

Feedback Form

Energy Webinar for Communities #2 Municipal Feedback – January 17, 2024

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Andrea Furniss

Title: Manager of Development Services

Organization: Loyalist Township

Email:

Date: February 7, 2024

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on this [engagement webpage](#) unless otherwise requested by the sender.

Following the Energy Webinar for Communities held on January 17, 2024, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback. A copy of the presentations as well as recordings of the sessions are available on the [engagement web page](#).

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by February 7, 2024.

Transmitter Selection Framework

Topic	Feedback
How do you want to be involved in developing the Transmitter Selection Framework?	Please provide municipalities with the time to review and comment on draft framework and RFP requirements.
Would you want to participate in upcoming targeted sessions? If so please indicate topics of interest.	Interested in participating in any sessions regarding procurement
What additional input or feedback do you think the IESO should consider as it embarks on this initiative?	Click or tap here to enter text.

Long-Term 2 Request for Proposals

Topic	Feedback
How do you want to be involved as part of the IESO's engagement on the procurement design?	Request to be given the opportunity to review and provide comments on the RFP requirements.
How can the IESO streamline relevant processes (i.e., community engagement, municipal support) to the benefit of Proponents and municipalities?	Need to incorporate best practices in public engagement prior to proponents coming before Council to request a MSR. RFP documents should have strict requirements in regards to notice circulation. Only notifying the adjacent landowner is not sufficient. Similar notification requirements for standard Planning Act applications can be used as a guide, such as utilizing a minimum 120 metre notice circulation radius as well posting signage along the frontage of the proposed site with details of the project and the open house. Notice and sign posting should be provided at least 20 days prior to the open house. During the previous procurement round, several open houses were all held in the same week and one at the same time as a Council meeting. This was due to the rushed nature of the process and affected relevant staff and council members being able to attend all the open houses. Open houses should be held a couple months before the deadline to submit applications. This will allow time to bring a proposal forward to Council for information and obtain any public input and requests for further information. An additional Council meeting may be required to provide further information to Council and to address any potential public

Topic	Feedback
	<p>concerns. One proposal in the LRT1 held an Open House after their proposal was brought forward to Council to seek a support resolution. There were significant concerns with this approach. Due to public engagement occurring late in the process and with limited notice circulations, the public did not become aware of many of these proposals until the last minute and concerns were unable to be addressed within the time period required to obtain a MSR. Proper engagement and providing sufficient time to properly undertake this will benefit both proponents and municipalities.</p>
<p>Based on your experience in past IESO procurements, what feedback can you provide with respect to Municipal Support Resolutions, including around the removal of municipal rated criteria points?</p>	<p>Support the recommended approach of not requiring municipal rated criteria. This caused a lot of confusion during the LRT1 procurement. Proponents had indicated that the MSR was a support in principle and was only for criteria points, however if not received now, then they would be required to obtain support within 18 months. The general public was confused as it appears as though Council is refusing the project when not granting a MSR early in the process, when in fact applicants can still proceed through the process and return to Council again at a later date to obtain a MSR. Following our Council's refusal to grant a MSR, proponents all indicated that it would break their project as it was not worth applying to the IESO due to a requirement to pay a costly deposit without assurances that they will receive a future MSR. The proposed approach to now simply require a MSR in order to make an application to IESO will be more straightforward and provide proponents with assurances from the start as to whether their project is supported or not (rather than not obtaining criteria points for an early MSR and then trying to lobby Council for the next 18 months trying to secure a MSR after the fact). Flexibility in resolution wording is also needed, particularly allowing the ability to use the words "support in principle." This is an important statement as proponents who require other approvals such as a zoning by-law amendment may not be able obtain Council approval which would result in the use not being permitted in the end.</p>

Topic	Feedback
<p>What are some key considerations around the treatment of proposed projects in prime agricultural areas?</p>	<p>Commercial scale solar projects should not be permitted in Prime Agricultural Areas due to the significant land consumption needs for solar projects. It should also be noted that the Township's Official Plan does not permit commercial scale solar projects on Prime Agricultural designated lands. Battery storage projects also have the potential to consume large portions of land and should not be permitted in Prime Agricultural Areas in order to preserve higher class soils for farming (Class 1-3 soils).</p>
<p>How can the IESO better support municipalities to make decisions about proposed projects?</p>	<p>Require longer community engagement timeframes in order for meaningful public input to be obtained prior to municipal Councils being asked to make a decision on whether to support a project or not. IESO should also provide educational materials on the types of energy they are looking to procure. For example, the previous battery storage procurement resulted in a lot of questions from the public and Council that could not be answered by proponents. Proposals presented to Council were high level and lacked sufficient details required for Council to make an informed decision. In addition to the IESO providing educational material on what they are procuring, specific details on the projects should be provided by proponents early in the process. The quality of presentations and the ability to respond to questions was not done well by all proponents during the previous procurement. The RFQ process should consider qualifying companies that are reputable and have proven development and public engagement experience. The IESO should also present to municipal Councils on future procurements. While this was done during the last round of procurement, the IESO was unable to discuss the particular procurement and as a result any questions that the Township were looking for answers on could not be discussed. The IESO should engage with Councils prior to the procurement opening in order to provide for a more meaningful dialogue.</p>

General Comments/Feedback

Click or tap here to enter text.