

Feedback Form

Northwest Regional Electricity Planning – Webinar #4 held on November 3, 2022

Please submit your written comments by November 23 using this feedback form by email to engagement@ieso.ca

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Sunil Kumar

Title: VP Energy Strategy & Engineering

Organization: Kinross Gold Corporation (Great Bear Resources Ltd)

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: 22 Nov 2022

Note: This feedback is being submitted in response to the webinar held on November 3 for the NW IRRP engagement initiative. To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Northwest Regional Electricity Planning [engagement webpage](#) unless otherwise requested by the sender.

Visit the [engagement webpage](#) for more information.

...2/

Feedback:

Topic	Feedback
What other information or insights should be considered in the recommendations and findings outlined in the presentation?	See below – Item 1
How can the IESO and/or members of the Northwest IRRP Technical Working Group continue to engage with communities as the recommendations in the plan are implemented, or to help prepare for the next planning cycle?	See below – Item 2

General Comments/Feedback

Item 1 – Information and Insights to be Considered

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Nov 3 Webinar. We acknowledge the challenges of planning in an environment with new technologies, high potential load growth, promoting mining and industrial development in the north, and the goals of decarbonization. Our comments are below, and we are available for further discussions:

- a) To what extent do the load forecasts incorporate the push for electrification? As organizations are still evolving their climate change strategies in line with government policy, the current forecasts may not fully reflect likely future scenarios. What is the range for the “High Growth” forecast? Can this growth forecast be updated and included in the IRRP report?
- b) Slide 7: “... forecast to approach but not exceed system capacity in the forecast horizon ...” Many projects, such as our GBR project near Red Lake, are in advanced development stage but not yet fully committed for construction. Given the lead-time to study, engineer, procure and construct transmission projects, an IESO work strategy to advance these projects (without necessarily committing to their construction) is needed. Otherwise, the mine developments will need to be downsized to fit within the available power capacity or be forced to generate on-site using natural gas with much higher costs and much higher GHG emissions. Recently, there have been some mining projects that have had to select natural gas generation due to insufficient transmission capacity.
- c) Slide 17: are the load forecasts for the “Base Case”. Consideration should be given to how quickly the growth cases may materialize. What would be the approximate cost and time frame for a new line from Dryden to Ear Falls to Red Lake to support a “High Growth” case? Investing in refurbishments to meet immediate needs and then having to build a new line shortly afterwards to serve growth would not be an efficient deployment of capital.
- d) Slide 20: Are the \$35M and \$23M refurbishment costs just for the circuits? Do the costs include provisions for alternative power arrangements and reactive power support systems?
- e) Slide 20: If the thermal limits of E4D/E2R are raised to 130 MW, is an LMC of 130 MW reachable without voltage instability? If required, what is the estimated cost of the reactive power support? It appears that the load on E2R cannot be raised to 130 MW without upgrades to Dryden (either transformers and/or voltage regulation). Does IESO foresee potential needs for new lines parallel to E2R and E4D (instead of just upgrades) to achieve the higher loads.

- f) Is Waasigan Phase 2 needed to support the “High Growth Forecasts” for Red Lake area?
- g) Given that load growth can happen quickly, consideration should be given to project delivery models which accelerate the time to in-service date. For example, a staged approach to engineering/permitting prior to a “definitive” decision to construct.
- h) Since there is a load forecast update currently underway, consideration should be given to delaying the finalization of the IRRP report until this update is completed.

Item 2 – Technical Working Group

- a) Given the rapidly changing nature, consideration should be given to broadening the membership of this group and providing a forum for more frequent two-way dialogue.
- b) The next formal assessment of this Region should happen well before another 5 years.