

Meeting Summary	
Date:	January 24, 2017
Location:	Town of Newmarket Municipal Office, 395 Mulock Drive, Cain Rooms A & B
Subject:	IESO York Local Advisory Council Meeting #5
Attendees:	<p>Committee Members: Avia Eek Behdad Bahrami Brent Kopperson Dr. Alis Kennedy Graham Seaman Jennifer Wong Meghan White Peter Miasek Stephen Kitchen Teresa Cline Tony Iacobelli Tricia Myatt</p> <p>Regrets: Brian Defriatas Chief Donna BigCanoe Debra Scott Dr. Anita Tucker Harry French Marc Pourvahidi Matt Hopps Natasha Charles Norm Vézina</p> <p>Newmarket-Tay Power: Larry Herod Gaye-Donna Young Ted Wojcinski</p> <p>PowerStream: Neetika Sathe Riaz Shaikh</p> <p>Hydro One: Mark Van Tol</p> <p>IESO: Bob Chow Chuck Farmer Amanda Flude Bernice Chan Alexandra Barrett</p>
LAC Meeting Materials	http://www.ieso.ca/Pages/Participate/Regional-Planning/GTA-North/York-Region.aspx

Key Topics	Follow up Actions
<p>Opening Remarks</p> <p>Larry Herod, Director, Distribution Services, Newmarket-Tay Power, welcomed participants to the fifth meeting of the York Region Local Advisory Committee (LAC) and introduced Amanda Flude, Senior Advisor, Regional and Community Engagement, from the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO).</p> <p>After roundtable introductions, Ms. Flude summarized discussions from the previous York LAC meeting in September 2016. The focus of the meeting was the long-term planning process, with a discussion on the long-term needs in Vaughan and Northern York Region. From the list of priorities identified at the meeting by the committee, the IESO sent out a survey to LAC members for a vote. The Meeting Priorities and</p>	

<p>Schedule document has been updated to reflect the results of that survey. Going forward, that document will be used to plan the agenda for each meeting.</p> <p>In response to a question, Ms. Flude said the discussion items are grouped by theme where applicable, and not ranked. The focus for the committee for 2017 will be the next Integrated Regional Resource Plan (IRRP) for York Region that will be getting underway at the end of the year, which has been triggered early ahead of the standard five-year planning cycle due to the region’s high growth rate. Comments on the summary of the last meeting were requested by the end of the week, before the summary is finalized for posting. An external service provider has been hired to provide note taking services for the LAC meetings going forward.</p>	
<p>Markham/Richmond Hill Update: Needs and Solutions</p> <p>Neetika Sathe, Vice President, Corporate Development, PowerStream, provided an update on the Power.House pilot project feasibility study. This study looked at the cost and feasibility of implementing residential solar storage in the Markham/Richmond Hill/Vaughan area. The report will not be made public until February. Early results of the study predict that within the next 15 years, 30,000 units of solar storage could provide the system with 140 MW of local dependable solar power. Based on the anticipated Power.House adoption level, there may be an opportunity to defer the longer-term infrastructure needs in Vaughan for at least two years over the longer-term. However, there would not be enough capacity to address Markham’s projected electricity needs in the early 2020s. The study is expected to be completed by the end of February and LAC members will be notified when the study is posted.</p> <p>Bernice Chan, Planner, IESO, said that PowerStream and Hydro One Transmission have requested that the IESO provide a hand-off letter for the Markham/Richmond Hill needs and solutions around mid-late February. The hand-off letter will request that PowerStream and Hydro One commence development work on a new transformer station and connection lines to address the electricity needs in the Markham/Richmond Hill area. The details related to the siting (e.g., the location of the new transformer station) and routing of these facilities will be addressed as part of the project development process and there will be opportunities for public input as part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process.</p> <p><u>Questions and comments from LAC members</u></p> <p>A LAC participant asked if the Power.House study included condominiums. The working group replied that this has not been studied yet, and that Power.House was looking at community-driven solutions for residential storage, rather than institutional, industrial, or commercial sectors. The study was built on actual data from 20 homes in the PowerStream service area.</p> <p>Asked what assumptions were made for uptake in new communities, the working group said it assumed costs for Distributed Energy Resources (DER) would be lower with new buildings than with retrofits for existing homes, but forecasts that most of</p>	

the inventory of 30,000 homes will be existing homes.

Considering that portion of the housing stock that is not appropriate for solar, a participant asked if battery storage could be used for off-peak buffering. The working group said pilot projects in Ontario are underway to look at storage solutions to provide regulation services, such as flywheel projects, compressed air, and big battery, but because they have not come online, they cannot be completely assessed. It comes down to how much storage these systems can provide and for how long. Most of them are appropriate for solar ramping support. The cost savings of storage-only would be lower compared to solar because the costs of storage have not yet experienced the same dip that solar technology has due to innovation. It remains to be seen what consumers are willing to pay for increased resiliency in their power supply.

The Power.House feasibility study explores and assesses the potential benefits of aggregating and controlling 30,000 power.houses as a single generator or virtual power plant, including providing system ancillary services. This way, customers will not have to pay for costs of solar installation. Collaborative models are the way of the future, because everyone benefits by coordinating their activities.

The working group spoke about next steps for Markham and Richmond Hill. Because the results of the Power.House feasibility study indicate that it will not be possible to defer the need for the infrastructure requirements in the Markham/Richmond Hill area for the near-term wires solution, the IESO will draft a hand-off letter to PowerStream and Hydro One to begin project development that encompasses a transformer station, and transmission and distribution works as required. The letter will be a high-level discussion of the project, with no specifics as to site selection. This letter begins the process and ensures that the project could be in service by early 2020. The hand-off letter will be completed in mid- to late February 2017.

A participant asked if that letter would be shared with LAC members. The working group confirmed that it would. Once that letter is provided to PowerStream and Hydro One, it will be available to LAC.

A participant said that in a previous meeting it was suggested that a stakeholders' advisory committee (SAC) should be formed to consult in the development of this project and asked if that level of detail would make it into the hand-off letter. The working group said that if the project requires a transmission line to be developed, it will be covered by the Environmental Assessment Act (EA) and that public engagement will be required. The participant said that a SAC is routinely used with large transportation projects. "You may wish to go beyond the minimum EA requirements. You have been burned in the past."

Another committee member said that he would strongly encourage the working group to go far above the EA process, as it will be a politically charged conversation. Make sure affected municipalities are involved to help guide how the community is consulted in development of this project, he said.

Presentation: Provincial Planning Context and its Input into Regional Planning

Chuck Farmer, Director, Stakeholder and Public Affairs, IESO, said the Ontario government's forthcoming Long-Term Energy Plan (LTEP) is expected to be released in the second quarter of 2017, and will have a significant impact on what regions and municipalities can do in the energy sector. It will restate the government's goals and where program funding will come from. The Ontario government is now modeling future scenarios that will inform the LTEP; a guiding document for the next 20 years. Once the LTEP is released, the IESO and the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) will be required to develop implementation plans to respond to policy directions outlined in the LTEP. At the moment, there is an unprecedented level of uncertainty in the energy sector.

In the past 10 years, Ontario's electricity grid has seen substantial investment to address a reliability gap, replace the generation lost due to phasing out coal-fired generation, and respond to the Green Energy Act. As a result, Ontario's power supply mix is remarkably clean, boasting an emissions drop over the period of 80%. Prices have risen as a result of this investment and at the same time demand has dropped, creating additional upward pressure on rates. The good news story is that the investments have been made and the forecast is for prices to increase for one or two more years before flattening and declining, even under the most aggressive demand scenario (Outlook D) in the Ontario Planning Outlook (OPO).

Due to Ontario's slow economic recovery and increased energy efficiency, the most likely future scenario is flat demand. Outlooks C and D in the OPO hypothesize that consumers will respond to government incentives to reduce their carbon footprint by switching from gas to electric heating, which could shift the province's peak demand period to winter from summer, which would mean increased energy demand at night. This change would have implications for the role that solar power could play in meeting demand. Under all four scenarios described in the OPO, demand can be met in the next 8–10 years without new infrastructure builds. Beyond that, the question becomes how customers react to climate change.

Questions and comments from LAC members

Looking at slide 20, titled "Provincial Resources Adequacy Outlook," a participant asked about the meaning of the term "directed." The working group said the term refers to targets that have not yet been met for renewable energy, demand response, and conservation, but which the IESO assumes will be met on schedule. Two significant things have happened since this chart was prepared: the second large renewable procurement was cancelled and the province has entered into an import deal with Quebec for 2.3 TeraWatts; neither of which are in the OPO. But generally the slide holds true for where the province will be by 2020.

A participant asked if Scenario D reflects the government's commitment to the Climate Change Action Plan, which has huge amounts of electrification with rail and electric vehicles (EV). The working group said that all scenarios reflect that commitment. The target is 2.4 million EV and there are 7,000 now, so "there is a long

<p>way to go.” People are surprised to hear that electrification of rail does not have much of an impact on the system overall, but when that load becomes local it becomes more of an issue. These are strictly scenarios, and it’s currently unknown what the government will commit to. All these unknowns might favour local solutions.</p>	
<p>Discussion: York Region – Aligning Local Planning Assumptions</p> <p>Mr. Herod said the purpose of this portion of the agenda was to begin a dialogue in anticipation of the planning cycle commencing at the end of the year for the next Integrated Regional Resource Plan (IRRP). Topics for this discussion are load forecasting, conservation programs, and community growth and energy plans. Mr. Herod asked Riaz Shaikh, Manager, System Planning, PowerStream and Mark Van Tol, Distribution and Engineering Office, Hydro One, to describe the methods used to forecast load.</p> <p>Mr. Shaikh, said there are two ways to do a forecast. One is trend analysis, but significant economic changes can produce an inaccurate picture. The other method is end-use analysis, which considers growth forecasts that come from the municipality. Each year, PowerStream meets with municipalities to look at growth plans and Municipal Comprehensive Reviews (MCR) to get numbers for residential and commercial growth. Information is then transferred into PowerStream’s model on a per house; per job basis (non-residential space) and comes up with a load forecast number. The projected load is a gross number for peak and is corrected for weather conditions. Following that, conservation and demand management (CDM) and Distributed Generation (DG) is subtracted. Based on timelines for when current system capacity is exceeded, PowerStream then proposes new investment in system capacity if needed.</p> <p>Mr. Van Tol said Hydro One has a group that performs its load forecasting, and his responsibility is for planning on the local level, down to the subdivision level. This data is merged with other local needs and used in forecasts for general areas.</p> <p>Mr. Herod said that Newmarket-Tay Power does an annual review and works with the municipality to get an idea of projected growth and CDM, and also takes into account regional allocation. He asked regional representatives to describe the assumptions they use to make growth plans.</p> <p>A participant said that they are not involved in forecasting. The region gets population and employment information from the province for the region and then does an exercise to calculate how it can be allocated to each municipality. The growth plan, demographics, and people per unit are factored in, as well as housing stock—making sure there is an appropriate mix and range. When asked if the province gives the region an actual number for projected population growth, the participant confirmed that was the case. The region is expected to demonstrate how it will meet the target. Asked how long it takes for this process to be completed, the member said the last target was set in 2009 and it is still in process. Another participant added that this is an iterative process that can then be contested by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), which can go on indefinitely.</p>	

Mr. Herod asked the group to describe how regions factor in economic changes when assigning populations to various municipalities.

A participant said that in their region, those changes are tracked after the forecast is made. For example, the region gauges how quickly land is being used during a housing boom. Even with all the fluctuations within the housing market, the region's projections have been accurate.

Another participant representing a municipality said that the variations from projected numbers tend to even out across the area. Population numbers ebb and flow among the municipalities, although not as much in the smaller townships.

Mr. Herod asked what the implications of shifting populations are for municipalities.

A participant who is a municipal representative said information from the province can help in planning for increased housing density.

Mr. Herod asked if there are any assumptions that are common across municipalities.

A participant said that despite looking at a variety of issues, constraints, highways, and density targets drive the planning process, even in new community areas; electricity planning does not factor much into planning.

Mr. Herod asked how municipalities could better utilize community energy plans (CEP).

A participant who is a municipal representative said this is a struggle for their area. There are many questions about what it is and what it is meant to contain, and their team needs some direction and tools. The working group replied that they had heard that from other municipalities that they have met with. The participant said that it was new territory where municipalities have not been before.

Another participant said that much of the discussion focuses on urban areas, but the changing climate has meant that smaller farmers aren't making it; they are being bought up by bigger operations that then build larger buildings. Farms now have to use coolers in the winter instead of relying on cold weather, or when it is extremely cold, heaters to ensure the produce remains just below 0°C. The participant said that municipalities should consider these changes as part of their community energy plans. Farms cannot benefit from Time-of-Use (TOU) savings because the work has to happen no matter what time it is.

Mr. Herod said the Community Energy Plans were started years ago by the province, with just a few municipalities taking part. As energy consumption takes on higher profile, the province could conceivably require everyone to do energy forecasts. He asked if anyone had heard about this as a possibility.

Yes, as it is outlined in the Climate Change Action Plan, a participant replied. There is

money for communities to do energy plans/climate change action strategies. Part of the challenge is that the focus for CEPs is not energy planning, but much more about how energy and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions come together. It has a big GHG focus, and is not just about electricity.

Mr. Herod asked how the contents of a CEP would affect other parts of the local planning context.

A participant said that when their municipality met with the IESO earlier in the year, the conversation led to the idea of net zero energy buildings and a discussion of the role that municipalities could play in that. Builders are resistant to going beyond the requirements of the Building Code. For other ideas, like fuel switching or building electric train networks to get people out of cars, the community uptake is very hard to forecast. The working group replied that it is important to have tangible numbers. For example, “net zero” does not have any meaning without agreed upon standards. Utilities need to know what the impact will be on the load forecast.

A municipal representative said, “We would like that too! Right down to kilowatt hours per square meter per year.”

Another participant said that their municipality is trying to use what energy use data is available to establish a baseline from 2011–2015, and then ratcheting down to zero emissions from there. The phrase “net zero” may mean different things to different people, but being transparent about the data helps in that discussion.

CEPs usually consider various sources of energy - for example, planning transit to reduce automobile use, or designing water systems to reduce pumping demands, said one participant. These represent embedded energy in community design decisions. There will be different strategies based on each municipality’s circumstances, but CEPs look at energy holistically. It can help guide communities in how to use renewable energy sources or how to drive down kilowatts per hour. In situations where communities have future urban plans in advance of a CEP, that can be tricky to manage.

The working group said that the Ministry of Energy released a document called the Fuel Sector Report, which contains helpful information on how to reduce emissions from every type of energy.

A municipal participant said that their energy plan used a 2013 baseline as a snapshot of all energy use data across residential and commercial areas. City council set the goal of 40% reduction in per capita energy use and GHG over the next 20 years. Assuming that goal can be achieved, it might be of assistance to utilities to know that about that plan.

Mr. Herod concluded the discussion by asking participants to consider how they could better exchange information with the working group. This discussion is meant to start a dialogue that will continue as part of the upcoming IRRP process. The working group added that making connections between municipalities can help in the planning

<p>process as well. The working group acknowledged the challenge in trying to respond to documents that come from various jurisdictions at different times. In response to an earlier comment about confusion around CEP, the working group agreed that it is a very complex problem. The IESO starts the planning process in the same way, by visualizing all the pieces and looking for connections between them. In the context of climate change, energy has become an economic matter. Conservation is already in place and after a while, connections can be made between reducing GHG emissions and energy planning.</p> <p>One participant said that their municipality is trying to be smart about it by setting aggressive reduction targets, but they do not understand how to get there. The working group replied that things are changing; there are questions about where the plug-ins for EVs will go, and whether there will be a code for them. In cases where multi-storey buildings replace parking lots, are they going to have plug-ins? These questions have yet to be answered and could have a big impact. Developers are saying they “will do this, or it would be nice to have that”, so it would be good to have an outlook that shows the range of options. Also, information about the charging habits of people most likely to use the plug-ins would be helpful. There is a lot of uncertainty in trying to forecast these things.</p> <p>Surveys would be needed to track market uptake, a participant said, as they did not think municipalities would have those answers. The working group said one approach is to take a provincial average and divide that by the population in a given area.</p> <p>A participant replied that such an approach would not provide a sufficient level of detail. The working group said it recognizes the need for a toolkit or framework to help along the CEP process. It intends to identify where the gaps are and what it can do to provide resources.</p> <p>Another participant said that a basis of assumptions about the impacts on energy use would be helpful.</p> <p>A participant said that they appreciated the discussion about generation and reducing GHG emissions and hoped that as part of the IRRP process, distribution and transmission would also be discussed.</p>	
<p>Presentation: Distributed Energy Resources and Regional Planning</p> <p>Ms. Chan provided an overview of DER technologies, how DERs is being considered today in regional electricity planning and opportunities and barriers of implementing DER solutions in the context of regional electricity planning. Ms. Chan described a number of pilots and initiatives that are underway in Ontario to help utilities and IESO better understand costs and feasibility of developing distributed energy resources in a local area.</p> <p>To examine the extent to which DER can be used to defer the longer-term needs in Northern York Region/Vaughan, the IESO asked the LAC members to share their experiences with DER initiatives, especially in their communities and to gather local</p>	

information to help develop York-Specific DER solution options at the next LAC meeting. .

Questions and comments from LAC members

Looking at the slide 29, titled “How do we consider DERs in Regional Electricity Planning?” a participant asked if the cost/benefit analysis is done at the scale of the project or has a broader range? The working group replied that, as in the case of Power.House, it does not look at just one house but the needs of the fleet. The IESO looks at the actual, planned installation, life cycle, and time varying, which is the only way to establish its true benefit.

Referring to the third bullet underneath the Challenges column on slide 30, titled “Opportunities & Challenges,” a participant asked if the phrase “no mechanism to target DER projects to areas where they are needed” meant that wind power only feeds the provincial grid and not local needs. The working group replied that at a regional level it does not matter where the power is used because it is addressing the overall provincial gap. If energy is generated for use only within the region, that region pays for it. When local solutions creates dual benefit (i.e.it benefits both the provincial and regional electricity system), then the installation qualifies for provincial funding. Ideally, if the system and local needs are met, “everyone is happy.”

Another participant asked whether, if the system shut down and the only power available was from DER, that energy would be available to local consumers. The working group said that it would. If in the future everyone does this and produces half their energy, the system should not require half the capacity to provide supply.

A participant asked if that leads to the matter of stranded assets. The working group said an asset is stranded if it has been paid for and cannot be used, but if it is at end-of-life and does not need to be re-contracted, then it is not stranded. It is a matter of timing.

A participant said the fifth bullet on slide 30, seemed important: “No provincial need for additional energy or capacity in the near-term.” The working group said that while this is true at the macro level, there will still be regional needs. In addition, the benefit upstream is much lower with more local generation because a plant will either have to be closed, or sold at a reduced price.

A participant asked for more explanation about the Demand Response (DR) pilot program in the Brant area. The working group explained that a demand response program encourages customers to reduce their energy at the time of local and provincial peak. There are many ways to implement a demand response program, including a demand response auction. Demand Response Auction is underway at the provincial-level. Consumers bid in for a set amount of electricity through a competitive process, which creates an incentive to draw less power at the time of peak. The program is for big customers (or aggregators) and is an instrument for moving DR into an electricity market framework. There is a DR stakeholder engagement working group studying how to allow homeowners to participate. The

hope is that eventually Local Distribution Companies (LDCs) will run these programs. It is also possible to have generators bid to supply energy in similar capacity auctions. A similar process is being implemented for the Brant Local Demand Response pilot.

Farmers joined the solar Feed-In Tariff (FIT) program because they saw it as a great business opportunity, said a participant. Now that these rural areas are contributing large amounts to the system, even during summer peak, the participant wanted to know if farmers could participate in these auctions. The working group replied that having a FIT contract means that you are already being paid for the power you produce.

A participant said that if the IESO wants more collaboration with municipalities doing CEP, perhaps it could make it easier for the municipalities to do that. The working group replied that the IESO and LDCs could benefit from a discussion with communities that are leading the pack in order to get a better idea of shared realities among the municipalities. The planning for what this process could be like has just begun.

A participant said that these discussions should happen on a grassroots basis and lead up to LTEP.

A participant said that she observed the CEP process of three different communities and, following the same process, they ended up with different products in response to their local contexts. That is to be expected, but the question remains how to monitor the outcome and what metrics are used, because every community will do something different.

Another participant said it is a matter of establishing what kind of data the IESO can use. Whichever objectives are chosen, the data must be standardized. The working group replied that one of the best things to come out of CEP is the wealth of information about emissions data and energy mapping at the community level. Collating that with geographic information system (GIS) data, age of housing, and other factors, makes it easier to identify areas where it makes sense to do district energy or retrofits. That kind of information is very helpful and has not been possible until very recently.

Municipalities in northern York Region may be better candidates for collaborating with the IESO around CEP, said a participant. Those communities have a real need for economic development and for resiliency and they have not engaged in any CEP planning. The fact that these are smaller communities and use less energy would perhaps make it more manageable. Small and medium-sized communities across the province want to have more say and self-sufficiency in their energy use.

Ms. Chan asked LAC members to reflect on their experience and for the next meeting, advise the IESO as to what extent DER can be cost-effective and reliable enough to address the longer-term needs in Vaughan and Northern York Region. Suggestions can be based existing initiatives in the communities or lessons learned from other jurisdictions. Although this may be a conceptual exercise, members are encouraged to

<p>consider context-specific ideas, and to address questions such as: What are the costs? Who will pay for it? What are the mechanisms for cost recovery? It may be that members do not have this information, but they might have suggestions about who the IESO could contact.</p> <p>A participant asked if IESO would provide project dollars for potential DER studies and pilots in York Region. The working group replied that IESO can only provide funding when authorized by the government to do so. Money for this effort would have to come through existing funding sources.</p> <p>Another participant asked if money would be available through the funding for IRPP. The working group said the assumption is this process will have benefits for each LAC member’s community.</p> <p>Perhaps the IESO needs to partner with other government agencies to provide funding for this study to happen, said a participant. Local municipalities did CEPs and the implementation of funding seems to be problematic. “We need to be thinking about how we achieve multiple objectives together and how government agencies can partner and actually achieve these targets,” the participant said. Barriers need to be broken down because “what we’re talking about achieves a lot of objectives.” The working group said this is a complex issue, and that cost allocation is a major barrier to implementing DER solutions at the regional level. For transmission and distribution solutions that are implemented to address regional needs, costs are typically recovered by the affected customers according to rules set out in the OEB’s Transmission System Code and Distribution System Code. There is currently no clear regulation on cost responsibility for DER solutions to meet regional electricity needs. It may be possible to get funding by showing how programs like this ultimately replace wires. An LDC could approach the OEB to say a particular DER program will defer an investment for two years, and ask for cost recovery. Maybe the OEB would have a mechanism for that.</p>	
<p>Discussion: Drafting Agenda for Meeting #6</p> <p>Ms. Flude suggested that the agenda for the next meeting on April 25, in addition to the items already identified by the working group, should delve deeper into the conversation about funding. She asked participants to refer to the Meeting Priorities and Schedule document and suggest other topics that the LAC would like to see added to the next meeting’s agenda.</p> <p>A participant suggested a discussion about going above and beyond the EA process for the Richmond Hill/Markham transmission and distribution project. The working group agreed and suggested that another LAC-identified priority topic, infrastructure siting criteria, would fit well with that.</p> <p>In response to a comment from a participant, the working group committed to following up with LAC members to provide a schedule for feedback on DER initiatives, consolidate what is received from members, and distribute that to the committee prior to the next meeting. The document will include an inventory of the</p>	<p>Each LAC member will brainstorm York-specific DER initiatives that could play a role in addressing energy needs in the region</p> <p>The IESO to provide a schedule for receiving feedback from</p>

<p>communities' various infrastructure siting criteria.</p>	<p>the LAC, compiling it and distributing to members prior to the next meeting</p>
<p>Comments and Questions from the Public</p> <p>A member of the public said that they had concerns about scenarios C and D in the OPO, which calls for converting 25–50% of homes from natural gas to electric heating, but that generation only runs 30% of the time in winter, so the levelized cost of production would be double, pushing rates up even further. Scenarios C and D have cost projections about 2% over inflation per year for 20 years. Also, on the coldest winter days, auxiliary heat would need to be provided by gas-fired power, which is only 50% efficient, and would therefore double GHG emissions on the coldest days. “Is the IESO seriously going ahead with scenarios C and D?”</p> <p>The working group replied that these are potential futures based on possible scenarios. The concerns raised are valid and are similar to what the government heard when doing the fuel sector working groups. The government uses this information when deciding how to roll out the Climate Change Action Plan. The OPO is not a plan, it does not say how to achieve targets, it just sets out what could happen in a given scenario. There is still time to direct concerns about the LTEP to the government.</p> <p>A member of the public asked if IESO would provide funding to support building a micro grid. The working group said that funding vehicles for such projects are being proposed. LDCs would be a good place to start a search for funding. The Ministry of Energy runs a smart grid fund, so support might be found there as well.</p>	
<p>Closing Remarks</p> <p>Ms. Flude thanked everyone for participating and said that she would be following up in the coming days by email and will provide further information on some of the resources that were mentioned in the meeting, such as the Fuel Sector Report and information on the Demand Response Working Group. Further information discussed will be circulated in the coming weeks.</p> <p>Ms. Flude adjourned the meeting.</p> <p>The next LAC meeting will be held on April 25, 2017.</p>	