## Feedback Form

# Long-Term RFP Community Engagement: Municipal Discussion Session- July 14, 2022

#### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Bruce McAllister, RPP, MCIP

Title: General Manager, Community Development

Organization: Municipality of Chatham-Kent

Email:

Date: 21 July 2022

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Long-Term RFP Community Engagement Webpage unless otherwise requested by the sender.

Following the Long-Term RFP Community Engagement Municipal Breakout discussion session held on July 14, 2022, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback as outlined during the presentation. A copy of the presentation as well as a recording of the session that includes an overview of the feedback request, can be accessed from the <u>engagement webpage</u>.

**Please submit feedback to** <u>engagement@ieso.ca</u> by **August 5, 2022**. If you wish to provide confidential feedback, please submit as a separate document, marked "Confidential". Otherwise, to promote transparency, feedback that is not marked "Confidential" will be posted on the engagement webpage.



#### **Proposed Mandatory Criteria**

Topic Feedback

In the past, the IESO has not mandated Municipal Support resolutions in procurements. but has rather awarded rated criteria points to those able to obtain them.

Does this approach present any opportunities or challenges to municipalities?
 If an alternative should be considered, what other municipal processes could complement, supplement or replace municipal resolutions?
 How does the concept of a support resolution align with existing planning and

permitting processes?

Chatham-Kent supports mandating Support
Resolutions as it provides an opportunity for
communities to understand and evaluate projects and
to discuss their impacts/benefits. This approach has
worked well for Chatham-Kent in the past. Having a
community support agreement in advance allowed
Chatham-Kent to successfully streamline permitting
and construction timelines for multiple electricity
related projects. Given our past success and the
compressed timelines proposed under the expedited
RFP, a Community Support resolution should be
mandated.

The support resolution would work within the existing environmental, planning and permitting processes (i.e. no exemptions would be permitted). However, timelines for municipal reviews and approvals would be aligned with project milestones. This will be accomplished by clearly defined processes and information filing requirements, dedicated staff and parallel processes reviews. Chatham-Kent used these processes, governed by community support resolutions and benefit agreements to successfully site 1050 MW's of generation projects in our community.

### **Guidance Materials for Municipalities**

Topic Feedback

Guidance materials are under development to prepare municipalities for future steps. The key areas of focus in the guidance document will include:

- Overview of the components within the procurement processes including the timelines related to the roles of municipalities and their interaction with proponents
- Information and key messages to support discussions with elected officials, staff and constituents
- Access to resources for municipalities to support their work
- 1. What other information would you expect to find in a guidance document that the IESO could provide to assist municipalities in this procurement process?

It would be very helpful for the IESO to provide a summary, or cheat sheet of the various pieces of provincial legislation and regulations that apply, any restrictions that might exist (i.e. solar farms on class 1, 2 or 3 soils), and the various approvals that would be required for each type of generation project possible under the LT1 RFP.

It would be very helpful if the IESO could clearly mandate that the MCSR is a requirement and where it fits within the larger review and approval process so we might be able to communicate this to proponents, Council and the public (i.e. even if a community provides an MSCR it does not necessarily mean that the project will proceed as there are various evaluation criteria that will determine if a PPA will be awarded and a project will proceed). Based on this, it would be very helpful if the IESO could prepare a standard Municipal Council Support Resolution Form template.

What are the land use planning implications for Municipalities? Will the local land use planning process that is in place for other forms of development fully/partially/not apply to these energy generation projects? If so where do local land use approvals fit within the larger regulatory review process? Does Section 1.6.11 Energy Supply of the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 generally provide justification for generation facilities in most locations i.e. Prime Agricultural Areas for instance?

#### **Engagement Activities for Municipalities**

Topic F	Feedback
---------	----------

Based on your experience with this Long-Term RFP Community Engagement: 1.What questions do you have related to your ability to provide input into LT1 RFP contract design elements, including Mandatory Criteria for Proponents?

- 2. What future information is important for you to receive or provide throughout the engagement of this procurement process?
- 3. What other engagement or outreach activities should be considered by the IESO?

In addition to municipal and First Nations engagement, the IESO should consider consulting directly with the Local Distribution Companies in areas that are likely to see new generation activity resulting from the LT1-RFP process, particularly those who operate in the priority areas identified by the IESO.

Regular communication is important throughout the trajectory of the procurement process including at key milestones (i.e. number of proponents qualified under the RFQ process).

Consider targeted information and engagement sessions for Councilors to make them aware of the initiative, the MCSR process, and possible local implications/impacts. Send invitations to the Mayors and/or Clerks office.

#### General Comments/Feedback:

Continue engaging with municipalities; distill the information presented to the very essential using non-technical language (consider the use of a communications firm for reviewing draft presentations); consider what is important from a local government's perspective, help us optimize the local benefits and minimize the local drawbacks the LT1-RFP has the potential to produce.