

Message

From: Nicholas Ingman [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=4B1F8DCE56FC407D89CFDE7EF5F68F46-NICHOLAS IN]
Sent: 2017-06-09 6:37:00 AM
To: Tam Wagner [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=70ad853871354761a98848de59c4c792-Tam Wagner]; Bernice Chan [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=262b63e0090e4fa9bf81010f439655e3-Bernice Cha]
CC: Nicholas Ingman [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=4b1f8dce56fc407d89cfe7ef5f68f46-Nicholas In]
Subject: Notes from Our Meeting with OEB Staff regarding the Power.House Feasibility Study

Clean notes incorporating comments. Feel free to share as necessary.

Thanks,

Nicholas Ingman
W. (905) 855-6108
C. (416) 427-2567

Meeting Held at the OEB Office Monday June 5th 1:00 – 3:00 PM

Purpose: Bring OEB staff up to speed on the Power.House Feasibility Study and start discussions around regulatory barriers identified as part of the study.

Attendees:

OEB

Brian Hewson
Andres Mand
Stephen Cain
Saleh Lavaee
Paul Gasparatto

IESO

Nicholas Ingman
Bernice Chan
Tam Wagner

Alectra/Navigant

Jodi Amy
Neetika Sathe
Tamar Heisler
Vikram Singh
Indy Butany

Ministry

Ryan Zade
Richard Ford
Eric Stein

Vikram led the group through a slide deck that provide a deep dive into the Power.House study and findings. Points of clarification raised by Alectra and IESO included:

- Cost benefit analysis was developed prior to the introduction of the Fair Hydro Plan – Results of the analysis would obviously be impacted by this;
- Although we didn't provide the cost of the Power.House units we did identify that the model used by the study represented a significant subsidization for the customer adoption;
- We highlighted the substantial payback period under both outlooks;
- We stated that the IESO remains agnostic to who provides these types of services;
- Indy Butany, Alectra's head of regulatory Affairs raised the issues around how a utility might ratebase such a program as Power.House;
- The OEB expressed their interest in seeing open access for these types of technologies and felt that ratebasing would give an unfair advantage to LDC's;
- OEB noted that they would expect that this type of application would be outside of rates but within the utility's regulated business similar to CDM and solar programs.
- IESO spoke to planning considerations (i.e., cost-recovery mechanisms for DER/non-wires investments that address system needs), the need for more technical standards for DER and the recognition of storage as providing a service rather than simply a load or a generator;
- IESO noted that 2 year deferral value in Vaughan area is relatively insignificant in the context of infrastructure development. Alectra/IESO agreed that it may be more effective to implement DER (e.g., Power.House) in slower growth areas (e.g., Parry Sound/Muskoka).
- Next steps are for OEB staff to meet internally to discuss the issues raised and reach out to Alectra in the coming weeks.