### Feedback Form

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

#### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Cephas Panschow

Title: Development Commissioner

Organization: Town of Tillsonburg

Email:

Date: August 5, 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?
- 1. I'm familiar with and have been involved in obtaining municipal support resolutions and I thought the points process was a good one. Frankly, I prefer the "carrot" approach versus a more "heavy-handed" mandatory requirement.

The challenge with obtaining support resolutions is similar for both voluntary and mandatory although each have their own pros/cons. For example, voluntary means that more risk averse municipalities may be unsure as to what they are approving and, since they would not be mandatory, they may eschew providing one. A mandatory requirement may help municipalities get over their risk analysis, but could also hinder them further. Hence, I believe the voluntary approach is the best one. Plus, if one is not able to be obtained due to a risk averse council, the proponent can still proceed even if somewhat

- 2. An alternative approach could be to require public engagement through public information sessions, surveys, etc, that follow prescribed timelines such that no one can claim that the process was deliberately managed to avoid public scrutiny.
- 3. the concept of a support resolution has, to date, been outside the standard bureaucratic process. It is an interesting question to see how it could be brought into that process as most planning and permitted processes are entirely bureaucratic through delegated authority. To bring political decision making into an administrative process is an interesting thought and would require more analysis in order to best "marry" the two types of decision making.

#### 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?

This sounds good. Particularly information that could be used to inform constituents and address their concerns.

Other information that would be helpful is guidance as to the types of studies and reports required for the project type being considered and when they are most relevant to be considered in the process. A lot of more complex studies often become available at the end of the process, but concerned constituents may argue that the information should be available before any decision whatsoever is made, which, frankly, is not fair to the proponent. Helping constituents understand when information will generally be available and the appropriateness of various levels of decision making throughout the process could help allay concerns throughout the approval process.

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

# 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?

**Topic** 

3. What other engagement or outreach activities should be considered by the IESO?

#### Feedback

During the Green Energy & Economy Act (2009) implementation, project proponents often came directly to the municipality but, at least in small communities, there was no contact by the energy authorities at the time to advise of projects being considered in our area nor the background information on projects as they were submitted nor resources to assist municipalities in decision making.

Frankly, it often felt like we were "flying blind" or that we had to rely on the proponent to provide information or interpret regulations and processes. A more proactive communication approach as projects enter the IESO pipeline would be helpful in enabling municipalities to respond in a timely and appropriate manner.

#### General Comments/Feedback:

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input to date and the much more consultative approach being taken so far. This is encouraging and I hope it will continue through the long term procurement process.