

Feedback Form

Long-Term 2 RFP – April 21, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Jane Wilson

Title: President

Organization: Wind Concerns Ontario

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: May 5, 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Long-Term 2 RFP engagement page unless otherwise requested by the sender.

- NO - There is confidential information, do not post**
 YES - Comfortable to publish to the IESO web page

Following the April 21st Long-Term 2 RFP engagement webinar, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from stakeholders on the items discussed. The presentation and recording can be accessed from the [Long-Term Procurement 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 May 8, 2026.

Repowering Eligibility Framework

Do you have feedback related to scenarios where repowering work may overlap with existing contract obligations?

Our chief concern is that industrial wind power complexes now applying for repowering, may not have met the obligations of their previous approvals, and that there are unresolved issues with regard to social and environmental impacts of these projects.

We are currently engaged in reviewing internal documents from 2024 provided by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) via Freedom of Information requests, and we can tell you, the problems of noise pollution and probable health impacts from wind turbine noise emissions has not been resolved. The MECP had multiple complaints in 2024 from individuals and families reporting ongoing noise and in some cases, serious health impacts (sleep disturbance, headache, physiological symptoms of anxiety, even nosebleeds and other effects). One family, for example, has been submitting aggregate noise reports monthly for more than 12 years, and have had no resolution to their problems.

Yet another has experienced noise for more than seven years with only cursory response from the operator (they sent their bookkeeper out to see if she could hear the turbines).

This is par for the course with wind turbine noise complaints, which we have been reviewing since 2006. We recall that the IESO during one web event early in 2025 asked the MECP about the noise reporting process, was told everything is fine, and accepted that response without question.

In the case of Nation Rise, internal documents revealed questions from residents about noise complaints for the turbines even before the project received final contract approval and whether the IESO should grant Commercial Operation. In one internal email, a senior MECP staff member said, "IESO has never reached out to us and I suspect are well acquainted with the concerns of other wind farms..." [p. 000533 FOI request A-2021-03739] In other words, the IESO and MECP appear not to be communicating about whether approval requirements have been met, despite the IESO contract requirement that proponents be in compliance with appropriate regulations.

Again, our concern is that facilities where there have been problems may now receive approval for repowering, which will extend these problems further for residents and communities.

It is no coincidence that now, 159 municipalities in Ontario branded themselves Unwilling Hosts to new industrial wind power complexes. As explained in an editorial by the Christian Federation of Farmers of Ontario, these communities did so "not out of fear but from experience."

The IESO cannot look the other way on these issues. It is not enough to justify what is going on by relying on the complaint resolution process when clearly it is flawed, and the foundation for it (noise limits, setbacks) is inadequate. The IESO claims its goal is to work toward "the best options" for powering communities. That cannot be true when so many problems exist, without acknowledgement or resolution.

Thank you.

Alternate Eligibility Pathways for Repowering

Do you have feedback related to specific existing facilities that do not fit into the proposed repowering framework and may justify an alternate pathway? Please include as much detail as possible (technology type, facility age, contract history etc.).

Yes, see above.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

As learned during the 2025 LT2-RFP, several municipalities complained that the decision process was too short for them to make an informed decision, and that the information they required to make a decision to support proposals was onerous.

In the case of repowering, especially where there have been problems such as noise pollution, disruption of groundwater supply etc., is there any requirement for proponents to provide impact assessments and to assure communities that problems will not occur/persist?

To be perfectly frank with you, there are people across Ontario living inside industrial wind power complexes who have been waiting, some in desperation, for these contracts to end so the problems will cease.