

Meeting Summary	
Date:	April 25, 2017
Location:	Aurora Cultural Centre, Brevik Hall, 222 Church Street, Aurora
Subject:	York Region Local Advisory Committee Meeting #6
Attendees:	<p><u>Committee Members:</u> Avia Eek Brian Defriatas Debra Scott Dr. Alis Kennedy Graham Seaman Harry French Meghan White Peter Miasek Teresa Cline Tony Iacobelli</p> <p><u>Regrets:</u> Behdad Bahrami Brent Kopperson Chief Donna BigCanoe Dr. Anita Tucker Jennifer Wong Marc Pourvahidi Matt Hopps Natasha Charles Norm Vézina Stephen Kitchen</p> <p><u>Newmarket-Tay Power:</u> Larry Herod Gaye-Donna Young Ted Wojcinski</p> <p><u>Alectra Utilities (formerly PowerStream):</u> Riaz Shaikh Tamar Heisler Tom Wasik</p> <p><u>Hydro One:</u> Mark Von Tol Farooq Qureshy</p> <p><u>IESO:</u> Alexandra Barrett Amanda Flude Bernice Chan Bob Chow Chuck Farmer Evelyn Lundhild Humphrey Tse</p>
LAC Meeting Materials:	<p>http://www.ieso.ca/Pages/Participate/Regional-Planning/GTA-North/York-Region.aspx <i>Copies of all presentations are available at the LAC Meeting Materials Link above.</i></p> <p>Information about Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities http://www.hydroone.com/Projects/ClassEA_Amendment/Pages/default.aspx</p>

Summary	Follow-up Actions
<p>Opening Remarks</p> <p>Amanda Flude, Senior Advisor, Regional and Community Engagement, IESO, welcomed participants to the sixth meeting of the York Region Local Advisory Committee (LAC) and summarized discussions from the previous meeting in January 2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants were given a preview of early results from the Power.House pilot project feasibility study for Markham/Richmond Hill. An update of that study has been posted on the IESO website. LAC members were provided with an overview of how provincial planning feeds into regional planning, such as the Ontario Planning Outlook, the Climate Change Action Plan, and the Long-Term Energy Plan (LTEP). Local planning opportunities were highlighted 	

<p>during that discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was discussion about how distributed energy resources (DERs) are being considered in regional electricity planning. LAC members were asked to identify DER initiatives that they have had experience with, for further discussion at today's meeting. <p>A full summary of the January meeting has been finalized and is posted online.</p> <p>LAC members were provided with the hand-off letter (now being referred to as the Letter of Support) by email that the IESO issued to Alectra Utilities and Hydro One Transmission for the Markham/Richmond Hill project. The letter has been posted to the IESO website.</p> <p>No updates have been made to the Meeting Priorities and Schedule Document.</p>	<p>Ms. Flude will circulate a link to the Letter of Support that is posted online.</p>
<p>Status Update on Near-Term Projects and Activities</p> <p>Bernice Chan, Planner, IESO, provided an update on the Markham/Richmond Hill planning activities. Ms. Chan noted that the Power.House pilot project feasibility study for Markham/Richmond Hill has been posted. Results from the feasibility study confirmed that it is not feasible to rely entirely on distributed energy resources to defer the near-term supply need in this area, and a new transformer station and associated distribution and transmission connection lines will be required to meet the growth projections for the Markham-Richmond Hill area. Subsequently, a letter of support has been provided to Alectra Utilities and Hydro One Transmission last week to initiate the infrastructure project for addressing electricity needs in the Markham/Richmond Hill area. With the letter of support, the Markham/Richmond Hill electricity needs will now move from the planning to project development phase. There will be an opportunity for public/LAC input as part of the project development phase (e.g., Environmental Assessment process).</p> <p>A participant asked where the 2016 feasibility study for implementing residential solar in Markham/Richmond Hill and Vaughan was posted. The working group said it is posted on the Alectra Utilities website.</p> <p>Another participant asked whether the York LAC is involved in the project addressing near-term electricity needs in the Markham/Richmond Hill area. The working group said the Markham/Richmond Hill project is being presented to the LAC as an item of information only and the focus for the York LAC going forward is on longer-term needs in York Region. Information from the Markham/Richmond Hill project feeds into the formal Environmental Assessment (EA) process, and input on the project can be provided during that process.</p> <p>Two other projects are also under way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alectra is building a new transformer station at 5380 Kirby Road in Vaughan, which is scheduled for completion in September 2017. <p>Asked whether all the Alectra projects pertaining to the new transformer required an EA, Alectra Utilities said yes, and added that a lot of community input was received during the three public information sessions that were held. Between 15 and 20 members of the public attended the first meeting, and attendance decreased after that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydro One is implementing wire solutions to improve supply to York Region. Two projects are located at the Holland transformer station and along the Parkway Belt transmission corridor in the Dufferin Street area. Hydro One said it is increasing supply to Northern York Region, and work will be completed by the end of 2017. As well, new switching functions to increase supply reliability will be completed by the middle of 2018. 	<p>Ms. Flude will circulate the link to the 2016 residential solar feasibility study on the Alectra website.</p>

<p>The working group said extracting more capacity out of the Vaughan line will allow Alectra’s new transformer station to be built without having to build a new line. The Markham transformer station will be next, followed by a new station for Northern York Region.</p> <p>Commenting that there is a lot of truck traffic along the parkway, a participant asked how the work will impact the area. Hydro One replied that all work will be done near the towers, within the right-of-way.</p>	
<p>Preparation for the Next Iteration of the York Region Electricity Plan</p> <p>Ms. Chan said growth in Vaughan and Northern York Region is expected to exceed capacity by the mid-2020s. Now is the time to consider what is driving long-term growth, and also examine what has changed since the 2015 demand forecast. Now is also the time to identify the steps required to manage long-term growth.</p> <p>The last York Region Integrated Regional Resource Plan (IRRP) was published in 2015, and the next planning process kicks off at the end of 2017. The working group is currently between two planning cycles. Preparing for the next iteration of the plan involves gathering community input to help inform long-term decisions. The working group has created Workstream 1 to help gain a better understanding of the drivers of growth, and Workstream 2 to focus on DERs within communities (slide 7).</p> <p><u>Workstream 1</u></p> <p>Alexandra Barrett, Planner, IESO, said many inputs go into a load forecast, including local housing starts, municipal targets, official planning documents, density targets, electrification initiatives, and provincial policy direction. The load forecast is required to determine needs and is used to stress test the system. Specific targets must be captured within scenarios so that planners can understand the impacts of these targets. The largest inputs come from municipalities and communities, such as new subdivision developments. Over the next couple of months, the working group would like to start gathering information to update the York Region electricity planning forecast. An updated York Region demand forecast/scenarios will be developed as part of the next planning cycle, which will be initiated at the end of this year. The updated demand forecast should reflect the key changes (e.g., Places to Grow Updates, Climate Change Action Plan, Long-Term Energy Plan) since the 2015 York Region IRRP.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments from LAC members</u></p> <p>A participant asked whether the next York Region IRRP will require multiple planning scenarios, similar to the four scenarios developed for the Ontario Planning Outlook. The working group said it is waiting for the LTEP to reveal which of the four provincial scenarios is the most likely to be implemented. However, even if a provincial scenario is not adopted, a community can initiate a scenario if there is merit to it. The LTEP provides a starting point to run scenarios before moving to the options stage.</p> <p>A participant said consultation with municipalities might influence local assumptions. They asked whether electrification of rail lines and additional loads have been factored into the growth forecast. The working group confirmed that anything that is already planned by municipalities has been included in the forecast.</p> <p>Another participant said members of their municipality are waiting for the province to update the LTEP this year. Once received, the municipality will require 12 to 18 months to study its impact on growth. The working group replied that although exact intensity numbers may not be known, LTEP information can lead to the development of different planning scenarios.</p>	

When asked if a municipality decides to put in more district energy if it would constitute a scenario, the working group said when a project is committed to it will be included in the forecast as a scenario. One option would be to leave it out of the forecast and introduce it when the need arises.

A participant asked where peaker plants fit in. Since peaker plants are only 40% efficient, perhaps combined heat and power units are more effective. The working group replied that the peaker plant (i.e. York Energy Centre) is an existing asset designed to boost capacity very quickly within a local area. Flexibility, not efficiency, is the prime consideration for a peaker plant.

Workstream 2

Ms. Chan said the goal is to work closely with conservation planners and local utilities to gain an understanding of the cost and feasibility of various DER resources in York Region. The Local Achievable Potential Study will be used to collect information that will aid in the evaluation of DERs and to explore opportunities to implement these DERs. An example would be to explore a local demand response program similar to the one that was piloted in Brant.

Questions and comments from LAC members

A participant asked about the composition and mandate of the technical working group and the mandate of the working group. The working group clarified that the technical working group and the working group are the same entity. In York Region, it is comprised of IESO members, Newmarket-Tay Power, Alectra Utilities, Hydro One Distribution, and Hydro One Transmission. The working group is mandated by the Ontario Energy Board to carry out the regional electricity planning process, with the goal to carry out an 18-month planning process and develop a 20-year plan, at a minimum of every five years for a region. There are 21 planning regions across Ontario. The first IRRP was mandated for release in 2015, and the IESO continues to work with all regions within varying time frames.

Asked whether a menu of DER ideas will be presented to the LAC, the working group replied that the kick-off to the planning cycle will happen at the end of 2017 into early 2018, and about 18 months will be allotted to complete the plan. The outcome will be a recommendation. It will not require that anything be implemented by mid-2018. The participant said trying to do the work of identifying options by mid-2018 seems like a short timeline. The working group replied that work piloted in other areas, such as in Brant, should be able to be used as a framework and implemented elsewhere. The Local Achievable Potential Study will further inform the process.

A participant asked whether terms of reference for Workstream 2 are in place. The working group replied that terms of reference will be put in place at the start of the planning cycle. A third-party consultant will be hired to help with the Local Achievable Potential Study.

The same participant added that their municipality is struggling with community engagement, asking whether the working group has any opportunities for municipalities spark community engagement. The working group replied that it and the LAC should brainstorm approaches for how to successfully reach out to communities.

A participant noted that there are four members of the committee present at the meeting who are not connected to government or Hydro One.

When asked why Enbridge is not at the table, the working group said if gas is a potential fuel option for the area, the gas company will be invited to the committee, on an as needed basis. DERs can be on the demand or the supply side, renewable, solar, or storage, and have no particular technology attached to them. It is not that energy is lacking in the community; it is that capacity is lacking. Gas utilities are now actively involved in community-level discussions about thermal energy.

<p>A participant said there was an expectation that LAC members would have more opportunity for discussion and input regarding the short-term Markham/Richmond Hill decisions, but that this has not happened. Thus, there is a trust issue when it comes to having sufficient opportunity for input into the longer-term decisions for York Region. The working group replied that this concern was acknowledged in a letter last June to the LAC members. As outlined in the letter and at previous committee meetings, the focus for the LAC will be on providing input for long-term planning. The participant responded that LAC members are not experts in transmission and distribution, so it will be necessary to build their knowledge.</p> <p>A participant representing the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) echoed the concern that LAC members lack technical background and can also get lost in the acronyms used. They asked for clarification on what is expected from them as a LAC member. The working group said the participant's voice is valued, and the IESO presented at the Métis Nation of Ontario's request to participate in a symposium earlier in April. The participant acknowledged that the presentation was helpful. The working group offered to reach out to the community again and offer to provide another presentation to help provide further background information.</p> <p>A participant asked how it is possible to get input from community members when there is no menu of ideas to show them. The working group replied that the Local Achievable Potential Study will help to provide some clarity on this subject area.</p> <p>A participant asked whether it is possible to use retrofits (homes requiring the right roofing pitch for solar panels, for example) to offset more growth, and whether this can be considered a DER or a local demand response. The working group said the planned provincial conservation activities in place have already been factored into the load forecast. As well, the Local Achievable Potential Study will consider and assess the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of implementing additional conservation measures beyond what was forecast, such as retrofits, in York Region. To assess the feasibility of these measures, information such as housing stock in the region, the proportion of electric heat used, insulation levels, and building age, will be need to be gathered as part of the study.</p> <p>When asked if the updated LTEP will be the starting point for this committee, the working group's response was yes, and no. For example, if the government determines that electrification is the goal, this will influence community planning. If the LTEP update arrives in late June, it will work into the data-input-and-assumption portion of the regional planning study to be done this summer.</p> <p>LAC members will be updated on the progress of the two workstreams at the remaining York LAC meetings scheduled for September and December 2017. Feedback from the LAC will be collected at those meetings.</p>	<p>The IESO to reach out to MNO in invitation to meet.</p>
<p>Local Achievable Potential Study</p> <p>Ms. Chan said the Local Achievable Potential Study for Vaughan and Northern York Region will begin this summer. Data will be gathered in late 2017 and early 2018 and analyzed in spring 2018. A consultant will be hired this summer to work on the study and the final report will be released in summer 2018. Local Achievable Potential Studies are now in the early stages in the Parry Sound/Muskoka and Toronto regions.</p> <p>The purpose is to estimate electricity savings that could be realized through the implementation of conservation and demand management measures. This will involve assessing cost and feasibility within different categories of technologies to manage peak demand growth. The study will also identify the types of measures that are cost-effective.</p> <p>Specifically, the IESO is looking for activities that can be implemented within the next five years, as well as in the next five to 10 years.</p>	

Questions and comments from LAC members

A participant asked whether learnings gained from a Local Achievable Potential Study in one region will inform other areas, and the working group confirmed that this will be the case.

Another participant asked whether the working group has an average cost per kilowatt-hour estimate of a station and wire solution that can be used as a benchmark. The working group replied that a transformer station in York Region supplies 150 megawatts (MW), which is a lot of capacity. The idea will be to defer further investment as long as possible.

A participant said it would help to know the cost of one transformer station compared with two in terms of cost per kilowatt-hour. The working group clarified that reinforcing the regional transmission and distribution infrastructure enables more power to be delivered into the local area from the rest of the province, thereby leveraging the existing provincial resources. As such, when assessing a “wires” solution, it is important to consider the cost of wires (e.g., transmission/distribution infrastructure) as well as the attributes (e.g., emissions from provincial supply mix)/costs of existing provincial resources. The trade-off between DERs/local supply solutions versus delivering power from the rest of the province (e.g., costs of wires, emissions from provincial supply mix) would need to be considered when evaluating the various alternatives for a local area.

As such, a participant said that to go to City Council to pitch ideas and get public buy-in, return on investment would need to be understood.

A participant suggested that local impacts such as jobs and taxes might be quantifiable. The working group clarified that economic development is beyond the scope of the IESO.

A participant said a systematic approach should be taken. LAC members would like to see ratepayer dollars leveraged with other taxpayer dollars, rather than seeing the money isolated.

Another participant said that when discussing cost-effectiveness, it is worth defining who will benefit: the ratepayer or the utility.

A participant suggested scheduling future York LAC meetings at key study planning milestones.

A participant asked whether, in lieu of a clear mandate or terms of reference, there will be diversity and expertise at future LAC meetings. They asked whether the working group can clarify the roles, responsibilities and mandate of LAC members/working group in the context of the Regional Planning Process and the purpose/scope of the LAC at the next meeting. The working group said that this information will be added to the next committee meeting agenda.

A participant asked for clarification of slide 14, entitled “Draft Study Scope,” and asked whether the identification of alternative fuels has been included in other Local Achievable Potential studies. The working group replied that it is being considered in the Parry Sound/Muskoka study.

Approaches to Gather Community Input on York Region Electricity Planning Activities

The working group said that it is interested in input from LAC members regarding ways to broaden community engagement.

In follow up to the previous committee meeting discussion, Harry French, Ontario Sustainability Services, presented an example of a DER initiative for Northern York Region, representing grassroots, bottom-up approaches from municipalities for the engagement of the 11 communities within the region using a process called QuickLaunch; a tool for small to medium-sized communities to focus on

<p>energy generation through DER, conservation, and climate adaptation. The idea is that by engaging the 11 communities, Ontario Sustainability Services would develop an energy map of what DER initiatives would look like in Northern York Region. Once complete, needs, costs, and technical feasibility can all be studied. Mr. French presented a picture of what the DER energy savings might look like in Northern York Region in the next five to 10 years. A plain-language understanding of DER could be gained from a report on emerging energy trends published by the Mowat Centre and commissioned by the Ministry of Energy. The report examines DER from the perspective of international experiences, digging into pricing, policy issues, and the importance of the many inputs required within regional planning processes. There is a movement in these planning processes to think beyond electricity. Notionally, a detailed work program reflecting regional needs would be developed within the next three months, and a LAC subcommittee with full representation from Northern York Region stakeholders would be needed.</p> <p>The working group noted that the City of Vaughan had submitted a letter of feedback as well as some questions on the planning activities contained in Mr. French’s regional survey. The letter has been shared with LAC members. It was suggested that a more in depth discussion with Tony Iacobelli, City of Vaughan, could take place sometime following the IESO and Alectra’s presentation to Vaughan’s Committee of the Whole on May 8. Mr. Iacobelli said Vaughan has more questions than recommendations at this time, but this may change once the Local Achievable Potential Study gets under way.</p>	
<p>Environmental Assessment Process and Engagement</p> <p>As part of a standing agenda item to provide the committee with updates on the future Markham/Richmond Hill Transmission project, the LAC requested further information on the Environmental Assessment (EA) Process. Riaz Shaikh, Manager, Distribution System Planning, Alectra, explained that an EA is an environmental planning process approved under the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> for certain classes of projects that have predictable environmental impacts that can be mitigated. A proponent who receives approval for more than one project in the same class does not need to obtain separate EA approval for each specific project, providing that the Class EA planning process is adhered to for each specific project. Construction on a project may not commence until after EA requirements have been met.</p> <p>Projects subject to Class EA include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New transmission links with a nominal operating voltage of 115 kV and that are greater than 2 km in length, or with a nominal operating voltage of greater than 115 kV but less than 500 kV and less than 50 km in length • Modified or upgraded transmission lines with a nominal operating voltage of 115 kV to 500 kV where work requires replacement of poles or towers, or changes to a right-of-way • New, modified, or upgraded transmission stations with a primary nominal operating voltage of 115 kV to less than 500 kV and where acquisition of property is required <p>A Class EA screening process is required for projects that have environmental impacts that are so insignificant as to be of no concern. A Class EA also applies to small projects with a predictable range of effects that may be assessed using a common planning process. If a project is not successfully screened, the Class EA process is initiated. The public and affected agencies are consulted, and studies are conducted to assess the effects and develop mitigation requirements. The proponent then prepares a draft environmental study report that includes the results of the review, consultations, and management commitments. The proponent then publishes a statement of completion of the final environmental study report, and after a 30-day public review period the project may proceed.</p>	

<p><u>Questions and comments from LAC members</u></p> <p>When asked whether a transformer station project requires an EA, Alectra confirmed that it does. It was clarified that a transformer station is the same thing as a transmission station.</p> <p>A participant said LAC members want to provide input into the screening process, including a discussion on evaluation criteria and how they are weighted. The working group said that input and discussions of those nature are part of the EA process; which is a separate forum outside of the LAC. When asked about the timelines for the EA process for the Markham/Richmond Hill project, Alectra said that the Letter of Support was received very recently, and once the solution is determined, the timelines will be clearer.</p> <p>Tamar Heisler, Director, Government and Industry Relations, Alectra, said that Alectra is committed to finding the least socially and environmentally disruptive solutions as possible within communities. The utility is also committed to going above and beyond the requirements of the mandated EA process.</p> <p>The working group said there will be an item on the next LAC meeting agenda for updates on the EA process, as part of the standing agenda item for updates on the Markham/Richmond Hill need. In the interim, the LAC will be kept informed about any potential updates via email.</p> <p>A participant suggested that there be a workshop, separate from the LAC meeting, whereby LAC members can learn more about the EA standards, process and the next steps. One LAC member volunteered to meet with Alectra about this and report back to the LAC in September.</p> <p>A participant cautioned against inadvertently using the LAC members as a resource for obtaining approvals for projects.</p>	<p>LAC member and Alectra to meet to discuss next steps for EA standards and report back to the LAC in September.</p>
<p>Drafting Agenda for Meeting #7</p> <p>The following items are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on the LTEP • Progress updates on the two workstreams • Clarify the roles, responsibility and mandate of LAC members/Working Group in the context of the Regional Planning Process and the purpose/scope of the LAC • Update on the Local Achievable Potential Study, including how the milestones of this study will coincide with future LAC meetings. LAC feedback will be invited on ideas for DER. • Discussion on how to boost community involvement within the Local Potential Achievable Potential Study 	
<p>Public Questions</p> <p>An observer introduced themselves as the owner of a small solar solutions company, and suggested inviting input for innovative ideas from some of Alectra’s competitors. Local distribution companies are interested in storage because they want to own the assets and charge for them. Thus, some competitive models should be brought in for consideration. There should also be some give on fuel subscription restrictions. Tens of thousands of houses are being built with gables that destroy any chance of a solar rooftop. They asked where the planning department’s involvement in this was. Developers claim that it is the planning departments that want these things. They have lost business to Power.House, and their company is barely surviving due to the loss of the microFIT program. Other companies should be allowed into the market as well to look after the whole market.</p>	



<p>Closing Remarks</p> <p>Ms. Flude thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting.</p> <p>The next meeting will be held on September 14, 2017. Location to be announced.</p>	
--	--