

Feedback Form

Community Webinar for Municipalities Feedback Form – July 30, 2024

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Andrea Furniss

Title: Manager of Development Services

Organization: Loyalist Township

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: August 14, 2024

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

Following the Long-term Two RFP Webinar for Communities held on July 30, 2024, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback. A copy of the presentations as well as recordings of the sessions can be accessed from the [engagement web page](#).

Please submit feedback to communityengagement@ieso.ca by August 23, 2024.

Long-Term 2 Request for Proposals

Topic	Feedback
<p>How can the IESO streamline relevant processes (i.e., community engagement, municipal support) to the benefit of Proponents and municipalities?</p>	<p>Municipalities dictating public consultation requirements is supported. Proponents however, should not just be encouraged to consult with municipalities on public consultation matters but it should be mandatory for them to obtain these requirements and must adhere to them. Deadlines for municipal consultation should be required early in the process to ensure there is sufficient time to undertake the required public engagement. If in the situation that the final RFP documents do include public consultation requirements, it is recommended that at a minimum the consultation requirements under the Planning Act for Zoning By-law and Official Plan Amendments be used. Comments pertaining to municipal support resolutions is noted below.</p>
<p>How can the IESO better support municipalities to make decisions about proposed projects?</p>	<p>It is recommended that municipal support resolution templates be made more flexible. Previous wording in the LT1 templates were problematic as it was difficult to use the template support wording for a project prior to undergoing applicable Planning Act approvals. Municipal Councils should be provided with the flexibility on how to write a support resolution. This could include wording such as supporting a renewable energy project on a subject parcel in principle only and subject to various conditions (i.e. successfully obtaining a zoning by-law amendment). It is noted and appreciated that timelines are being enhanced as part of the LT2, however, the RFP should build in requirements for timelines between some milestones such as a deadline to approach the municipality in obtaining public consultation requirements to ensure that there is sufficient time to undertake the appropriate public engagement. It would also be appreciated if the IESO make themselves available to municipalities for any questions. In the previous procurement, questions were raised about the battery storage technology that were unable to be answered by the proponents or IESO.</p>
<p>What key considerations are there from a municipal perspective that relate to Agricultural Impact Assessment?</p>	<p>Prohibiting solar farms on prime agricultural areas is strongly supported. For other projects, the webinar session indicated that it would be the municipality who determined whether the Agricultural Impact Assessment was deemed</p>

Topic	Feedback
	<p>to be satisfactory or not, which is not appropriate outside of a Planning Act process. Not all municipalities have staff expertise to evaluate these types of studies. In the Township, these studies that are submitted as part of a planning act application would be peer reviewed by experts and the costs recouped by the developer as part of the application process. The costs for these peer reviews should not be born by the municipality. The IESO could request OMAFRA to undertake these reviews or retain an independent peer reviewer. The municipality should also be kept informed during this review process and also have the opportunity to comment if a process such as this is undertaken.</p>
<p>What feedback or municipal perspectives can be shared on the new LT2 RFP proposed municipal requirements and engagement approach?</p>	<p>If a municipal support resolution is required, the change to requiring it upfront as opposed to utilizing criteria points and then requiring it 18 months after a contract is strongly supported. The previous approach created confusion in that it appeared the 18 months would allow more time for proponents to work with the municipality to obtain their support resolution whereas the need for proponents to obtain the criteria points was very significant and many proponents advised that they would not be in a position to submit a proposal to IESO if the criteria points were not obtained. The support resolution should be more flexible as noted above. Comments on the engagement approach are noted above.</p>

General Comments/Feedback

Click or tap here to enter text.