

Engagement Information	
Date:	January 11, 2016
Location:	PowerStream Offices – Vaughan
Subject:	York Region Local Advisory Committee Meeting #2
Attendees:	<p><u>Committee Members</u></p> <p>Dr. Alis Kennedy Dr. Anita Tucker Behdad Bahrami Brent Kopperson Debra Scott Graham Seaman Harry French Jennifer Wong Marc Pourvahidi Peter Miasek Teresa Cline Tricia Myatt</p> <p><u>Newmarket-Tay Hydro</u></p> <p>Larry Herod Gaye-Donna Young Ted Wojcinski</p> <p><u>PowerStream</u></p> <p>Neetika Sathe Riaz Shaikh Alison Price</p> <p><u>Regrets</u></p> <p>Avia Eek Chief Donna BigCanoe Jason Unger Jennifer Ladouceur Matt Hopps Norm Vézina Rob Detta Colli</p> <p><u>IESO</u></p> <p>Bob Chow Julia McNally Nicole Hopper Amanda Flude Bernice Chan</p>

	Key Topics	* Follow up Actions
2	<p>Welcome, Introductions and Administrative Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Henderson, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, PowerStream welcomed everyone, and provided background and context into the role that regional planning plays in Ontario’s electricity system planning. ○ Neetika Sathe, VP, Corporate Development, PowerStream reviewed the role of the committee and the topics that the LAC will be discussing at the meeting. 	
3	<p>Municipal Energy Plans presentations and discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tony Iacobelli, Manager, Environmental Sustainability, City of Vaughan presented on Vaughan’s Municipal Energy Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One of the first group of eight municipalities to receive 	



	<p>funding from the Ministry of Energy to develop a plan under the Municipal Energy Plan (MEP) Program in 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Followed the development of the Community Climate Action Plan (CAP), approved by council in April 2014 - Goal of 10% absolute green house gas emissions reduction from 2006 baseline by 2031 (46% per capita) - MEP Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) helped guide the direction of the MEP - MEP will leverage the 16 goals identified in the CAP, with the addition of two new goal areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Stimulate economic development in Vaughan → Raise awareness of a smart energy future through conservation - Next steps are to review draft MEP with SAG and following that, provide draft to Vaughan Council for feedback in Q1 2016; Council Endorsement in Q2 2016 and complete Ministry of Energy funding agreement; Launch MEP in Q3 2016. <p>○ Graham Seaman, Director, Sustainability, City of Markham, presented on Markham’s Municipal Energy Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evolved from and aligned with City’s Greenprint Sustainability Plan to achieve net zero energy, water, waste and emissions by 2050 - Also received funding from the Ministry of Energy under the Municipal Energy Plan (MEP) Program in 2014 - MEP Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) in place; consisting of a variety of representatives including municipal, local utilities, landowner group, residents’ association, MUSH sector, building association, Markham Environment Advisory Committee, an industrial group and the IESO. - Progress to date includes four SWG meetings, and successful bidder awarded after RFP process. - Next steps are Energy Mapping and Study to define net zero objective, review CEP Terms of Reference for Secondary Plans, build energy intensity map, and develop cost impact evaluation. 	
5	<p>York Region IRRP Regional Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation delivered by Nicole Hopper, Sr. Planner, IESO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commented on the Municipal Energy Plans (MEP) presentations in relation to Integrated Regional Resource Plans (IRRP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MEPs focus on longer-term (e.g., 40 year) outlook; IRRPs have a 20 year outlook - MEPs focus on energy; IRRPs focus specifically on electricity, and needs are typically driven by peak demand (maximum amount of electricity used at the top hour of the year) and not by energy use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> IESO to change map on “Growth and Intensification in York Region” slide in future materials. Teresa Cline to provide updated map. <input type="checkbox"/> IESO to include Richmond Hill growth areas/intensification area (e.g. north of Langstaff)in future maps and presentation materials <input type="checkbox"/> IESO and the Working Group to provide further information where possible at the



Meeting Summary

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Both look to ultimately solve the same problems but have different processes, problems along the way and outcomes.o Presented on the electricity needs across the Regiono Gave additional details on the needs forecasted in the Markham areao Discussed potential approaches to meeting the needso Invited a discussion on how to move forward• Committee asked questions/commented on the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- “Growth and Intensification Map” on slide 7 is outdated- Richmond Hill has intensification planned (e.g. North of Langstaff; Yonge Street corridor) that isn’t reflected on slide 9- LAC requested more information on history of electricity planning in York Region- LAC needs to focus on bigger picture, and discussion needs to include Northern York Region and Vaughan as well as Markham.- Concern over a possible disconnect between MEPs and IRRPs. i.e.. A target in a MEP could be focused on increasing electric vehicle use, which in turn would boost electricity demand and affect the IRRP.- The LAC asked about burying transmission lines. The Working Group indicated that it is possible but typically costs 5-10 times more than overhead lines, and cost responsibility would have to be established.- A LAC member asked about burying transmission lines in areas with high water tables. Hydro One indicated that technical challenges are surmountable but would increase the cost.- LAC members suggested that there could be a potential business case for burying lines since land above grade could be developed, helping to offset the cost.- LAC members asked about the role of municipal government in decision making for the York Region Electricity Planning process. IESO clarified that the Working Group will be making the recommendations in consideration of community’s input, including feedback from municipal governments.	<p>next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- More detailed information on the three approaches to meeting needs in Markham- More information on how solutions for Markham would impact other parts of the Region
--	---



Meeting Summary

6	<p>LAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following was discussed by the LAC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LAC members agreed with the growth projections assumed in the York Region Electricity Plan - Need for more information on options before committee can provide comment, advice on engaging the broader community, give insight into public acceptance, etc. - An interest in budget estimates comparing one solution option to another; different scenarios. - LAC members would like to spend more time to better understand community-based solutions and the extent to which these solutions can help address the electricity supply needs identified in this area. - A square foot equivalence for the solar panel need per year, as depicted on slide 18. - An interest in the governance of the final decision and the role that municipal government has in helping to make or influence that decision. - Given that the timeline on making a decision for the near-time option, LAC meetings need to be held more regularly to allow for committee members to be involved in the education process in a timely manner. Suggested that meetings be held monthly going forward. • Proposed by the Working Group for LAC members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For LAC members to provide feedback on the needs in Markham more formally by providing answers in a follow up email after the meeting, to five questions posed by the Working Group. - Committee members are welcome to work on questions independently or collectively outside of the meeting. If collective, the Working Group is not looking for consensus. - Feedback to that request given during the meeting from the committee is that answering the questions require more details than the LAC currently has. Working Group suggested that such feedback could be included and elaborated on as part of the answers submitted from members in follow-up. - Decision was made that LAC members would provide feedback independently and provide to the Working Group within two weeks of meeting to allow for IESO to summarize and report back high level at next LAC meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> IESO to provide LAC with electronic version of five questions discussed during LAC meeting for feedback after the meeting. <input type="checkbox"/> LAC members who wish to do so, to submit feedback to questions by January 25 to Amanda Flude, IESO.
7	<p>Updates/Other Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This agenda item to be carried over to next LAC meeting, due to time constraints. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> IESO to add Updates/Other Items to be discussed at LAC meeting #2, to Agenda for LAC meeting #3

Meeting Summary

9	Closing Remarks	
	Meeting closed at 9:00 pm Next meeting FEBRUARY 25, 2016	