Feedback Form

Regional Electricity Planning in the Peterborough to Kingston Region – July 29, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: MSIFN

Title: Consultation Department

Organization: Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation (MSIFN)

Email: [redacted]

Date: August 12, 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Peterborough to Kingston region engagement webpage unless otherwise requested by the sender.

Following the Peterborough to Kingston regional planning webinar held on July 29, 2026, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback on identified needs and options screening for the region. A copy of the presentation as well as recording of the session can be accessed from the engagement webpage.

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by August 12, 2026.

Topic	Feedback
What feedback do you have on the screening of wire and non-wire options?	MSIFN acknowledges the IESO's screening of wire and non-wire options, including distribution-level load transfers, demand response, eDSM, storage, and new/upgraded transmission infrastructure. As noted in the presentation, *"options screened-in for further evaluation include distribution-level load transfers, demand response, eDSM, transmission- and distributed-connected generation and/or storage, and new and/or upgraded transmission stations and lines."* MSIFN emphasizes that the proposed Napanee–Belleville 230

	kV line is located within Crawford Purchase territory, where MSIFN holds constitutionally protected rights and responsibilities. As stated in MSIFN's January 23, 2026, Eastern Ontario Bulk Planning submission, *"Any activities within these regions will impact the Crawford Purchase lands."* Screening must therefore incorporate rights-based analysis, territorial stewardship, and cumulative impacts—not only technical feasibility. MSIFN also stresses that non-wire alternatives must be evaluated for Indigenous equity participation, consistent with MSIFN's advocacy for extending Hydro One's 50–50 equity model to transmission, substations, DERs, and storage. These options represent meaningful pathways for Indigenous ownership, revenue generation, and long-term prosperity. Transmission-heavy solutions should not be privileged by default. With projected growth reaching up to *"96% in summer and 82% in winter"*, flexible, distributed, community-owned solutions are essential for resilience, sovereignty, and economic reconciliation. MSIFN requests that the next stage of analysis clearly demonstrate how Indigenous territorial considerations, rights, and economic reconciliation opportunities influenced screening outcomes.

Topic	Feedback
What additional information should be considered in the evaluation of wire and non-wire options?	MSIFN recommends that the IESO incorporate: • Territorial analysis of the Napanee–Belleville corridor, including Crawford Purchase lands, cultural heritage, ecological sensitivities, and rights-based considerations. • Indigenous-specific economic development inputs, including MSIFN-led housing, commercial development, tourism, and energy projects. • Clear pathways for Indigenous equity participation in non-wire alternatives, consistent with MSIFN's January 23 recommendations to extend Hydro One's 50–50 model. • Transparent cost-benefit analysis that includes Indigenous economic benefits, such as revenue sharing, job creation, and long-term community wealth. • Cumulative impact assessment, reflecting MSIFN's past concerns regarding lakebed ecosystems, endangered species, cultural heritage, and knowledge transmission. • Climate resilience scenario testing, particularly for communities with limited redundancy or high outage risk. These additions will ensure that evaluation reflects MSIFN's rights, responsibilities, and economic reconciliation priorities.
Are there any additional information that should be provided in future engagements to help understand municipal perspectives and insights?	MSIFN requests: • Territory-specific mapping of all proposed transmission reinforcements, especially the Napanee–Belleville line, to support rights-based review and economic planning. • Station-level and circuit-level data for all identified needs, consistent with MSIFN's past requests for corridor-specific information. • Clear explanations of how Indigenous economic development priorities are incorporated into forecasting, needs assessment, and options evaluation.

	• Government-to-government engagement, consistent with MSIFN's January 23 submissions. • Dedicated Indigenous engagement sessions at each IRRP milestone. • Early involvement in route selection, impact assessments, and monitoring, including First Nation-led impact assessment protocols. • Review of draft IRRP recommendations prior to public release, consistent with MSIFN's request to review the Eastern Ontario and South/Central Bulk Plans before publication. These steps will ensure that Indigenous perspectives—particularly those of MSIFN—are meaningfully integrated into future planning.

General Comments/Feedback

MSIFN acknowledges the IESO's land acknowledgement recognizing the Williams Treaties territories. However, meaningful recognition requires structured, rights-based involvement throughout the IRRP process.

MSIFN emphasizes:

- Energy sovereignty and economic reconciliation as core priorities. MSIFN's past submissions consistently advocate for Indigenous equity participation in transmission, storage, DERs, and substations.
- The Napanee–Belleville 230 kV line intersects Crawford Purchase territory, requiring early, ongoing, and rights-based engagement. Any infrastructure in this corridor must consider MSIFN's stewardship responsibilities and economic interests.
- Environmental stewardship and cumulative impacts must guide all decisions, consistent with MSIFN's past concerns regarding lakebed ecosystems, endangered species, cultural heritage, and knowledge transmission.
- Long-term planning must reflect Indigenous priorities, including climate resilience, sustainable development, and protection of lands and waters.

MSIFN looks forward to continued collaboration and expects future IRRP iterations to reflect Indigenous leadership, territorial considerations, and economic reconciliation opportunities.