



**NextGrid: Utility of the Future Study  
Stakeholder Advisory Council (SAC)  
Meeting No. 3**

**Date:** August 2, 2018

**Time:** 9:30 am- 12:30pm pm

**Location:** ICC Main Hearing Room, 160 North LaSalle, Suite C-800  
Chicago Illinois 60601

**WebEx Information:**

[www.webex.com](http://www.webex.com) or 1-415-655-0002

Meeting number (access code): 806 974 162

Meeting password: JMc8ME8

**Meeting Summary**

*[Note: descriptions of comments and discussion are condensed summaries and paraphrases]*

**Attendee List**

**NextGrid Project Team:**

**In Person:**

- Annette Beitel, *NextGrid Senior Study Consultant*
- Marty Cohen, *NextGrid Senior Study Consultant*
- Terrance Garmon, *Illinois Commerce Commission*
- Katharine McErlean, *Illinois Commerce Commission*

**WebEx:**

- Pete Sauer, *University of Illinois, NextGrid Lead Facilitator*
- George Gross, *University of Illinois, NextGrid Lead Facilitator*
- Ken Costello, *Co-Leader of WG 7 Ratemaking*
- Dr. Govindarasu, *Co-Leader of WG 3, Reliability, Resiliency and Cyber Security*
- Dominic Saebeler, *Co-Leader of WG 3, Reliability, Resiliency and Cyber Security*
- Dr. Kiesling, *Working Group leader of WG 5, Electricity Markets*

**SAC Members:**

**In Person:**

- Dan Foley, *Glidepath LLC*
- Sean brady, *Wind on the Wires,*
- Debra Stone, *Cook County*
- Katie Stonewater, *Illinois Chamber of Commerce*
- Chris Foley, *ComEd,*
- Leah Scull, *Midwest Energy Efficiency Association*

**WebEx:**

- Jared Policicchio, *City of Chicago*
- Pete Colarelli, *Exxon Mobil Corporation*



- Dave Kolata, *Citizens Utility Board (CUB)*
- Brice Sheriff, *Ameren IL*
- Robb Karr, *Illinois Retail Merchant Association*
- Brett Balke, *Archer Daniels Midland*
- Susan Satter, *Illinois Attorney General*

**Absent:**

- *DuPage County*
- *Sierra Club, Illinois*
- *Illinois Manufacturer's Association*
- *Elevate Energy*
- *Environmental Defense Fund*
- *Environmental Law and Policy Center*
- *DuPage Mayors and Managers*
- *British petroleum American Inc.*

**Public and non-SAC members:**

**In person:**

- John Weinberger, *John R. Weinberger LLC,*

**WebEx:**

- Chris Townsend, *The NextGrid Coalition*

**Agenda Item I: Opening and Introductions**

Annette Beitel, *NextGrid Senior Study Consultant*, made welcoming remarks, opened the meeting under the Open Meetings Act, took attendance and reviewed meeting agenda.

**OMA Opening Remarks:**

*Pursuant to the Illinois Open Meetings Act, I am calling to order today's meeting of NextGrid Stakeholder Advisory Council.*

*Before I begin with introductions, I want to make a few preliminary remarks. First, because this is being conducted as an Open Meeting, members of the public are invited to observe this meeting and, at the appropriate time in our agenda, participate by making comments – regardless of whether they are participating in person, on the telephone, or by WebEx. To facilitate the discussion, we request that members of the public who are interested in making a public comment fill out a speaking card and hand it to Katharine McErlean. If you are participating by WebEx, you may indicate your desire to make a comment by clicking on the hand icon and announce your name prior to making your comments. And if you are participating by telephone, you may send an email to [ICC.NextGrid@illinois.gov](mailto:ICC.NextGrid@illinois.gov), and we will attempt to call you on at the appropriate time. More details about the public comment period will be provided when we reach that part of the agenda.*

*Second, minutes are being taken but there will be no verbatim transcript of this meeting. [Members of the public may record the meeting, but I ask that this be done without interrupting our speakers.]*

*Finally, before we begin, I will take attendance. Let's conduct a roll call, indicating your name and organization, starting with people in the room. [Roll is taken.] Now, individuals participating by*



WebEx. [Roll is taken.] Any individuals participating by telephone. Any other individuals I have not called on? [Roll is taken.] See above attendee list above.

---

Annette Beitel, *NextGrid Senior Study Consultant*, invites the public to contribute to the meeting equally due to the small number of people present and there will be more time for public comment at the end of the meeting.

Agenda Review:

- Discuss the public meetings
- Introductory chapter
- Discuss structure of subsequent chapters and report over all, how to make report most useful to the broad range of stakeholders who will be using it hopefully.
- Welcome the public to contribute to the meeting equally due to the small number present and at the end of the meeting there will be time for public comment at the end.
- August 15<sup>th</sup> NextGrid Project Update and Public Comment Session will be held at the University of Illinois in Urbana and on August 16<sup>th</sup> the NextGrid Project Update and Public Comment Session will be held at the Dunn-Richmond Economic Development Center in Carbondale.

**Agenda Item II: Updates On NextGrid Study Process**

Marty Cohen, *NextGrid Senior Study Consultant*, discussed updates to the NextGrid Calendar.

- Calendar is on track. Each of the Seven working groups has operated on its own schedule. The working groups overlap. Schedules have been set by Working Group Leaders (WGLs) and agreed to by participants.
- Working Groups (WGs) 1,2 and 3 have submitted draft reports to the U of I (available at [Nextgrid.illinois.gov](http://Nextgrid.illinois.gov)).
- WG 4 and 6 have posted preliminary draft reports (available at the [Nextgrid.Illinois.gov](http://Nextgrid.Illinois.gov)).
- WGs 4,5,6 and 7 are in the process of drafting draft reports.
- Marty Cohen, also WGL of WG 4 will host a meeting August 6<sup>th</sup> to discuss WG 4 initial draft report authored by WGL and has not received any comments to the draft yet.
- Public will see the draft study, there will be a public comment period in October and sent back to University of Illinois for review and compilation of the final report.

Q&A from SAC and Public:

Annette Beitel, *NextGrid Senior Study Consultant*, opens the floor for questions about the status of the drafts and production of the final report.

- **Q1:** I have participated in a lot of working groups. Are the chapters using a uniform format? Based on the format of the questions, seems like it fits that.
  - (Annette Beitel), yes, there is an outline to chapters that authors were asked to follow. Happy to receive feedback from what the outline is. We have a section allocated to the introductory chapter but we would like to get feedback on structure.



- **Q2:** The perspective I come at this is the potential of the next generation of the Illinois grid. Each group I worked on talked about some of the challenges, in my experience of doing electric market analysis, upfront usually there is an upfront forecast of what could happen in the future. Is there going to be a portion of this where we see the hurdles generally for Illinois, a broad spectrum or is it going to be addressed chapter by chapter?
  - (Annette Beitel), future scenarios- is what we are trying to plan for, could be a great addition to the Introductory chapter. As a group I think we could discuss if we should address challenges chapter by chapter. Thank you, great questions and comments.
- **Q3:** How are the public comments going to be received and handled? For members that were not in working groups, are their comments going to be in a document received?
  - (Pete Sauer), non-member comments are posted to the NextGrid website.
- How will public comments be treated vis a vis the final report? Want to hear options. We are trying to strike a balance between length and cohesiveness and there is going to be some tradeoff.

### **Agenda Item III: Updates on Working Groups 4-7**

#### **Working Group 4, Customer and Community Participation: Presentation by Working Group Leader, Marty Cohen:**

- Scope: The subject matter of Working Group (WG) 4 is broad. All the working groups subject matter is broad. There has been a lot of overlap. WG 4 focused on the role of customers and communities in the future. One of the difficulties/ challenges has been to be future oriented. It is a challenge to see around the corner to a future that is different with options and policies, and anticipate the changes that may be need for a successful transition. We have an electric system that is changing rather dramatically.
- Key sets of changes:
  1. Availability of data. Granular data in near real time for every customer will be available. How that data gets used is a key element for emerging set of changes.
  2. Electrification- is ongoing and a transformative set of changes that affect customers in communities in electrification of transportation but also, a whole set of other technologies such as heating.
  3. Availability of DERS for customers of all sizes. In the future, a typical customer may have solar panels on the roof or be participate in community solar, may have a battery storage unit in the closet, may have an EV charger in the garage, building, street lights. The implications are profound. Could be a lot of benefits but could be also challenges if don't get policies in place to benefit customers. Very broadly speaking that is subject of WG 4.
- Process:
  - Identified issues out the outset. The 4 E's 1) Empowerment, 2) Engagement, 3) Equity and 4) Education.
  - All these are laid out in the draft report I authored and there is a library of reference materials.



- 1<sup>st</sup> meeting- April 18<sup>th</sup>: Asked each participant to discuss what they believed were the crucial issues that would affect customers and communities. What would be the best outcome/ worse case. Identified issues to work further on.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting- May 2<sup>nd</sup>: Had a series of presentations from Ameren, ComEd, Elevate Energy- 3<sup>rd</sup> party administrator of real time pricing and IGS.
  - Looked at current best practices in engagement and communications opportunities/barriers to effective engagement. What consumers want? How do we know what they want? What are the benefits of consumer choices? How can we ensure customers have the tools they need to make educated decisions? What does it mean to have Customer protection/ education in Consumer Choice?
  - WG 4 draft report- is not final, its initial.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting- May 15<sup>th</sup>: Presentations from IGS, Delta Institute, Environmental Justice Organization and CUB.
  - Focused around the residential customer and community. Issues- how can DER opportunities be captured for customers effectively? How do we address issues for Low Income customer? Crucial issue for people who do not have the capital. What policies could provide benefits for people not involved in Distributed resource acquisition? Looked at transportation electrification issues. In draft report a lot of proposals for policy on electrification for vehicles. Community solar issues- kind of programs needed to make sure benefits of AMI that customers are paying for are brought to all customers. Looked to optimize the roles for utilities, vendors and other actors in the whole energy landscape. All with the idea to make sure the changes that are underway in the industry to power people, customers and communities benefits all customers and maintaining accessibility of electricity and affordability of service.
- 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting - June 5<sup>th</sup>: Heard from very large customers and their concerns what they see the future looking like. Presenters included Charter Dura Bar- A huge user of electricity and big employer in Northern Illinois and two hospital groups, Advocate Health Care and North Western Memorial Health care.
  - Issues- discussion about large customer viewpoints. Want reliable service and least cost. As manufacturing customers competing in global markets, costs are of importance, they have sophisticated energy managers on site and work very hard to improve operations and minimize costs. Hospitals have a different set of issues- reliability in a hospital is essential. Life and death is at stake when the electricity goes out.
- Discussion Exercises:
  - The 3Ps exercise- Asked for submissions of ideas for programs, policies and pilots that would be equitable to community and customer participation issues and might be useful in the evolution of electricity in Illinois.
  - Received dozens of proposals. WG 4 Draft Report was written with all proposals in mind and many are included.
- Goal is to reflect different stakeholders' views and provide equal billing. Chairman Sheahan made it very clear the study is not trying to forge consensus or come up with a strategic plan for



moving into this new era. Currently, we are at the early stage of this transformation, trying to identify issues, opportunities, challenges and make sure we well describe and lay out policy options, unless we find agreement, which is hard to find, we are not attempting to forge it. If you read this years from now, we can see if we are on target or not.

Questions/Comments:

- No questions or comments

**Working Group 5, Electricity Markets: Presentation by Working Group Leader, Dr. Kiesling:**

- Meetings have concluded. Drafting process is about to begin. May be one additional meeting of draft report. Don't have a document now.
- Focus: Economics on electricity markets design. How do we take insight of market design and apply to Illinois context and achieve various interests in transition of the electricity distribution grid and industry with a clearer and prosperous future?
- Had a very diverse group of stakeholder participants.
- Started process by sending everyone a survey to get a feel for what they thought most important topics were and what they wanted to see as outcomes in the Working Group. Took Chairman's framing making this an effort to discuss and catalog our ideas and not to achieve consensus.
- 1<sup>st</sup> meeting- talked about goals and objectives. In particular wanted to frame out the ensuing discussion in two different ways.
  - 1<sup>st</sup> step- frame our activities as one of design. There is very well-established literature on market design not just within economics, within a broader field of design thinking includes web design and product design. Work Group worked together to define our design principles by starting with brief of what are we supposed to accomplish and whatever it is we are designing, what do we want it to do?
  - What do we want market participants to be able to accomplish using technology, enabled retail markets in Illinois? Form that list derived functionality requirements.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> step- in terms of generating ideas, how do we evaluate if the functionality requirements have higher priority or lower priority and how do we know if functionality requirements will achieve end goals?
    - Come up with design principles used to evaluate the design dimensions, in econ language -the metrics to evaluate the institutional choices we make. What do we need to enable markets to accomplish what people want?
  - Highlighted the existing state of play in terms of retail markets, in both policy and academic literature. How customers respond to price signals? How customers respond to dynamic pricing, peer effect?
  - Talked about definitions because needed common definitions.
  - Defined resilience as different form reliability
  - Defined differences in network architecture between centralized and decentralized and transactive energy.
  - In every meeting had small group breakouts enabling people to talk it out.
  - Goal was to create a community where we were co-creating ideas- very important. Did small group break out with focus questions and people worked together.



- 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting: David Chassin Presentation -on using digital technology to automate homeowner response on pricing signals. Have been many pilot projects after. Discussed what we know and what we don't know. How having a more transactive network would affect system outcomes that will affect future outcomes. Discussed a lot of transactive energy.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting- Presentation on Platforms: Farrok Rahimi from *OATI* presentation on platform for providing grid services- what are engineering implications and Paul Centonella, *Paul Centonella and Associates* talked about economic aspects. Focused on functional requirements on retail and automated retail market. Focused on functions- the what. What needs to be done? Stayed away from who. Wanted this to be a co-creative process not to get into topics that will bring up issues with parties who often intervene against each other in regulatory proceeding.
  - Created 6 different representative customers.
  - Single homeowner family through the mayor of a city thinking about smart cities initiatives- Discussed how automation and transactive markets can interact with smart cities initiatives.
- Distributed reading assignments in advance of meetings. Will report out on those in WG report. will be collecting a repository of resources. For example, will include *NARUC DER Interconnection Manual*. Want to take public awareness and education aspect of the study seriously and collect a range of references with different technicality levels.
- 4<sup>th</sup> meeting- sent a survey with a set of functionality requirements and design principles that emerged out of group discussions. For functionality requirements aske working groups members to rank them. Gave task to rank design principles from 1-18. Small sample size, not statistically robust, but will give a starting point, where agree more tightly and others where have a larger spread of opinions.
  - Presentations were on the Utility perspective of the current state of play. *Ameren's* presentation was technical on the grid and equipment from investment and equipment perspective. *ComEd's* presentation focused on markets. Presentations complimented each other well. Had a presentation form Rao Konidena, *Rakon Energy LLC*, on market settlement for distributed markets, which actions occurring in distribution layer at different nodes will change settlements and ways people do transactions. At engineering and economic level- there is a blurring of wholesale, transmission and distribution layer. For legal regulatory implications there is a bright line. Discussed the tension there.
- In all the meetings had a lot of activities and discussion.
- Ended the working group meetings with draft outline prepared by WGL. Participants gave some feedback to the outline.

#### Questions/Comments:

- **Q1:** Can you elaborate about the difference form resilience and reliability?
  - (Dr. Kiesling), other Working Groups focusing on resiliency. Knew it would come up as an aspect of functionality as a market design principle. When asked to rank design principles- reliability and resiliency were at the top of the charts. We used the resilience definition from Alice Silverstien's paper where they define resilience. Non-engineer, difference between reliability and resilience, think of reliability as 9 sigmas, SAFI, it's always on, resilience is much more about ability of the system to recover to base state



of operation after some sort of shock. Resilience- how do you measure; how do you quantify is a broad national conversation.

- **Q2:** Can you make available the google docs library-
  - (Dr. Kiesling), WGLs are the one managing the google docs. Will have a reference listed in reports with any links.
- **Q3:** It will be difficult for public to review this without the background information. Would it be useful to report where there is consensus and where there is not consensus? In WG 5, you have wires, grid operator, there certainly is not consensus. From the start would articulate where consensus emerges.
  - (Annette Beitel), where do people agree and where do people disagree may be identified in the report. Where there is consensus would have to be the next step. Has not been time.
- **Q4:** In the main body of the introductory chapter- should state the point of this was not to reach consensus.
  - (George Gross), from the very early stages this is not a consensus building process. Throw out the word consensus and non-consensus. Focus on agreement and disagreement. Will indicate where there is agreement or disagreement. (Take word of consensus off the slide.)
- **Q5:** Real concern about what this report is going to be used for. If it says consensus and it was not consensus there is going to be a real issue.
  - (Annette Beitel), will note as an important issue.
- **Q6:** Dr. Kiesling covered a broad sea front with the issues, I see this as being one of the very important chapters in terms of this report. One of the visions in the next 20 years, looking at the growth of the distribution networks, moving from a hub and spoke electric grid towards how best to optimize the grid for Illinois consumers who have an interest and want to use it. Growing the distribution side and how to value the bulk distribution system. Important in helping Illinois establish its value going forward will help establish its policies.
  - (Annette Beitel), encourage you to get the word out about meetings down south.
- **Q7:** Stakeholders we understand that this is not supposed to be a consensus document. I would request a short form document that identifies consensus and non-consensus. Process has been far too fast. Had not identified the challenges and opportunities.
- **Q8:** Questions regarding cost, important for the document, identify what the costs are going to be. Is there a working group that is charged with that? I would like to follow that a little more closely.
  - No working group that has cost in the title. WG7 Ratemaking.

**Working Group 6, Regulatory and Environmental Policy Issues: Presentation by Marty Cohen, NextGrid Senior Study Consultant:**

- Mary Gade is the Working Group Leader, she is the founder of Gade Environmental Group. Mary was Appointed regional administrator of EPA Region 5 after 25 years at the EPA. Quite an expert on these issues.
- Issues on Regulatory and Environmental Policy Issues



- Overview: Draft intro to WG 6 Report, in early stages of development covering Environmental concerns.
- Meetings: Lot of discussion and information sharing.
  - 1<sup>st</sup> meeting -Initial presentation from Rocky Mountain Institute
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting presentation from Tom Skilling and large insurance company, Zurich Insurance Co. Held workshops, breakouts and reports back from a lot of participants.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting included presentations from David Farnsworth and Mark Templeton, lead breakout sessions. May be another meeting to talk about the final chapter.
  - All meetings presentations and meeting summaries can be found on the NextGrid website.
- Long list of recommended readings on issues related to environment.
- Some people asked what is the legal authority- basis for consideration, NextGrid is a blue-sky consideration of issues. We were unfettered by arguments over legal authority in different areas. Discuss issues from a broad exploration on environmental policy issues and how they affect Illinois.

#### Questions/Comments:

- No questions or comments

#### **Working Group 7, Ratemaking: Presentation by Ken Costello, Co- Working Group Leader:**

- Had 3 meetings:
  - 1<sup>st</sup> meeting- was the introduction and overview
    - Defined the scope, discussed ideas about transforming ratemaking such as increased DER penetration, increasing grid complexity, continuing the need for reliability, resilience security, evolving infrastructure, functions, process, systems and exploiting of smart technologies for benefit of utility customers. Discussed the status quo of ratemaking in Illinois, supply options, and requested feedback form participants on issues they wanted to explore.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting discussed Revenue Requirement Determination and Recovery
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting discussed Economics of Modern Rate design, using peer benchmarking in distributor performance evaluation, how to achieve a cleaner grid, assessing cost shifts, ratemaking issues questions from participants, standby use of distribution resources, cost recovery and rate design.
  - Next meeting is September 13<sup>th</sup>.
- To review some more issues discussed in the working groups include discussion on:
  - Rates vary this is a component of the NextGrid world, service to help facilitate new tech world with resources, such as power.
  - Incentive- based ratemaking is not just about how much customers pay, but also about ow much value they receive from utility services
  - We talked about where are we now in Illinois in terms of ratemaking; we had discussions for primary ratemaking from Ameren and ComEd. Think of ratemaking in 3 parts.



- Revenue requirement- framework, prospectively how rates were set in Illinois and how does that affect the grid? How can we monetize these rates making decisions to better accommodate these new technologies on the market?
- Challenge is getting parties to articulate their positions and perspectives on specific ratemaking issues. There was some discussion on performance measurement and more discussion on time varying rates, for example.
- Questions will be handed out to parties for their reactions to different ratemaking mechanisms and issues.
- How can we get more customers to become more engaged in ratemaking? What are some of the barriers and what are some of the down sides? All rate mechanisms have a down side.
- Outline of report for next meeting of September 13. Address topics. Challenge now is to make sure we have enough material that reflects the position of different participants. Position is not to reach consensus or agreement. At the end of the day it is to reflect the positions of different parties.

Questions/Comments:

- **Q1:** Is this the working group that FERC vs. ICC jurisdiction will be discussed?
  - (Marty Cohen), no, did not address that. Was touched on in 5 and came up in WG 4s last meeting.

**Agenda Item IV: August 15<sup>th</sup> NextGrid Project Update and Public Comment Session Discussion Lead by Annette Beitel, NextGrid Senior Study Consultant**

- We will send public meeting agendas out to the SAC. Please invite your contacts.

**Agenda Item V: NextGrid Introductory Chapter Feedback (posted online)**

Final report direction and structure:

- Study is an investigative study as opposed to a consensus building study. It's a description of challenges and opportunities. The study is supposed to be technically rigorous. University of Illinois will make sure technical assertions are correct and complete. University of Illinois will have several colleagues who will be reviewing the study helping understand the range of issues. Chapters will be succinct. A goal of the report is to report reflected the range of perspectives.

Final Report Comments Summary by Annette Beitel, Senior Study Consultant:

1. Forecast- will report or introductory chapter include discussion of what we think that state of the world will be like- what is going to be happening in the future.
2. Structure of individual chapters- did provide common structure created by study consultants, staff and lead facilitators- describe issues, opportunities/challenges, talk about next steps, open issues. To varying degrees working groups reports reflect that.
3. Public comments- will and how are public comments to be reflected in the final report?

4. Reference list- can be published on website, by chapter or by end of report. Legal issues about copyrights.
  5. Issue of consensus building- can we identify issues of consensus and if not, what is the best alternative?
  6. Do we want to address how the report is intended to be used? Possibly in the introductory chapter.
- Now is a great time for advisory committee or public to provide comments about drafting the final report.

#### Questions/Comments:

- **Q1:** Key question is cost. Cost to the utility and how public is expected to pay for costs. Which portion of cost would be borne by shareholders. Which portions would be paid for by customer groups. Size and scale. Whether they are regulated recovered costs. All part of necessity that electricity remains affordable.
- **Q2:** What costs are we talking about?
  - Cost associated with a market or platform or costs associated with marketing products, costs associated with EV charging stations. To what extent are those costs attributable to particular segments? What are requirements for cost benefits in order to socialize costs? Everything that the distribution utility does is almost de facto considered a regulated cost. How would cost associated with innovation be treated? Not proposing ratemaking would be totally revamped. What are advantages of traditional, formula, performance based ratemaking?
- **Q3:** What do we do about important questions that groups did not cover thoroughly? Do we put them in public comment section or open issues section?
  - (Annette Beitel), each individual WGL had broad discretion to cover topics they wanted to cover. As well has participants could suggest topics to cover and make presentations.
  - (Ken Castello), one could argue that we did not fully address those issues, but participants had opportunity and some did to raise those issues. My opinion we will address issues in the report to reflect discussions we had.
  - (Dr. Gross), in fact nearly every group paid very close attention to cost. The whole issues are driven by efficiency. May not be cogent conclusion. Present challenges and single them out so they might consider further consideration. Collection of this outstanding challenge. So, process does not conclude with this report because there are a number of challenges that still have to be face.
- **Q4:** Question of quantifying the cost has not been a subject. No effort of quantifying specific costs with any program and designing a rate program. If there is not going to be any effort to quantify the cost. Needs to be front and center of report.
- (Dr. Gross), not directive from ICC or from WGLs that we were going to specify costs.
- Issues of quantifying cost and doing cost benefit analysis was raised
- Cost benefit was not done and would need to be done relative to implementation.
  - Request the Working Groups address that.



- (Ken Costello), costs have been qualified, a major principal of ratemaking is that utilities can recover costs to rate payers if ratepayers receive a net benefit from them. We did not discuss quantification of the costs.
- (Dr. Gross), cost benefit analysis is one of challenges that remains.
- Request disclaimer of the scope of report, cost was not meant to be in the study and not consensus building.
- Costs are important and needs to be added to the report. Take a couple of days and figure out ways to assess the cost.

Topic of cost Comments Summary by Annette Beitel, Senior Study Consultant:

1. Acknowledge the open questions with specificity, here are the keys issues that need to be considered
2. Identify the challenge we have to figure out cost
3. Don't drop the question, answer it.

Summary of different uses of cost in the group discussion by Marty Cohen, Senior Study Consultant:

1. Viewpoint of cost benefit analysis- cost must exceed benefits.
2. Costs of actual costs of various technologies, programs, initiatives, programs, platforms. NG has not quantified actual costs of new technology.
3. Cost allocation- who pays, what risks taken on by which parties, does utility collect all costs as revenue requirement?
4. Cost as rate design question and implicit with cost causality principles. Many issues addressed in WG 7 except for actual costs of these technologies and yes beyond the scope to quantify these new speculative costs. WG 7 has looked and WG 4 has touched on these issues.

- A forecast is the common thread between all seven of these chapters. Lots of discussion started describing this is the scope, identified topics, what are challenges and solutions going forward? Each group looked at own topics individually. Common thread is what is the future. What future do you see out there as a range and how NextGrid fits into that? This is where we see Illinois being. Two RTOS. Maybe forecast belongs in WG 1, very good description there. All ideas we have here set the context of the future. For continuity to tie all together, look at this is where we are at and a range of futures.
- **Q5:** How should report reflect comments from the public? if want to contribute, are they going to be incorporated or are they going to be in a separate section? What is value that people have in contributing to this process?
- No preference. One burden is collecting and shifting through all this information relative to the need and the benefit. Not a litigated case, this is for information purposes. Identify the comment and attribute to that person, when submitted or do it by topic. Could also collect all the information and synthesize and turn into general feedback comments. Question is why it would be needed? There are some challenges to this case so maybe more specificity is needed.
- To extent the public makes comments, WGL should consider input. Would not have a rule that public comment will be simply listed. WGL should have obligation to read comment and incorporate to extent that they can.



- (Annette Beitel), WGLS have been instructed to read public comments from the very beginning.
- (Marty Cohen), as comments come in will be given weight and consideration for inclusion for report that will be set to University of Illinois if relevant input germane to the issues.

#### Reference List Comments:

- Some references are on the website for WG 5 and 6 and there is intention to have references as footnotes and a list in the back with links.
- Give everyone an opportunity to review the document. 210-page document that has libraries of stuff.
- In working groups, some had experts come in and do presentations, some WGS circulated study lists, I don't know how much those lists influenced the discussion or outcome. I have seen a list of 15-20 documents. I have not read any of those documents. References are not influential, more like background information.
- (George Gross), many of these articles have copyrights. We cannot put them out on our website. List of references can be done. Not a problem.

#### Issues around consensus and non-consensus building:

- No process or procedure established at the beginning to identify consensus. From a procedural standpoint would not be possible. Since it keeps coming up, need to have a statement in introductory chapter that this was not a consensus building exercise.
- Request statements in Introductory chapter, how is the report going to be used and clear statements what the report is and what it is not.

### **Agenda Item VI: Public Comments and Questions:**

#### ***OMA Public Comment Opening Remarks:***

*At this time, I want to again thank everyone here for their interest and participation in the NextGrid study. At this time, we would like to open the floor for public comment. First, a note: input from the public on the issues being addressed by the NextGrid study is strongly encouraged, whether through white papers, expert research, or general comments, written or verbal. You may always submit written comments following the directions provided on the NextGrid website.*

*For those members of the public who wish to make a comment, we will first recognize those who filled out a speaking card in advance. I will call your name in the order in which the registration was received. We will then open up to those who are in the room in Chicago and on WebEx or telephone. If you would like to speak and did not indicate so beforehand, please fill out a speaker card, and you will be recognized in the order which it is received. I will alternate between speakers in Chicago and WebEx/Telephone, as time permits.*

*In order to accommodate as many speakers as possible, each speaker will have 3 minutes to provide comments. Time cards will be displayed for your reference. Should time run out, or as a supplement to a comment, we invite you to provide written comments of any length which will be shared with study leaders. Please do so by emailing [ICC.NextGrid.Illinois.gov](mailto:ICC.NextGrid.Illinois.gov). All the contact information we mention here is also available on the NextGrid website.*



*If you have a question, please understand that the questions likely will not be answered in today's session, but will be considered by the Working Groups in their deliberations. [Note: the Working Group Leader or any member may, but is not required to answer questions. We do not recommend responding to a question, unless the question is very straightforward, such as "When do you anticipate having a draft chapter for public review?"]*

*To help facilitate free and open discussion and the unrestricted exchange of information and ideas, stakeholders and participants in the NextGrid study have agreed that statements made, positions taken, and documents and papers provided by a stakeholder or participant will not be used in a manner adverse to the proponent by other stakeholders or participants in any subsequent proceeding or litigation, including matters before the Illinois Commerce Commission or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or before any other federal, state, or local governmental court, tribunal, or authority.*

***Finally, as required by the Open Meetings Act and Commission rules, a summary of all comments will be made part of the meeting minutes and posted onto the NextGrid website.***

*I want to thank you again for being here to offer comment on this important study for the state of Illinois.*

*Our first speaker will be .....*

---

No Public Comments Received.

**Agenda Item VII: Closing and Next Steps**

- Please send in comments to the Introductory chapter within 10 business days.

Meeting Adjourned.