

Feedback Form

Long-Term 2 RFP – November 21, 2024

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Warren Howard

Organization: Consultant

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: December 6, 2024

Following the LT2 RFP November 21, 2024, engagement webinar, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from stakeholders on the items discussed. The presentation and recording can be accessed from the [LT RFP engagement web page](#).

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Long-Term RFP engagement page unless otherwise requested by the sender. If you wish to provide confidential feedback, please mark "Yes" below:

- Yes – there is confidential information, do not post**
- No – comfortable to publish to the IESO web page**

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by **December 6, 2024**.

Agricultural Impact Assessment Process

IESO Presentation	Feedback
Do you have any comments for the IESO to consider regarding the timing of the AIA requirement in the LT2 RFP and LT2 Contract	Prov.ided in separate document
OMAFA Presentation	Feedback
Are there any specific aspects outlined in the session that you would like further clarification on?	<p>The comment near the end of the webinar that the IESO intends to use the existing MECP decommissioning report suggests that the IESO has a very limited understanding of the failings of this report from the municipal perspective. Detailed recommendations are outlined below.</p>
Is there any additional information related to agricultural considerations that would be helpful?	

General Comments/Feedback

The comment that the discussion of Decommissioning of project would be handled within the Decommissioning Report required by Regulation 359/09 suggests that IESO has no understanding of municipal concerns about the inadequacy of this process to deal with the issues related to the existing wind turbine projects.

It is not clear why the IESO would believe that a report prepared by the proponent and approved by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks without input and a sign-off from the affected municipality would be a satisfactory solution to this issue.

Many municipalities have taken steps to address the gaps in the current process and there are a number of challenges that need to be addressed before additional turbine projects are approved.

Responsibility for Decommissioning

From the municipal perspective, the current process does not effectively define who is responsible for ensuring projects are properly decommissioned.

The current guidance for preparation the decommissioning report suggests that the applicant is responsible for decommissioning but municipal experience has been that projects are flipped many

times before the decommissioning takes place, meaning that the original applicant will likely be no longer involved in the project.

The existing Decommissioning reports do not point to any role for the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks in ensuring that proper Decommissioning takes place. Given the experience of municipalities with this Ministry's ineffectiveness in managing the noise audit process and ensuring that complaints about the project are properly addressed, making the MECP responsible for Decommissioning would not be seen as a credible solution by municipalities.

The IESO seems to have opted out this process entirely, stating previously that decommissioning takes place after the end of the IESO contract and the IESO's responsibility does not extend beyond the end of the contract.

While the applicant can be held responsible at the start of a project, experience has shown that operational projects are traded as investments. By the end of the life of a project, the project has been divided into small groups of one or two turbines owned by untraceable, numbered companies. When the project is operating, these companies are assigned a portion of the revenue stream from the IESO and a portion of the financing for the project. This is a viable operating arrangement only as long as the project is earning income. When the revenue stops each of these companies are essentially bankrupt as the turbines have become liabilities with no offsetting assets or income.

As part of the permitting process, some municipalities have set out requirements for lines of credit or other financial instruments to fund the decommissioning activities when the applicant is still involved in the project but there is no guarantee that these funds will be sufficient to fully decommission the project at the end of its life.

Municipalities do have powers to hold land owners responsible to addressing derelict structures on their property. The process starts with an order to take action relative to the derelict structure. If the property owner does not take action, the municipality can then take action to remove the structure with the costs being charged to the property taxes owed by the property owner. If these taxes are not paid, the municipality has the power to seize the property and sell it to recover the costs.

To obtain municipal support, there needs to be a clear framework that ensures the project will be properly decommissioned at the end of its life. As the manager of the contract for the facility, it would be logical for the IESO when advised of a change in ownership to ensure that the new owners have assumed the responsibilities of the original applicants in regards to decommissioning of the project. The agreements where the new owner assumes these responsibilities should be shared with the municipality hosting the facility.

Disposal of components

Turbine blades contain toxic elements, making them unsuited to disposal in municipal waste disposal facilities. Other arrangements should be made with the MECP for the disposal of these components. This arrangement should be documented in the decommissioning plan. Similar arrangements will be needed for the removal and disposal of other toxic materials contained within the nacelle.

Site Remediation

The requirements for remediation of project sites also needs to be made more precise. This is particularly important for wind turbines located in agricultural areas. At best, the current practice is to remove the foundation up to a depth of 1 metre which does not allow the site to be fully productive as farmland. Complete removal of the cement and steel foundation for wind turbine towers should be the standard. All transformers and other electric equipment and cabling need to be removed.

The equipment needed to remove the blades and dismantle the tower will have an impact on the land adjacent to the tower and this land will also need to be restored. Any damage to local tile farm drainage or wider municipal drainage will need to be promptly addressed. Similarly, any damage to municipal roads needs to be repaired.

Financial Support for Remediation

In the decommissioning plan, the applicant should outline a process to provide financial guarantees to support the implementation of the decommissioning plan at the end of the project's life. These guarantees need to be in place for the IESO to issue the commercial operation. The decommissioning plan should reviewed every five years including an assessment by the IESO that security held for the decommissioning will adequate given changes in costs or requirements..

Municipal Approval

The decommission plan for the project should be provided to the municipal for review and approval. The timing of this submission should be aligned with the Agricultural Impact Assessment. The proponent should provide confirmation that it has received this municipal approval. If it fails to receive this sign-off, the project would be in default REA approval similar to the treatment of the Agricultural Impact Assessment.