

Feedback Form

Regional Electricity Planning in the GTA East Region – September 14, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: MSIFN Consultation Team

Title: Consultation Department

Organization: Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation (MSIFN)

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: October 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 September 14, 2026, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback on the detailed options analysis and draft recommendations to meet the needs. 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 October 5, 2026.

Topic	Feedback
What feedback do you have on the draft recommendations?	The Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation (MSIFN) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft recommendations for the GTA East Integrated Regional Resource Plan. The GTA East planning area includes

Topic	Feedback
	MSIFN's traditional and treaty territory and encompasses lands and waters of continuing cultural, environmental, harvesting, and economic importance to the Michi Saagiig Anishinaabeg. MSIFN generally supports the proposed combined approach of targeted electricity demand-side management and new station infrastructure. The draft recommendations include: • Targeted incremental electricity demand-side management at Cherrywood, Whitby, Thornton, and Wilson transformer stations; • A new 230/44 kV station in the North Whitby or Pickering area; • A new 230/44 kV station in the Clarington area; and • Ongoing monitoring to determine the need and timing for longer-term transmission reinforcements. The recommended approach appears responsive to the scale and timing of the forecast electricity needs. However, MSIFN's support is dependent on the final IRRP embedding the following engagement, rights, and economic-participation requirements before any siting or procurement decisions proceed. Rights must be considered before locations and corridors are constrained The exact locations of the proposed North Whitby/Pickering and Clarington stations remain subject to further study. MSIFN must be engaged before potential station sites, transmission connections, access roads, or expanded rights-of-way are narrowed or preferred. Engagement after a location has effectively been selected would limit the ability to avoid impacts on Aboriginal and treaty rights, harvesting areas, cultural heritage resources, areas of archaeological potential, and lands and waters of interest to MSIFN. Indigenous-led resources should be treated as part of the solution MSIFN supports targeted electricity demand-side management but recommends that the final IRRP expressly identify opportunities for Indigenous-led demand management, distributed energy resources, battery storage, renewable generation, renewable natural gas, microgrids, and community energy initiatives. The final IRRP should provide a clear pathway for Indigenous-led projects to access the energy capacity created by the recommended infrastructure. Indigenous participation should be incorporated into system planning and implementation, not treated as a separate or later-stage consideration.

Topic	Feedback
	Economic reconciliation should be built into implementation The recommended stations, potential future transmission lines, electricity demand-side management programmes, battery storage, and other non-wire resources create opportunities for Indigenous equity ownership, revenue sharing, procurement, employment, training, and supply-chain participation. MSIFN recommends that the IESO and implementing utilities establish an Indigenous economic participation framework before projects proceed to procurement. The framework should include: • Equity participation in new stations and transmission reinforcements; • Consideration of majority Indigenous ownership where commercially and technically feasible; • Indigenous participation in distributed energy resource, storage, electricity demand-side management, environmental monitoring, archaeology, construction, and maintenance procurements; • Indigenous procurement targets and transparent reporting; • Early identification of financing and loan-guarantee mechanisms; and • Priority opportunities for rights-holding Nations whose territories may be affected. Monitoring must lead to early engagement The recommendation to monitor load growth, electrification, and electricity demand-side management performance is appropriate. However, monitoring should not become a rationale for deferring Indigenous engagement. The planning materials identify possible longer-term transmission expansion at Clarington or Bowmanville, with the exact location subject to further study. MSIFN should be engaged while the triggers, alternatives, and evaluation criteria for those future reinforcements are being developed.
What information needs to be considered regarding the draft recommendations?	MSIFN recommends that the following information be incorporated into the final IRRP, the Regional Infrastructure Plan, and subsequent siting, routing, environmental, and procurement processes. Indigenous rights, land use, and cultural information Planning must consider MSIFN's Aboriginal and treaty rights, traditional land and water use, harvesting activities, cultural heritage, archaeological interests, and intergenerational stewardship responsibilities.

Topic	Feedback
	Indigenous knowledge must be incorporated through a process developed with MSIFN and with appropriate protections for confidential and culturally sensitive information. The evaluation of station sites and connecting infrastructure should consider: • Known and potential archaeological resources; • Culturally significant landscapes and waters; • Traditional harvesting areas and access routes; • Impacts on the exercise and intergenerational sharing of rights, culture, and knowledge; • Opportunities to avoid disturbance rather than relying primarily on mitigation; and • MSIFN participation in archaeological, environmental, and cultural heritage studies and fieldwork. Cumulative effects and related infrastructure The GTA East IRRP should not assess electricity infrastructure in isolation. The region contains existing and planned transmission projects, nuclear facilities, transportation and utility corridors, major growth areas, and other development pressures. MSIFN recommends a regional cumulative-effects assessment that considers the interaction of the proposed stations and future reinforcements with: • Existing and planned transmission corridors; • The Durham-Kawartha Power Line; • The Bowmanville-to-East GTA Power Line; • Ongoing and proposed nuclear projects and associated transmission requirements; • Urban growth and land-use intensification; • Transportation and other linear infrastructure; • Loss or fragmentation of harvesting areas; • Effects on cultural heritage and archaeological resources; and • The combined effects of repeated development on MSIFN's ability to exercise Aboriginal and treaty rights.

Topic	Feedback
	Early, integrated planning is required so that cumulative environmental, land-use, harvesting, cultural, and community impacts are identified before routing or siting flexibility becomes constrained. Transparent option and site evaluation The IESO identifies technical feasibility, ability to address the need, cost-effectiveness, lead time, and community considerations as principal option-evaluation factors. Indigenous rights and interests should be established as a distinct evaluation criterion rather than being subsumed within general community considerations. For each proposed station and future reinforcement, MSIFN requests disclosure of: • Preliminary study and search areas; • Whether existing or new rights-of-way would be required; • Anticipated land footprints, access needs, and connecting-line requirements; • Environmental, archaeological, and cultural constraints; • Alternatives considered and the reasons for screening them in or out; • Assumptions used to compare wires and non-wire solutions; • How Indigenous rights, interests, and knowledge were considered; and • How avoidance, mitigation, accommodation, and economic participation will influence option selection. Indigenous growth and energy planning The demand forecast should explicitly consider Indigenous housing, economic development, infrastructure, energy generation, storage, and electrification initiatives. This information should be obtained directly from Indigenous Nations rather than relying on municipalities or local distribution companies to represent Indigenous plans and priorities. MSIFN also requests clarity on how future Indigenous-led projects that are not yet formally committed will be reflected in reference, high-growth, and sensitivity scenarios. This is important both to avoid under-forecasting Indigenous demand and to ensure sufficient connection capacity for Indigenous-led generation and storage. Climate resilience and reliability

Topic	Feedback
	The final IRRP should provide more information on how the proposed infrastructure will perform under extreme heat, storms, flooding, wildfire smoke, ice events, and other climate-related conditions. The plan should also explain how Indigenous knowledge and community experience will inform climate resilience, emergency preparedness, load restoration, and system-security planning.
How can the IESO continue to engage with communities and stakeholders as the recommendations are implemented, or to help prepare for the next planning cycle.	MSIFN must be engaged as a rights-holding Indigenous government, not solely as a stakeholder or member of the general public. Engagement should be bilateral, distinctions-based, appropriately resourced, and proportionate to the potential effects on MSIFN's rights, territory, and interests. MSIFN recommends that the IESO: 1. Establish a bilateral engagement process with MSIFN for implementation of the GTA East IRRP, including regular meetings involving the IESO, Hydro One, and relevant local distribution companies. 2. Provide direct access to the Technical Working Group or establish an Indigenous technical advisory process so that MSIFN can participate in the development of assumptions, evaluation criteria, site-selection processes, and triggers for future reinforcements. 3. Engage MSIFN before siting and routing decisions are made, including before preferred study areas, station sites, transmission connections, or rights-of-way are publicly advanced. 4. Hold Indigenous-specific technical workshops addressing: ○ Demand forecasts and scenario assumptions; ○ Station-level needs; ○ Wires and non-wire alternatives; ○ Siting and routing criteria; ○ Environmental, archaeological, and cultural constraints; ○ Capacity available for Indigenous-led projects; and ○ Ownership, procurement, financing, and revenue-sharing opportunities. 5. Create a transparent comment-tracking table that identifies each MSIFN recommendation, the IESO's response, whether and how the

Topic	Feedback
	recommendation was incorporated, the organisation responsible for implementation, and any follow-up commitments. 6. Provide capacity funding sufficient for MSIFN to retain technical, environmental, archaeological, legal, and financial expertise throughout IRRP implementation and development of the Regional Infrastructure Plan. 7. Coordinate engagement across related plans and projects. MSIFN should not be required to address interconnected station, transmission, nuclear, growth, and corridor issues through fragmented processes involving different proponents and schedules. 8. Provide updates between formal planning cycles, including annual reporting on: ○ Actual demand compared with forecast demand; ○ Electricity demand-side management performance; ○ Changing station and supply needs; ○ Emerging projects and large-load connections; ○ Progress on Indigenous-led resources; ○ New cumulative-effects information; and ○ Whether triggers for further transmission reinforcement are being approached. 9. Co-develop an Indigenous economic participation plan early enough to meaningfully influence project structure, procurement, financing, and ownership. Economic reconciliation should not be deferred until after technical recommendations and procurement models have been finalised. 10. Allow engagement timelines that respect Indigenous governance processes. Engagement schedules should provide sufficient time for MSIFN's technical review, community processes, and internal decision-making.

General Comments/Feedback

MSIFN supports reliable and forward-looking electricity planning for the GTA East region. However, reliability, affordability, environmental protection, economic reconciliation, and respect for Indigenous rights must be advanced together.

The final IRRP should expressly commit to:

- Early, rights-based, and government-to-government engagement;
- Integration of Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous-specific planning data;
- Avoidance and assessment of cumulative impacts;
- MSIFN involvement in siting, routing, archaeology, environmental assessment, and monitoring;
- Equitable access to new system capacity for Indigenous-led energy projects; and
- Economic reconciliation through ownership, revenue sharing, procurement, employment, training, and long-term participation.

MSIFN requests a bilateral meeting with the IESO before implementation begins to discuss the proposed North Whitby/Pickering and Clarington stations, possible longer-term transmission reinforcements, the structure of ongoing engagement, and opportunities for Indigenous economic participation.

MSIFN remains committed to collaborative, rights-respecting solutions that support a reliable and resilient electricity system while protecting Michi Saagiig lands, waters, rights, cultural heritage, and opportunities for future generations.

Miigwech,

MSIFN Consultation Team

Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation