

Feedback Form

South and Central Bulk Planning Update Webinar

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Tim Williams

Title: Manager of Planning

Organization: Middlesex County

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: May 12, 2026

To promote transparency, the submitted feedback will be posted on the South and Central Bulk Plan engagement webpage unless otherwise requested by the sender.

The Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback following the April 30, 2026, presentation of the draft recommendations for South and Central Bulk Plan. A copy of the presentations as well as recordings of the sessions are available on the [engagement web page](#).

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by May 21, 2026.

South and Central Bulk Plan - Feedback

The April 30, 2026, webinar focused on the draft South and Central Bulk Plan recommendations as presented. With the plan objectives and scope established, we are seeking feedback on clarity, understanding, and considerations important to note as the plan moves toward finalization.

Question	Feedback
<p>What additional data or context would help provide more clarity and for consideration in the final report?</p>	<p>From the County of Middlesex perspective, additional clarity is needed regarding the local land-use implications, agricultural impacts, natural heritage considerations, and corridor selection methodology associated with the proposed transmission expansions through Southwestern Ontario. Specifically, the final report would benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More detailed mapping identifying the preliminary study areas and potential corridor widths associated with the proposed Longwood TS to Guelph North/Wellington infrastructure and the Bruce Nuclear to Longwood TS corridor. While the bulk planning process is appropriately high-level, municipalities require a clearer understanding of the geographic implications to support long-range land use planning and infrastructure coordination. • Additional explanation regarding how agricultural impacts were evaluated within the portfolio assessment process. While “land-use impacts” are referenced as an evaluation factor, there is limited discussion regarding the extent of prime agricultural areas, impacts to specialty or intensive agricultural operations, fragmentation of farm parcels, and long-term impacts on agricultural productivity. • Greater transparency regarding how natural heritage systems, wetlands, woodlands, species at risk habitat, and watercourse crossings will influence future corridor identification and routing decisions. Given the scale of the proposed infrastructure, municipalities and conservation partners require greater clarity on how environmental constraints as well as mitigation will be incorporated into future stages of planning. • Additional information regarding cumulative impacts. Middlesex County is already experiencing significant infrastructure pressures associated with energy generation, transmission, transportation, aggregate extraction, settlement growth, and industrial development. The cumulative effect of multiple infrastructure corridors on agricultural land base, ecological systems, and rural communities should be considered in detail. • Additional information regarding alternative approaches and corridor co-location opportunities, including opportunities to maximize use of

Question	Feedback
	<p>existing transmission corridors, transportation corridors, or other infrastructure rights-of-way to minimize impacts on agricultural and natural heritage systems.</p>
<p>What questions or concerns do you have about the draft recommendations that the IESO might consider in future planning activities?</p>	<p>The County’s primary concern is ensuring that future transmission planning appropriately balances provincial (including the County’s) energy needs with the long-term protection of prime agricultural areas, rural communities, and natural heritage systems.</p> <p>Specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft recommendations appear to prioritize system reliability and future growth readiness, but there is limited discussion regarding minimization of land-use impacts in rural and agricultural areas. Middlesex County contains extensive prime agricultural lands that are important to the regional and provincial agricultural economy. New 500 kV corridors have the potential to create permanent fragmentation of agricultural operations and constrain future farming activities if not carefully planned and implemented. • There is concern regarding the pace of implementation and corridor preservation activities occurring before sufficient local consultation and technical analysis has been completed. Early corridor protection may have significant implications for municipal planning, rural landowners, development potential, and infrastructure coordination. • The County requests that future planning activities place greater emphasis on early and meaningful municipal engagement prior to the identification or protection of preferred corridors. The County and Local Municipalities require adequate opportunity to review potential impacts, provide local land-use and environmental information, and coordinate with other local municipalities and affected landowners. • The County also encourages the IESO to ensure that future engagement moves beyond broad information sharing toward more collaborative consultation processes with municipalities, Indigenous communities, agricultural organizations, conservation authorities, and directly affected property owners. • Additional concern exists regarding the long-term cumulative impact of multiple transmission projects across Middlesex County. The current planning framework evaluates projects individually, however communities may experience overlapping impacts from the recent increase in generation project being secured through IESO, transmission corridors, transportation infrastructure, and associated servicing expansions.

Question	Feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County requests that future planning activities consider opportunities to reduce overall corridor footprint, including co-location with existing infrastructure corridors wherever feasible and the evaluation of alternative technologies or phased approaches that may reduce land disturbance. • Further clarity is also requested regarding how future Environmental Assessment processes will address compensation, agricultural mitigation measures, drainage restoration, construction timing restrictions, and long-term operational impacts on farming operations.
<p>What additional data or local considerations should the IESO be aware of in finalizing the draft recommendations, or for future planning?</p>	<p>In finalizing the draft recommendations and advancing future planning work, the IESO should be aware of several important local considerations specific to Middlesex County and Southwestern Ontario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middlesex County contains some of the most productive agricultural land in Ontario, including extensive cash crop operations, livestock operations, greenhouse agriculture, and agri-food related industries. Protecting the long-term viability of the agricultural land base is a significant municipal (and provincial) policy priority. • Rural properties within the County often rely on comprehensive municipal drain systems and private agricultural drainage infrastructure. Transmission development has the potential to disrupt drainage patterns and agricultural productivity if not carefully planned and coordinated. • The County contains significant natural heritage features, including river corridors, wetlands, woodlands, and habitat areas associated with the Sydenham River and Thames River watersheds and tributaries. Future corridor studies should incorporate early environmental screening to minimize impacts on ecological systems and reduce future conflicts. • Southwestern Ontario is already experiencing significant infrastructure pressure associated with industrial growth, electrification, transportation infrastructure expansion, and renewable energy development. Municipal servicing capacity, road infrastructure impacts, and cumulative land consumption should be considered holistically. • Municipalities require timely access to mapping, technical information, and corridor planning studies to ensure coordination with Official Plan updates, infrastructure master planning, emergency servicing, and economic development initiatives.

Question	Feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="496 264 1442 533">• The County also emphasizes the importance of proactive public engagement. Rural landowners and agricultural communities will be directly impacted by transmission projects and require clear, accessible, and transparent information early in the planning process. Future engagement processes should include in-person consultation opportunities within affected communities and clear explanation of how feedback informs decision-making. <li data-bbox="496 541 1451 810">• Finally, the County encourages the IESO to continue coordinating with municipal governments throughout future phases of transmission planning, including corridor selection, Environmental Assessment processes, and implementation planning, to ensure provincial infrastructure objectives are advanced in a manner that minimizes impacts on local communities and supports long-term land-use compatibility.

General Comments/Feedback

Please note that the comments are being provided on behalf of administration, as this material has not been provided to Council.