

Feedback Form

Toronto Third Line – October 1, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Sean Morris

Title: Principal

Organization: Urban Capital REI (UCREI)

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: October 14, 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the [Toronto Third Line engagement page](#) unless otherwise requested by the sender.

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

The Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from Indigenous communities and stakeholders on the Contract Draft #1 document and Preliminary System-Level Requirements. The materials can be accessed from the [Toronto Third Line engagement webpage](#).

Note: The IESO will accept additional materials where it may be required to support your rationale provided below. When sending additional materials please indicate if they are confidential.

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by October 15, 2026.

Please respond only to the questions that are relevant to your expertise, or interest. There is no expectation to answer every question.

Cost Containment

Question 1: Does the proposed Target Cost model appropriately balance cost certainty, risk sharing and incentives for efficient project delivery while achieving cost containment?

Question 2: What other cost categories can be designated as Fixed Costs?

Question 3: What indexing approaches or indices should the IESO consider to address inflation and/or long-lead equipment cost escalation?

Question 4: Is the proposed Capital Cost ceiling an effective safeguard for ratepayers?

Proponent Experience Qualification

Question 5: Does the proposed experience qualification framework provide flexibility without compromising competition and delivery certainty?

Preliminary Corridor Study

Question 6: What additional information would proponents and participants require from the Corridor Study to support engagement activities and proposal development

For the Preliminary Corridor Study, it would be helpful to distinguish information drawn from public records from information confirmed by the relevant authority or property owner.

For each material constraint, please identify the source and date, what has been verified, what remains uncertain, and who would need to confirm it at the next stage. Please also explain how corrections from participants will be incorporated when draft findings are reviewed.

This would make the common information baseline more useful without treating desktop mapping as confirmation of land access, servicing availability or permission to proceed.

General Comments / Feedback

Please use this section to provide any additional comments that may not be captured in the questions above.