

**TO BE E-FILED: Boardsec@oeb.gov.on.ca**

March 19, 2010

Ontario Energy Board  
2300 Yonge Street  
27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Attn: Ms. Kirsten Walli, Board Secretary

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

**Re: Hydro One Networks Inc. Toronto Midtown Transmission Reinforcement Project –  
Your File EB-2009-0425 –  
Additional Interrogatories filed by The North Rosedale Ratepayers Association**

Further to our letter of March 9, 2010, we have now had an opportunity to review and consider the Draft March, 2010 Class Environmental Assessment Environmental Study Report for this Project (the “ESR”)

**The following items are intended to be our Interrogatories relating to the ESR which only became available for review last week. Unless otherwise indicated, the following Interrogatories relate specifically to the noted Sections of the ESR.**

**ESR Interrogatory #1**

**Reference:**

- 1) Section 4.8 – Key Issues Summary and Hydro One Responses

**Preamble:**

Table 4-2 contains very general “Hydro One Responses” and fails to address a number of serious concerns.

**Question/Request:**

Please be more specific about the following (*emphasis added*), particularly in the vicinity of the main shaft / construction staging area and the exit and intermediate shafts:

**ROUTE SELECTION**

a) Since the cost of tunneling seems very much higher than the cost of trenching, why isn't trenching, on the CPR corridor, being seriously considered? Please provide Plans and/or Surveys showing full details of the existing use of the relevant portion of the CPR corridor with dimensions.

**COST OF BURYING TRANSMISSION LINE**

b) Please provide detailed cost comparisons for trenching and tunneling options

**INCONVENIENCE**

c) "Hydro One recognizes that *some* neighbourhood disruption will occur...this *temporary disruption* will be *minimized* by *mitigation measures* addressing resident concerns". For residents and business owners, particularly in the vicinity of the main-shaft and construction staging area, the neighbourhood disruption, in the form of heavy truck traffic, construction noise, dust, dirt and other air pollution will be both severe and long-lasting, since construction of the Project is expected to last nearly 3 years. Please provide detailed comparisons of all such factors relevant to trenching and to tunneling.

**LOCATION OF SHAFTS AND CONSTRUCTION STAGING AREAS**

d) Has serious consideration been given to placing the main-shaft and construction staging area on the west side of Mt. Pleasant Road? Please provide details.

**TRAFFIC**

e) "Hydro One will make *best efforts* to schedule construction activities in order to *minimize adverse effects* on the community." Please explain in detail and provide comparisons of all such factors relevant to trenching and to tunneling.

**NOISE AND EMISSIONS FROM VEHICLES**

f) "*Standard best practices* will be followed to ensure *typical* construction disturbances, such as noise, are *minimized*. What does Hydro One consider to be "typical construction disturbances" in a residential neighbourhood? What steps will Hydro One take to ensure that its contractors and sub-contractors also use well maintained equipment and noise silencers at all times?"

g) What specific "best practices" will be taken to minimize emissions from vehicles during preparation and construction of the Project?

**VIBRATION**

h) Please provide detailed support for the statement that that "During the boring of the deep rock tunnel, there will be no noticeable vibration at surface."

**ESR Interrogatory #2**

**Reference:**

- 1) Section 5.4 - Construction Method Selection (Trenching or Tunnelling)
- 2) Section 6 - Project Description

**Preamble:**

Trenching versus Tunnelling - Section 5.4 briefly discusses two alternative methods of construction to undertake the cable section between Bayview Jct and Birch Jct and certain advantages and disadvantages of each. Section 6 describes the Project as involving construction using the "rock tunnel method and construction of five associated shafts" between Bayview Jct

R/A  
B-1-5+6

R/A  
" R  
R/A  
C-1-6

JIM

RA  
C-1-6

JIM

JIM

JIM

and Birch Jct. However, the ESR does not examine the environmental issues associated with trenching or compare their impact with those associated with tunneling.

*Cynthia* **Question/Request:**

Please provide an Addendum to the ESR containing an examination of the environmental issues associated with trenching and a comparison of the environmental impact of trenching and the environmental impact of tunneling.

**ESR Interrogatory #3**

**Reference:**

- 1) Section 7 – Potential Environment Effects and Mitigation Measures

**Preamble:**

Tables 7-1 and 7-2 are very general in terms of both “Proposed Mitigation” and “Residual (Net) Effects” and fail to address a number of serious environmental concerns.

*Cynthia* **Question/Request:**

Please be more specific about the following (*emphasis added*), particularly in the vicinity of the main shaft / construction staging area and the exit and intermediate shafts:

**AIR QUALITY & NOISE**

- a) “*effective* dust suppression techniques” – what kind and amount of dust and debris will this Project generate and what chemicals and toxins will they contain?
- b) “Cheminfo (2005) best practices to *minimize* effects on air quality” – provide full copy
- c) “locate access routes and lay down areas away from residences *to the extent possible*”
- d) “*noise* levels will conform to municipal noise by-law” – provide full copy of relevant by-law (bearing in mind that an industrial type operation is being proposed in the heart of an well-established, low density residential neighbourhood) – what will be the maximum noise level associated with the Project?
- e) “*suitable* noise controls or silences, *as required*” – please specific the types of equipment and proposed noise controls
- f) Please provide complete plans and specifications for fences and gates to surround and secure the main-shaft / construction staging area and the exit and intermediate shafts.
- g) Air pollution and odours caused or released by the Project or related activities – please provide complete details of all emissions , including those from truck traffic, cranes, ventilation fans
- h) It was our understanding that construction activity would be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekdays, but not on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. This is a residential neighbourhood. Please explain why it would be acceptable to have industrial type activity being conducted in a residential neighbourhood on weekends and public holidays. What exactly do you mean by “if activities need to be *extended* to *facilitate* their completion”?

**VIBRATION** – Please provide complete details.

## TRAFFIC

- i) Will Carstowe Road withstand the loading from the extremely heavy truck traffic that is proposed? Please provide details.
- j) Dozens of heavy trucks will create serious air pollution. Please provide study of this issue
- k) Please provide details of arrangements to ensure that truck traffic serving the project will, with the exception of Carstowe Road, use only major arterial roads and not the local streets in Rosedale and Moore Park

## AESTHETICS – DURING PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION PERIODS

- l) Please provide details consistent with verbal assurances previously received from Mr. Goodfellow.

We expressly reserve the right of the Association to submit written evidence and further Interrogatories after receipt of Hydro One's response to the foregoing and the matters raised on our letter of March 9, 2010.

Yours truly,

The North Rosedale Ratepayers Association

Per: Normunds Mierins CFA, MBA, P.Eng,  
Director, The North Rosedale Ratepayers Association

c.c. Hydro One Networks Inc. **BY E-MAIL TO [regulatory@hydroone.com](mailto:regulatory@hydroone.com)**

c.c. Hydro One Networks Inc. **BY E-MAIL TO [mengelberg@hydroone.com](mailto:mengelberg@hydroone.com)**