

# Feedback Form

## Regional Electricity Planning in East Lake Superior – December 11, 2025

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Sam McQuiggan

Title: Community Energy Coordinator

Organization: M'Chigeeng First Nation

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: January 21<sup>st</sup> 2026

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

Following the East Lake Superior electricity planning engagement webinar held on December 11, 2025, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking your feedback on the wire and non-wire options that will be considered to meet the needs. A copy of the presentation and the recording of the session can be accessed from the [engagement web page](#).

**Please submit feedback to [engagement@ieso.ca](mailto:engagement@ieso.ca) by January 30, 2025.**

Topic	Feedback
What feedback do you have on the wire and non-wire options that will be considered to meet the region's electricity needs?	Since the electrification of the Algoma steel foundry is by far the greatest need in the region, MFN believes that DER's should be the primary option to solve the supply issues. This should include renewables (wind, solar, hydro) as well as battery storage to sustain the power supply throughout the year. eDSM options will not reduce power consumption in a reasonable manner when the load is

Topic	Feedback
	<p>expected to increase drastically, this quickly. It would be wise to consider wire options if the local generation cannot supply the entire load and MFN suggests a line from the Sudbury/Algoma region which could be powered by DER's along the north shore. This line could also be used as a distribution-level load transfer in the future if needed as the power requirements in the region are growing significantly. Similar plans are mentioned in the Northeast bulk system reinforcement report suggesting a new line from Hanmer TS to Mississagi TS and Mississagi TS to third line TS.</p>
<p>What additional information should be considered in the evaluation of wire and non-wire options?</p>	<p>MFN believes that the IESO should consider community led/owned options as a priority to improve local energy resilience and interest. Also, it is believed that acknowledging the constraints and needs of nearby regions could lead to one single solution to multiple problems across the larger grid. The Sudbury/Algoma region (adjacent to the east) has several stakeholders (MFN included) which plan to build more local generation and various DER projects. Since the East Lake Superior region is expecting a significant increase in load capacity, other regions could be enticed to be generators.</p>
<p>Are there any additional information that should be provided in future engagements to help understand community perspectives and insights?</p>	<p>Some stakeholders seem to be missing the Algoma steel foundry electrification project and MFN believes this is increasing the hesitancy to acknowledge the 'needs' of the region. The information is well documented; however, not all stakeholders read all the reports released, and it is believed that the presentation could have included more data to avoid reaffirming the 'bottom-up approach', predictability/uncertainty, as well as the considerations of electrification across the energy sector.</p>

## General Comments/Feedback

Thanks, as always, for the opportunity to engage with this planning process!