

4. Consultation and Engagement

As part of the Class EA process, Hydro One identified and consulted with potentially affected and interested parties. They include: government agencies, elected officials, interest groups, affected area residents and businesses, First Nations and Métis communities and the general public. The purpose of consultation and engagement is to keep the potentially affected and interested parties informed throughout the planning process, identify issues (if any), develop mitigation plans that address those issues where appropriate, and ensure that there are opportunities for input at each stage in the process.

This section describes Hydro One’s consultation and engagement program, input received and the result to date. Hydro One intends to continue consultation with stakeholders and area residents along the preferred route throughout project implementation to address their concerns regarding the proposed transmission facilities.

All Project Notices and Newsletters provided stakeholders with the contact number of Project Team at Hydro One and Toronto Hydro. This ensured that stakeholders could have direct contact with the Project Team if desired.

An email address was also advertised in the Notices and Newsletters as a medium for soliciting comments and submitting questions. The email address provided stakeholders with a convenient way to contact the Project Team to receive feedback and answers to their questions.

The Project’s stakeholder mailing list consisted of interested and potentially affected interest parties, those who provided contact information at the PICs and on the Project website, and those who wrote to Project Team members and provided a mailing address or email address. Throughout the course of the planning process, the mailing list was updated to ensure all interested parties would receive Project updates. **Appendix A1** provides the List of Stakeholders.

The Project web site was used to provide stakeholders with an overview of the Project, timelines, Class EA process and the OEB approval process. Project documents such as PIC display boards, Newsletters, and Notices were also provided on the Project web site: <http://www.hydroone.com/Midtown>.

4.1 First Nations and Métis Communities

The existing transmission corridor for this project is located completely within the City of Toronto. On August 29, 2008 Hydro One sent letters to the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) and the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) to inquire about any potential claims that occur within the Project study area, and any potentially interested First Nations and Métis communities. A copy of the letter is provided in **Appendix A2**.

Hydro One received a letter of response on September 19, 2008 from the Specific Claims Branch at INAC identifying the Mississaugas of the New Credit and Six Nations of the Grand River Territory as First Nation communities located within the vicinity of the Project. Furthermore, Hydro One decided to notify the Mississaugas of Scugog First Nation as their community is located within geographic vicinity of the project study area.

Hydro One received a second letter of response from the Litigation Management and Resolution Branch of INAC dated September 10, 2008 advising that their “inventory did not include any active litigation in the vicinity of the property”. A letter of response from MAA was also received dated October 20, 2008 stating that “the project does not appear to be located in an area where First Nation(s) may have existing or asserted rights that could be impacted by your project”. No Métis communities were identified by INAC or MAA in their letters of response to Hydro One.

In consideration of the information received above, the following First Nations have been provided with all written correspondence in relation to the Midtown Project:

- Six Nations of the Grand River Territory First Nation;
- Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation; and

- Mississaugas of Scugog First Nation.

On February 9, 2009, Hydro One notified in writing the above-mentioned First Nations communities about plans to replace the aging cable between Bayview Jct and Birch Jct, while also increasing capacity by adding an additional circuit. The letters also extended an invitation to attend the first set of PICs which were held in late-February 2009. Follow-up telephone calls were made in mid-August 2009. Voice messages were left with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation and Mississaugas of Scugog First Nation. The Six Nations of the Grand River Territory requested that we keep them on the distribution list for further Project information, and indicated that they will notify Hydro One if questions or concerns arise. On November 20, 2009, Hydro One sent letters to invite the communities to attend the second set of PICs that were held in early-December 2009.

Hydro One will continue to notify these First Nations regarding the Midtown Project. To date, one comment was received from the Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation during the draft ESR review period, which is documented in **Section 4.9.1**. No other issues or concerns have been raised by the First Nation communities. Hydro One will work with the First Nations to resolve any issues or concerns that might arise.

4.2 Municipal Officials Consultation

The initial step in the consultation process involved meetings held jointly by Hydro One and Toronto Hydro with City of Toronto elected officials and staff. The consultation list is provided in **Appendix A1**. Meetings were held with representatives from the Mayor's office and with councillors from the wards within the study area. At these meetings, Hydro One and Toronto Hydro provided a briefing about the Midtown Project including the need to renew aging infrastructure and the need for additional supply capacity along the corridor to address steady load growth in the midtown area and areas to the west. The Class EA process for the proposed Midtown Project and its timelines were also discussed. Hydro One obtained contact information for relevant resident associations and interest groups.

A second series of meetings were held with City of Toronto officials following the selection of the preferred route.

City officials and staff agreed that there was a need for infrastructure renewal in this area. They noted that residents might be concerned about tree removal, construction disturbance affecting local roads and neighbourhoods, and any potential health concerns associated with electric and magnetic fields (EMF). Mitigation measures to address these concerns are provided in **Chapter 7**.

Below are the meetings held with municipal officials:

- Representative of Mayor Miller and Councillor Kyle Rae, November 6, 2008 and September 18, 2009;
- Councillor John Parker, November 27, 2008 and September 10, 2009;
- Councillor Case Ootes, December 4, 2008 and September 14, 2009;
- Councillor Michael Walker, October 21, 2009;
- Constituency Assistant Pierre D'Aoust on behalf of Michael Walker, February 16, 2010; and
- Representative of Councillor Kyle Rae on May 10, 2010, to discuss the main shaft relocation (see **Section 4.10.1**).

4.3 Meetings with Residents Associations

Following initial discussions with City of Toronto officials and staff in November and December 2008, subsequent briefings were provided by Hydro One and Toronto Hydro to representatives of a number of the local resident associations. These representatives agreed there was a need for the Midtown Project, with the majority of representatives supporting the rebuilding of the infrastructure on the existing corridor to minimize disruption, and indicated that their members would likely agree that there is a need for transmission refurbishment. Concerns included alternative route options, the need for taller transmission towers, road and neighbourhood disruption associated with construction, and health effects associated with EMF. The representatives indicated that they would communicate Project

details to the members of their associations. Hydro One advised that they would continue to keep them informed and would consult with them throughout the duration of the Midtown Project.

Meetings with resident associations are listed below:

- Bennington Heights Residents Association (December 18, 2008);
- Moore Park Ratepayers Association and North Rosedale Ratepayers Association (December 19, 2008);
- Leaside Property Owners Association Executive Committee (February 4, 2009 and January 6, 2010). Presentation material for the meeting on January 6, 2010 is presented in Appendix I1;
- Summerhill Residents Association and Mark Wilson, Executive Assistant to Councillor Kyle Rae, Ward 27, Toronto-Centre Rosedale (February 26, 2009); and
- Governor's Bridge Residents' Association (October 5, 2009).

On November 2, 2009, Hydro One and Toronto Hydro held a Resident Association Presentation to present the preferred route option. This meeting was held at Hydro One's offices in Toronto with Toronto Hydro staff. Representatives of the resident associations were provided information about the preferred route option, alternative routes, tunnelling technology, shaft locations, construction activities and mitigation, landscape approach and predicted EMF levels. The presentation given at this meeting by Hydro One can be found in **Appendix I3**.

A number of groups were represented at the meeting including Governors' Bridge Residents Association, Shaftsbury Community Association, Bennington Heights School Council, Bennington Heights Residents Association, Moore Park Ratepayers Association, Leaside Property Owners Association, North Rosedale Ratepayers Association and the Rathnally Area Residents Association. Overall, the representatives were in support of the preferred route and tunnel option in that it would reduce adverse effects on local neighbourhoods. A preference for steel poles was also expressed for the overhead line section between Leaside

TS and Bayview Jct. Other discussion points included EMF and post-construction landscaping.

4.4 Government Notification and Consultation

Throughout the planning process, Hydro One informed and sought input on the proposed undertaking from a broad range of government agencies. A list of agency stakeholders and their contact details is provided in **Appendix A1**. A Notice of Commencement and PIC #1 Invitation Letter, Pre-PIC #2 Letter to Key Agencies, and Notice of PIC #2 were sent to relevant provincial ministries, agencies, the City of Toronto and the TRCA. Please see **Appendices A3, A4 and A5**. Details of agency comments and concerns are provided in **Table 4-1** and **Appendix E1** provides agency consultation documentation.

4.5 Meetings with TRCA

Two meetings were held between TRCA and Hydro One. The first meeting was held on July 28, 2009 to present the need for the proposed Midtown Project and the preliminary alternative routes. TRCA indicated a preference for routing along road allowance rather than through parkland. Additional concerns were public safety during construction, watercourse crossings, and removal of trees. Hydro One advised the TRCA that their comments and concerns would be considered during the route selection process.

The second meeting was held on November 24, 2009 to introduce the preferred route and construction methods for the proposed Midtown Project. TRCA had no concerns regarding the tunnel section between Bayview Jct and Birch Jct along the existing CPR corridor. Concern was expressed regarding construction of towers and shafts as well as the associated access roads on local vegetation, particularly butternut trees, and the Iroquois Shoreline ESA. Hydro One advised that no butternut trees were observed during the vegetation survey on October 23, 2009 at the tower locations and the preliminary temporary access route alignments. However, due to the high proportion of black walnut (with similar structural attributes) identification confirmation will be taken when the trees are in full-leaf. Hydro

One also indicated that no adverse effect is anticipated on Iroquois Shoreline ESA. Please see **Appendix F** for details.

4.6 Other Stakeholder Groups

4.6.1 School Boards

Hydro One staff met with representatives of both the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) and the Toronto Catholic District School Board due to the proximity of Bennington Heights Elementary School, Whitney Junior Public School and Our Lady of Perpetual Help to the existing transmission corridor (see **Figure 3-3**). School board officials were provided with background information on the Midtown Project and on EMF, including a Health Canada fact sheet. The school board officials subsequently provided these materials to the principals of the schools located in close proximity to the existing transmission corridor as well as with a Hydro One contact name and number. During the draft ESR review period, TDSB provided comments regarding the Project (see **Section 4.9.4** for details). Hydro One staff will continue to update school board officials on the proposed Midtown Project through approvals and construction.

4.6.2 Toronto Board of Health, Toronto Public Health and, the Medical Officer of Health

Hydro One met with representatives from the Toronto Board of Health including the Medical Officer of Health (MOH) on January 16, 2009 and on February 1, 2010 to provide background information on the proposed Midtown Project, to determine any concerns regarding the Project and to answer questions. Hydro One provided measurements of current EMF levels proximate to the existing transmission facilities and the modeling results for anticipated EMF levels when the proposed Midtown Project is operational. The modelling information indicated that EMF levels along the transmission line with the addition of a new 115kV circuit between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct and replacement of conductors from Birch Jct to Bridgman TS will be lower than current levels. EMF levels would not be measurable at street level between Bayview Jct and Birch Jct as this portion of the line will be placed in the deep rock tunnel. The MOH indicated a willingness to work with Hydro One and Toronto Hydro if needed, to answer public inquiries on EMF.

EMF modeling for the junction locations is extremely complex with the results dependant upon installation design of the associated equipment. However, Hydro One will be using the same design principles to lower the EMF for overhead transmission lines and expects that EMF levels at the junctions will either not change significantly or be lower when the proposed Midtown Project is operational.

The MOH will make an independent assessment of the EMF modelling information for the overhead transmission facilities and provide comment to Hydro One.

Subsequently, on February 1, 2010, members from the project team met with representatives from the Toronto Board of Health. A presentation was given by Hydro One (see **Appendix I2**) followed by an opportunity for questions and answers. Concerns raised by representatives from the Toronto Board of Health included EMF levels at actual corridor vs. levels at adjacent owner's properties, the Project crossing any green space and EMF levels where transmission lines are in proximity to schools. Hydro One advised that by changing the order in which the conductors are strung on the tower, the magnetic fields from one circuit would cancel the magnetic field from the adjacent circuit. Further answers to Toronto Public Health's concerns can be found in **Appendix D**.

4.6.3 Task Force to Bring Back the Don

Hydro One met with Task Force to Bring Back the Don (TFBBD) on May 14, 2009 to present the proposed Midtown Project. The TFBBD requested that they be kept informed regarding Hydro One plans on vegetation management and landscaping for the Project and that Hydro One provides the plans prior to PIC#2. The TFBBD favoured the use of existing corridors to minimize tree cutting and replanting.

Hydro One sent the Pre-PIC #2 Key-Agency letter dated November 5, 2009 to TFBBD to present the preferred route and construction method with a follow-up on November 18, 2009. TFBBD responded on November 27, 2009 indicating that there were no concerns regarding the preferred route and requested a digital copy of Notice of Second Public Information Centre. A copy of the pre-PIC #2 Key-Agency letter is provided in **Appendix**

A5. In a letter dated January 5, 2010, TFBBD stated that “*they supported the proposed alignment of the preferred option*” which “*proposes to use the route of existing hydro lines and the use of a corridor that closely parallels the rail corridor*”.

4.6.4 Rosedale Main Street Business Improvement Area Board

Hydro One met with the Rosedale Main Street Business Improvement Area (BIA) Board on January 12, 2010 to present an overview of the Midtown Project, and explain the preferred route, tunnel technology and construction activity and mitigation. The BIA was generally positive about the tunnel technology; however, expressed some concerns about proposed equipment changes (e.g., new towers and structures) required at Birch Jct to accommodate the new circuit, as well as concerns around EMF. Hydro One has committed to work with the BIA and other area residents and businesses to address these concerns through the landscape design of the station, and provide more information about EMF.

Some representatives from the BIA expressed interest and suggested, if possible, for Hydro One to eliminate Birch Jct altogether. Since this facility serves an important role in the delivery of electricity to area homes and businesses, Hydro One has no plans to eliminate Birch Jct at this time. The presentation slides for the meeting are provided in **Appendix I4**.

Hydro One met with the representatives from BIA on April 28 to further present a preliminary concept drawing of Birch Jct and to indicate the landscape design of streetscape wall. BIA representatives asked the timeline for construction of the streetscape wall, provided suggestions on the design for the wall and took the drawings to the board to review. Based on the community input, Hydro One will revise the concept drawing and provide additional visual assessment. Hydro One will meet with BIA Board again once we have the design developed.

4.6.5 Loblaws

As part of the proposed Project, Tower #2, currently located at the entrance of the Loblaws docking area, will be replaced with a larger angle tower, as indicated in **Figure 6-3**. Hydro One has been requested by Loblaws to consider the relocation of Tower #2 within the

Loblaws property to allow for a wider access to the docking area (see **Appendix G Tile 10/11**).

Hydro One met with the representative from Loblaws on April 12, 2010. In the meeting, Hydro One indicated that the relocation of Tower #2 will result in an easement change to the existing right of way between Tower #1 (located at Leaside TS) and Tower #2 (located on Loblaws property). The two towers span over Crothers' Woods, which is owned by the City of Toronto. The change of easement will increase the project cost. Hydro One also proposed to build temporary accesses for Loblaw in order to keep customers separated from the Project and as much as possible to keep the delivery and waste traffic isolated from the Project.

Due to the issues indicated above, Hydro One does not plan to relocate Tower #2 at this point. Loblaws has no concerns regarding the decision. Hydro One will continue to work with Loblaws throughout the Project.

4.6.6 Meetings with Property Owners

Hydro One has met with a number of property owners whose homes or businesses are adjacent to Birch and Bayview Jct and along the preferred route to discuss the potential project effects and possible mitigation. The issues raised have included construction nuisance effects, EMF, tower and station design and associated impacts, and design and landscaping approaches to mitigate concerns. To address the issues on main shaft location that were raised by local residents, Hydro One has set up the Carstowe Community meeting on May 10, 2010. **Section 4.10.2** provides the details of the meeting. Hydro One has committed to working with these individuals throughout the duration of the project and a goal to mitigate their concerns. Please refer to **Appendix E2** for details.

Table 4-1 Agency and Interest Group Comments

Comment/ Issue: Agency	Description of Comment/Issue	Hydro One Response
<p>First Nations Engagement:</p> <p>INAC/ MAA</p>	<p>No specific claims or litigation is underway by First Nations in the vicinity of the study area.</p> <p>City of Toronto has a special relationship with the Litigation Management and Resolution Branch of INAC and all aboriginal litigation inquiries are handled by City authorities.</p> <p>INAC recommends that in the future all land project inquiries located in the City be directed to the City of Toronto.</p>	<p>Hydro One consulted with three First Nation communities. To date, one comment was received from the Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation during the draft ESR review period (see Section 4.9.1). No other issues or concerns have been raised by the First Nations. Hydro One will continue to consult with these First Nations and will work with them to resolve any issues that might arise.</p>
<p>Line and Tower Height:</p> <p>NAV Canada/ City of Toronto</p>	<p>Will tower height above ground level change when the line is replaced?</p> <p>Towers would generate interest due to the height increase and greater visibility.</p>	<p>The new towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct will increase in height approximately from 30 m to 40 m (Figure 1-4). There will be no change to the tower height between Birch Jct and Bridgman TS as the existing towers will be use (see Section 7.2.6).</p>
<p>Crane Height</p> <p>Transport Canada</p>	<p>The use of construction cranes could be a concern from an aviation point of view, as cranes may need to be marked and/or lighted.</p> <p>If Hydro One is erecting any cranes for this Project, Transportation Canada would ask that you fill out the Aeronautical Obstruction Clearance Form.</p>	<p>Based on Hydro One’s consultation with Transport Canada, the transmission corridor is not on any flight path. Based on Transport Canada’s assessment on 156-foot crane moving along the corridor, no lighting or marking is required for construction cranes.</p>
<p><i>Navigable Waters Protection Act (NWPA):</i></p> <p>Transport Canada, Navigable Waters</p>	<p>If a project traverses a watercourse with a natural width of 15 m or greater or is located within 1,000 m of a lake, an application under the NWPA is required.</p>	<p>The proposed Project does not cross a navigable waterway and is more than 1,000 m from Lake Ontario.</p>

Comment/ Issue: Agency	Description of Comment/Issue	Hydro One Response
Protection Office		
Railway Work Permit : Construction Permit Transport Canada	A permit is required to avoid a <i>Railway Safety Act</i> trigger of the federal EA process.	Hydro One will work with the CPR to obtain a letter of agreement from the CPR regarding the proposed undertaking.
Natural Environment Effects: MOE/ City of Toronto/ TRCA	Ecosystem protection and restoration concerns due to sensitive environmental features located within or adjacent to the study area, including ESAs, an ANSI, SAR, watercourses and woodlots. Consultation with the MNR, DFO, and TRCA was recommended.	Hydro One consulted with MNR, TRCA, and the City's Urban Forestry and Parks regarding the preferred route / option. It will have minimal environmental effects (see Section 7.1).
Surface Water: MOE	The MOE Guideline B-6, Evaluating Construction Activities Impacting on Water Resources should be used to plan and construct this Project. The MOE's Storm water Management Planning and Design Manual should be referenced in the EA.	As no watercourses will be affected by the Project, MOE Guideline B-6 does not apply. The MOE (2003) Storm water Manual will be referenced in the draft ESR (see Section 7.1.4).
Don River: Task Force to Bring Back the Don (TFBBD)	Questioned whether the proposed Project will have any effects on the Don River.	The Don River is outside of the study area and the preferred route/option will not affect this watercourse.
Groundwater: MOE/TRCA	The status of and potential impacts to water wells should be addressed. If the potential construction or decommissioning of water wells is identified as an issue, the EA should refer to Ontario Regulation 903, Wells, under the OWRA. A Permit To Take Water (PTTW) will be required for any water takings that exceed 50,000 L/day.	Based on the MOE Water Well Database, there is one water well in the study area (see Section 3.1.2) and will not be affected. A PTTW will be obtained from the MOE for any water taking greater than 50,000 L/day.
Dust: MOE	If dust suppressants are proposed to be used, the use of non-chloride based compounds was recommended to protect water quality.	Hydro One will monitor fugitive dust during construction and adhere to Cheminfo (2005) best practices (see Section 7.2.1).
Contaminated Soils: MOE	The disposal of any contaminated soils should be consistent with the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> . The EA document should identify the location and integrity of any underground	Excavated soils will be analyzed for contamination and based on the results will be disposed of according to MOE requirements

Comment/ Issue: Agency	Description of Comment/Issue	Hydro One Response
	storage tanks, current or historical waste disposal sites and underground transmission lines in the study area.	(see Section 7.1.3). The preferred route does not traverse any landfills (see Section 2.9 of the Environmental Baseline Report in Appendix F). No underground storage tanks have been identified along the preferred route (M. Thompson, Ecolog ERIS, 2010, pers. comm.) Underground transmission lines are delineated on Figure 1-2 .
Iroquois Shoreline ESA : MOE/ City of Toronto/ TRCA	Potential effects of the main shaft on the Iroquois Shoreline ESA.	<p>The main shaft area east of Carstowe Road will occupy less than 1% of the ESA area, thereby minimally affecting overall structural characteristics of this Earth Science feature. Moreover, the geotechnical studies and boring of the shaft will likely contribute to a better understanding of local glacial stratigraphy and possibly glacial Lake Iroquois shoreline development processes.</p> <p>Note that the response was based on the main shaft site located east of Carstowe Road. The main shaft has been relocated to south of Rosehill Pumping Station on Mount Pleasant Road.</p>
Butternut trees: MOE/ TRCA	Butternut is designated as endangered provincially.	Based on a vegetation survey, no butternut trees were identified along the proposed route and associated access (see Section 3.1.1). However, due to the high proportion of black walnut (with similar structural attributes) identification confirmation will be taken when the trees are in full-leaf.

Comment/ Issue: Agency	Description of Comment/Issue	Hydro One Response
Mitigation and Monitoring: MOE	Mitigation, rehabilitation and enhancement of affected areas should be based on best practices clearly referenced in the EA and regularly monitored during construction. All waste generated during construction must be disposed of in accordance with MOE requirements. Contractors must be made aware of all environmental considerations so that all environmental standards and commitments for both construction and operation are met. Post- construction monitoring is recommended.	Mitigation measures are detailed in Chapter 7 and summarized in Table 7-1 . A project-specific Environmental Specification will be prepared as a basis for construction monitoring by the Environmental Specialist and environmental training will be provided for construction personnel (see Chapter 8). All waste will be disposed of in accordance to MOE requirements (see Section 7.2.1). Post-construction monitoring will be undertaken (see Chapter 8).
Preferred Route Selection: MOE	The selection of the preferred route should have minimal impact on the Natural Heritage System with appropriate mitigation applied to further minimize effects on its features and functions.	TRCA has indicated support of the preferred route (see Section 4.3).
Approvals and Permits: City of Toronto/ TRCA	Specific construction activities may require approvals and/or permits as determined during consultations with TRCA and City Forestry Department.	Hydro One will determine if any permit is necessary based on ongoing consultation with the City and TRCA.
Recreational Use: City of Toronto	City Parks Supervisor should be made aware of the Project schedule with respect to trail closures and restrictions to park use during construction.	Hydro One will consult with the City on the Project schedule. No effects on trails or park use are expected.
Planning and Policy: MOE	Hydro One should demonstrate how this proposed project is consistent with Places to Grow policies, including policies for Infrastructure to Support Growth (OMPIR, 2006).	As indicated in Section 1.1 , electricity load in the midtown area is steadily increasing as a result of land use intensification and redevelopment. Although electrical utilities are not specifically identified as Infrastructure to Support Growth in the Plan, the proposed Midtown Project addresses the existing overloaded situation and the need to meet forecast load growth in the midtown area.

Comment/ Issue: Agency	Description of Comment/Issue	Hydro One Response
Class EA Process: MOE	The EA should provide clear and complete documentation of the planning process for decision making traceability, fulfillment of public consultation requirements (including issue identification and resolution) and consideration of the effects of alternatives on all aspects of the environment. A list of all permits and approvals that may be required should be provided.	The Class EA process is detailed in Chapter 2 . Public consultation and engagement is presented in Chapter 4 . Route selection is provided in Chapter 5 . Hydro One will determine if any permit is necessary based on ongoing consultation with the City and TRCA.
Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF): City of Toronto	EMF levels after the construction of the proposed Midtown Project.	Hydro One has committed to maintain or reduce current EMF levels.
Potential Effects on Other Infrastructure Projects: City of Toronto	<p>Potential interference with the following projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access roadway along the corridor extending west from Redway Road to the Bayview Extension at some future date • watermain project at Rosehill Pumping Station. • sewage works near the access road to Tower #6 • reconstruction of Pottery Road between Bayview and Broadview Avenue • Don Mills Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project • Don Waterfront EA project 	<p>Hydro One will coordinate with the access roadway extension to avoid potential conflicts during construction.</p> <p>Hydro One has met with the City and will continue to meet throughout the planning and construction of the watermain project and sewage works to address any potential conflicts.</p> <p>No effects on reconstruction of Pottery Road, Don Mills LRT Project and Don Waterfront EA project are anticipated due to distance of these projects from the proposed Midtown Project.</p>
	Rogers easement access to service their equipment along the CPR tracks.	Hydro One has obtained all potentially affected underground utility data to ensure construction has no effect on other utility facilities.
Heritage: MOC/ City of Toronto	Birch Jct is adjacent to Summerhill Station, a declared heritage structure. The concern is the impact of the proposed expansion at Birch Jct and how that may potentially affect the viewshed of Summerhill Station. A Heritage Impact Assessment is recommended.	Hydro One will be conducting a Heritage Impact Assessment along the Midtown Project corridor and will provide the findings to the MOC and Toronto Heritage (if necessary).

4.7 Public Information Centres

As indicated in **Section 2-2**, two PICs were held for the proposed Midtown Project. The local community, potentially-affected property owners, key interest groups and agencies were notified about the proposed project and the PICs via newspaper advertisements and direct mail-outs.

4.7.1 Public Information Centre #1

The first PIC was held on February 17, 18 and 24, 2009 at Leaside Memorial Gardens, Rosedale Heights School of the Arts, and Timothy Eaton Memorial Church, respectively. Newspaper advertisements were placed in the following local newspapers to inform the public about the specific details of the PIC:

- *City Centre Mirror* and *East York Mirror*, February 6, 2009
- *Annex Guardian*, February 13, 2009
- *Leaside - Rosedale Town Crier*, February 5, 2009

The newspaper ads and notification of PIC #1 were also mailed to residents living 100 m on either side of the existing transmission corridor. **Appendix B** provides the information related to the PIC #1.

The objective of the first round of PICs was to provide interested parties with the opportunity to learn about the need for the Project, review the planning process, and discuss questions and concerns about the Midtown Project Team.

In total, 46 individuals attended the first set of PICs: 29 at Leaside Memorial Gardens, four at Rosedale Heights School of the Arts and 13 at Timothy Eaton Memorial Church. Attendees included staff from the City of Toronto, Councillor John Parker, representatives from Toronto Public Health, the OEB, Moore Park Ratepayers Association and Bennington Heights Residents Association. Seventeen written comment forms were submitted. Samples of the Sign-in Sheet and Comment Sheet are provided in **Appendices B4 and B5**, respectively. Handouts with information on EMF were also provided at the PIC (**Appendix D**).

In general, most attendees agreed that there was a need for upgraded transmission facilities along the CPR corridor and that the most sensible solution would be to replace the aging cable and add the additional circuit at the same time. The main issues focused on tree removal, other environmental effects, road disruptions, potential concerns with EMF and the visual impact of taller towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct. Specifically, residents indicated a preference to route the transmission line within the existing CPR corridor to avoid the mature trees on the south side of Shaftesbury Avenue. Potential effects and inconveniences to local residents during the construction phase were discussed, notably due to traffic disruptions and construction noise. Health concerns regarding EMF and low level radiation were also of concern, particularly in consideration of the Project's proximity to Bennington Heights Public School. Changes to the local viewscape as a result of replacing the existing 115 kV lattice towers with taller 115 kV lattice and/or steel pole towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct were also a concern.

The PIC #1 Summary Report is provided in **Appendix B6**.

4.7.2 Public Information Centre #2

The second round of PICs was held on December 1, 2009 at Bennington Heights Elementary School and on December 2, 2009 at Whitney Junior Public School.

Newspaper advertisements were placed in the following local newspapers to inform the public about the specific details of the PIC on both November 20 and 27, 2009:

- *East York/Riverdale/Beach Mirror*
- *Bloor West Villager/Annex Guardian*
- *Toronto City Centre Mirror*

The newspaper ads and notification of PIC #2 were also mailed to residents living within 120 m on both sides of the preferred route and around the initially five proposed shaft locations. **Appendix C** provides the information related to the PIC #2.

The purpose of this second PIC was to introduce the preferred route for the Midtown Project and obtain public and stakeholder input on the option.

In total, 36 people attended the second set of PICs: 21 people at Bennington Heights Elementary School, and 15 people at Whitney Junior Public School. The majority of attendees were residents living in the vicinity of proposed facilities (e.g., junction sites and shaft locations), in addition to representatives from Councillor John Parker's office, Bennington Heights Residents Association, Summerhill Residents Associations and the OEB. Fourteen written comment forms were submitted by the participants at the PICs. Samples of the Sign-in Sheet and Comment Sheet are provided in **Appendices C4 and C5**, respectively.

Overall, residents and the rate payer association were in favour of the proposed route using the tunnel technology and the proposed shaft locations. The main comments from the attendees are provided below:

- Residents living near shaft locations were generally more concerned about noise, vibrations, truck traffic, visual impacts and tree loss;
- Some residents expressed a preference for steel poles instead of lattice towers;
- A small number of neighbours that live near Bayview Jct noted that the tower that connects into Bayview Jct is visible from the top of Bayview Heights Drive and asked if this tower could be moved further east and out of the sight line from the street;
- Approximately 10 participants raised questions about EMF and most were relieved to hear that levels were expected to remain the same or decrease; and
- Residents would like to have input in the landscaping plans to be implemented around the stations and shaft locations following construction.

The PIC #2 Summary Report is provided in **Appendix C6**.

4.8 Key Issue Summary and Hydro One Responses

Table 4-2 outlines the key issues received during the consultation and Hydro One Responses.

Table 4-2 Summary of Key Issues and Hydro One Responses

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
Route Selection	<p>Preference for use of existing ROWs; specifically the CPR corridor route, to minimize disturbance to city streets and residents.</p> <p>The Summerhill Ratepayers' Association expressed a desire for an alternative route south of the CPR tracks along Shaftsbury Avenue as a routing north of tracks would affect mature trees.</p>	<p>Alternative routes will be identified as part of the EA process and evaluated based on effects on the natural and socio-economic environment, costs and meeting the electrical system requirements. This evaluation will also include a comparison of alternative technology options to select the preferred technology (overhead, trench and/or tunnel) as part of the final route selection. As indicated in Section 5.3 the preferred route follows existing ROWs (predominantly the CPR corridor).</p> <p>The proposed deep rock tunnel would run along Shaftsbury Avenue within the city road allowance approximately 60 m underground in bedrock. The proposed tunnel would not affect or require removal of mature trees along Shaftsbury Avenue There may be a requirement to drill a borehole to determine rock elevation prior to construction. If a borehole is required on Shaftsbury Avenue the disruption would be less than one week.</p>
Reliability and Capacity for Meeting Load Growth	<p>Concerns relating to old infrastructure and its ability to meet load growth and provide sufficient reliability.</p>	<p>Hydro One, together with Toronto Hydro, has identified a need to refurbish the existing infrastructure and add capacity along the midtown power corridor. This project will replace the aging underground cable between Bayview Jct and Birch Jct. An additional circuit to increase capacity will be installed at the same time between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct to minimize future electricity supply disruption to the community.</p>

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
Tower Structure	Type of towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct.	The proposed towers would consist of a combination of lattice towers, steel pole towers. All replacement towers will be approximately 40 m in height. As indicated in Chapter 6 , Towers 2 and 3 near Loblaw's will be heavy towers (either large lattice or double steel poles). Tower 9 would also be a heavy tower (either large lattice or double steel pole) It may be adjusted further east to be aligned with structures in Bayview Jct. The environmental footprint of a steel pole tower is 1/3 less than the existing lattice towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct.
Re-construct Existing Overhead Lines into an Underground Cable	<p>Suggestions regarding replacing the overhead line between Leaside TS to Bayview Jct with an underground line.</p> <p>"Can't Hydro One bury the line for its entire length?"</p>	<p>This option was evaluated as part of the route selection process. A number of technical/construction challenges were identified for underground installation of the additional 115 kV circuit adjacent to the overhead double-circuit transmission line compared to the installation of nine tower structures for the overhead three-circuit line:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - greater vegetation clearing along the entire trenching route compared to only portions of the route for access and at the tower structure locations; - greater adverse effects on Crothers' Woods ESA due to greater trenching distance compared to tower access route distance; - greater potential for environmental nuisance effects (noise, dust) due to soil disturbance and excavation along the trench route; - greater potential for encountering contaminated soil; - greater vehicular traffic due to removal and disposal of more excess soil; and - trenching construction scheduling would need to be coordinated with CPR operations. <p>In addition, an overhead transmission line would have greater ease of maintenance and repair resulting in faster service restoration.</p>
Cost of Burying Transmission Line	Difference in cost between building overhead vs. underground transmission lines.	The cost of burying a transmission line is approximately seven times more expensive than installing overhead lines.

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
EMF	<p>Concerns regarding potential human health effects of the transmission line, particularly with the addition of a new line to the existing corridor (e.g., exposure to EMF).</p> <p>Concern expressed over “radiation”.</p>	<p>For more than 30 years, research studies have examined questions about EMF and health. Health agencies and a large number of reputable scientific organizations around the world have concluded that scientific research does not demonstrate that EMF cause or contribute to adverse health effects. However, some scientific questions remain and these are subject to ongoing research. At present, it is Health Canada’s position that there is no compelling scientific evidence that EMF in living and school environments, regardless of locations from power transmission lines, cause ill health such as cancer. Links to expert agencies have been made available to the public via the Hydro One website EMF page: http://www.hydroonenetworks.com/en/environment/emf/.</p> <p>The strength of a magnetic field is dependent on many factors including the number and height of the conductors (wires), the amount of current flow, and the configuration (termed optimal phasing) of the conductors. Due to perceived public concerns, Hydro One will aim to maintain or reduce EMF levels in areas of public exposure, by using options such as optimal phasing.</p> <p>Transmission towers, electrical equipment and power cords produce EMF, not radiation. Power-frequency EMF has no ionizing effects and typically no thermal effects, unlike radiation produced by x-rays and microwaves.</p> <p>Hydro One has conducted EMF modelling which indicates that EMF levels between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct and between Birch Jct and Bridgman TS will be lower than existing levels.</p>

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
<p>Altered Visual Appearance due to Tower Type and Landscape Changes/ Aesthetic Effects at Shaft Locations</p>	<p>Concerns regarding the potential change in the tower height and type, and the resulting effects on views and aesthetics of the area. This was seen as negatively affecting property values.</p>	<p>An option under consideration is to replace the existing 115 kV lattice towers with 115 kV steel pole towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct. Although these poles are equal in height to the proposed lattice structure, their base footprint and associated vertical width are smaller, thereby reducing the visual effect. For this reason, some residents and stakeholders expressed support for this proposal. Poles have a cleaner look than lattice and are therefore generally more preferred in more urban areas.</p>
	<p>Potential loss of vegetation affecting landscape character expressed by residents living near Shaftesbury Avenue, Carstowe Road and Rosedale Heights.</p>	<p>Hydro One has provided pre- and post-development photorealistic visual simulations of existing and proposed tower designs and changes in landscape character and will work with the community on screening in key areas especially in the Bennington and Mallory Heights areas.</p> <p>Due to the rock tunnel option, there will be no loss of vegetation near Shaftesbury Avenue. The main shaft area at the end of Carstowe Road and below Rosedale Heights will be restored to a park like setting. Note the proposed main shaft has been relocated to south of the Rosehill Pumping Station on Mount Pleasant Road.</p>
	<p>Potential aesthetic effects to neighbours at the Birch Jct shaft location.</p>	<p>Vegetation loss and changes in landscape character will be minimized through route and construction option selection, as well as landscape mitigation to offset any potential losses or changes in character within the community. Most of the valley/ridge vegetation will remain intact and unaffected throughout the Project area.</p>
	<p>Plans to landscape Bayview Jct.</p>	<p>Hydro One will work with neighbours on the streetscape design in front of Birch Jct. However, there will not be much of a landscape buffer remaining after the shaft and electrical arrangement is built. Hydro One will work with the City and the BIA to identify any opportunities for landscaping at Birch Jct.</p> <p>Hydro One will work with the community in the Bayview Jct area on the final landscaping plan around the junction. The access road following the old Pottery Road Allowance will be restored as a pathway/ track for use by the community/school after construction and final restoration.</p>

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
Safety	<p>Replacement/repair of chain link fence at Standish Avenue and Astley Avenue and along Glen Road.</p> <p>Replace the wood board fence at Birch Jct and extend the Durisol wall at Bayview Jct.</p>	<p>There are several locations across the length of the project but especially at proposed shaft locations where the existing CPR chain link fence is in disrepair. These openings should be repaired to secure the Project site before and after construction.</p> <p>For aesthetic and security concerns the heights of the proposed walls will be increased and the top of the wall fixed with a deflector panel to discourage access.</p> <p>The wall material should be specified to reflect adjacent residential character and provide sound attenuation.</p>
Protecting the Local Natural Environment	<p>Importance of protecting the natural environment within the study area.</p> <p>Potential for butternut tree removal between Leaside TS and Birch Jct.</p> <p>Potential damage to vegetation from equipment and road widening.</p> <p>Potential effects of the main shaft on the Iroquois Shoreline ESA.</p>	<p>A number of mitigation and restoration measures will be proposed to avoid or reduce potential Project effects. Approaches to mitigation have been developed based on Hydro One’s experience developing and operating transmission facilities throughout Ontario. The implementation of these conventional, proven mitigation and restoration measures, as well as those recommended by provincial and federal agencies, during the EA and permitting processes, will protect the natural environment.</p> <p>A vegetation survey was undertaken on October 23, 2009 at the tower locations and along the access routes. No butternut trees were observed during the survey; however, the high proportion of black walnut (a species closely related to butternut) at some locations warrants identification confirmation when the trees are in full-leaf.</p> <p>Towers 1, 2 and 3 are located within anthropogenic landscapes (i.e., paved areas). The remaining six towers are located within cultural thicket. No mature trees are expected to be removed at Towers 4, 6, 7 and 8, or along the access routes to these towers. Some mature trees will need to be removed at Towers 5 and 8, or along the access routes to these towers, and possibly as part of the expansion of Bayview Jct. Hydro One will work with the City Forestry Department in the development of a replacement plan for these trees.</p> <p>The Iroquois Shoreline ESA is representative of the glacial Lake Iroquois shoreline, expressed as either a raised sandy beach line or a bluff cut into the glacial till. The main shaft area will occupy less than 1% of the ESA area and thereby minimally affecting the overall structural</p>

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
Protecting the Local Natural Environment (continued)	<p>Underground stream in an area near Bayview Jct.</p> <p>Potential impacts to Moore Park Ravine, Vale of Avoca and Crothers’ Woods ESAs.</p> <p>Tree removal at ravine and south side of Old Bridal Path.</p>	<p>characteristic of this Earth Science feature. The information obtained from the geotechnical survey and main shaft boring to be undertaken at the main shaft location will likely contribute to a better understanding of local glacial stratigraphy and possibly glacial Lake Iroquois shoreline development process. Note the proposed main shaft has been relocated to south of the Rosehill Pumping Station on Mount Pleasant Road.</p> <p>The location of underground Cudmore Creek is indicated on the City utility services plans and will be taken into account in the shaft location at Bayview Jct and the final design of junction equipment.</p> <p>The proposed plan for the section between Bayview Jct and Birch Jct is a deep rock tunnel at approximately 60 to 75 m underground. The tunnel would pass through bedrock underneath Moore Park Ravine and Vale of Avoca. The shaft locations for the tunnel will be more than 120 m from the two ESAs. Therefore, no environmental effects are anticipated on these two ESAs.</p> <p>Towers 5 would be constructed within cultural thicket in Crothers’ Woods ESA. As indicated above, no mature trees are expected to be removed at Tower 4 or along its access route. Some mature trees will need to be removed at the Tower 5 location. Hydro One will work with the City Forestry Department in the development of a replacement plan for the lost trees.</p> <p>Hydro One will minimize tree clearing to accommodate the construction compound of the proposed main shaft, which is located east of Carstowe Road and south of Old Bridal Path. As indicated above, the main shaft area will be restored to a park-like setting.</p>
Wildlife Preservation	Some residents noted wildlife preservation as an important issue.	Most urban wildlife species are used to human activities and are mobile. The construction disturbance will be sufficiently local and transitory that little displacement of wildlife is expected. Any sensitive resident animals can relocate temporarily to avoid noise and disturbance associated with construction activities and return after construction is complete. If possible, vegetation clearing will be avoided during the bird breeding season (May 1 – July 31). Otherwise, a breeding bird survey must be

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
		<p>undertaken by a qualified avian biologist and any nests found must not be disturbed by the clearing activity until the young have fledged. A buffer zone restricting active construction activities is generally applied around the nest.</p>
Inconvenience	<p>Effects and inconvenience created by the construction process.</p> <p>Duration of construction.</p> <p>Disruption to businesses and residents.</p>	<p>Hydro One recognizes that some neighbourhood disruption will occur during the construction of this critical infrastructure. However, this temporary disruption will be minimized by mitigation and restoration measures addressing resident concerns.</p> <p>Construction of the main shaft is anticipated to begin in the fall of 2010. Construction of this shaft is expected to take approximately 6 to 9 months. Following excavation of the shaft a tunnel boring machine would be lowered down to begin tunnel construction. Tunnel boring is expected to take 12 to 18 months. During construction of this shaft and the tunnel there will be trucks removing earth and rock via Carstowe Road.</p> <p>Exit shafts which are located at each end of the tunnel may take from 2 to 6 months to construct. Intermediate shafts could also take up to 6 months to construct (note the intermediate shafts are no longer required in the final proposal). All shafts will be used as portals to pour concrete into the tunnel for a permanent liner and floor and concreting would likely occur throughout 2012. During 2012 all station work would also be completed at Leaside TS, Bayview Jct, Birch Jct and Bridgman TS. The replacement of the conductor on the line from Birch Jct to Bridgman TS, and the construction of new towers between Leaside TS and Bayview Jct will also be completed during 2012. During the year of 2013, it is anticipated that the only remaining work will be to install the new cables into the tunnel and final connections at the junction ends.</p> <p>In general, disruption to businesses and residents would be localized at the shaft locations. There will be construction traffic using Carstowe Road and Mt. Pleasant Avenue from fall 2010 to fall 2012. Construction traffic will be reduced from fall 2012 to fall 2013. There will be excavating equipment and a crane at the Carstowe compound until the end of 2012. At the exit and intermediate shafts there will be augers and trucks during</p>

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
		<p>the drilling of the shafts and concrete trucks later in the project.</p> <p>Note the proposed main shaft has been relocated to south of the Rosehill Pumping Station on Mount Pleasant Road.</p>
Location of Shafts	Appearance of shaft locations during and after construction	<p>During the drilling of the shafts there will be construction fencing or hoarding around the perimeter. Activities at shafts are described above. Following construction the exit shafts will be inside of the expanded junction fences. The main shaft east of Carstowe Road will be landscaped to a parklike setting following the project and will have an accessible cover or small building for future maintenance access requirements.</p> <p>Note the proposed main shaft has been relocated to south of the Rosehill Pumping Station on Mount Pleasant Road.</p>
Traffic	Short term disruption of traffic due to equipment and materials delivery, worker vehicle traffic and construction activities.	Hydro One will make best efforts to schedule construction activities in order to minimize adverse effects on the community. Hydro One will develop a traffic plan with city officials, as well as monitor and respond to resident complaints.
Noise	<p>Increased noise levels during daytime hours associated with construction equipment and worker vehicles.</p> <p>Emissions from vehicles during construction.</p>	<p>Construction activities will comply with the municipal noise by-law.</p> <p>Standard best practices will be followed to minimize typical construction disturbances, such as noise. Hydro One utilizes well maintained equipment and, as required, noise silencers.</p> <p>Hydro One will implement best practices to minimize effects on air quality (e.g., Chemflo, 2005).</p>
Vibration	Vibration during tunnel and shaft construction.	During the boring of the deep rock tunnel, there will be no noticeable vibration at surface. There will be some vibration felt during the auguring of the shafts at distances very close to the drill.
Power Outages	Questions regarding whether power outages would be necessary during construction.	Hydro One is expecting no power outages in any neighbourhoods during project construction.

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response
Vegetation Management	Concerns expressed about cutting mature trees and suggestions that Hydro One attempt to utilize existing corridors to minimize impact on trees.	Vegetation removal will be minimized by the selection of the preferred route and construction options. As indicated above, Hydro One will develop a replacement plan for the lost trees in consultation with the City Forestry Department.
Energy Conservation	Whether energy conservation would be enough to solve the capacity issue.	<p>While Toronto is conserving electricity, managing its power use and exploring the potential of renewable power, the proposed Midtown Project is still necessary to replace the aging infrastructure which is reaching the end of the service life and to increase the capacity to meet the economic growth in the central Toronto neighbourhoods.</p> <p>During peak times, transmission circuits along the power corridor are running at or near their reliability limit, which means the potential for equipment failures and power outage increase. Energy conservation would not be enough to solve the capacity issue. The proposed undertaking is necessary.</p>
OEB Hearing Process	How can the general public get involved?	As part of the OEB Section 92 approval process, stakeholders have an opportunity to participate in the interrogatory process. Information on how to get involved is provided on the OEB website www.oeb.gov.on.ca .
Bayview Jct Landscaping Plans	Adjacent resident concerned about adverse effects of junction expansion plans in relation to plans for re-modelling their home and how it will affect their views.	<p>Landscape plans will take into consideration home owner/builder needs/concerns.</p> <p>Station equipment at Bayview Jct will continue to be housed within a wall and low profile equipment will be used to mitigate views.</p>
Birch Jct Proposed Tower Heights	Due to upgrades required at Birch Jct, new towers would be required to be installed.	Hydro One is proposing to install lower profile towers at Birch Jct as expressed by the BIA for visual/aesthetic purposes.

4.9 Review and Comment Period for the Draft ESR

The Draft Environmental Study Report (ESR) was available for a 45 day public and agency review period from March 8, 2010 to April 21, 2010. A notice of the Draft ESR completion and review period was published in local newspapers to inform the public and stakeholders that the Draft ESR was available at several public locations and on Hydro One's project website for review and comment. The notice also provided information on the review process including how interested parties could submit their comments to Hydro One and the MOE.

The Notice of Completion advertisement was published in the following newspapers and a copy can be found in **Appendix J1**:

- *Leaside Rosedale Town Crier* (March 4, 2010)
- *East York / Riverdale / Beach Mirror* (February 25 and March 4)
- *Bloor West Villager / Annex Guardian* (February 25 and March 4)
- *Toronto City Centre Mirror* (February 25 and March 4)

Letters regarding the Notice of Completion were also sent to relevant ministries, agencies, the City of Toronto and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. A hardcopy of the draft ESR was sent to the interested First Nations communities. In addition, residents living within 120 m on both sides of the preferred route and in the vicinity of the original five proposed shaft locations were mailed a copy of the notice. Notice of Completion letters are contained in **Appendix J2**.

During the review period, a number of comments and concerns were raised by local residents, Leaside Property Owners Association, North Rosedale Ratepayers Association, Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, Transport Canada, Ministry of the Environment, Toronto District School Board and the Toronto Public Health. Comments received and Hydro One responses are summarized in the sections below.

4.9.1 Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation

A Hydro One representative met with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation on April 20, 2010 to provide a briefing of the preferred plan for the Midtown project. The main comments related to archaeological and burial sites. Hydro One committed to contacting the community should a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment reveal any findings, and agreed to their involvement in further Stage 3 and Stage 4 Archaeological Assessments.

4.9.2 Resident Association

A. Leaside Property Owners Association (LPOA)

A letter was received from the Leaside Property Owners Association (LPOA) dated March 9, 2010 requesting that Tower #7 be relocated to the south side of the CPR corridor to minimize visual effects for residents in the Mallory Court area. Councillor John Parker from the City of Toronto emailed Hydro One on March 15, 2010, requesting that Hydro One follows up on this concern. After preliminary consideration of technical, real estate and community issues, Hydro One responded to the LPOA in a letter dated April 19, 2010 which indicated that the relocation of Tower #7 would not offer any significant advantages over the existing location. This was because the relocation would also trigger Towers #6 and #8 to be relocated, the new tower locations would require new and/or re-negotiated permits and easements, and the views from most of the affected residential properties were already either partially screened or blocked by continuous woodlot cover or the row of garages. LPOA's letter and Hydro One's response letter can be found in **Appendix J3**.

B. North Rosedale Ratepayers' Association (NRRA)

Hydro One received two letters from the North Rosedale Ratepayers' Association (NRRA) dated March 19, 2010 and April 15, 2010. Hydro One staff also met with a representative of the group on April 16, 2010. The primary concerns of NRRA centred on the cost of burying the line in a tunnel, route selection, project timeline, the locations of shafts and construction staging areas, and potential construction hazards regarding traffic, noise and emissions from vehicles and vibrations. Hydro One responded to these concerns in a letter dated June 7, 2010. These letters can be found in **Appendix J4**.

4.9.3 Government Agencies

A. Transport Canada

Transport Canada sent an email on April 21, 2010 to advise Hydro One that permits are required under the *Navigable Waters Protection Act* (NWPA) and the *Railway Safety Act* if any activities crossed or affected a potentially navigable waterway (which could trigger a federal EA), or crossed a railway line.

On April 30, 2010 Hydro One responded in an email, confirming that the project did not require a permit under the *Navigable Waters Protection Act* and therefore an application under NWPA was not required. Hydro One is also working with the CPR to obtain a letter of agreement and to seek the necessary permits in order to replace the overhead line which crosses the railway. The proposed project will comply with the requirement under the *Railway Safety Act*.

B. Ministry of the Environment

A letter by the MOE sent on April 21, 2010 advised Hydro One to consult with the MOE regarding Permit to Take Water (PTTW) requirements prior to detailed engineering design, to test and handle contaminated soils according to Environmental Protection Act (EPA), and to confirm Certificate of Approval requirements.

Hydro One responded via letter on May 13, 2010 indicating that Hydro One would consult with the MOE if it was suspected that a PTTW was required, that disposal of contaminated soils would follow the *Environmental Protection Act* (EPA) and Ontario Regulation 153/04, as indicated in **Section 7.1.3**, and that a Certificate of Approval was not required for this project as there would not be any modifications to the existing drainage or the installation of any noise producing equipment. These letters can be found in **Appendix J5**

4.9.4 Other Stakeholders

A. Toronto District School Board (TDSB)

The Toronto District School Board sent Hydro One a letter on April 21, 2010 outlining concerns regarding EMF levels, construction activities, and potential hazards related to

construction, vehicular traffic, weakening of the school building structures, noise and air quality.

In a letter dated May 26, 2010, Hydro One responded to the TDSB's comments and expressed its willingness to work with the TDSB to develop and implement mitigation measures to address any safety concerns during construction. These letters can be found in **Appendix J6**.

B. Toronto Public Health

Toronto Public Health emailed Hydro One on March 11, 2010 requesting the information from the Draft ESR that related to EMF. On March 12, 2010 Hydro One responded in an email providing the specific page reference and appendices that discuss EMF.

C. Adjacent Property Owners

During the Draft ESR review period, 19 emails were received from members of the community living in the study area. The main concerns expressed in these emails included: the duration of construction, the impacts of construction, tower replacement, construction methods, landscaping and aesthetics, EMF levels, the geotechnical survey, the location of Bayview Junction, and the main shaft location. **Table 4-3** provides a summary of the comments received from the local residents and Hydro One's responses and actions.

In particular, eleven residents suggested in their correspondence that an alternative location for the main shaft and the associated construction staging area. They indicated that a site, at the Rosehill Pumping Station (RPS) on the City of Toronto's property, which is further from homes and adjacent to an industrial operation (see **Figure 5-5, Figure 6-8** and **Appendix G Tile 5/11**) would reduce construction effects on the community. The main shaft was initially proposed on Hydro One-owned property on Carstowe Road, south of Whitney Junior Public School (see **Appendix G Tile 6/11**).

Hydro One took into consideration the possibility of relocating the main shaft from Carstowe Road to City of Toronto property south of the RPS by initiating discussions with the City of Toronto and holding a community open house to explore this option further.

Section 4.10 summarizes the steps taken by Hydro One to address this particular issue raised by the local residents.

Table 4-3 Comments from local residents during the draft ESR review period and Hydro One’s Responses

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response/Action
Construction Activities around Bayview Junction	The length of time for the construction on Moorehill Drive; safety; possibility of road closure and increase in noise levels.	No construction traffic will pass the resident’s property. Hydro One is working with the City of Toronto to access our site from Bayview Ave. to avoid construction traffic on residential streets. Construction at our site should begin January 2011 and be completed by April 2013. A road closure is not anticipated. Work is planned between 7am and 7pm and safety is the top priority. An increase on noise will occur for a 6 month period - during shaft construction but will be mitigated with a temporary wall.
Landscape around Bayview Junction	Request to review drawings of Bayview Junction landscape design.	The drawings were sent out in June, 2010. Hydro One has also offered to discuss the final design with affected residents.
Landscape around Birch Junction	The aesthetic effect of Birch Junction on the adjacent property.	Hydro One’s landscape architect is working on a draft concept plan. The conceptual plan will be shared with the adjacent owners and local BIA.
Burial of Hydro Facilities beyond the Project	Request to consider burial of facilities south of the CPR corridor at Summerhill Avenue.	Burial of the transmission line south of the CPR is not in the scope of this Project.
EMF	Interest in receiving more information regarding EMF.	More information regarding EMF can be found on Hydro One and Health Canada websites.
Construction method along Shaftsbury Avenue	Will the refurbishment of the underground hydro cable require construction along the sidewalk on Shaftsbury Avenue?	The underground cable refurbishment will not require any excavation along the Shaftsbury Avenue.

Issue	Description of Issue	Hydro One Response/Action
Relocation of Tower #7; appearance of landscaping	<p>Tower #7 has visual effect on the resident's property. Hydro One was requested to consider moving the tower to the west side of Bayview Avenue.</p> <p>There was also a request that landscaping be co-designed with the community for Mallory Green.</p> <p>Effects of construction on nesting area of finches and preservation of Yellow Crabapples.</p>	<p>Hydro One cannot move Tower #7 as it would require the relocation of two other towers, new land right acquisition shift impacts associated with real estate and community issues. A landscape plan will be developed at this area.</p> <p>Hydro One Landscape Architect met with this resident to discuss the landscape plan for Mallory Green and restoration of the access road and construction staging area for Tower #7.</p> <p>Also discussed was how trees and migratory birds (finch nests) would be protected.</p>
Main shaft location and the associated construction effects	<p>Concern over the location of the main shaft east of Carstowe Road on Hydro One's property. The site is in a residential area; construction activities may result in potential hazards regarding construction accidents, traffic, noise and air quality and suggestion of the alternative site south of RPS as the proposed site would be disruptive to nearby Whitney Junior Public School.</p>	<p>Hydro One considered the RPS site from technical and real estate perspectives, consulted with the City of Toronto, and held the community meeting to address the concerns and agreed to relocate the site. Please refer to Section 4.10 for details.</p>
Geotechnical Survey	<p>Bore-holes were drilled on Shaftsbury Ave, adjacent to residents without notifying local residents; Hydro One's plan regarding the deep drilling on Shaftsbury Ave.</p>	<p>Hydro One apologized for not providing advanced notice to the community. Hydro One was aware that its sub-contractor would be drilling a borehole but not the exact date. This borehole was necessary to determine the depth of rock at this location for tunnelling below the street.</p>

4.10 Main Shaft Relocation to Rosehill Pumping Station

4.10.1 Meetings with the City of Toronto

To address the property owners' concerns, Hydro One met with the City of Toronto, Toronto Water, Facilities and Real Estate and Parks on May 6, 2010. Hydro One presented preliminary drawings for the alternative main shaft location at RPS, discussed technical and real estate issues with City staff, and reviewed the approval process timeline. The City of Toronto committed to review a set of revised drawings to determine technical feasibility of main shaft at RPS in light of current and future Toronto Water requirements.

On May 10, 2010, Hydro One met with a representative of Councillor Kyle Rae to provide an overview of the process underway to determine the feasibility of relocating the main shaft to RPS. The advantages and disadvantages of the RPS Site and Carstowe Road site were discussed, the steps involved in the City's approval process and factors that Hydro One would consider in its decision to accept the RPS site. There were no significant issues or concerns raised during this meeting.

On May 17, 2010, a meeting was held with the City of Toronto to discuss property appraisals for the various properties Hydro One would need to acquire to complete the project. Reference Plans for these properties will be provided to the City for approval.

The City of Toronto has later concluded that Hydro One's main shaft/construction staging area proposal on the RPS is technically feasible. Currently, Hydro One and the City of Toronto are working cooperatively to address land acquisition and municipal planning issues.

4.10.2 Carstowe Community Open House Regarding the Main Shaft Location

On May 10, 2010, Hydro One held a Community Open House at the Whitney Junior Public School to discuss the concerns raised about the location of the proposed main shaft and construction staging area for the proposed tunnel at Carstowe Road. Hydro One retained a third-party consultant to facilitate the community meeting.

Notification flyers were emailed to the residents who expressed concerns relating to the main shaft location, and flyers were delivered to residents living in proximity to the proposed Carstowe Road main shaft location. The flyer invited residents to the Community Open House and provided details about the project and a map of the main shaft locations being considered. It also provided contact information for Hydro One, as well as a link to the Hydro One website where more information about the project could be obtained. A copy of the notification flyer is attached in **Appendix J7**.

A total of 18 people attended the Community Open House and more than half were residents living in the vicinity of the proposed Carstowe Road main shaft. The first half of the community meeting was an open house format where attendees could review project display panels and maps, followed by formal presentation by Hydro One and a discussion regarding the main shaft location at Carstowe Road and the RPS proposal.

Hydro One presented information on the tunnel option, and the proposed main shaft and construction staging area on Carstowe Road, as well as preliminary findings regarding the feasibility of an alternative site at the RPS site. A copy of the presentation is provided in **Appendix J8**. A copy of the sign-in sheet is provided in **Appendix J9**. The notes for the Carstowe Road Community Open House are provided in **Appendix J10**.

4.10.3 Notification of the Main Shaft Relocation to Rosehill Pumping Station

An advertisement was published in the following newspapers on June 17, 2010 to inform the public of Hydro One's final decision to relocate the main shaft/construction staging area to the southern portion of RPS.

- *Bloor West Villager*
- *City Centre/Annex Guardian*
- *East York Mirror*

The Carstowe Road Community was sent a notification flyer on June 7, 2010 to advise them that Hydro One would move the preferred site of the main shaft/construction staging area to City property south of the RPS. The flyer summarized the community open house and

that the City of Toronto had concluded that Hydro One's main shaft/construction staging area on RPS was technically feasible. The flyer also outlined the next steps in the process and that Hydro One would be filing the final ESR with the MOE identifying the southern portion of the RPS as the preferred site. Hydro One's OEB application would also be updated. The notification letter and newspaper advertisement can be found in **Appendix J11** and **J12**.

On June 21, 2010, Hydro One emailed the Carstowe Road Community to provide to the communities the newspaper ad, and an update on the OEB Approval of Hydro One's Leave to Construction application.

An email was sent to key agencies and interest groups on June 16, 2010 to inform them that Hydro One planned to file the final ESR with the MOE at the end of June, 2010, and to update them on the main shaft/construction staging area relocation. Below are the key agencies and interest groups:

- Ministry of the Environment – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch
- Ministry of the Environment – Central Region Office
- Ministry of Culture
- Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
- City of Toronto – Urban Forestry
- City of Toronto – Parks, Forestry and Recreation
- City of Toronto – Heritage Preservation Services
- Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation

4.10.4 Comments Received Regarding the Main Shaft Relocation

Hydro One received comments and concerns from the Ministry of Culture (MOC), Toronto District School Board (TDSB), North Rosedale Ratepayers Association (NRRRA) and local residents regarding the main shaft relocation from the originally proposed site, east of Carstowe Road to the City's property, south of Rosehill Pumping Station (RPS).

Specifically, one local resident emailed Hydro One to support the main shaft relocation to RPS. A representative of TDSB and a resident on Carstowe Road emailed to thank Hydro One for addressing their concerns. MOC and three local residents emailed Hydro One to express interest in being informed throughout the following stages of the project. Hydro One will keep the local residents, interested groups and MOC informed through the project stages.

NRRA requested via email that Hydro One confirm if the main shaft and staging area will definitely be at the RPS site and whether Hydro One will issue a revised ESR to incorporate the relocation of the main shaft. Hydro One responded on the same day explaining that the ESR will state unequivocally that Hydro One is proposing that the main shaft will be located at the south portion of the RPS property and the Carstowe Road site will be used for worker parking during construction. Once the ESR is filed with the MOE, Hydro One may proceed with the proposed undertaking outlined in the ESR document.

A local resident from the Summerhill Gardens and Mathersfield Drive community emailed Hydro One to express concerns on the potential effects of the proposed main shaft and construction staging area at the RPS sit, and has asked for a meeting. Hydro One will set up a meeting and work with the residents in this area to address their concerns regarding the proposed main shaft.