

Feedback Form

Regional Electricity Planning in the Toronto Region – July 10, 2025

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Corey Helm

Title: Click or tap here to enter text.

Organization: Toronto Resident

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 25, 2025

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

Following the Toronto regional planning webinar held on July 10, 2025, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback on the results of the options screening. A copy of the presentation as well as recording of the session can be accessed from the [engagement web page](#).

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by July 25, 2025.

Topic	Feedback
What feedback do you have regarding the results of the wire and non-wire options screening?	I commend the IESO for excluding new gas generation from the list of future energy sources and for including some non-wire options such as distributed energy resources and energy efficiency. It is very disappointing however that the most affordable, quickest to build/implement, and healthy transmission options (namely wind generation, solar generation and wind and /or solar + battery storage) have been excluded. The feasibility of Great Lake wind power integrated with other renewable options should be investigated; the rationale for screening out a combination of solar, wind, and batteries due to large land requirements is not supported and needs further examination. The full potential of rooftop and parking lot solar is not given adequate consideration.
What feedback do you have on the preliminary transmission wire options?	A clear target date for Portlands gas plant decommissioning should be developed that includes milestones and regular public reporting of progress. Given that Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) (as proposed as a new source via a 3rd transmission line) are a new and untried technology, there is a risk that PEC will have to make up the generation gap for an extended period which is counter to the stated intention of reducing reliance on PEC. Insufficient cost analysis is provided for the preliminary transmission wire options, especially compared to renewable options which according to reports worldwide and IESO's own reports are less expensive. Reliance on enriched uranium for SMRs and fossil gas for PEC leaves us open to supply chain risks and increased costs to consumers.
What feedback do you have regarding how screened-in options could inform the options analysis and draft recommendations?	It is premature to finalize recommendations before the Local Achievable Potential Study is complete and open for public comment.
Additional information that should be provided in future engagements to help understand perspectives and insights.	There needs to be more complete and transparent reporting of sources and analysis.

General Comments/Feedback