

Table E2: Public Consultation Summary

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
Ongoing Stakeholder Consultation				
Email	11 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map of Study Area only goes as far west as Avenue Rd, although Bridgman Jct is farther to the west. Will MacPherson Ave, west of Avenue Rd, east of Plains Rd will be affected? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Study Area did not include the transmission line section that connects Birch Jct and Bridgman Jct. Proposed plan does include using existing line to transmit additional power between Birch Jct and Bridgman Jct. Hydro One has no plans to make any physical changes to the transmission tower line. Existing transmission tower line currently has an idle circuit, which will be re-energized. This will involve Hydro One undertaking some tree trimming and removal to ensure the line is clear of trees. Hydro One has worked closely with Cottingham, MacPherson and Rathnally residents to develop a landscape plan following our vegetation management work in the area, we would take a similar approach in the event that we need to cut/trim trees along the transmission corridor. 	14 February 2009
Email	16 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which of the three community meetings should I attend? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meetings are not specific to a certain area; each meeting will have the same information available. Feel free to attend whichever location is most convenient for you. 	17 February 2009
Email	19 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please clarify the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Size of proposed tower at Bayview Jct. Amount of voltage that will run through this tower. Bennington Heights school council and ratepayers association were told all lines in area were to be buried. If lines are buried, why the need for a larger tower? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approximate height of existing 2 circuit tower is 97 ft, and 3 circuit tower, 142 ft. Voltage of power line will remain unchanged. Burying existing towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct is not part of proposed plan. We plan to replace only existing lattice towers with new steel pole structures in approximately the same location. 	23 February 2009

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<p>5. What is the cost to bury the lines?</p> <p>6. What is "new equipment" proposed for Bayview Jct?</p> <p>7. When is the proposed project scheduled to start?</p>	<p>Plan is to replace existing underground cable (located between Bayview Jct and Birch Jct) with two underground cables.</p> <p>4. Between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct there is no plan to install underground cables.</p> <p>5. Cost to bury transmission lines is approximately 7 times more expensive than installing overhead lines.</p> <p>6. If existing route is selected as preferred route, Bayview Jct will remain as a jct which serves as transition point for overhead line to become an underground cable. There will be one additional circuit that will be terminated at this jct. This would mean a new pole structure similar in nature to what is already there.</p> <p>7. Selection of a preferred route and associated approvals will take approximately 9 – 12 months. We expect to begin construction sometime in 2010.</p>	
Survey Response	21 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When is work expected to begin? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of a preferred route and associated approvals will take approximately 9 - 12 months. We expect to begin construction sometime in 2010. 	24 February 2009
Email	21 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided photos taken over the year, will take more over the weekend showing tree cover on Shaftesbury side of tracks vs. empty corridor south of tracks. All the trees will be lost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passed photos on to landscape architect and team members. Part of EA process is to identify and evaluate alternative routes, but we will also continue to consider the Shaftesbury route. Hydro One is meeting with members of Summerhill Residents' Association and will show them some landscaping plans from our landscape architect. 	23 February 2009
Survey Response	06 March 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that the Project will increase EMF levels. Recognize that Health Canada has not yet proven a link between EMF 	N/A	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<p>and health issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cables should be buried even if it increases cost. 		
Email	29 April 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiring about updates regarding route selection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant is still gathering all underground information from utilities and the City. • Still talking to CPR about using existing corridor and area north of the track in Shaftesbury Area. • This information should be available in May, plan is to identify alternative routes and then hold another round of PICs in June. • Our commitment to the Summerhill Residents' Association is to meet with you once we have all information regarding Shaftesbury Ave and rail line. 	01 May 2009
Email	14 May 2009	<p>Please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro One is in process of gathering location of utilities under Shaftesbury Ave and boulevard in between Shaftesbury Ave pavement and the CPR boundary on north side of tracks. • This takes time because Hydro One must contact all municipal departments and businesses handling water, gas, electricity, cable, phone and sewer lines. • Hydro One considers that one alternative is to bury new and replacement of existing 115 kV lines underneath Shaftesbury Ave. This alternative is not looking good because there is a question as to whether there is enough room under Shaftesbury Ave to place two 115 kV lines. However, no decision has been made yet regarding the possible location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro One is in the process of gathering location of utilities under Shaftesbury Ave and boulevard in between Shaftesbury Ave pavement and CPR boundary on north side of the tracks. As well as a number of other potential routes along City of Toronto streets and parks. • If the chosen route is under the berm (north of CPR track), Toronto Hydro is willing to consider removing wooden hydro poles along south side of Shaftesbury Ave and burying them underground which will improve visual landscape of area. • Hydro One's landscape architect will work with community to plan and develop an acceptable plan to replace existing trees and garden plantings should existing cable route be selected as preferred route for two new cables. 	15 May 2009

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydro One has not yet determined who owns the land in between the CPR fence line south of railway tracks and high sound barrier protecting Mathersfield Ave from train noise. This means that they have not yet asked for location of the utilities under this location. 		
Email	16 June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested laying the cable in depression at foot of sound barrier wall and covering it with required amount of soil. Instead of excavating, build up the soil level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction manager for project and engineering staff will be out to the site to assess the option. Hydro One staff is still focused on identifying and assessing the following alternative routing options in the Shaftesbury Ave area: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPR rail route Existing cable corridor (sidewalk) Tunnel option in proximity of Shaftesbury Ave. Crossing Yonge St also poses a significant technical challenge and solution for Shaftesbury Ave. will be considered together with this technical issue. Our plan is to identify technically feasible alternative routes for entire Study Area in the next month. I will set up a meeting with the Summerhill Residents' group (and other ratepayers groups) to review and discuss options this summer. 	17 June 2009
Meeting	15 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resident had recently purchased a home in the area, adjacent to a Hydro One station – the resident's plans were to renovate the home and add a second story. Hydro One provided the resident with an overview of the Project and focused specifically on the logistics/construction of the two exit shaft proposals. The shafts have a diameter of 5 m, while a shaft location behind that station would minimize disruption to road traffic access to this site; it is complicated by the presence of two trees. Contractor has indicated the trees would have to be cut. 		N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident and President of Bennington Heights Residents' Association indicated that it is not preferable to cut the trees. • Hydro One discussed options for landscaping during and post construction. • Suggested that evergreens could be moved temporarily to line path way beside the resident's home to create a visual buffer from the construction site. • Following construction, a more extensive landscape plan could be discussed with the resident and the two neighbours across the street that looks onto the site. • Durosol fence around the station would also be extended by 1.5 panels and overall the station would increase in size by about 50%. • Pending approvals, construction was unlikely to begin until 2011. • Resident hoped renovations would be completed before the end of the school year 2010. • Although resident was not happy with the prospect of construction, the resident understood the project was needed. • Resident also raised issue of EMFs; Hydro One indicated that with the addition of a third circuit and re-phasing, our modeling indicated that levels would decrease. 		
Email	16 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciated Hydro One coming out on Sunday. • Worried about visual impacts from of our window. • I know that it was said that there will be trees planted around it, but I really want to make sure that is done. • Would like trees on all three sides as it should be a little more covering than the trees there now. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand your concerns about the visual impact of the proposed changes at Bayview station on your newly purchased home. • Our team has worked in Toronto and in your neighbourhood for many years, and fully recognizes that trees and landscaping will be a major part of this project. • Also understand that it makes sense to work effectively with our neighbours in the City to achieve the best outcomes. • As we outlined at the meeting, we have two options for the shaft: 1. place on the road allowance, 2. place on our property behind our existing station and to the east. • We will do our best to avoid tree removal. • Our team is exploring ways to access the location behind our station via the ravine to the south of the station, thereby avoiding need to remove large trees adjacent to the station. • The shaft option on the road allowance would also likely result in no tree removal. 	17 November 2009

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having said that, we will not know definitely about final shaft locations, access and any potential tree removal until we have done further investigation. Following construction, Hydro One will work with you and your neighbours directly across from the Bayview Jct station to develop a landscape plan that works for you and the community. Our landscape architect would also be open to meeting with your architect to provide him/her a sense of landscaping options. We mentioned the size of the station is proposed to increase by about 50%, as such, the durosol wall will be extended to the east, and this may be something the architects could discuss. 	
Email	16 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with the visual aesthetics at Bayview Jct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Shelton, our landscape architect is starting a draft design for the landscape plan for Bayview Jct which we can review and discuss with you in the New Year. Paul is working towards a mid-January completion date. We would like to plan to meet with you (and if you would like a representative of the Bennington Heights Residents' group present) later in January. We can work around your schedule, but our preference would be a time during the week and evenings are fine. Please let me know if this is agreeable, and then we would follow up with you in January to confirm a specific date. 	14 December 2009
Phone Call	24 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inquired if the new route would run along Pape Ave. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This line is not proposed for Pape Ave and is for local supply. The Ontario Power Authority has a third supply plan in its Integrated Power System Plan which considers a Pape option 	24 November 2009

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
			(underground), but there are no plans from Hydro One's perspective to move forward at this time.	
Phone Call	27 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident has a tower close to property, curious as to how Hydro One will re-string the lines. Inquired about burying lines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydro One informed resident that some tree trimming may be necessary in the area, but resident would be advised in advance. Hydro One informed resident that lines in area would not be buried. Lines from Bayview to Birch section were to be underground as they were already underground. 	27 November 2009
Meeting	30 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health impacts associated with EMF Burying the lines Putting fences around lines Would Hydro One consider putting line underground when towers need to be replaced? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMF would be addressed in the Class EA and will be posted on the Project website. Anticipate EMF levels to drop in resident's area due to phasing and tower design. 	01 December 2009
Email	01 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Property manager of a condominium What effects will this project have on our immediate area and residents? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Called and left message 	01 December 2009
Email	14 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that the contractor in charge of drilling bore hole at Astley Ave and Standish Ave dig in the north-west corner of the property instead of the centre where the stake was originally placed. In our discussions we had agreed that the north-west corner of the property would be an ideal and feasible location for all parties. Requests that the work be completed in the first week of February when family will be away. Neighbourhood children tend to play on the land and I would ask that all possible precautions be taken to keep the site as safe as possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our contractor is scheduled to complete borehole primarily during week of February 1, 2010 although if they make good progress on another hole, they may start borehole late during the week of January 25, 2010. They will try to move as close as possible to the north-west corner of the lot – borehole is presently staked in line with front wall of the adjacent building (7 m east of west property line) and roughly at north-south mid-point of lot or, about 5 m from each property boundary. They can push it a little closer to the west limit of the lot, from a practical perspective they will be unable to drill it much closer than about 3 m of any lot line, such that they have working room around the drill rig. Nonetheless, they will do the best they can 	14 January 2010

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
			<p>and will drill in the order of 3 to 5 m east of the northwest corner of the lot and 3 to 4 m south of the north lot line</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As for safety, GeoTerre and their drilling sub-contractor make this the number one priority on every project for both our employees and related 3rd parties. To this end they will essentially "cone off" the lot and will prohibit access to the public. 	
Email	18 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replied to arrange a meeting on January 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing to set-up a meeting with you and your architect to discuss some of your concerns regarding Bayview Jct to assist Paul Shelton our landscape architect, to prepare his concept drawing. Following this meeting, he can then prepare a draft design that is more reflective of your needs. 	05 January 2010
Email	18 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If they are unable to move borehole very far from where they have staked because of space restrictions, how will they be able to drill ultimate tunnel in north-west corner of the lot where we had discussed? I am assuming they want to do the borehole with as little disruption to the lawn, garden and fence as possible whereas the ultimate tunnel will require the removal of these items in order to accommodate desired placement - is this understanding correct? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our intention will be to drill access/rescue shaft as close to CPR property as we can. Once design engineering is done which should be by May I can provide more accurate details. The fence and some shrubs etc. will need to be removed and replaced following the work much later in the project. Will keep you informed of our schedule and plans for this property. 	19 January 2010
Email	20 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided permission for Hydro One to visit property if homeowner is at home or away. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our EMF specialist will be returning near the end of next week so I thought it would be more appropriate if we both met you on the same day. If this is OK, we'll call you ahead of time to make an appointment. 	22 January 2010
Email	26 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I just wanted to check in to see if we are "good to go" for next week's work while my family is out of town. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have just confirmed that the contractor is on schedule and hopes to mobilize at the property adjacent to yours on Monday. We will 	27 January 2010

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your attention to this request. 	<p>have a Hydro One Site Inspector on site to monitor the contract next week.</p>	
Meeting	26 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding larger lattice towers, health effects due to EMF, and lack of notification regarding the Project were discussed. • Resident expressed that from a good city planning and corporate citizen perspective, thought that Hydro One should consider moving the station to Bridgeman TS area where this equipment already exists. • Concerned that like the tobacco companies, lowering EMF was akin to making "light cigarettes" which are still bad for you. • Not happy with past experience with Hydro One and felt that the wall built on Mathersfield Drive was an "embarrassment". • Hydro One would also work with the community to develop a station design and landscape approach for the station that would be acceptable to the community and fit with the existing design elements in the neighborhood. • Once station design was determined, Hydro One would work with the community to develop a station design and landscape approach for that station that would be acceptable to the community and fit with the existing design elements in the neighbourhood. • The resident was concerned that he was not notified earlier about the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was determined that the site on Mathersfield Drive is Balfour Jct, and that the wall is an early example of a "durisol" wall, since then walls have improved. • Given the concerns, Hydro One is looking into another design approach for the station. • Hydro One made it clear that the resident was in no way disadvantaged by entering the process now and there would be plenty of time to participate in the process and provide comments. • Hydro One explained that burying line between Birch Jct and Bridgman TS, and moving the station to the Bridgman area would be approximately 20 times more expensive and it would not be a prudent investment and not justified to have all ratepayers in Ontario bear this incremental cost to bury the line and move the station. 	26 January 2010

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro One notified landowners located within 120 m of either side of the line for two mailings, it was unclear why none of the resident's companies appeared on the database used. • The resident expressed that the line should be buried between Birch Jct and Bridgman TS, and the station should be moved to the Bridgman area. • The resident suggested that there would be a willingness from Toronto customers to pay an additional cost for this benefit; this proposal could be made to the OEB or discussions with Toronto Hydro representatives. 		
Email	28 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is under the impression that (resident), along with the community, will be actively involved in the ultimate look of the Birch site from an architectural and landscaping perspective, trust this is your understanding as well. • In speaking with another stakeholder, was informed that there would be a massive hydro tower on the Birch substation site in addition to the large pole and sub-poles already on the site. • It would be along the line of those towers in Hydro ROWs that cross the province and could be as tall as the clock tower on top of the former railway station to the east of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro One is committed to working with you and your neighbours to develop the station's architectural design and landscape plan to best meet the needs of the local community. • To this end, we propose the formation of a working committee that would include at a minimum, you, a representative from the Rosedale Street Business Improvement Area, a representative from Councillor Walker's office. • Hydro One will also be working with the City of Toronto to ensure the site meets the City's expectations. • At this point, we have not undertaken any detailed engineering for the Birch Jct site. We are not proposing a massive tower at this site. Following our meeting with the Rosedale Main Street BIA and in light of concerns raised regarding the height of the proposed tower, we began discussions with our station engineering group to explore other design features for the tower. 	01 February 2010

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An alternative design has now been proposed that would include installing two steel poles at Birch Jct. • These poles would be similar in design to the existing one at the site; however, we expect that the poles could be 15 ft shorter than the current steel pole at Birch Jct. • Inside the Jct, we expect the equipment to be less than 40 ft in height. With the development of a suitable wall, we expect that the equipment inside the Jct would not be visible. • Typically, we would set up a community working committee once we have received the necessary approvals; however, given the concerns raised, we are prepared to start this process immediately. 	
Meeting	30 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was arranged to receive input to the draft landscape design for Bayview Jct. to address concerns of the resident who will be living adjacent to the station. • The resident's architect noted that Hydro One's proposal seemed reasonable. It was agreed that Hydro One would prepare a draft landscape plan as discussed and present to the resident and the resident's architect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro One wanted to meet with the resident and the resident's architect and builder to ensure draft landscape plans would take into consideration their needs and concerns. • Hydro One indicated that equipment at the station would continue to be housed in a durisol wall. • Hydro One would also be using low profile equipment which will be lower in height than is currently the case. • From a landscape perspective, Hydro One will extend the landscape treatment to cover the station expansion and provide some foreground understory planting along the wall, as per the original plan. Hydro One also proposed adding a row of trees closer to the resident's house, lining the pathway (road allowance) and general clean-up and improvements of the site. 	30 January 2010
Meeting	03 February 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident was under the impression that new lines would be closer to resident's home and impact the CPR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro One indicated that new lines in this area would not be near/impact the CPR lands behind resident's home. 	03 February 2010

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> lands adjacent to resident's property. Resident had no further EMF related questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydro One indicated that lines in this area are quite far from resident's home and EMF from the lines would be minimal/close to background. Hydro One provided resident with copies of EMF material. 	
Email	04 February 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Just a quick note to thank you both for taking the time to visit (resident's) home and allay resident's concerns regarding the distance from resident's home to the Midtown line and any associated EMF (or lack thereof). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Shelton and Jim Ferguson, a Hydro One Safety Advisor, will meet with a resident at home on February 3rd, to take EMF measurements and photos for the visual simulation. In an earlier email you asked whether it was possible to move the point where the line crosses the CPR lines westward, perhaps making the crossing over the Bayview Extension. Unfortunately, this is not possible given our current easement. We are obliged to generally maintain the existing footprint of the tower. Moving one tower would also require further alignment of other towers. 	29 January 2010
Email	24 February 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of work on adjacent lot has been completed with most of drilling being done on schedule in a very timely fashion - thank you to your contractors for being so accommodating and quick. While most of the heavy machinery/apparatus has been removed there still remains 6 large barrels - can you let me know if/when they will be removed? We would appreciate if the area was to be repaired/re-sodded as needed - was the plan to repair any damage to area in spring or at some point. A significant amount of earth was unearthed and has been washing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We usually wait until spring to replace sod. As for the Phase 2 work we will work with you regarding fencing. I have confirmed that our contractor is in the process of arranging for removal of the barrels of drill spoils and will have them out of there by end of next week. After that, they will probably have to wait until we get a warming period in March to return to the site and try to address any remnant fine grained surface drilling materials that may be present. However, the site will likely not be perfectly clean after we finish in March, although I fully expect that after spring rains and related spring growing season, allied perhaps with some surface triple mix and supplementary surface over seeding, 	24 February 2010

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<p>away across our driveway leading to dangerous ice (which we, and your team, salted) and deposits of dirt on the driveway - is there any clean-up plan scheduled?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If initial drilling is an indicator of what we can expect if/when the actual dig takes place in the future I would like to request that a temporary safety fence be strung across the open area of the property line - nothing elaborate, just something to keep children and dogs out of the work zone. 	<p>evidence of us having been there should be quite limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please let me know if there is any mess on your side of the fence that I will get immediately cleaned up. 	
Public Information Centre #1				
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer to see cables buried as opposed to putting up large towers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible health concerns, adding more lines to towers. Amount of population affected in proposed areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low level radiation and visual pollution concerns. Questions about route will be raised. Cost criteria should not be the decisive element, impacts to homes and health must be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most significant issues are to meet load growth. Stay along current route to avoid disturbing more people. Representatives from Hydro One and Toronto Hydro were attentive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing power requirements without compromising safety (overcapacity issues) proactive replacement of aging transmission cables. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental impact, EMF, concerns about increased capacity, proximity of towers to residences. 		
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to property/reconstruction, jobs for construction and sufficient reliable capacity. Impact to property, environment and other services (i.e. traffic, road and rail). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human health, wildlife preservation, aesthetics. Environmental disruption, maintaining property values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destruction and disruption of mature trees. Construction in regards to road traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Security of supply and capacity to meet future demands. Aesthetics – hide tower if possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Just get the job done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure is old and running at/above capacity – timely project. Try to use as much existing corridors, routes as possible – minimize impact on trees. Will the new equipment going in be “smart-grid” enabled? I think there should be some information that says this project is not related to the impending “3rd line hydro corridor”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you dig along south side of Shaftesbury Ave: please replace all spruce and pine trees (about 50 trees) that residents planted during past 6 years. Also residents have paid for and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		planted about 1000 daffodils bulbs along south side of Shaftesbury Ave.		
Letter and Comment form	17 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction noise, altered view, higher towers. • Identify alternative routes farther east in valley, away from homes. • Hydro One will need a new agreement with CPR to bury a new, larger cable along the railroad line, agreement is not a sure thing, and their Plan B is to run the cable underground along Southvale/Moore Roads across to Summerhill Station. • Existing towers will be taken down and replaced with larger towers needed to carry increased power capacity – new towers looked twice as high as existing ones with starker design. • New, larger towers will run directly behind homes, along railroad on southern side, dominating view. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	18 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay in CPR corridor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	18 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Shaftesbury (Yonge to Summerhill Gardens) do not run new line in green road allowance – mature and large trees will be destroyed. Use alternative routes south of CPR tracks on City land. • Abandon old line in above stretch to minimize disturbance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	24 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity supply to customers and demand and overload on infrastructure coupled with conservation, the new infrastructure will be long lasting. • Effects on people's urban and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		natural environment.		
Comment Form	24 February 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we want reliable electrical supply, we must be prepared for inconvenience while the work is being done. As little inconvenience to road users as possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Public Information Centre #2				
Comment Form	01 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I understand the 5 m diameter shaft will be in the lower land and close to the street at Birch Jct. As the nearest neighbour, with considerable invested in adjacent properties and concern for aesthetics, I would appreciate the opportunity to have serious input to the design, construction and appearance of necessary enclosures for above-ground equipment and to landscaping to improve assimilation into the neighbourhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of this project, we will be developing a landscape design for the front of Birch Jct, and would be pleased to involve you and other representatives of your community in this initiative. Hydro One will also work with City of Toronto Urban Forestry and Business Improvement Areas to ensure that the appropriate restoration and landscaping plan is developed to mitigate vegetation loss and reflect the character of your community. Hydro One has worked with the communities near Birch and Bridgman Jct in the past with vegetation management projects and residents in the area have been very pleased with the end results of our landscaping efforts. 	09 December 2009
Comment Form	01 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers underground deep tunnel option. Not as firm on detailed information as I would like and would have expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	01 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preferred option is the best one as far as I am concerned. Shaft B2 is preferred over E1. It will cause far less disruption and it is better to have the shaft contained in the walled-in area. I prefer pole to lattice. How long will the construction of the Bayview Jct shaft last? Will we be told ahead of time when the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		<p>construction will start so we can arrange to be away?</p>		
Comment Form	01 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We hope that the noise, dirt, disruption and traffic will be minimized as much as possible. We have had a lot of new house construction in the immediate area for several years and are not keen about hearing of more construction. • It is unfortunate the towers have to be so much taller. They are already an unattractive feature in the neighbourhood. Anything you can do to minimize the site of these will be appreciated. • We hope that there will not be any new health concerns due to either the construction or finished project. • I understand that the machine with the auger will have to be on all day in order to dig the shaft. Can the pollution and emissions be reduced from this vehicle? • Will digging such a deep shaft adversely affect surrounding house foundations or cause underground water to be re-routed and potentially cause water problems for houses? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	01 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I like the proposed option of putting two 115 kV lines in a tunnel between Bayview and Birch Ave Jct stations. We are pleased that you plan to abandon the existing line along Shaftesbury Ave. • Please do not disturb any of the plantings (trees, bushes, flowers, etc.) along Shaftesbury Ave. I understand that your plan does not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		require you to make any alterations to the south side of Shaftesbury Ave.		
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I prefer the steel pole option for the above-ground portion. The preferred option (#1) for the tunnelling seems the least disruptive. Hopefully the objective to maintain or lower EMF from current levels will be met. Hopefully the building (one story) or access point will be tasteful and well hidden by landscaping. Hopefully the vibrations of the tunnelling will be minimized as much as possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am 100% in favour of tunnelling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It seems most logical; hopefully consideration of homeowners will be high on list of concerns. Jim Goodfellow was very informative! It was reassuring to have a landscape architect here. We would like to have the chain link fence repaired at D2 (Standish and Astley). I am hopeful the timeline will be well out in advance of the shaft work commencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please choose a site close to the road with minimum disturbance to the yard (which is of course, your property), but which we obviously enjoy and maintain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I found it very well thought out and it was presented clearly. Very detailed responses were given. Could something be done about the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
		chain link fence along the street of Glen Rd to fix the damaged spots? It would be greatly appreciated.		
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extremely disappointed that you have not considered going underground with existing tower lines between Bayview Jct and Balfour Jct at the same time as other lines are being installed in a new underground tunnel. The additional cost would probably be minimal in relative terms at this time, and significant savings could be achieved in the long run ('penny-wise and pound-foolish'). If the neighbours are going to be subjected to 12-18 months of noise, heavy traffic, dust, surely there should be some collateral benefits. Staff didn't really answer questions – why wasn't the aforesaid seriously considered from the outset? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned with removal of trees adjacent to main tunnel entrance on the ravine south side of Old Bridle Path. Also, a lot of graffiti on any structures in area (e.g., foot bridge) so do not want graffiti on structure above tunnel entrance (once completed). You'll have to figure out how to make the Carstowe/McLennan 'shed' attractive, invisible, and vandalism-free. Use CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I hope the new transmission tower (Birch Ave.) will be attractive as well as efficient – i.e., good design. It is in a conspicuous position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A

Type of Correspondence	Date	Comment, Issue or Concern	Project Response	Date of Response
Comment Form	02 December 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The representatives on hand were able to answer all questions and make clarifications. • RE: potential tunnel access structure – please design with architectural qualities to add dignity and nobility to public works projects. It'll add to the City's environmental quality and make the citizens proud once again with our public buildings and structures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments raised were considered during the ESR process. 	N/A