Feedback Form

Regional Electricity Planning in the GTA East Region – April 20, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Christine Drimmie

Title: volunteer

Organization: Climate Justice Durham

Email: [redacted]

Date: May 5, 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the GTA East engagement webpage unless otherwise requested by the sender.

Following the GTA East regional planning webinar held on April 20, 2026, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback on the identified electricity needs and initial screening of potential options. A copy of the presentation as well as recording of the session can be accessed from the engagement web page.

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by May 11, 2026.

Topic	Feedback
What feedback do you have on the wire and non-wire options that will be	This exercise still reveals the Provincial government's preference to build huge expensive things like nuclear plants and to support the fossil fuel industry with no

Topic	Feedback
considered to meet the region's electricity needs?	concern about the fate of wastes and emissions. The starting assumption is that big bulk generation stations will continue to dominate the development of energy system and the supply is endless. The only question to be answered are how much and how fast and what new transmission structures will be needed to support it. In this presentation I saw no commitment to, or even suggestions for, any distributed renewable sources and storage in the GTA East. Could such resources help address growth in demand for example or how might they be used to reduce or prevent some of the capacity issues identified? It does not seem to be in the IESO's or HONI's wheelhouse to even think hard about this. Could a more distributed approach to generation shift some of the station capacity or load supply capacity needs in space or timing? As a non-engineer, perhaps I am mistaken to think that there could be synergies between the systems. •There did not seem to be any acknowledgement that geothermal systems are another option that should be available most places but might be especially applicable to large complexes/campuses of buildings and institutional settings where the cost can be spread among more users. • There is also no mention of tapping into major sources of so-called "waste heat" from the cooling of the nuclear plants. Rather than dumping hot water from the generating stations into Lake Ontario, damaging the ecosystem. Could this excess heat be captured and the energy used as a resource in the GTA East or in the bulk plans?
. What additional information should be considered in the evaluation of wire and non-wire options?	It seems to me that the exclusion of an improved Ontario building code from non-wires solutions is a massive oversight in Ontario's energy planning. Why are we ignoring the opportunity to, at least, slow future growth in demand related to new structures, especially as electrification of space heating takes hold? Has the IESO or anyone else ever taken a serious look at what impact a modernized and routinely updated building code - one that optimizes the energy performance of all new structures - could have on the forecast of future energy demand? If the uncertainties around this kind of projection are too great, why not do a pilot project with a willing developer in a greenfield setting? The Region of Durham conducted a study like this related to water efficiency years ago in

Topic	Feedback
	Clarington, tracking the performance and bills of the upgraded houses compared to a code-only control group. The findings were clear on the savings to the system and to homeowners. I believe there have been also been small-scale demonstration projects with net-zero or even energy positive housing and offices in Guelph and Waterloo that demonstrate the costs and benefits of energy efficiency. We have available technologies and opportunities to test and innovate. Why not try something like this in the GTA East where there is lot of building? This would help establish a baseline for a standard set of building code efficiency measures. Perhaps, even some behind the meter generation measures could be tested. The results would be used to better understand what the impact of a new code would be on energy demand and bills at the neighbourhood level. We would have some solid data to put into future demand modelling, comparing status quo to a better type of building. We need to do this for homes, apartments, stores, offices. Industrial buildings might be more of a challenge. Your current set of CDM measures are focused on existing users who face many barriers to change. Helping them with smart/demand-shifting thermostats and retrofits to improve the structures are necessary tools and probably need to be better promoted. But we also need to look at future structure design and neighbourhood development, where the only barriers to energy savings are the ones we allow to be created. The IESO should be advising the Province that removing existing Green Building Standards from municipal authority (in Bill 98) is a terrible idea, until such time as the Province implements a comparable set of standards to help us build more energy efficient and resilient communities.
Are there other types of information that would be helpful for us to provide in future engagements to enhance understanding of community perspectives and insights?	What if instead of starting from the assumption that we can continue to grow the energy system without limits, we instead first address how well we could live with minor adjustments, excellent maintenance, continuous improvement of efficiency and resiliency, distributed generation and storage as a standard approach, and more household/site level measures to offset demand? What if we said system growth is very costly and will be constrained unless we become more efficient? Would that

Topic	Feedback
	get the Province and developers more interested in updating the Building Code?

General Comments/Feedback

This is likely out of scope but if the Province is in favour of laying a transmission cable on the bottom of Lake Ontario, why are they not considering also offshore wind generation with related storage to replace gas plants which are supposedly only for peak period offsets?

How/when will residents of the GTA East be informed (and by whom) about proposals for a huge industrial energy demand (such as a data centre) being added to the forecast for our Region? Is there a publicly available strategy or plan for how the Province/IESO/HONI/LDCs/municipalities would assess whether a proposed location can be serviced and is accepted by the community. This is especially concerning given the apparent potential impact on the load and requirements of a system that has been built with public and ratepayer investment. How initial and long-term costs and impacts of such a facility would be assessed also needs public scrutiny and social acceptability.

A really basic question for the IESO: Why is OPG, as our provincial generating utility, not planning substantive investments in wind and solar as is being done in other jurisdictions? Is it purely due to Provincial (and federal) direction to put all/most of our public eggs in the expensive nuclear and emissions-heavy fossil fuel baskets? Consider this a question from a shareholder in all of the Provincial energy agencies.