>	

Metrolinx Eglinton Crosstown Light Rapid Transit project is the major driver for it. The Horner Transformer Station (TS) expansion is within that time frame as well. The design of the Local Demand Response (DR) program is under way at Cecil Transformer Station (TS) downtown, and the Copeland expansion project is also underway.

It was indicated that the IESO has recently released a request for proposals to investigate industry practices for enhancing resilience for hospitals, transit and high-rise buildings and the working group will provide the preliminary results at a future LAC meeting.

Questions and comments from LAC members

A LAC participant noted that fuel cell locomotives are currently manufactured in Mississauga and shipped to Germany, and asked whether fuel cell trains could be used in Toronto. The working group responded that the first Metrolinx trains will be electric, but the long-term plan is unknown. Metrolinx is the customer requiring reliable capacity and plans to enable this must be put in place.

Asked how many times it has met since the June 2016 LAC meeting, the working group responded that there have been a number of meetings between IESO, Toronto Hydro and Hydro One that were focused mainly on implementation matters related to the 2015 IRRP recommendations.

A participant asked whether the minutes of these meetings would be made available to the LAC. The working group said a summary could be provided, but not the minutes, due to confidentiality. The participant asked whether confidential sections could be redacted, and the working group responded that this can be discussed in the future, potentially with the LAC liaison.

With electricity rates on the rise, why not ramp up conservation projects in an effort to lower customers' bills, especially with respect to electric trains and new infrastructure, one participant suggested. The working group said conservation projects have been going full tilt with programs, pilots, and demonstrations in nearly every market sector.

With respect to plans for the Runnymede high-voltage lines, a participant asked whether the IESO will still be doing transmission demand management programs in addition to potential new loads. The IESO said discussions with Toronto Hydro are ongoing. A targeted area was identified in the IRRP, and the working group is looking to expand that area to avoid future power system facilities.

A participant said the LAC has not received any information about local avoided costs and in their view, logical decisions cannot be made without this information. A bottom-up assessment is needed, and the working group is urged to make this a priority. The working group responded that this is a top priority for Toronto Hydro

- Provide a summary of working group meetings to the LAC. Consider providing redacted minutes of the working group meetings.
- Inform the LAC of impacts of investments on all electricity rates in Toronto so that questions about electricity bill increases can be answered.

<p>in its input in to the Long-Term Energy Plan (LTEP) process. A policy framework is needed, and the working group is making strides. Other jurisdictions are being examined to see how they do things within their regulatory contexts. The LTEP coming out in 2017 is the next iteration of the framework of how projects will be funded. In terms of timelines, planning assumptions could be discussed at the next LAC meeting with specificity around local avoided costs.</p> <p>Another participant noted the provincial government is supportive of things the LAC is starting to look at, but there is the potential to end up with an unsupportive government. With 2018 being an election year, timing is critical. The participant said the working group should inform the LAC of the impacts of investments on all electricity rates in Toronto and whether or not these impacts are built into the Ontario Energy Board (OEB)-approved forecasting. The media are beginning to explore electricity pricing that includes the global adjustment, and suppliers need to provide answers for how electricity bills will be affected in the future. The working group said it does not have the detail to unbundle costs at this meeting but will take that back for discussion.</p> <p>This year the commodity price of electricity with global adjustment included has grown by at least 30% or 40%, which is unheard of, a participant said. This increase is affecting business decisions in terms of what can be done to hedge, because the Hourly Ontario Electricity Price (HOEP) is worthless, and global adjustment is out of control. A reduction to one megawatt would increase the number of people able to manipulate the global adjustment transfer cost by 20 or 30 times. Class A participants can write off about 80% of their hydro bill. Class A participants, who stop their business for five hours per year, bringing their demand to zero, pay no global adjustment. The participant said, “Three years ago, I begged our organization to start to hedge against Class A alone. We are at the point where we will either spend significant capital for energy onsite production to avoid the Class B terawatt-hour section, or we will have to become Class A participants ourselves to stay competitive.” Also, food plant layoffs are occurring because it is cheaper to produce food outside of the province and transport using diesel than it is to freeze the food in Ontario and pay the hydro rate.</p> <p>With respect to the request for proposals for a distributed generation study for resilience in downtown Toronto, a participant said distributed generation is needed to keep hospitals and subways running at full capacity, and not just to service basic needs. The working group responded that the definition of basic need depends on the customer, and understanding basic needs in order to continue operating is part of the scope of the project.</p>	
<p><b>Presentation: IESO’s Ontario Planning Outlook Highlights in Relation to the Toronto IRRP</b></p> <p>Chuck Farmer, Director, Stakeholder and Public Affairs, IESO, said the Ontario</p>	

Planning Outlook (available online at [www.ieso.ca](http://www.ieso.ca)) was prepared at the request of the provincial energy minister. It provides both a review of the past 10 years and a 20-year outlook for the electricity system. The planning outlook is accompanied by a ministry-prepared fuel sector report. Government consultations on the planning outlook will end in December 2016. The LTEP is planned to be issued in 2017 and followed by implementation directives to the IESO and the OEB. The planning outlook is not a plan. It does not offer policy advice. Rather, it identifies issues according to four separate outlooks based on potential net energy demand. Its seven modules (available on line) lay out the assumptions made by the IESO. The major theme of the planning outlook is how to deal with uncertainty that will be driven by the performance of the economy and the demand for electricity. In summary, there is adequate supply provincially for the next 10 years. After that, if demand increases, additional resources will be needed starting in 2024-2025.

#### Questions and comments from LAC members

A participant said the 1-megawatt reduction will put downward pressure on small businesses that do not receive the reduction. As a result, there will be no job creation and no spinoff businesses. The working group replied that this is good input to provide to the plan. The government has made a statement about reducing the threshold through the Industrial Conservation Initiative. In addition, there could be a lower demand forecast if what the participant described occurs.

Another participant asked what the outlook curves would look like if only Toronto were considered. The working group said they would be similar. The working group expects to refresh the outlooks for next year, and the case for Toronto is being looked at now, based on the uptake of electrification.

The provincial outlook could inform Toronto, but the Toronto outlook also should inform the province, one participant said. The timing of the refreshed outlooks is important to ensure there is enough time to inform the minister and have an impact on the provincial plan. Other regions are likely asking the same questions. There should be a coming together of bottom-up and top-down approaches.

The working group said the minister has received briefings on most regional plans and intends to review briefings from all regions. There is great interest in making the process more community-driven. The message is getting through. Reducing greenhouse emissions will be a major challenge.

A participant said the assumption that we are electrifying based on the needs of today is an oversimplification. What makes up the generation makes a big difference. Unless the forward electricity is being handled by something low-carbon, it is not achieving the goal. "We do not want to increase costs without having a significant impact." The working group agreed these are good points, adding that how fast electrification will happen, how policies will unfold, and how customers will react are all unknown.

A participant said transmission systems are geographically dependent, and asked for detail regarding the next steps in the provincial plan. The working group said it will be up to the government to decide on the level of granularity. The last LTEP addressed some regional issues, while other issues were left to regional planning processes.

A participant asked whether the LAC has any more weight than an Environmental Bill of Rights submission, adding that a short statement from a Toronto perspective should be submitted, because “we are struggling in our city in the context of development and price.” The working group suggested the LAC could make a submission as a committee.

A participant asked whether IESO assumes electric resistance heating in its high-demand forecast during winter peaking. The IESO said no, it assumes that the conversions will be done with heat pump technology. Conservation targets will be met. There will be a mid-term review, and there will still be much work to do post-2021.

Asked whether there is an opportunity to ramp-up the conservation numbers, the working group said opportunities may exist. Provincially available generation is comprised of an existing fleet, committed and directed resources, a nuclear refurbishment program, and existing resources with contracts set to expire. This must be compared to electrical demand net of conservation—there is a lot of choice.

Another participant asked how the October 21 signing of the agreement for two terawatt-hours of energy from Quebec factors in. The working group said no contract has been signed yet with Quebec. What was signed was a memorandum of understanding, and negotiations are continuing. Also, the cancellation of the Large Renewable Procurement (LRP) II request for qualifications process, halting 1,000 megawatts of renewable energy, has not been factored in.

If the 10 cent-per-kilowatt-hour energy that is being sold into New England were brought into Ontario, there would be potential savings, but only if global adjustment, and HOEP are factored in. If only HOEP is factored in, then Ontario is buying commodity power at 10 times what we are generating it at, a participant said. The working group responded that it cannot speak to commercial terms, but encouraged the LAC members to provide their input to the government as policy advice.

A participant asked whether materials under contracts that are currently contributing to global adjustment to recoup costs and will eventually fall off will ever be made public. In other words, if there was a commitment for \$100 million based on 10 contracts that were coming up at the end of 2018, would these fall off of global adjustment recoup costs? Will there ever be a projected rise and fall off?

The working group said no costs are committed beyond the terms of the contract. Global adjustment is the difference between what they can recoup and what they are guaranteed.

One participant offered an analogy: “If 10 people are on unemployment insurance and are getting paid for the next four years, will they still be collecting in year five? This is how global adjustment works. I want to know if in five years they are going to get off the dole, and if they are, what it will mean to the cost and also to on-contract and out-of-contract reserve capacity.”

The working group replied that the Market Renewal Project is designed to address efficiencies and changes in the way the market operates. One element of market renewal is to change how to procure capacity with the aim to move away from long-term contract commitments toward shorter-term capacity auctions. The IESO is moving toward a more competitive model. Cap and trade will give preference to clean imports over the gas fleet, the gas fleet will become more expensive, and gas burning will be suppressed. The working group sees a very flat outlook for emissions, subject to policy.

Another participant asked whether this factors in the preference of local distribution companies (LDCs) for trying to meet their targets by promoting the uptake of combined heat and power (CHP). The working group said it would not include the achievement of the conservation targets using gas. Given the size of the conservation target, there would be no large impact.

A participant asked where the conservation portfolio to meet increased electricity demand is, and the working group replied that there are many technologies to choose from, including conservation. Diversity is required. The IESO did not look at an increased conservation option, and perhaps should have.

Considering all of the planning outlooks, with the exception of the low-growth one, Ontario is in a supply deficit, and there is a short-term gap in 2025, one participant said, asking whether the IESO is happy with its chosen base scenarios. The IESO agreed there is a short-term gap in 2025, which should be addressed. The demand lines include a reserve requirement. There is 17–20% wiggle room in that number.

Asked whether Outlook B will fall short if there is anything more than marginal growth, the working group said yes.

One participant asked what will happen if the OEB says raising Ontario Power Generation’s (OPG) rates by 160% is too much. The working group said there will be uncertainty in the supply side, for example if Pickering does not continue until 2024.

One participant said stakeholders in Toronto will build in options regardless of what is in the Ontario Planning Outlook. IESO said that is good feedback for the

<p>government.</p>	
<p><b>Presentation: Distributed Energy Resources</b></p> <p>Mr. Norrie provided an overview of distributed energy resources (DER) technologies and approaches to programs in Ontario and elsewhere. He provided an update on the opportunities, benefits, and challenges for DERs in Toronto.</p> <p>Currently almost 1,500 solar PV Feed-in Tariff (FIT) projects are contracted in Toronto. The installed costs have been falling in recent years, and this is expected to continue. Storage can be paired with solar PV to improve capacity and dependability. Storage costs are dropping rapidly, and pilot projects are testing the costs and benefits. Wind and water opportunities along with biogas and biomass opportunities are very limited in urban areas like Toronto.</p> <p>There are many opportunities for CHP that generate thermal and electrical energy using a single fuel source. In ideal situations these are highly efficient when output is closely tied to thermal demands; actual efficiency in operation of CHP plants averages much less than 80%.</p> <p>Conservation and demand management resources are important parts of a distributed solution. The Toronto Green Standard provides incentives for people to build to a higher level of efficiency. DERs are highly distributed throughout Toronto. Depending on their size and location, they are comparable in cost with conventional sources. There are two demand response pilots in Ontario: the Brant Local DR Pilot and the Cecil TS Local DR Pilot in Toronto.</p> <p>The working group has looked at DER approaches in other jurisdictions. In Brooklyn-Queens, New York City, for example, there is a demonstration project to defer \$1.2 billion in new substation investments through investments in distributed alternatives. In Orange County, California, there is a regional pilot to measure the impact of alternatives to building new gas-fired power plants.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments from LAC members</u></p> <p>If FIT and microFIT have done their jobs to get renewables in the market, bringing their cost down and making them mainstream, at what point will net metering be allowed, one participant asked.</p> <p>The working group said the government has had a net metering regulation for a long time, up to 500 kilowatts. Updated regulations have been posted. The idea is to size the system to one's need using the grid as the back-up source. This is expected to start next year, with microFIT expected to end at the end of 2017. Over the course of a year customers would generate approximately equal to their consumption. They will get credits for whatever they feed into the grid; unused credits will be forfeited.</p>	



A participant commented that the word “pilot” must be used clearly: What is being piloted is not the technology, but the approach to implementation.

Regarding the New York demand management project, the development and implementation insights are interesting, said another participant. The most difficult thing was for the utility to not hedge. The project shows a change in culture and approach. We must support implementation agencies in a new way, the participant added. Transmission planners are risk-averse by nature, the working group replied. In Toronto the Cecil TS work should avoid about \$30 million in station upgrades. This work is very insightful for the kinds of loads and the kinds of customers IESO and Toronto Hydro can engage.

In response to a question about procurement and timing at Cecil TS, the working group said there will be a mix of customer load and other asset investments. There will be peaksaver approaches where Toronto Hydro is looking for loads to participate. Some things will come on stream in 2017, and Toronto Hydro will monitor their success through 2018 and 2019.

In response to a participant’s request, the working group agreed to provide the LAC with a map to show customer segmentation in the Cecil TS area.

A participant asked what percentage of the current capacity is constituted by DERs. The working group replied that for Toronto it is 179 megawatts divided by about 5,000. It is not a large percentage, but it is expected to continue to grow.

Another participant asked how difficult it is for the average consumer to get access, and whether there is a lot of regulation, red tape, and paperwork. The working group said the City of Toronto has a fast-track process for small projects.

The IESO is working with some LDCs on a conservation fund study to take its work at the provincial level and try to identify the achievable potential for conservation, drilling down to local areas. It is very challenging to get this level of granularity, to the customer level. California, for example, identified spatially detailed conservation achievable forecasts as a huge challenge. The IESO is doing it in Ontario in a manner that will be replicable, so that lessons learned can be more broadly applied.

A participant asked about the timeline for the Toronto Achievable Potential Study and whether the LAC will be consulted. The working group said it intends to talk to the committee. It will take eight months to complete the study.

Another participant asked whether the Achievable Potential Study will include an avoided-cost estimate, and the working group said that could be part of it, but most of the focus is on segmentation and understanding the loads. There are provincial avoided costs, but local costs could be worked in as well.

- Provide the LAC with a map to show customer segmentation in the Cecil TS area.
- Work with the LAC to create scenarios showing local avoided costs and how a discussion about conservation might be brought into each.

One participant asked what the point of this LAC is if the committee is not consulted on anything meaningful. The working group responded that a better discussion is needed about local avoided costs—whether those are avoiding a transformer station or a line upgrade—and the infrastructure needs that will be addressed must be clearly specified. If an upgrade is needed in the next three to five years in the near term, there is no time to implement a conservation solution and there is no avoidable cost.

A participant said the utility industry always says there is never time to do conservation as an alternative, and the IESO never gives participants the forecasts of what the needs will be three or four years out. “You always rig it. We can never do conservation,” the participant said. The working group disagreed with this view.

A participant said some avoided costs could be put on the table for discussion, such as high-voltage transmission. “We can quantify, create scenarios, and work with those.” Then there could be a discussion around what kind of conservation could be brought into each scenario, and the LAC and working group could work together on creating these.

The working group said that in jurisdictions with vertically integrated utilities, it is an easier construct because it is all part of the same value chain. When the parameters are to look at distribution, transmission, and generation, it is more challenging to make comparisons. When Toronto Hydro looks at avoided costs for the purposes of the OEB, generation is not an avoided cost. This is a problem, and it is a factor in IESO’s advocacy about LTEP with respect to how the regulatory construct needs to adapt. Right now there are challenges because the system lacks vertical integration.

Another participant said the issue is to determine what is best for customers. OPG is asking for a 180% price increase for nuclear power. Nuclear power is going up to 16.8 cents per kilowatt-hour. Mr. Farmer referred to the avoided cost being five or seven cents, all in, for everything. The participant said there is huge potential for savings.

The working group agreed. Scenario-based planning is a good way to go, especially at the transmission level. Local greenhouse gas targets have to be a big factor in that. The LAC can help IESO plan the scenarios and calculate the local avoided costs.

Another participant asked whether, if one of the scenarios were a high-voltage transmission, the avoided cost would be borne by Toronto ratepayers. There is a de facto integration here.

The working group responded that the situation is a bit complicated. When infrastructure has to be built, the electrical grid that supplies the city has an impact

on other service territories. The OEB ultimately decides how the costs break out. However, this should not prevent us from developing local avoided costs.

A participant said the working group looked at North American jurisdictions, so why not look at countries that went through these pilots 20 years ago to see where they are at now. International trade agencies would be pleased to make presentations on what has happened in Denmark and Germany. Hamburg has over 100 megawatts of wind generators. In Europe the big thing now is energy-plus housing and the energy-plus community where homeowners contribute to the generation needs of their communities. A lot of innovation is being done. The participant said it is strange that Ontario is piloting what is commercially viable in other countries. The working group replied that it is interested in this information and staying current on progress in other jurisdictions.

A participant said the issue is about not hedging. Rather, accomplishing anything meaningful requires taking a brave step. The bulk transmission options that are always defaulted to are not without risk. They are large, provincially funded projects. One of the benefits to distributed approaches is that they are funded largely by the private sector. Private sector dollars will move into these projects where there are lower or no restrictions. From a public policy perspective, the city and province can benefit significantly by getting out of the way of private sector investments in electricity infrastructure. Also, conservation does not have to take long. The sector has been doing conservation in Toronto for decades. Electricity consumption in kilowatt-hours was relatively flat in Toronto during a population increase of 200,000 people between 2010 and 2014. New construction is being delivered successfully through the Save On Energy program. “We are selling ourselves short” regarding the ability to use conservation to help supply future growth, the participant said.

Ms. Da Rocha said the working group has put together questions on DERs for LAC feedback. These will be sent out, and committee members can respond by email or phone.

One participant said the questions are a waste of time. The IESO assumes conservation and distributed generation will cost more, leading to a discussion about who should pay, but it isn’t possible to know whether distributed generation will cost more when the avoided-cost studies have not been done. “Let’s not put the cart before the horse. Let’s look at conservation potential and reduce customers’ bills,” the participant said. The working group said it will take that feedback to its debrief meeting.

Another participant said a big policy question is the moratorium on offshore wind. “We need to take a position that offshore wind could be great for Toronto. We could have direct connection with no long-distance transmission required.” The working group said it will take that back for discussion as well.

<p><b>Development of Agenda for Next LAC Meeting</b></p> <p>Ms. Da Rocha asked the LAC members what they would like to see on the agenda for the February 2017 meeting.</p> <p>LAC members suggested the following agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local avoided cost analysis and conservation potential scenarios</li> <li>• Schedule and timing for output that the LAC can aspire to</li> <li>• Carbon pricing and the impacts of cap and trade</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Comments and Questions from the Public</b></p> <p>A member of the public said that in the different scenarios it would be helpful to see some probabilities attached along with some short-term monitoring of the economic factors, given the election in the United States. On the electricity side, it is good that the IESO has factored in intense weather events as they translate into risks.</p> <p>Another member of the public asked how it is possible to reconcile the customers that are very sensitive to price and reliability and those that are high-tech where a very short outage can cost them a lot of money. The working group replied it will take this into consideration after the meeting.</p> <p>Another member of the public said, “I came here to see what we were going to do. People at this meeting have been contentiously going after each other. We are not seeing any basis to leap off or any benchmarks. I have at least four questions which if the committee could have asked there would have been an explanation. Why do I have to ask them? I feel like I’ve wasted my night.”</p> <p>The working group said a goal of the LACs across the province is to get a diversity of perspectives. At the last meeting, the committee members said presenting a collective voice to the IESO, to Toronto Hydro, and to Hydro One is okay but not really the point. There are 17 people on the Toronto LAC, and the Working Group wants all perspectives. Some perspectives come across louder. As the committee evolves, it is hoped there will be more complete feedback into the regional planning process.</p> <p>A member of the public said not much difference is evident between the three Toronto LAC meetings so far. “I see no movement. I see people complaining and lobbying. Do we have the right facilitation? Do we have the right objective? This is not going anywhere.” A LAC member replied that the LAC wants to evolve as a committee.</p> <p>A LAC member echoed that frustration, agreeing that no progress has been made throughout the first three meetings. Collecting 17 points of view should not be the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss ways to make the LAC meetings work better.</li> </ul>

<p>objective because that means no consensus and no progress. Instead, “We need to find good solutions and we need a good facilitator.” The participant suggested hiring Ken Rosenberg, a lawyer who facilitates OEB dispute resolution conferences, to facilitate the LAC meetings.</p> <p>Mr. Farmer said that since he is accountable for stakeholder and community engagement at the IESO, he would like to improve the process. He said he will invite discussion with committee members and members of the public outside of this forum with the intent to make the meetings better. He agreed that some elements are working in the LAC meetings and some are not.</p> <p>Another LAC member said everyone here wants greater resilience, security of supply, and lower bills, and consensus can be achieved with proper facilitation and leadership.</p>	
<p><b>Closing Remarks</b></p> <p>A representative from Toronto Hydro thanked everyone for participating and said the LAC feedback would help the utility with its priorities. Points were heard loud and clear on avoided costs and their rate impacts. The Ontario Planning Outlook provides insightful context. LAC members are encouraged to participate in the LTEP, as some points are best directed there. The Ontario Planning Outlook is an important document for the province, especially around climate change policies. DERs will be important in meeting load long-term and providing a chance for regional preferences to come forward and shine. Some DERs will be intermittent, some firm, some market-driven, and these must be properly expressed in our planning.</p> <p>Ms. Da Rocha adjourned the meeting.</p> <p>The next LAC meeting will be held on February 15, 2017.</p>	