

## 8.0 Monitoring Program

Although attempts have been made to be conservative in estimating environmental effects, there is always a degree of uncertainty. Construction plans will be finalized during and after filing of the Final ESR with the Ministry of the Environment. There is always potential for actual field construction to vary from the plan. For example, property owner preferences, results from the geotechnical survey, material supply delays and weather conditions can affect schedules.

Monitoring helps to confirm that predictions of effects are accurate and mitigation measures are effective. Monitoring also confirms that the commitments, conditions of approval, where applicable, and compliance with other environmental legislation, e.g. the *Environmental Protection Act*, are met. An Environmental Specialist will be assigned to the project for the duration of construction to monitor construction activities and provide guidance on needed field changes.

As previously noted in **Section 7.0**, a project-specific Environmental Specification will be prepared to guide construction activities. The specification will be based on the commitments, requirements of all relevant environmental legislation, terms and conditions of approval (if any) and good environmental construction practices, e.g. as set out in Hydro One's *Environmental Guidelines for Construction and Maintenance of Transmission Facilities* (Hydro One 1993).

At the end of construction, an as-constructed plan will be prepared to guide ongoing operation and maintenance activities. The plan will document as constructed conditions as well as any ongoing monitoring requirements. The plan will be put in place to ensure that the project is constructed in compliance with the:

- Commitment made in the Class EA,
- Terms and conditions of OEB approval and other permits, licenses and approvals, and
- Other legislated requirements.

Some issues monitored during construction will include:

- Noise and dust levels;
- Water drainage, runoff, silt and spills;
- Waste materials management;
- Protection of cultural and heritage features;
- Effects on agricultural resources, e.g. minimizing soil compaction;
- Storm water management measures at the construction site;
- Restoration of the ROW.

A post-construction monitoring program will include inspection of areas that have been restored, including any newly planted trees and any other vegetation, ditch crossings and potential erosion areas identified during construction (as required). The effects of the project, the effectiveness of the mitigation approaches, and the need for remedial action will be assessed in the program.

Monitoring reports will be prepared and submitted as required to the OEB after the completion of the project.

## 9.0 Conclusions

Hydro One Networks Inc (Hydro One) is proposing to construct a new transformer station (TS) and replace an existing 115 kilovolt (kV) single-circuit transmission line with a double-circuit line. The line would be continue to be operated as a 115 kV facility but is designed to be operated at 230 kV in the future. The proposed undertaking is supported by Woodstock Hydro and addresses the growing electricity needs created by strong economic and industrial growth in the Woodstock area.

The transmission line upgrades and TS construction fall within the definition of the projects covered by the Class EA document which is approved under the *EA Act*.

This Draft Environmental Study Report (ESR) has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of the *EA Act* and it described the Class EA process that has been carried out for this project. Contingent upon the successful completion of the approval process, detailed engineering and construction would start around February 2010. The Commerce Way TS and the upgraded transmission line between Woodstock TS and the new station constitute the first phase of the undertaking and are planned to be in-service by December 2011. The second phase, which involves the line upgrade between Commerce Way TS and Toyota Junction, would take place at some point in the future, as required.

Environmental, socio-economic and technical criteria were established to evaluate the site alternatives. Based on the analysis undertaken, Site G was selected as the preferred site. The location of the preferred site for the new Commerce Way TS site is south of Parkinson Road, and west of Commerce Way, within the Commerce Way Business Park in the City of Woodstock, just west of Norwich Township.

Potential short term environmental effects were identified and corresponding mitigation measures were suggested for the proposed transformer station and the transmission line upgrade. No long term environmental effects were identified.

Hydro One has conducted extensive public and government agency consultations since December 2007 to inform stakeholders about the project and to identify issues and concerns and to resolve or propose appropriate measures to mitigate concerns. Provincial ministries, agencies, county and local municipalities and Conservation Authorities were consulted by way of meetings, telephone conversations and mailing of project information.

Two Public Information Centres (PIC) were held for this project in February 2008 and February 2009. The local community and key interest groups were notified about the project and the PICs by way of newspaper advertisements and direct mail outs. A dedicated project contact was made available and a project web page was also created on Hydro One's corporate website. A toll-free inquiry line also provided the public with the ability to speak with a Hydro One representative at any time to provide comments or obtain further information on the project.

This Draft ESR is being made available for public and government agency review and comment from March 12 to April 13, 2009. During the review period, comments and issues received regarding the proposed project will be reviewed and addressed. The issues raised and Hydro One responses will be documented in the Final ESR. Any request to elevate or "bump-up" this Class EA to an Individual EA will also be included in the Final ESR. After the review period, the ESR will be finalized and filed with the MOE for a decision, and the project would be considered acceptable.

## 10.0 References

- Baldwin, D.J.B., J.R. Desloges, and L.E. Band. 2000. Physical Geography of Ontario. Chapter 2. Pages: 1 -17 *In: Ecology of a Managed Terrestrial Landscape: Patterns and Processes of Forests in Ontario*, ed. A.H. Perera, D.L. Euler, I.D. Thompson, University of British Columbia Press.
- Bezener, A. 2000. Birds of Ontario. Lone Pine Publishing. 376 p.
- Canadian Land Inventory (CLI). 1990. Land capability for agriculture. Natural Resources Canada. <http://geogratis.gc.ca>
- Chapman, L.J., and D.F. Putnam. 1984. The physiography of southern Ontario. Third Edition. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Ontario Geological Survey, Special Volume 2.
- Class Environment Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities. Revision 6. April 1992.
- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC). 2008. [http://www.cosewic.gc.ca/eng/sct2/index\\_e.cfm](http://www.cosewic.gc.ca/eng/sct2/index_e.cfm)
- County of Oxford (1961). Soil Survey of Oxford County. Report.
- County of Oxford (2006a). County of Oxford Official Plan. Report.
- County of Oxford (2006b). Oxford Natural Heritage Study. Report.
- County of Oxford. 2007. <http://www.county.oxford.on.ca>
- Cudmore-Vokey, B., C.A. MacKinnon, and S.E. Madzia. 2004. Aquatic species at risk in the Thames River watershed, Ontario. Can. MS Rpt. Fish Aquat. Sci. 2707: v +123 p.
- Eder, T. 2002. Mammals of Ontario. Lone Pine Publishing. 215 p.
- Environment Canada. 2004. How much habitat is enough? 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. [www.on.ec.gc.ca/wildlife](http://www.on.ec.gc.ca/wildlife).
- Golder Associates. 2001. Groundwater Protection Study Phase II – County of Oxford. Reported prepared by Golder Associates.
- Hydro One 1993. Environmental Guidelines for the Construction and Maintenance of Transmission Facilities.
- Mandrak, N.E., and E.J. Crossman. 1992. A checklist of Ontario freshwater fishes. Royal Ontario Museum. 176 p.

- Metcalf-Smith, J.L., S.K. Staton, G.L. Mackie and N.M. Lane. 1997. Biodiversity of freshwater mussels in the lower Great Lakes Drainage Basin. Plenary presentation at the 3rd National EMAN Meeting, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 24 January 1997. NWRI Contribution No. 97-90.  
[http://www.eman-rese.ca/eman/reports/publications/nm97\\_mussels/intro.html](http://www.eman-rese.ca/eman/reports/publications/nm97_mussels/intro.html)
- Natural Heritage Information Center (NHIC). 2008. [http://nhic.mnr.gov.on.ca/nhic\\_.cfm](http://nhic.mnr.gov.on.ca/nhic_.cfm)
- Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH), 2005. Provincial Policy Statement. [http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts\\_1\\_23137\\_1.html#1.6](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts_1_23137_1.html#1.6)
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR). 1999. Natural Heritage Reference Manual for Policy 2.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement. OMNR, Report 128 p.
- Rosenberg, D.M. and V.H. Resh. 1993. Freshwater Biomonitoring and Benthic Macroinvertebrates. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc.
- Rowe, J.S. 1972. Forest Regions of Canada. Canadian Forest Service, Publication 1300.
- Species at Risk in Ontario (SARO). 2008.  
<http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/Business/Species/2ColumnSubPage/246809.html>
- Statistics Canada Census 2001 and 2006.
- Upper Thames River Conservation Authority. 2001. The Upper Thames River Watershed Report Cards. Report 21 p. + Appendices.
- Upper Thames River Conservation Authority. 2007. Woodstock Natural Heritage Study (WNHS). Prepared by the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, January 2007.