

Appendix M

Draft Terms of Reference Comment and Response Tables



The following provides a list of acronyms used in the Terms of Reference comment and response tables.

Acronyms

AOC	Area of Concern
AMSI	Abandoned Mine Information System
ANSI	Area of Natural and Scientific Interest
CHC	Cultural Heritage Committee
CHEC	Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions
CHER	Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
CHVI	Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
CLUPA	Crown Land Use Policy Atlas
EA	environmental assessment
EA Act	<i>Environmental Assessment Act, 1990</i>
ECCC	Environment and Climate Change Canada
EMA	Enhanced Management Area
EMF	electric and magnetic fields
END	Endangered
EPRI-GTC	Electric Power Research Institute-Georgia Transmission Corporation
ESA	<i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i>
FMP	Forest Management Plan
FMZ	Fisheries Management Zones
GCT # 3	Grand Council Treaty # 3
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIS	geographic information system
GLP	Gwayakocchigewin Limited Partnership
Ha	hectares
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
Hydro One	Hydro One Networks Inc. (<i>also HONI as used by some commenters</i>)
IESO	Independent Electricity System Operator
IK	Indigenous Knowledge
IO	Infrastructure Ontario
km	kilometre
kV	kilovolt

LIO	Land Information Ontario
LUPS	Land Use Permits
L/V	Landform/Vegetation
m	metres
MECP	Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks
ENDM	Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines
LRIA	<i>Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, 1990</i>
MHSTCI	Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries
MNO	Métis Nation of Ontario
MNRF	Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MW	megawatt
N/A	Not Applicable
NAPS	National Air Pollution Surveillance Program
NHIC	Natural Heritage Information Centre
NOW	Northwestern Ontario
OEB	Ontario Energy Board
OEB Act	<i>Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998</i>
OGDE	Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange
OWES	Ontario Wetland Evaluation System
PLA	Public Lands Act, 1990
PPCRA	<i>Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act, 2006</i>
PPS	Provincial Policy Statement
ROW	right-of-way
RSSA	Route Selection Study Area
SAR	Species at Risk
SARA	<i>Species at Risk Act, 2002</i>
SARB	Species at Risk Branch
SFL	Sustainable Forest Licence
SWH	Significant Wildlife Habitat
S&G	Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties
ToR	Terms of Reference
TS	Transformer Station

Appendix M-1

Agencies Draft Terms of Reference Comment and Response Tables



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
City of Thunder Bay							
1	August 14, 2020	Email	Devon McCloskey MCIP, RPP Planning Services Supervisor 807.625.2406 dmccloskey@thunderbay.ca City of Thunder Bay, Development & Emergency Services Department Planning Services, 111 Syndicate Avenue South, Thunder Bay, ON P7C 5K4	On behalf of Leslie McEachern, Planning Services, City of Thunder Bay, I am providing comments below in response to your request for comments. We have coordinated to compile comments from City Departments including Planning Services, Realty Services, Parks and Open Spaces, but further review will be required where any new lines cross City property.	Hydro One will continue to consult with the City of Thunder Bay during the EA and as more Project-specific information becomes available, including on any areas where new transmission lines cross City-owned property.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
2				For Alternative Route 1 and 1A, we have no comment as does not involve crossing the City boundary, however utility providers such as TBayTel may have comments.	Utility crossings will be taken into account as part of the alternative route assessment to be completed during the EA. Hydro One will also continue working with applicable stakeholders to minimize any potential effects to existing utilities during the EA as more Project-specific information becomes available. Utility providers will be kept informed throughout the EA as more Project-specific information becomes available.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
3				For Alternative Route 1B, we would like to note that this route bisects City owned Parkland north of Highway 11/17, however we recognize it is on an existing Hydro One corridor and not owned by the City.	Recreational amenities, including parks and trails, will be taken into account as part of the alternative route assessment to be completed during the EA. Hydro One will also continue working with applicable stakeholders to minimize any potential effects to these facilities during the EA as more Project-specific information becomes available.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
4				While this corridor is not deemed parkland, there are a number of mountain bike trails that cross the corridor and have leases with Hydro One for their crossing. A parallel line to the existing line on the same corridor may result in possible rerouting of the crossing points if there is any conflict with new tower locations.	Recreational amenities, including parks and trails, will be taken into account as part of the alternative route assessment to be completed during the EA. Hydro One will also continue working with applicable stakeholders to minimize any potential effects to these facilities during the EA as more Project-specific information becomes available.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
5				Hopefully the physical impact will be minor, but there will be some visual impact with another line of towers.	Hydro One will consult with applicable stakeholders as part of project planning to minimize potential effects to aesthetics. The visual landscape (aesthetics) will be considered as part of the net effects assessment that will be completed during the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
6				Dependent on the location of any new towers, there may be potential conflict on the "Hydro Hill" portion of the red trail system that follows the north side of the corridor north of the Thunder Bay Expressway. If this main access trail to the trail system is closer than the minimum setback distance allowed adjacent to towers, it may have to be relocated. Visual impact along this trail may also be a consideration.	Recreational amenities, including parks and trails, will be taken into account as part of the alternative route assessment to be completed during the EA. Hydro One will also continue working with applicable stakeholders to minimize any potential effects to these facilities during the EA as more Project-specific information becomes available. Hydro One will consult with applicable stakeholders as part of project planning to minimize potential effects to aesthetics. The visual landscape (aesthetics) will be considered as part of the net effects assessment that will be completed during the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
7				The route crosses several City roads and coordination is required to minimize disruptions on traffic and nearby residences.	Potential for disruptions to road crossings will be taken into account as part of the net effects assessment to be completed during the EA. Hydro One will work with applicable stakeholders to receive input on this issue as more Project-specific information becomes available.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
8				Some observations are as follows, all 3 routes start in the municipality of Shuniah between Floral Beach and Wild Goose Bay.	Comment noted.	N/A	N/A
9				Route 1B does cross a City owned property west of Bear Point Road. Route 1B splits and rejoins with one section extending through an existing hydro corridor and another section that appears to be new. There does not appear to be any existing corridors or easements for this new section (see green hatched line on the map below).	The alternative routes provided in the draft ToR are considered preliminary and meant to provide a general context with respect to routing options. These alternative routes will be carried into the EA where they will be evaluated, including the consideration of the length of route located parallel to existing ROW. As noted in Section 6.2.2 (Identification of Alternative Route), feedback received during the ToR phase indicates a general preference for paralleling existing ROWs to the extent possible; however, there may be reasons to locate the route away from an existing ROW, such as to reduce angle points.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
10				Important to note that if this is a new connection line then it may possibly hinder future	The potential for impact on future land development would be considered in the	N/A	Comment noted; no



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
11				development in that area. The lands are protected from development due to the City's intake protection zone however. It is not possible to zoom in more closely on the interactive map, to see the remainder of Route 1B, which appears to follow the existing corridor from Hodder Avenue and out Dawson Road past the City's boundary at Townline Road. The .pdf maps do not represent the split and this new line in the same way as the interactive map.	alternative route evaluation and net effects assessment that is to be undertaken in the EA. More detailed routing work and mapping will be available for review and comment during the EA.	N/A	change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA. Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
12				The City has not undertaken an exhaustive review and further evaluation of existing crossing agreements and licences with Hydro One, is needed.	Hydro One will continue working with the City of Thunder Bay relating to any required crossing (or other) permits for the Project as more information becomes available during the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
13				From our review, the only new Route within the City of Thunder Bay is the area just west of Barepoint Road, for which high level detail is not provided, so we would appreciate the opportunity for further review.	Hydro One will continue consulting with the City of Thunder Bay as part of the EA where additional detail on the alternative routes and their evaluation will be provided.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
14				Lastly, we would also be interested to view any proposals for new access roads or installation of infrastructure within the area of concern we've denoted above	Hydro One will include the City of Thunder Bay in discussions during the EA related to any ancillary infrastructure proposed within City limits that is needed to support the Project (e.g., access roads), as well as any areas of concern.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Environment and Climate Change Canada / Government of Canada							
1	August 11, 2020	Email with table attachment	Daniel DeOcampo Assignment/ Environmental Assessment Officer, Environmental Protection Branch Environment and Climate Change Canada / Government of Canada daniel.deocampo@canada.ca / Tel : 416 739 4838	s. 4.2.2.9 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Page 38 <u>Context and Rationale</u> Section 4.2.2.9 states that "Data used to characterize current air quality and climate conditions in the area is anticipated to be obtained from ECCC National Air Pollution Surveillance Program (NAPS) air monitoring stations (e.g. Thunder Bay Station)." However, the project area is over 350 km in length and it is uncertain which stations are proposed to be used. <u>Comment</u> ECCC recommends that the proponent clarifies which NAPS air monitoring stations will be used to obtain air quality and climate conditions data and their distance to the project area.	There are only two NAPS stations within 100 km of the alternative routes, Thunder Bay (NAPS ID 60809) approximately 20 km from southern most point of the alternative routes and Experimental Lakes (NAPS ID 64001) approximately 60 km from the northern most point of the alternative routes. However, not all stations monitor all indicator compounds and/or have 5 years of data availability. Therefore, additional stations may need to be reviewed during the EA. This could include the next closest NAPS stations located in Pickle Lake (NAPS ID 65901) approximately 250 km from the northern most point of the alternative routes and Winnipeg (NAPS IDs 70119) and 70118) approximately 300 km from the northern most point of the alternative routes. The NAPS air monitoring stations to be used for the Project will be determined in the EA once additional project-specific information becomes available (e.g., confirmation of preferred route, study areas, potential impact areas).	Section 4.2.2.9	Section 4.2.2.9 was updated to indicate that the specific NAPS air monitoring stations used to obtain air quality and climate conditions will be confirmed during the EA once additional project information becomes available.
2				s. 4.2.2.9 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, Page 38 <u>Context and Rationale</u> Section 4.2.2.9 states that "Given the nature of this Project, only temporary construction-related air emissions are anticipated. A quantitative assessment of air quality emissions is not anticipated to be required for the EA". An EA typically assesses the impacts on receivers over the multiple stages of a project (pre-construction, during construction, post construction). Given that the construction phase may be in proximity of sensitive receptors and residents and that this is the period that the greatest possibility for air quality exceedances to occur, ECCC recommends that an air quality assessment be conducted during this phase examining impacts by construction emissions such as dust, NOx and particulate matter. <u>Comment</u> ECCC recommends that a quantitative assessment of air quality impacts be conducted for the construction phase of the project.	The ToR will be updated to indicate that a quantitative assessment will be completed for air quality and greenhouse gases during construction.	Section 4.2.2.9	Section 4.2.2.9 was updated to indicate that a quantitative assessment will be completed for air quality and greenhouse gases during construction.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines							
1	August 19, 2020	Letter	Clare Pineau Initiatives Coordinator (A) Strategic Support Unit, 933 Ramsey Lake Road, B6 Sudbury ON P3E 6B5 ENDM (705) 561-6912 Clare.Pineau@ontario.ca	<p>Company Information</p> <p>The following should be updated in the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lac des Iles is owned by Impala Canada Inc. (not North American Palladium) • Hammond Reef is fully owned by Agnico Eagle Mines (Yamana Gold can be removed) • Thunder Bay North project is owned by Clean Air Metals Inc. (can remove Rio Tinto and Panoramic Resources) • Clean Air metals Inc. also owns the Escape Lake project, adjacent to Thunder Bay North 	<p>These updates to stakeholders in the Project area will be made in the ToR. Ownerships may change again and will be further reviewed during the EA.</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.3.3 under the Mining sub-heading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lac des Iles is owned by Impala Canada Inc. • Hammond Reef is fully owned by Agnico Eagle Mines; Yamana Gold will be removed. • Thunder Bay North project is owned by Clean Air Metals Inc.; and, • Clean Air metals Inc. owns the Escape Lake project, adjacent to Thunder Bay North.
2				<p>In addition to the projects already listed, there are a number of other companies currently exploring in the Atikokan area. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rio Tinto Inc., Falcon Gold Corp., Nuinsco Resources Ltd., Benton Resources Inc., Portofino Resources Inc., Bold Ventures Inc., and Frontline Gold Corporation. • Metal Earth Research Centre is also conducting research and seismic traces in the Atikokan and Dryden areas currently. • Delta Resources Ltd., Tashota Resources Inc., and Portofino Resources Inc. are currently actively exploring the Shebandowan area. <p>If it has not already been done, all the listed companies should be contacted by Hydro One and notified of the project.</p>	<p>The noted companies and activities will be added to the ToR and listed companies will be contacted by Hydro One as part of the Project.</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.3.3 under the Mining sub-heading:</p> <p>There are also a number of other companies currently exploring in the Atikokan area, including Rio Tinto Inc., Falcon Gold Corp., Nuinsco Resources Ltd., Benton Resources Inc., Portofino Resources Inc., Bold Ventures Inc., and Frontline Gold Corporation.</p> <p>Metal Earth Research Centre is also conducting research and seismic traces in the Atikokan and Dryden areas.</p> <p>Delta Resources Ltd., Tashota Resources Inc., and Portofino Resources Inc. are also currently actively exploring the Shebandowan area.</p>
3				<p>Abandoned Mines:</p> <p>Mining hazards are not addressed anywhere in the document. There are fourteen Abandoned Mine Information System (AMIS) sites with active mining hazards in close proximity (1 km) to the proposed transmission line routes. If you have any questions or require further information please contact the Mine Rehabilitation and Compliance unit at 705-670-3023.</p>	<p>An update related to mining hazards will be included in the ToR. Hydro One will contact the Mine Rehabilitation and Compliance Unit for more information during the EA.</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.3.3 revised as follows under the Mining sub-heading:</p> <p>In addition, there are fourteen Abandoned Mine Information System sites with active mining hazards in close proximity (1 km) to the alternative routes. The Mine Rehabilitation and Compliance Unit of ENDM will be contacted for further information during the EA.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks Land and Water Division: Species at Risk Branch							
1	August 17, 2020	Email	MECP - Carolyn Lee	<p>Recommendation to prevent delays should an Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA) authorization be required.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that the project be planned and the environmental assessment prepared with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA) in mind. This can potentially facilitate the authorization process under the ESA, where authorization is required. In order to inform any future ESA authorization requirements, reasonable route/project alternatives should be assessed for impacts to all species at risk (SAR) and their respective habitats, and at least one avoidance alternative should be included. Please refer to the MECP "Avoidance Alternatives Form" for activities that may require an overall benefit permit under clause 17(2)(c) of the Endangered Species Act" and accompanying guide for reference. (http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/mbs/ssb/forms/ssbforms.nsf/MinistryResults?Openform&SRT=T&MAX=5&ENV=VWVE&STR=1&TAB=PROFILE&MIN=018&BRN=21&PRG=31)</p>	Route alternatives will be evaluated considering potential impact to SAR as noted in the draft evaluation criteria and indicators table included as an appendix to the ToR.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
2				<p>Recommendation to prevent delays should ESA authorization be required.</p> <p>Public/Stakeholder/Indigenous consultation regarding the project and alternatives should include impacts to ALL SAR and their respective habitats.</p>	Public, stakeholder and Indigenous communities will be consulted as part of the alternative route evaluation process which will include the consideration of potential impacts to provincially and federally-listed SAR and SAR habitat, including species of Special Concern, as appropriate.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
3				<p>Section 3.4 Providing Flexibility to Accommodate New Circumstances / page 15.</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that flexibility is primarily required to account for changes resulting from updated project design or other aspects of the project. While it is recognized that specific project details (e.g., access roads, laydown areas, pull sites, remote access sites, etc.) will not be known until the project design phase, it is recommended that, as much as possible, project design be completed with consideration for 'on-the-ground' realities well in advance of construction to ensure significant changes to the determination of adverse effects on the environment (particularly SAR) as determined through the Environmental Assessment do not result in necessary changes to the EA and/or ESA authorizations.</p> <p>Similar to comment 2 (General) above, to avoid delays in ESA authorizations, should one be required, all project components will be required for the development of an ESA authorization.</p> <p>Recommend project design be undertaken as early as possible.</p>	The EA will define all required project components to a concept design level that will include the identification of proposed locations of these components where it is reasonable and possible to do. As is the case with all major infrastructure projects, some project components may need to be refined, including their location, subject to subsequent detailed design activities. It is anticipated that the project components will be identified prior to the submission of an application for an ESA authorization.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
4				<p>Section 4.1 – Study Area / page 18-19</p> <p>The proposed Local Study Area (LSA) and Regional Study Area (RSA) are insufficient to appropriately address potential impacts to several species:</p> <p>Wolverine: Wolverine are a landscape species using large swaths of land. The LSA and RSA is not sufficiently large enough to meaningfully assess wolverine. It should be biologically relevant to this landscape species. Consider average home range size of wolverine and southern range extent in the determination of an appropriate study area.</p> <p>Lake Sturgeon: The LSA and RSA should consider the surrounding watershed of the potentially impacted sturgeon because they are migratory, potentially travelling very far distances to satisfy life processes.</p> <p>Northern Myotis and Little Brown Myotis: The proposed LSA and RSA do not appropriately reflect dispersal distances during roosting, foraging and/or swarming. Evidence shows that Little Brown Myotis foraging areas can be greater than 30 ha; and on average foraging occurs 2-5 km from day roosts.</p> <p>Additionally, evidence suggests Northern Myotis travel up to 7+ km from hibernacula entrance during swarming. As such, MECP SARB recommends the LSA for SAR bats be a minimum of 2-5 km on either side of the Project Footprint; and the RSA for SAR bats be a minimum of 10 km on either side of the Project Footprint.</p> <p>Gray Fox: The proposed LSA and RSA do not appropriately reflect estimated home range sizes for Gray Foxes (Gray Fox Recovery Strategy, MECP 2019). Consider average home range size of Gray Fox in the determination of an appropriate study area.</p>	The need for study areas for each specific wildlife SAR will be determined in consultation with MECP SARB.	Section 4.1	A commitment to consult with MECP SARB on specific wildlife SAR study areas added to ToR.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
5				<p>Update the LSA and RSA in the draft ToR to appropriately reflect the area(s) that may be impacted by the project and could result in impacts to SAR and/or their habitat.</p> <p>A one-size-fits all Study Area is inappropriate for some of the species present within the study area (listed at left). Consider incorporating a series of Study Areas to be assessed (a wolverine study area, a sturgeon study area, etc).</p> <p>Section 4.2 Description of Existing Environmental and Data Collection Methodology / page 19-20</p> <p>The list of baseline environmental conditions identified in the draft ToR for the Natural Environment does not include potential impacts associated with lighting. Light pollution associated with artificial lighting may result in disturbance to some nocturnal and/or crepuscular SAR (e.g., Eastern Whip-poor-will) should these lightings be used during construction and/or operation at specific project sites (e.g., laydown areas).</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to include light pollution for the list of Natural Environment conditions.</p>	The ToR will be updated to include light pollution as a potential effect of the Project to be examined in the EA.	Section 4.2	Section 4.2 updated to include light pollution as a potential effect of the Project.
6				<p>Section 4.2 Description of Existing Environmental and Data Collection Methodology / page 19-20</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that an aerial reconnaissance of the alternative routes is planned for 2020 to collect data for surface water, fish and fish habitat and the terrestrial environment to support alternative route evaluation. While it is recognized that the proponent is committing to developing detailed Work Plans for the 2020 and 2021-2022 programs, should any field work be conducted prior to the finalization of Work Plans, the results may not be considered sufficient and additional field surveys may be required.</p> <p>Consider the timing of necessary field work for each SAR in the development of Work Plans to ensure adequate consultation with applicable agencies to confirm the type, location, timing and methodologies of proposed fields studies occurs prior to field work being undertaken.</p>	The timing of necessary field work for each SAR will be considered in the development of work plans which will be done in consultation with MECP SARB.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
7				<p>Section 4.2 Description of Existing Environmental and Data Collection Methodology / page 19-20</p> <p>Additional details are required on the proposed ground-based survey planned for fall of 2020 to evaluate the physical characteristics of historic mine workings identified in the Abandoned Mines Information System (AMIS) spatial data layer to determine if they have potential to support bat hibernaculum; and which may be a constraint to development.</p> <p>Insufficient information is provided on the proposed methodology for these ground surveys and whether they are focused on determining physical characteristics or presence/absence of potential hibernaculum. It is recommended that appropriate surveys be completed on <i>all</i> potential hibernaculum that may be impacted by the project to determine presence/use by Northern Myotis and Little Brown Myotis following appropriate survey methodology. Survey methodology should be outlined in detailed Work Plans and submitted to MECP SARB for review and input to ensure the proposed approaches will be considered appropriate to informing potential impacts to hibernaculum.</p> <p>Should any field work be conducted prior to the finalization of Work Plans, the results may not be considered sufficient and additional field surveys may be required.</p> <p>Consider the timing of necessary field work for each SAR in the development of Work Plans to ensure adequate consultation with MECP SARB to confirm the type, location, timing and methodologies of proposed fields studies occurs prior to field work being undertaken.</p>	Hydro One will consider the timing of necessary field work for each SAR in the development of work plans to ensure adequate consultation with MECP SARB and survey methodology will be outlined in detailed work plans and submitted to MECP SARB for review and input prior to the field programs.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
8				<p>Section 4.2.2.7 Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat / page 32</p> <p>wester painted turtle" should be "western painted turtle".</p> <p>Correct typo.</p>	This error will be corrected in the ToR.	Section 4.2.2.7	Error corrected in ToR.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
9				<p>Table 4-3 Species at Risk Present or Potential to be Present in the Study Area</p> <p>There is no mention of SAR plants and whether they were part of the initial SAR screening.</p> <p>If there are none in the Study Area, please include a description that indicates that plants were part of the SAR screening but that no SAR plant occurrences or home ranges were found within the Study Area or the immediate vicinity.</p>	Plants were included in the SAR background review; however, the MNRF datasets did not identify any SAR plant occurrence records within and/or adjacent to the Study Area.	Section 4.2.2.8	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.2.8 (Species at Risk):</p> <p>Plants were included in the SAR background review; however, the MNRF datasets did not identify any SAR plant occurrence records within and/or adjacent to the Study Area.</p>
10				<p>Table 4-3 Species at Risk Present or Potential to be Present in the Study Area</p> <p>“Lake Sturgeon (Northwestern Ontario population)” has been renamed “Lake Sturgeon (Saskatchewan-Nelson River populations). Please update references in the draft ToR.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to reflect the correct name for this sub-population of Lake Sturgeon.</p>	The ToR will be updated to reflect the updated name for this sub-population of Lake Sturgeon.	Table 4-3	Table 4-3 updated to reflect the updated name for this sub-population of Lake Sturgeon.
11				<p>Table 4-3 Species at Risk Present or Potential to be Present in the Study Area</p> <p>Table 4-3 does not include all Threatened and/or Endangered SAR protected under the Endangered Species Act, 2007 that could potentially be impacted by the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chimney Swift (<i>Chaetura pelagica</i>) (THR) - Cougar (<i>Puma concolor</i>) (END) - American Badger (Northwestern Ontario population) (<i>Taxidea taxus</i>) (END) <p>Update the draft ToR to include these species in Table 4-3</p>	These additional species will be listed in the ToR.	Table 4-3	Table 4-3 updated to include the additional noted SAR.
12				<p>Table 4-3 Species at Risk Present or Potential to be Present in the Study Area</p> <p>Table 4-3 does not include all SAR identified as Special Concern on the Species at Risk in Ontario List (O. Reg. 230/08) that could potentially be impacted by the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evening grosbeak (<i>Coccothraustes vespertinus</i>) (SC) - Rusty Blackbird (<i>Euphagus carolinus</i>) (SC) <p>As noted in the draft ToR, subsections 9 and 10 of the ESA do not apply to SAR listed as Special Concern on the Species at Risk in Ontario List. However, where other provincial and/or federal legislation applies, the proponent is responsible for ensuring these species are appropriately considered.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to include these species in Table 4-3.</p>	These additional species will be listed in the ToR.	Section 4.2.2.8 Table 4-3	<p>Additional species added.</p> <p>ToR updated to reference intention to consult with MECP SARB on the field work plan and approach to SAR effects assessment.</p>
13				<p>Table 4-4 Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment – Species at Risk / page 56</p> <p>To be consistent with section 4.2, the SAR section of Table 4-4 should identify how the proponent plans to engage with MECP on the identification of necessary SAR field studies in support of the EA, with thought given to any potential baseline information that will assist in the development of an ESA authorization, should one be required.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR as appropriate.</p>	The MECP SARB will be consulted in the development of the field work plans and approach to SAR effects assessment.	Section 4.2.2.8	ToR updated to reference intention to consult with MECP SARB on the field work plan and approach to SAR effects assessment.
14				<p>Table 4-4 Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment – Species at Risk / page 56</p> <p>As noted in the draft ToR, subsections 9 and 10 of the ESA do not apply to SAR listed as Special Concern on the Species at Risk in Ontario List. However, where other provincial and/or federal legislation applies, the proponent is responsible for ensuring these species are appropriately considered.</p>	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
15				<p>No action required</p> <p>Section 4.3.1 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Natural Environment / page 59</p> <p>All references to potential effects of the project on SAR and/or identification of key natural environment considerations (e.g., s.4.2.2.8, s.4.3.1, Table 4-5, Table 7-1, etc.) should also include SAR habitat (i.e., SAR and SAR habitat) in addition to the species themselves.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to include "species at risk habitat" in addition to SAR themselves.</p>	The ToR will be updated to include potential effects of the Project on "SAR habitat" in addition to SAR themselves.	Section 4.3.1	Section 4.3.1 updated to include reference to potential effects to "SAR habitat".
16				<p>Section 5.1.1.1 Transmission Line / page 65</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that the RoW is expected to be approximately 40 to 76 m in width; and may vary depending on a number of variables. However, the RoW width will be confirmed based on the final route and construction specific variables. The specific RoW width should, as much as possible, be included in the EA for each alternative, including the portions of the RoW that will be wider.</p> <p>These details are required for the development of an ESA authorization, should an authorization be required.</p>	Comment noted. The comparative evaluation of the alternative routes will be completed assuming a standard ROW width which will be confirmed and described in the EA, prior to the effects assessment of the preferred route.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
17				<p>No action required.</p> <p>Section 5.1.1.2 Access Roads / page 66</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that the proponent's preference will be to use the project RoW for access and build access roads within the RoW, where possible; and where not possible, use existing roads and/or trails. MECP SARB agrees with this approach and encourages the proponent to, as much as possible, plan and design the project to minimize the development of new access roads; as these features are known to have an adverse impact on many SAR and their habitat. Alternatives which minimize the amount of new linear features will be preferred by MECP SARB, including those that co-locate new transmission RoW to existing infrastructure (as per results of model summary referenced in section 6.2.1.2).</p>	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
18				<p>Section 5.1.1.2 Access Roads / page 67</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that temporary access roads will typically be restored following construction, including those within the RoW. To minimize adverse effects on SAR, the proponent is strongly encouraged to restore <i>all</i> temporary construction components (i.e., access roads, laydown areas, pull sites, etc.) following construction, and that this restoration should occur progressively across the project as the temporary components are no longer required.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR as appropriate.</p>	The ToR will be updated to include a commitment to restore all temporary construction components/areas located on previously undisturbed lands. It may be necessary to maintain some access roads to support long-term inspection and maintenance activities. Access roads that would be maintained will be identified in the EA.	Section 5.1.1 Section 5.1.1.2	Section 5.1.1.2 revised to include a commitment to restore all temporary construction components/areas located on previously undisturbed lands. ToR also revised to indicate that it may be necessary to maintain some access roads to support long-term inspection and maintenance activities. Access roads that would be maintained will be identified in the EA.
19				<p>Section 5.1.1.3 Equipment and Material Laydown Areas / page 67</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that equipment and material laydown areas, as well as fly yards, construction/stringing pads and staging areas, may be required during project construction. However, there is no indication whether these will be temporary or permanent construction components; and if these will be restored following construction. The proponent is strongly</p>	<p>In most cases, construction equipment and material laydown areas will be temporary. The ToR will be updated to include a commitment to restore all temporary construction components/areas located on previously undisturbed lands after they are no longer required.</p> <p>Helipads may be required for project construction and would be temporary facilities;</p>	Section 5.1.1 Section 5.1.1.3	Section 5.1.1.3 to be revised to include a commitment to restore all temporary

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>encouraged to restore <i>all</i> temporary construction components (i.e., access roads, laydown areas, pull sites, etc.) following construction, and that this restoration should occur progressively across the project as the temporary components are no longer required.</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that helicopters may be used to transport materials to locations that are not accessible by ground. It is not clear whether helipads will be cut in these locations so that the helicopter can land. If helipads are required, please indicate if they are temporary or permanent features. If they are temporary, please indicate whether they will be restored.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to indicate whether equipment and material laydown areas will be temporary or permanent. If temporary, update the draft ToR to indicate whether the proponent intends to restore these project components or not.</p> <p>Please indicate if helipads will be constructed for the use of helicopters. If yes, indicate if the helipads are temporary or permanent. If temporary, update the draft ToR to indicate whether the proponent intends to restore these project components or not.</p>	however, some could be required on a permanent basis for more remote areas of the route. To be determined in the ToR.		<p>construction components/areas located on previously undisturbed lands.</p> <p>ToR also revised to indicate that helipads may be required for Project construction with some being permanent subject to route location along with other areas required during construction.</p>
20				<p>Section 5.1.1.3 Equipment and Material Laydown Areas / page 67</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that permits and/or authorizations for laydown areas will be obtained prior to their use, as applicable. The proponent may need to obtain an ESA authorization for these areas prior to their <i>construction</i>, if impacts to SAR cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to reflect that permits and/or authorizations will be obtained prior to their construction, where necessary.</p>	The ToR will be updated to include reference that required permits or authorizations will be obtained prior to construction.	Section 11	Section 11 revised to indicate that required permits or authorizations will be obtained prior to construction.
21				<p>Section 5.1.1.4 Construction Offices / page 67</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that temporary mobile offices may be required during the construction period; and that it is anticipated that these temporary offices will be located in developed areas near the RoW, laydown areas, storage yards or other temporary facilities. Should this change and additional areas which are currently undisturbed be required, the proponent is strongly encouraged to restore these temporary areas following construction, and that this restoration should occur progressively across the project as the temporary components are no longer required.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR as appropriate.</p>	Lands used for temporary storage that were in a natural state prior to use will be restored after these areas are no longer required.	Section 5.1.1.5	Section 5.1.1.5 updated to reflect commitment to restore natural areas disturbed from temporary construction facilities.
22				<p>Section 5.1.1.6 Upgrades to Existing Transformer Stations / page 68</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that expansions of the fenced-in areas of Lakehead TS, Mackenzie TS and Dryden TS may be required. If this will include the removal of trees (i.e., additional disturbance) this may result in adverse effects to SAR and/or their habitat and will need to be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA; and will be required in the development of an ESA authorization, should one be required.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to clarify whether the expansion of the fenced-in areas will require the removal of trees (i.e., additional disturbance) and indicate that this will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA.</p>	It is not known as this time whether additional lands will be required for transformer station upgrades. This will be determined in the EA, and any area of expansion will be included in the Project Footprint. Appropriate studies will be completed and necessary permits obtained should additional lands be required.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
23				<p>Section 5.1.1.7 Separation of Existing Transmission Lines / page 68</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that about 1 km of the double-circuit section of transmission line needs to be separated, which will include expansion of the exiting RoW. However, the draft ToR does not indicate that this will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA. As this may have an adverse effect on SAR and/or their habitat, this will need to be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to indicate that the expansion of the RoW to separate the existing 230kV transmission circuits out of the Mackenzie TS will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA.</p>	Clarity will be provided in the ToR to indicate that the expansion of the ROW to separate the existing 230 kV transmission circuits out of the Mackenzie TS will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA.	Section 5.1.1.8	Section 5.1.1.8 revised to clarify that expansion of the ROW to separate the existing 230 kV transmission circuits out of the Mackenzie TS will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA.
24				<p>Section 5.2.1 Construction / page 68</p>	Hydro One has not been directed by the IESO to complete detail design for this project and so at this time, is not in control of the timing for the detail design phase. It would typically	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
25				<p>The draft ToR indicates that specific timing, sequencing and staging will be determined during the detailed design phase, however this phase is not identified and/or described as part of the project activities. Recognizing that the details associated with timing, sequencing and staging of the project are important consideration in the determination of potential impacts to SAR, the proponent is strongly encouraged to complete the detailed design phase as early as possible; and that this phase of the project be described in the draft ToR so there is a clear understanding of when this work will be undertaken/completed.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to describe the detailed design phase and identify when this work is anticipated to be completed.</p> <p>Section 7.1 Potential Effects Assessment / page 105</p> <p>And</p> <p>Table 10-1 Stakeholder Consultation – Anticipated Milestones, Activities, Input and Training</p> <p>Additional clarity is required on the planned approach to effects assessment and selection of a preferred route. The selection of a preferred route should only occur after baseline information has been collected and a detailed assessment of impacts is completed for each alternative, which must include consideration of impacts to SAR.</p> <p>Section 7.1 of the draft ToR indicates that a “net effects assessment” of the project will be completed after a “comparative evaluation of the alternative routes is undertaken, and a preferred route is identified” (as described in section 6.0). However, the identification and evaluation of alternatives discussed in section 6.0 outline the process/model used to identify alternative routes, not select a preferred route.</p> <p>Table 10-1 indicates that baseline data will be collected between 2020-2022, but that the results of these studies and the effects assessment will be completed in the fall of 2022. Additionally, it identifies that the Alternatives Evaluation and identification of a preferred route will be completed during the spring-summer of 2021.</p> <p>It is unclear what information will be used to inform the selection of a preferred route if baseline information has not been collected and the potential effects of each proposed alternative route are unknown.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to clarify what information will be used to inform the selection of a preferred route and when the selection of a preferred route will be completed; and specifically what SAR considerations will be used to inform the selection of a preferred route.</p>	<p>occur after EA approval has been obtained; however, best efforts will be made to develop all project components to a concept level of design where it is reasonable to do so.</p> <p>Desktop information and field data collected during the 2020 field program will inform the alternative route evaluation process. More detailed field data collected during the subsequent programs in 2021 and 2022, during seasonally appropriate windows, will further inform the refinement of the preferred route and net effects assessment process.</p> <p>SAR will be considered in the alternative route evaluation for the selection of a preferred route relying on the preliminary results of the 2020 field program and existing data including existing data bases and Forest Management Plans. Species-specific datasets will be developed for the preferred route and assessed as part of the net effects assessment of the preferred route in the EA. The species-specific datasets will also be supported by the species-specific field surveys planned for the preferred route. Alternatives including route refinement, avoidance, and other mitigation will be considered where SAR or SAR habitat is identified for the preferred route.</p> <p>Additional detail describing the alternative route evaluation for the selection of a preferred route will be added to the ToR.</p>	Section 7.1	<p>required. Will be considered in the EA</p> <p>The ToR was revised to clarify how the proposed field programs will provide data during the route evaluation and effects assessment phases.</p>
26				<p>Section 7.1 Potential Effects Assessment / page 106</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that the project be planned and the environmental assessment prepared with the requirements of the ESA in mind. This can potentially facilitate the authorization process under the ESA, where authorization is required. In order to inform any future ESA authorization requirements, the net effects assessment for SAR should consider the requirements of the ESA (i.e., species and habitat protection), including the identification of baseline conditions for all SAR and their habitat, potential impacts of the project, mitigation measures, net effects that are likely to remain after mitigation measures are implemented, monitoring, etc.</p> <p>No action required at this time. However, it is recommended that the proponent complete the net effects assessment for the project with the requirements of the ESA in mind to prevent delays should an Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA) authorization be required.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The net effects assessment on the Project components will consider ESA requirements.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
27				<p>Section 8.1 Environmental Commitments / page 108</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that the project be planned and the environmental assessment prepared with the requirements of the ESA in mind. This can potentially facilitate the authorization process under the ESA, where authorization is required. In order to inform any future ESA authorization requirements, the development of mitigation measures for SAR should consider the requirements of the ESA (i.e., species and habitat protection).</p> <p>No action required at this time. However, it is recommended that the proponent develop mitigation measures with the requirements of the ESA in mind to prevent delays should an Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA) authorization be required.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
28				<p>Glossary / page 151</p> <p>Under the Description for Species at Risk, “engendered” should be “endangered”</p> <p>Correct typo.</p>	This error will be corrected in the ToR.	Glossary	Error corrected.
29				<p>Appendix B List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators / pg. B-3 and B-4</p> <p>The proposed criteria and indicators for SAR is insufficient to evaluate the potential effects of the project on SAR.</p> <p>The draft ToR indicates that the number and type of SAR and area (ha) of habitat potentially affected <i>in the RoW</i> will be considered. It is inappropriate to scope impacts of the project to only the RoW. All potential impacts should be evaluated within the Project Footprint, LSA and RSA for each Criteria and Indicator.</p> <p>To avoid prevent delays should an Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA) authorization be required, MECP SARB strongly recommends all SAR which may be impacted by the project be identified as criteria with appropriate indicators relevant to that species.</p> <p>Update the draft ToR to identify each SAR which may be impacted by the project as criteria that will be assessed in the EA and all appropriate indicators relevant to each species.</p> <p>The following are examples that should be expanded on in the draft ToR; and it anticipated that the full list of criteria and indicators will be further expanded during the development of the EA:</p> <p>Example Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wolverine, Grey Fox, Northern Myotis, Little Brown Myotis, American Badger, etc. <p>Example Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Den sites, hibernaculum, number of impacted home ranges, amount of habitat (ha) impacted by the project with consideration for loss of functional habitat within the Project Footprint, LSA and RSA, increased risk of mortality (e.g., trapping, road collision, etc.), etc. 	<p>The alternative route comparative evaluation criteria presented in the ToR are draft/preliminary and will be refined and confirmed in the EA. MECP SARB will be consulted during this process.</p> <p>An additional appendix with draft criteria for the net effects assessment of the preferred route will be added to the ToR and will include specific SAR. These criteria may be refined during the EA process and in consultation with MECP SARB.</p>	Section 6.3	<p>Section 6.3 revised to indicate that agencies will be consulted in the finalization of the comparative evaluation criteria and the effects assessment criteria.</p> <p>An additional appendix with draft criteria for the net effects assessment of the preferred route added to the ToR, including specific SAR.</p>
30				<p>Species at Risk Requirements – General</p> <p>August 5, 2020 from Nikki Boucher, Species at Risk Specialist – Comments provided regarding requirements for ESA authorizations.</p>	Comments noted and will be considered in the EA and post-EA permitting process.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
Land and Water Division: Ontario Parks							
1				<p>Section 4.2.1 Table 4-1 /page 21</p> <p>Within Table 4-1, Land Information Ontario data requested and/or accessed June 2019 should include ‘Conservation Reserves’.</p> <p>Please update table as per comment.</p>	Conservation Reserves are part of the CLUPA dataset that was assessed. Table 4-1 will be updated to include this.	Table 4-1	Table 4-1 revised to include reference to Conservation Reserves.
2				<p>Table 4-1 Key Records Reviewed / page 21</p> <p>Missing recreation and tourism for canoe routes, portages and campsites within protected areas in “Land Information Ontario data requested and/or accessed June 2019”.</p> <p>Please add recreation and tourism for canoe routes, portages and campsites within protected areas to be assessed.</p>	These features were included in the dataset that was obtained and assessed. Table 4-1 will be updated to include reference to these tourism features. We note that we also identified campsites from the OGDE Layers: MNRF non freehold Dispositions public.	Table 4-1	Table 4-1 revised to include reference to canoe routes, trails, portages, campsite etc.
3				<p>Appendix B, Section 4.2.1 Table 4-1 / page 21-22</p> <p>Ontario Parks implements the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act, 2006 (PPCRA) including the purpose, protection of values and ecological integrity objectives, and planning and management principles within the PPCRA for provincial parks and conservation reserves.</p> <p>Appendix B includes only the indicator of the number and area of provincial parks and conservation reserves under the Socio-Economic Environment (Factor) and Land Use (Criteria). This does not address the need to consider potentially impacted values from the project within provincial parks and conservation reserves that are important to meet our PPCRA mandate as</p>	<p>Reference to GapTool Data and INaturalist data will be added to Table 4-1 and will be considered in the assessment of alternatives through provincial parks and conservation reserves.</p> <p>The Natural Environment Factor of Appendix B will be updated to include new indicators to measure the area of critical L/V associations and underrepresented L/V associations crossed by the ROW.</p>	Table 4-1 Appendices	<p>Table 4-1 revised to include reference to GapTool data set.</p> <p>Evaluation criteria, Forests, Woodlands and Vegetation, updated to include a new indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area (ha) of



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
4				<p>described above. For example, Landform/Vegetation Associations are used as a surrogate for biodiversity and are reported through the GapTool for Ecodistricts (areas outside of existing protected areas for consideration during future land-use planning initiatives like adding new protected areas) and individual protected areas (critical L/V associations within protected areas to be protected) across the province.</p> <p>Table 4-1 does not include Record Source of Ontario Parks for GapTool data, including reports and shapefiles for underrepresented L/V associations for Ecodistricts and critical L/V associations within protected areas</p> <p>Please update Appendix B table to include the number and area of protected area values, including critical L/V associations and species at risk values, as an indicator under the Natural Environment Factor and Protected Areas Criteria. Please also update Appendix B table to include Terrestrial Biodiversity as a Criteria under Natural Environment Factor using the area and number of underrepresented L/V associations.</p> <p>Please update Table 4-1 to include GapTool data as mentioned in the comments. Note that GapTool output with L/V association analyses (reports and shapefiles) were provided to Sarah Galloway as part of the Wassigan Team by Steve Kingston/Louis Chora of Ontario Parks in July 2019.</p> <p>Please also update Table 4-1 to include iNaturalist data which is available online, including iNaturalist project data for each provincial park and conservation reserves.</p> <p>Section 4.2.2.4 / page 27, (paragraph 2)</p> <p>The evaluation of a preferred route that avoids protected areas, where possible is noted. Where avoidance is not possible, there would be the requirement for satisfying the PPCRA Section 20/21 conditions.</p> <p>At the ToR stage please identify that S. 20 & S.21 requirements are understood and that these sections will be considered at the EA stage for corridor alignment within a PP or CR.</p> <p>At the EA stage, please consider the conditions under PPCRA S.20 & S.21 and ensure enough detail is supplied at the EA stage of the project that will allow MECP/OP to be satisfied that decommissioning plans (S.20) as well the 3 conditions of S. 21 are met;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no reasonable alternatives. 2. Lowest cost is not the sole or overriding justification. 3. Environmental impacts have been considered and all reasonable measures will be undertaken to minimize harmful environmental impact and to protect ecological integrity. <p>Ontario Parks requests that these details and considerations be presented in a separate appendix within the EA.</p>	<p>The crossing of provincial parks and conservation reserves will be included as an indicator in the alternative route evaluation to minimize, or avoid, crossing these areas. Further, requirements of Sections 20 and 21 of the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act, 2006 will be considered in the EA stage for the preferred route if it crosses a provincial park or conservation reserve and the alternatives analysis in these areas will be presented as a separate appendix.</p>	Section 6.3	<p>underrepresented landform/vegetation associations in the ROW</p> <p>- Area (ha) of critical landform/vegetation associations in the ROW</p> <p>Section 6.3 revised to indicate that PPCRA Section 20/21 conditions will be considered.</p>
5				<p>Section 4.2.2.4 / page 27</p> <p>Recommend wording that expands on the concept of refining preferred route to avoid protected areas. Routes can be refined to avoid Protected areas themselves but also areas outside of protected areas that will still have a significant impact on values within a protected area such as a viewscape or feeling of remoteness. Refinement to preferred route should also be considered to avoid creating unwanted access to protected areas.</p> <p>Revise last sentence on page 27 to read. Refinement to the preferred route to avoid protected areas and areas adjacent to protected areas that will create a direct impact on viewscales, access and remoteness will also be evaluated, during the EA.</p>	<p>Refinement of the route will be undertaken in the EA to avoid, where possible, or to minimize effects on protected areas, including minimizing visual impacts within protected areas.</p>	Section 4.2.2.4	<p>Wording has been updated to provide more clarity.</p>
6				<p>Table 4-3 Species at Risk Present or Potential to be Present in Study Area. / page 36</p> <p>Under FISH AND OTHER AQUATIC SPECIES</p> <p>Lake sturgeon (Northwestern Ontario population) is not the correct population name as listed at: https://www.ontario.ca/page/species-risk-ontario#section-2 .</p> <p>The Saskatchewan-Nelson River population and the Great Lakes- Upper St. Lawrence River population are within the study area.</p> <p>Please update Lake Sturgeon population name from "Northwestern Ontario population" to the</p>	<p>This error will be corrected in the ToR.</p>	Table 4-3	<p>Table 4-3 revised to reflect updated Lake Sturgeon population name.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				Saskatchewan-Nelson River population which is listed as threatened under species at risk in Ontario.			
7				<p>Section 4.2.3.1 / page 40</p> <p>Paragraph starting "Additional policy direction is provided ..." should reference that the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act is legislation not policy.</p> <p>Recommend revising sentence to "Additional legislative and policy direction is provided".</p>	This sentence will be revised in the ToR, as recommended.	Section 4.2.3.1	In Section 4.2.3.1 sentence revised to "Additional legislative and policy direction is provided".
8				<p>Section 4.2.3.3 / page 45 (under tourism and outfitter operations heading)</p> <p>The scale and significance of wilderness canoeing in Quetico and Turtle River White Otter Lake Provincial Parks needs to be recognised. In this section canoeing almost seems to be an afterthought in the description. Quetico is a major international canoeing destination, the first wilderness park in the province of Ontario, and the busiest backcountry canoeing park in Northwestern Ontario and one of the most popular in the entire province. Tens of thousands of canoeists utilize the backcountry here annually with the expectation of a wilderness experience free of built infrastructure. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW) in Minnesota and Quetico Provincial Park are sister sites and together are a significant backcountry canoeing destination in North America. Turtle River White Otter Lake Provincial Park is also an internationally recognised backcountry canoeing destination.</p> <p>Provide a more detailed description of the scale and significance of wilderness canoeing.</p>	The ToR will be revised to provide the noted information about the scale and significance of wilderness canoeing and additional detail will be provided in the EA.	Section 4.2.3.3	<p>Section 4.2.3.3 revised to include the following:</p> <p>Wilderness canoeing is also a major recreational activity in the Study Area, especially in Quetico and Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Parks. Although outside of the Study Area, Quetico Provincial Park is a major international canoeing destination, the first wilderness park in the province of Ontario, and the busiest backcountry canoeing park in northwestern Ontario and one of the most popular in the entire province. Many residents and visitors to the area use the backcountry ever year with the expectation of a wilderness experience. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in Minnesota and Quetico Provincial Park are sister sites and together are a significant backcountry canoeing destination in North America. Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Park is also a recognized backcountry canoeing destination. These canoeing</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							destinations, as well as any others that are identified for tourism purposes, will be thoroughly reviewed and described in the EA along with any potential effects as a result of the Project.
9				<p>Section 4.2.3.6 /page 47 (third paragraph)</p> <p>Text says "sacred sites may occur". Sacred sites such as pictographs are known to occur within Turtle River White Otter Lake Provincial Park within the preliminary study area.</p> <p>Change text to explicitly list Parks and Conservation reserves as examples of identified sensitive landscape areas where aesthetics will be considered</p>	The ToR states that, "Cultural activities and practices and sacred sites may occur or be present throughout the area of the Project at specific sites or may occur independent of a specific location". The location of these sites in proximity to the proposed project components will be identified through the IK program as part of the EA. The ToR will be revised to note parks and conservation reserves as examples of sensitive landscape areas where aesthetics will be considered. For example, known pictograph sites located in Turtle River White Otter Lake Provincial Park.	Section 4.2.3.6	Section 4.2.3.6 revised to note parks and conservation reserves as examples of sensitive landscape areas where aesthetics will be considered. For example known pictograph sites located in Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Park.
10				<p>Section 4.2.4, Table 4-4 Component 'Economy, land and resource use' (Second bullet)</p> <p>The draft ToR references provincial parks management and users but should be inclusive of CR managers and users as well.</p> <p>Please ensure CRs are given similar consideration as provincial parks, as they are both administered under the same legislation.</p>	Table 4-4 to be revised to reference conservation reserve managers.	Table 4-4	Table 4-4 revised to reference conservation reserve managers as a data source for Economy, Land and Resource Use.
11				<p>Table 4-4 / page 57 (aesthetics heading)</p> <p>Given the importance of maintaining a wilderness experience free of views of built infrastructure in Quetico Provincial Park please explicitly add Parks and Conservation reserves as key areas to have aesthetics considered.</p> <p>Change table to explicitly list Parks and Conservation reserves as examples of identified sensitive landscape areas where aesthetics will be considered.</p>	Parks and conservation reserves will be included in Table 4-4 as examples of sensitive landscape areas where aesthetics will be considered.	Table 4-4	Table 4-4 revised to include parks and conservation reserves.
12				<p>Section 4.2.4, Table 4-4, Component 'Aesthetics'</p> <p>Notes that visual disturbance will be assessed at "key areas" which at any 'sensitive landscape areas'. While the intent is good, the wording seems vague.</p> <p>It is unclear if provincial parks and conservation reserves would be included in the assessment. Will viewscape analysis be conducted where developments are proposed adjacent to existing infrastructure?</p> <p>The recreational features (e.g. canoe routes, campsites, shore lunch sites, designated access points) within provincial parks and conservation reserves should be included with the definition of 'key areas', and viewscape analysis completed, as noted.</p>	The ToR will be revised so that the recreational features within provincial parks and conservation reserves, based on publicly available data, are included with the definition of 'key areas'. The inclusion of these features in the assessment of visual effects in the EA will be considered.	Section 4.2.4, Table 4-4	Section 4.2.4 and Table 4-4 revised to include recreational features within provincial parks and conservation reserves as 'key areas'.
13				<p>Section 4.3.1, Table 4-5 Feature 'Provincial Parks, Conservation Reserves and ANSIs'</p> <p>The environmental impacts and mitigations must be documented and provided to Ontario Parks for assessment as required in Section 20/21.</p> <p>In second bullet point add visitor experience to list of values being protected.</p> <p>At the ToR stage please identify that S. 20 & S.21 requirements are understood and that these sections will be considered at the EA stage for corridor alignment within a PP or CR.</p>	<p>Table 4-5 is an initial list of potential effects of the Project and provided for general information purposes only.</p> <p>Potential impacts and effects of the project associated with provincial parks, conservation reserves and ANSIs will be described in the EA giving consideration to Section 20 and 21 requirements.</p> <p>ToR to be revised to include "visitor experience" as a potential Project effect.</p>	Table 4-5	Table 4-5 revised to include "effects to visitor experience" under Provincial Parks, Conservation Reserves and ANSIs.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
14				<p>At the EA stage, please consider the conditions under PPCRA S.20 & S.21 and ensure enough detail is supplied at the EA stage of the project that will allow MECP/OP to be satisfied that decommissioning plans (S.20) as well the 3 conditions of S. 21 are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no reasonable alternatives. 2. Lowest cost is not the sole or overriding justification. 3. Environmental impacts have been considered and all reasonable measures will be undertaken to minimize harmful environmental impact and to protect ecological integrity. <p>In second bullet point add visitor experience to list of values being protected.</p> <p>Ontario Parks requests that these details and considerations be presented in a separate appendix within the EA.</p> <p>Section 4.3.2, Table 4-6 Discipline: 'Provincial and Municipal Policy'</p> <p>Reference to 'provincial parks and protected areas'. This is a change in language within the document; previously in the document reference has been made to 'provincial parks, conservation reserves and ANSIs' or 'provincial parks, conservation reserves and other protected areas' (page 40). Changes in terminology is confusing and has potential to be unclear.</p> <p>Please ensure consistent terminology is used throughout ToR and subsequent EA.</p>	The ToR will be revised with consistent terminology regarding references to provincial parks, conservation reserves, ANSIs and other protected areas.	Section 4.3.2, Table 4-6	Wording revised throughout ToR to provide additional clarity.
15				<p>Section 5.1.1.2 Access Roads / page 66</p> <p>There is no distinction between construction of and decommissioning of roads within protected areas such as Provincial Parks (PP) and Conservation Reserves (CR), and road construction and decommissioning outside of protected areas</p> <p>In order for construction of new access roads into a protected area (PP or CR) to occur, approval under Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act (PPCRA) S.20 and S.21 is required. Approval through S. 20 & S.21 is required prior to permitting.</p> <p>Any new access that is created within provincial parks and/or conservation reserves should be concentrated to within the RoW. New road development is not supported by most management direction, as developments should be minimised and avoid protected area lands whenever possible (Ontario Provincial Park Policy 1992).</p> <p>At the ToR stage please identify that S. 20 & S.21 requirements are understood and that these sections will be considered at the EA stage for roads within a PP or CR.</p> <p>At the EA stage, please consider the conditions under PPCRA S.20 & S.21 and provide details such as whether roads will be temporary or permanent and how temporary roads and other associated road infrastructure will be decommissioned once construction has concluded.</p> <p>Please ensure enough detail is supplied at the EA stage of the project that will allow MECP/OP to be satisfied that the 3 conditions of S. 21 are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no reasonable alternatives. 2. Lowest cost is not the sole or overriding justification. 3. Environmental impacts have been considered and all reasonable measures will be undertaken to minimize harmful environmental impact and to protect ecological integrity. <p>Ontario Parks requests that these details and considerations be presented in a separate appendix within the EA.</p>	<p>The concerns expressed regarding the development of new roads within a provincial park or conservation reserve are understood. New roads in these areas would only be proposed if there are no other alternatives. The details requested will be provided in the EA as a separate appendix.</p> <p>Section 5.1.1.2 to be revised to indicate that Ontario Parks has expressed concerns regarding the potential development of new access roads in provincial parks and conservation reserves.</p> <p>As indicated in previous response, ToR to be revised to reference PPCRA S.20 & 21 requirements.</p>	Section 5.1.1.2	Section 5.1.1.2 revised to indicate that Ontario Parks has expressed concerns regarding the potential development of new access roads in provincial parks and conservation reserves.
16				<p>Section. 6.2.1.3 / page 81</p> <p>The consideration of alternatives is a required consideration for any utility line or ancillary infrastructure within a provincial park or conservation reserve, as per PPCRA section 20 and 21.</p> <p>At the EA stage, please consider the conditions under PPCRA S.20 & S.21 and ensure enough detail is supplied at the EA stage of the project that will allow MECP/OP to be satisfied that decommissioning plans (S.20) as well the 3 conditions of S. 21 are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no reasonable alternatives. 2. Lowest cost is not the sole or overriding justification. 3. Environmental impacts have been considered and all reasonable measures will be 	Comments noted and will be considered in the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				undertaken to minimize harmful environmental impact and to protect ecological integrity. Ontario Parks requests that these details and considerations be presented in a separate appendix within the EA.			
17				Section 6.2.2 / page 85 See comment above (16) regarding consideration of Section 20 and 21 requirements of the PPCRA for 'alternatives' The term "sensitive land uses" does not appear in the glossary. There are a few land uses that are identified in the text that would assist in defining the types of uses defined as 'sensitive'. These land uses seem quite broad from residential, traditional and heavy industrial. Would protected areas be considered a 'sensitive land use'? See action in comment 16. Please add 'sensitive land use' to glossary to define what uses are categorised as 'sensitive' as this term seems very broad as written.	The term "sensitive land use" is defined in Table 6-4 and includes lands such as First Nation reserves, residences and built-up areas, agricultural lands, forest management areas, mining claims, etc.. The definition will be added to the ToR glossary.	Glossary	Glossary definitions updated to provide additional clarity.
18				Section 6.2.2 Table 6-4 / page 87 Factor: Socioeconomic Protected areas are not represented within the table, despite early mention of protected areas will be avoided in route selection. Similarly, there is consideration given in the rules to 'recreational properties'; however the avoidance or consideration of recreational features on the routing selection should also be considered. In the ToR and EA, please include the following in routing considerations and rules for minimizing disturbance to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected areas (including provincial parks, conservation reserves) Hiking trails Canoe routes and portages Campsites Other recreational infrastructure (boat launches, shore lunch sites, etc.)	The alternative routes identification criteria were established through a workshop held with provincial agencies including the MECP and MNRF. The features noted in the comment, including protected areas, hiking trails, canoe routes and portages and campsites, will be considered in route evaluation and refinement to be undertaken in the EA.	Appendices	Criteria updated to include these features.
19				Section 6.2.2.3 / page 96 (paragraph 1; line 3) The term 'protected area' is used - this is not defined in the glossary. This is the first occurrence of an EMA being grouped with provincial parks and conservation reserves. Is White Otter Enhanced Management Area being defined as a protected area, if so please define it as such and remain consistent. Other references have been made to 'provincial parks, conservation reserves and ANSIs, which leads the reader to believe these are 'protected areas' but are not clearly defined as such. In the ToR please add clarity to definition of 'protected area' and define in the glossary.	The definition of 'protected area' will be added to the ToR glossary.	Glossary	Glossary updated to include definition of 'protected area'.
20				Section 6.2.2.3 / page 96 (Bulleated section 3 alternative descriptions) These are good descriptions of the segmented alternatives. The way they are written differs from each alternative and should be consistent for clarity and transparency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Alternative 3A</u> does not mention the necessary crossing of any provincial park or conservation reserve (or enhanced management area [EMA]). <u>Alternative 3B</u> identifies the need to cross Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Park, and explicitly avoids Campus Lake CR and the White Otter EMA (which is not referenced in Alternative 3A). The Crossing of East Wabigoon CR is not mentioned as being required. <u>Alternative 3C</u> identifies the need to cross Turtle River-White Otter Lake PP and East Wabigoon CR, and the avoidance of Campus Lake CR and White Otter EMA. These routes (3B and 3C) may in fact be reversed or references confused as 3C is noted as crossing East Wabigoon CR,	The description of the routes in the ToR is for general information only. The information provided is not intended to be comparative. The routes will be assessed and compared in the EA on the basis of the same set of criteria and indicators. Description of Route 3C in the ToR was revised to address comment and match routing nomenclature on the figure.	Section 6.2.2.3	Routing description updated.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				yet on the map it's 3B that crosses, and 3B has a road label along it which reads 'Snake Bay Road', which is confusing. Please ensure consistency between comparisons of alternatives crossing provincial parks, conservation reserves (and enhanced management areas), and provide the same analysis/comparison of area crossed in alternative for 3A (crosses Campus lake CR, Turtle River-White Otter Lake [and EMA]).			
21				Section 6.2.2.4 (Paragraph 2; line 6) This section provides rationale as to why the consideration of consolidating utility corridors is not considered south of Thunder Lake. One of those reasons is the 'congestion' of infrastructure. Another consideration can be made that the majority of this area is regulated as Aaron Provincial Park, and previously provincial parks were being avoided as possible. Add the existence of Aaron Provincial Park as rationale for avoiding the utility corridor alternatives south of Thunder Lake.	The presence of Aaron Provincial Park as rationale for avoiding the utility corridor alternatives south of Thunder Lake will be included in Section 6.2.2.4 of the ToR.	Section 6.2.2.4	Section 6.2.2.4 revised to include reference to Aaron Provincial Park.
22				Sections 6.3 & 6.4 / page 103 Several terms are used in these sections, such as 'sensitive or valued features' and 'designated natural areas'. As these terms can be interpreted in different ways by various audiences, please add definitions to glossary.	Wording changes will be made throughout the ToR to provide additional clarification.	Glossary	Wording changes made throughout the ToR to provide additional clarification.
23				Section 6.4 Refinement of Preferred Route / page 104 Good brief discussion on possible avoidance of protected areas. This section notes that routing may consider environmental, social, economic and technical aspects. Section 21 conditions, which are required if crossing a provincial park or conservation reserve, require that financial reasons cannot be the sole or overriding factor in route selection. ToR could detail that the EA will include details for route selection as it relates to S. 20 & S. 21 of the PPCRA. S.20 & S.21 approval is required prior to permitting Please include details in the ToR of how route alternatives will include consideration of PPCRA S. 20 & S. 21. Please also include that further details will be in the EA, regarding PPCRA S. 20 & S. 21 conditions of approval. Ontario Parks requests that all information related to the consideration of conditions identified in Section 20 and 21 of the PPCRA be contained within the EA.	The selection of the preferred route will be based on a full set of evaluation criteria and indicators that consider the full definition of the environment. A preliminary list of these criteria and indicators was presented in Appendix B. Hydro One will develop the final evaluation criteria and indicators with the input of interested agencies including Ontario Parks and other interested agencies and persons. This can include criteria to reflect S. 20 & S. 21 of the PPCRA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
24				Figure 6.4 Section 1 Lakehead TS to Mackenzie TS: Eastern Section Mapping error? Route 1 at far west end of map veers north when it should veer south. Please verify	The mapping error in Figure 6.4 of the ToR has been corrected.	Figure 6-4	Updated Section 1 route alignment in Figure 6-4.
25				Section 7.1 Table 7-1 / page 106 While provincial parks and conservation reserves are noted in the 'natural environment' factor, will recreational uses occurring within those areas be considered in the socio-economic factor as well (e.g. economy, land and resource use)? Please also consider provincial parks and conservation reserve values from a recreational and social aspect (e.g. visitor experience, viewscape, etc), which also may vary by time of use/seasonality, and not only from a natural feature perspective.	Potential effects to recreational uses in provincial parks and conservation areas will be considered in the EA. This would include consideration of economic and land use perspectives.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
26				Section 11.1.5 Table 11-1 Other Relevant Provincial Legislation, Permits, Approvals and Authorizations / page 143	Table 11-1 of the ToR will be updated to include:	Table 11-1	Table 11-1 updated to include

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Ontario Parks, part of MECP is responsible for Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves (PPs & CRs), or "protected areas".</p> <p>The following MECP permits should be listed in Table 11-1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Permits issued under the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves Act (PPCRA) will be required for the clearing of land (cutting of trees), the construction of access roads, including associated water crossings, construction of the transmission line, or any other feature within the boundaries of the PP or CR. • Land Use Permits will be required to provide Occupational Authority for the transmission line RoW and roads, including roads infrastructure such as bridges and culverts, outside the transmission line RoW that are still within the protected area boundary. <p>Research Authorizations from Ontario Parks (under O. Reg 347/07 Section 2 (2) and/or under O. Reg. 319/07 Section 2 (2) of the PPCRA) will be required to provide access within Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves for the inventorying, monitoring, or researching of values (e.g., life-science, earth-science, cultural).</p> <p>Please ensure Table 11-1 is updated to include the requirement for Work Permits for the clearing, construction of RoW within a PP and/or CR (protected area), under "MECP".</p> <p>Please ensure Table 11-1 is updated to include the need for Land Use Permits for the RoW plus any additional infrastructure outside the RoW boundary but still within the protected area.</p> <p>Please ensure Table 11-1 is updated to include the requirement for research authorizations under MECP agency (note – related bullet is currently under MNRF agency incorrectly along with other provincial park and conservation reserve bullets that should be moved from MNRF to MECP).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for Work Permits for the clearing and construction of ROW within a provincial park and/or conservation reserve (protected area), under MECP. • The need for Land Use Permits for the ROW, plus any additional infrastructure outside the RoW boundary but still within the protected area. • The requirement for research authorizations under MECP. 		<p>additional noted permits and authorizations that may be required as noted in the comment.</p>
27				<p>Appendix B-5 Criteria: Recreation and Tourism The number and area of recreational trails and campgrounds is valid; however will these criteria also include canoe routes, backcountry campsites (not within campground), shore launch sites, and other recreational features (e.g. boat launches, etc)?</p> <p>Land Information Ontario is a data source that is not noted for recreational trails and campgrounds.</p> <p>Please consider other recreational features that are not presently notes in list of indicators. Recommended are the existence of canoe routes, portages, backcountry campsites and other recreational features for addition to the indicator column under the Recreation and Tourism Criteria.</p> <p>Please add LIO database as the possible data source for this information, as well as recreational trails.</p>	<p>The additional recommended indicators will be added to the criteria and indicators list and used in the alternative route evaluation where publicly available data exists.</p>	<p>Appendices</p>	<p>Recommended indicators added to the criteria and indicators list.</p>
<p>Drinking Water and Environmental Compliance Division: Northern Region</p>							
1				<p>Section 4.2.2.9 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases</p> <p>The draft ToR states that a quantitative assessment of air quality emissions is not anticipated to be required since only temporary construction-related air emissions are anticipated. It should be noted that potential air quality effects associated with construction activities are expected. A quantitative assessment should be conducted to assess whether potential air quality effects due to the project are significant, especially for sensitive receptors near the transmission line routes.</p> <p>In addition to the assessment of possible impacts of climate change on the project including adaptation, quantitative assessment of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the project should also be conducted.</p> <p>It is recommended that an air quality work plan including GHG emissions be developed in consultation with government agencies as early as possible.</p>	<p>The ToR will be updated to indicate that a quantitative assessment will be completed for air quality and greenhouse gas during construction.</p> <p>A work plan will also be developed in consultation with government agencies.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2.9</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2.9 to be updated as follows:</p> <p>Air quality in the Study Area is generally influenced by local sources as well as long-range transport of contaminants from other regions. Potential air emission sources</p>





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Note in the ToR that construction-related air emissions will be assessed during the EA. Include a commitment in the ToR for an air quality work plan including GHG emissions be developed in consultation with government agencies as early as possible.</p>			<p>include mining and other industrial operations, as well as vehicular traffic. Data used to characterize current air quality and climate conditions in the area is anticipated to be obtained from ECCC National Air Pollution Surveillance Program (NAPS) air monitoring stations (e.g., Thunder Bay Station). The specific NAPS air monitoring stations used to obtain air quality and climate conditions will be confirmed during the EA once additional Project information becomes available. Air quality criteria, standards and objectives in Ontario have been established by MECP and federally by ECCC. The purpose of air quality objectives and standards is to protect against adverse effects on health and the environment.</p> <p>The EA will document general baseline conditions for air quality in the area and climate normal using secondary information and the data from representative air quality monitoring. Given the nature of this Project, only temporary construction-related air emissions are anticipated.</p> <p>A quantitative assessment of air quality emissions</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>associated with construction activities will be completed. Key air quality parameters to be considered in the dispersion modelling are carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x) expressed as NO and NO₂, total suspended particulate (TSP), particulate less than or equal to 10 µm in aerodynamic diameter (PM₁₀) and particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 µm in diameter (PM_{2.5}), as well as greenhouse gases (GHGs). Vehicle exhaust emission rates will be calculated using published emission factors for non-road vehicles and the United States' Environmental Protection Agency Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator for haul trucks. Emissions from fugitive dust generated by the vehicle movements and material handling activities during construction will be calculated using published emission factors.</p> <p>The assessment would be completed using a concentration profile method to assess the air quality emissions from construction activities in the area. This will provide predicted air concentrations at regular distances away from the transmission line</p>





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>(e.g., predict concentrations at specified distances, out to a maximum of 2 km from the preferred route ROW). This method will increase efficiency by eliminating the need to identify all sensitive receptors in the study areas and will permit stakeholders to assess the potential effects of construction activity at any receptor, provided the distance from the transmission line is known.</p> <p>Like air quality, GHGs in the Study Area are influenced by local sources as well as long-range transport of GHGs from outside the Project Footprint. Due to the long-lived nature of GHGs and long-range transport, GHGs will be considered at a provincial and national level. Data used to characterize current GHG emission levels is anticipated to be obtained from the National Inventory Report 1990 – 2017 developed by ECCC and will be used to document the baseline conditions for GHGs in the area. For similar reasons to air quality, a quantitative assessment of GHG emissions associated with construction activities (including land clearing) will be completed.</p>





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>Annual GHG emissions from the Project will be quantified for the construction phase using the methodology consistent with the provincial and federal GHG reporting regulations, with preference given to provincial methodology where more than one methodology is available. These emissions will be compared to the provincial and federal emissions inventories to assess the relative contribution of the Project. The emissions from the operation phase of the Project will be qualitatively assessed in comparison to the construction emissions. Qualitative discussion will be provided on reducing GHG emissions through the reduction in reliance on diesel-based power generation, informed by studies completed for similar projects.</p> <p>The overall assessment of GHGs will have regard to the recently released Strategic Assessment of Climate Change (Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2020) guidance document that was released to look at carbon sinks and how the Project will benefit</p>





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>contribute to Ontario and Canada meeting its international obligations, including a plan to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050.</p> <p>In addition to the description of climate normals as baseline, Hydro One also commits to include in the EA a description of how the climate is projected to change in the Study Area based on available secondary source information.</p> <p>Desktop and field studies will be subject to consultation with Indigenous communities for their input and the studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities.</p> <p>The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.</p>
2				<p>Groundwater – General</p> <p>MECP hydrogeologist is satisfied with the study area and the methods to be used to assess groundwater impacts and well interference</p> <p>No action required</p>	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
3				<p>Surface Water – General</p> <p>Please see July 30, 2020 memorandum prepared by Scott Parker, Surface Water Specialist Incorporate recommendations into ToR and EA</p>	The EA will include a description of recommended environmental protection measures including the best management practices outlined in the provided letter. A commitment to develop a more detailed Environmental Protection Plan as part of the detail design phases will be included in the EA. Field surveys at representative waterbody crossings will be completed in 2021 and 2022 to support the EA and potential permitting. More details on	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
4				<p>It is recommended that an Environmental Protection Plan is developed for the project that summarizes mitigation measures and a strategy for their effective implementation. Inspection, monitoring, and follow-up should occur throughout the Project duration to evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures and modify or enhance measures as necessary through adaptive management. Due to the variability of water crossings and ancillary areas, the proposed construction mitigation measures presented in the plan does not need to be site specific except near waterbody crossings identified as a potentially sensitive receiver or area of concern.</p> <p>Confirmatory field sampling/testing of bed and bank materials near waterbody crossings of concern or in sensitive areas may be required. The collection and sampling of stream water to characterize background water quality for locations of concern prior to commencing construction activities at the site may also be required. In these cases, samples should be analyzed for the following parameters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pH, conductivity, alkalinity, turbidity, total suspended solids, total dissolved solids, cations, anions, total metals; and Field temperature and dissolved oxygen measurements. <p>MECP Permits and Approvals – General</p> <p>1. Environmental Protection Act - Air and Noise ECA Likely required for any off-grid diesel generators, possibly aggregate crushers. These approvals are subject to a one-year service standard from application date.</p> <p><i>It is also possible that generators can be approved through an Environmental Activity Sector Registry (EASR).</i></p> <p>2. Ontario Water Resources Act – Sewage Works Approval</p> <p>Any work camp with sewage effluent over 10,000 L/day requires a section 53 approval from the MECP. If contractors are retained to handle this aspect, they must have an acceptable ECA.</p> <p><i>These approvals are subject to a one-year service standard from application date. Other similar projects have had issues with this aspect, it is critical to plan and line up equipment and approvals as soon as possible.</i></p> <p>3. Environmental Protection Act - HWIN Registration/ Waste Management System ECA</p> <p><i>If transporting/handling waste, a waste management system approval is required (in some situations can be approved through an EASR). Also, HWIN registration for subject (hazardous and liquid wastes).</i></p> <p>4. Ontario Water Resources Act – Permit to Take Water</p> <p><i>For situations where over 50,000 L of water are taken per day.</i></p> <p><i>Update Section 11.0 (Other Permits, Approvals and Authorizations)</i></p>	<p>these surveys will be provided in the 2021-2022 Field Work Plan which will be submitted to Indigenous communities and applicable agencies for review and comment.</p> <p>Section 11 of the ToR will be updated to include reference to these other potential permit requirements.</p>	Section 11	Section 11 includes the listing of the additional noted permits that may be required for the Project.
Environmental Assessment and Permission Division: Environmental Assessment Branch							
1				<p>Section 4.1 Study Area / page 18</p> <p>To avoid confusion, if the Preliminary Study Area and the Route Selection Study Area are the same, one name should be used.</p> <p>Use one name for the Preliminary Study Area/Route Selection Study Area</p>	<p>The draft ToR indicated the following:</p> <p>Following the initial pre-consultation activities, the Study Area was renamed as the Route Selection Study Area (RSSA) and was used for the purpose of identifying route alternatives. More information on this is provided in Section 6.0.</p> <p>ToR to be revised to change Preliminary Study Area to Route Selection Study Area.</p>	Section 4.1	<p>Section 4.1 revised to change Preliminary Study Area to Route Selection Study Area.</p> <p>Also removed this paragraph:</p> <p>Following the initial pre-consultation activities, the Study Area was renamed as the Route Selection Study Area (RSSA) and was used for the purpose of identifying route alternatives. More information on this is provided in</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
2				<p>Section 4.2 Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology / page 20</p> <p>This section notes that fieldwork may be undertaken to support the alternative route evaluation during the EA. Can the ToR describe how Hydro One will determine the fieldwork necessary to support the evaluation of alternative routes? Will the government review team and Indigenous communities have an opportunity to provide input on field studies, work plans and study areas for specific disciplines?</p> <p>The draft ToR also notes that field work is planned for 2021 and 2022 once a preferred route is determined and additional project planning is underway. Can Hydro One include a preliminary list of field studies and analyses that will be carried as part of the EA to further the description of the environment in the EA (characterize baseline environment), evaluate alternative routes as well as assess the impacts of the preferred route?</p> <p>Provide a preliminary list of studies that will be carried out during the EA.</p> <p>Include commitment in the ToR that government review agencies, Indigenous communities and stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide input on discipline-specific study areas, proposed work plans and field studies at the beginning of the EA process.</p>	<p>The ToR will be updated to include a preliminary list of the field surveys proposed for 2021 and 2022. These surveys will be described in more detail as part of a 2021-2022 Field Work Plan that will be submitted to Indigenous communities and applicable agencies for review and comment. The preliminary 2021 and 2022 surveys include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife field surveys to collect species-specific information along the preferred route; • Vegetation surveys, specifically Ecological Land Classification and botanical surveys with a focus on relevant SAR species, rare species, invasive plants, and traditionally used plants; • Fish and fish habitat field surveys to obtain site-specific field data at a subset of representative waterbody crossings to verify or augment the results and assumptions from the aerial reconnaissance and desktop review; and, • Surface water surveys to document observed waterbody conditions at a subset of representative waterbody crossings. 	Section 4.2	Section 6.0. Updated list included in the ToR.
3				<p>Section 4.2.2.1 Physiography, Geology, Surficial Geology and Soils / page 23</p> <p>A map would complement the descriptions of the Ecoregions and Ecodistricts that comprise of the Study Area:</p> <p>Include a map of the Ecoregions and Ecodistricts within the Study Area in the ToR.</p>	<p>The ToR will be revised to include a map of the Ecoregions and Ecodistricts within the Study Area.</p>	Section 4.2.2.1	New map included of Ecoregions and Ecodistricts within the study area.
4				<p>Section 4.2.2.9 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases / page 50</p> <p>In addition to the description of climate normals as baseline, the EA should describe how climate is expected to change during the operational period of the transmission line.</p> <p>Include a commitment in the ToR to describe the forecasted change in climate or climate trends in the in the EA.</p>	<p>The ToR will be updated with a commitment that the EA include a description of how the climate is projected to change in the study area based on available secondary source information.</p>	Section 4.2.2.9	Section 4.2.2.9 includes commitment to include in EA a description of how the climate is projected to change in the study area based on available secondary source information.
5				<p>Section 4.2.2.10 Acoustic Environment</p> <p>Additional description of how the acoustic environment will be described in the EA would be helpful. The EA should describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current noise conditions (along the transmission line route corridors); • activities/sources that could impact noise and vibration and effects on existing conditions; • any sensitive receptors and the project's potential noise and vibration impacts on present and future sensitive receptors; • noise and vibration impacts that could arise from this project during both construction and operation; and potential mitigation measures. <p>Include more information on how general acoustic environment will be further described in the EA and a commitment in the ToR to develop a noise work plan in consultation with government agencies, Indigenous communities and interested stakeholders.</p>	<p>A work plan will be developed to describe the approach for the acoustic assessment in consultation with government agencies, Indigenous communities and interested stakeholders.</p>	Section 4.2.2.10	The ToR will be revised to include a commitment to develop a noise work plan in consultation with government agencies. This work plan will include general information about how the acoustic environment will be further described in the EA.
6				<p>Section 4.2.4 Summary of Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment Table 4.4 / page 55</p> <p>It would be helpful identify studies that will be completed to describe the existing environment in detail, and studies that will be completed to support the evaluation of alternative routes and the assessment of the preferred route.</p> <p>Improve Table 4.4 to show the studies that will completed to collect baseline data, evaluate</p>	<p>This will be addressed in the individual EA work plans to be prepared.</p>		Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
7				<p>alternative routes, and complete a detailed assessment of impacts of the preferred route.</p> <p>Section 4.2 Potential Project Effects</p> <p>Prior to the description of potential project effects it may be useful to provide an overview of scope of the project, its components, infrastructure involved etc.</p> <p>Move Section 5.1 Description of the Undertaking to after the section on the description of the environment and before the description of potential project effects.</p>	ToR to be revised to include in Section 4.3 a reference to Section 5.1 Description of the Project.	Section 4.3	Section revised to include a reference to Section 5.1 Description of the Project.
8				<p>Section 6.2.1 Identification of Alternative Corridors</p> <p>The sections that detail the EPRI-GTC Overhead Electric Transmission Line Siting process could be included as a supporting document to the ToR. Section 5.3.2 in the ToR Code of Practice outlines information that is typically included as supporting documents to the ToR.</p> <p>Provide the explanation of the EPRI-GTC Overhead Electric Transmission Line Siting process and the development of alternative routes as a supporting document to the ToR.</p>	The ToR will be revised to include a more detailed description of the EPRI-GTC Overhead Electric Transmission Line Siting process and the development of alternative routes in a supporting document.	Section 6.2.1	A supporting document was produced and appended.
9				<p>Section 6.3 Alternative Route Evaluation in the EA / page 103 Appendix B Preliminary List of Evaluation Criteria and Indicators</p> <p>Additional information would be beneficial in this section to outline the methodology/approach on how the alternative routes will be evaluated based on their potential effects on the environment. Will the EPRI-GTC siting process be used? Will the evaluation be completed by segment? How will alternative routes be systematically evaluated based on net environmental effects? How will the preliminary criteria, indicators and data sources in Appendix B be refined based on government agency, Indigenous community and stakeholder input?</p> <p>Provide additional information with respect to the methodology for evaluating alternative routes.</p> <p>Include a commitment in the ToR to refine alternative route evaluation criteria, indicators and data sources in consultation with government agencies, Indigenous community and stakeholder input.</p>	<p>Additional detail will be added to the ToR to describe the alternative route evaluation.</p> <p>ToR to be revised to include a commitment to refine alternative route evaluation criteria, indicators and data sources in consultation with government agencies, Indigenous community and stakeholder input.</p>	Section 6.3	Section 6.3 revised to include a commitment to refine alternative route evaluation criteria/indicators and data sources in consultation with government agencies, Indigenous community and stakeholder input.
10				<p>Section 7.0 Identification of Project Effects / pages 106-107</p> <p>Table 7-1 List of Key Natural and Socio-Economic Environment Considerations</p> <p>Table 7-1 does not appear to encompass all components (natural, social, economic, cultural and built environments) of the environment (referred to as factors in the table).</p> <p>One would expect that the same environmental components (outlined in Appendix B) would be considered but with more detailed environmental criteria and specific indicators, compared to the those for alternative route evaluation, to measure positive or negative changes/impacts to each environmental criterion.</p> <p>There is typo in the first bullet of page 107 "Determinate the significance of net effects and cumulative effects;"</p> <p>Append a preliminary list of impact assessment criteria to the ToR and mention that the EA will present the final list of criteria accompanied by the indicators that will identify how the potential environmental effects will be measured for each criterion and the data sources used.</p> <p>Correct typo on page 107</p>	<p>ToR to be revised to include in an appendix with proposed criteria for the net effects assessment of the preferred route. These criteria may be refined during the EA process.</p> <p>The error in the first bullet on page 107 of the ToR will be corrected.</p>	Section 7.1	<p>Section 7.1 revised to include reference to an appendix with proposed criteria for the net effects assessment of the preferred route.</p> <p>Corrected error.</p>
11				<p>Section 8.2 Project Effects and Compliance Monitoring / page 109</p> <p>As mentioned in section 5.2.8 of the ToR Code of Practice, the ToR should mention that the EA will include a comprehensive list of commitments made by the proponent during the ToR process, and indicate where or how they have been dealt with in the EA. The MECP encourages proponents to prepare this list of ToR commitments to be appended to the final ToR submission.</p> <p>In addition to effects monitoring, this section could more clearly state the commitment to compliance monitoring which is an assessment of whether an undertaking has been constructed, implemented and/or operated in accordance with the commitments made in the EA and the conditions of EA approval. The EA will need to provide a strategy that sets out how and when all commitments made in the environmental assessment will be fulfilled and how the proponent will report to the ministry about compliance.</p>	The ToR will include a list of commitments that the EA will fulfill including environmental effects monitoring and EA compliance monitoring commitments.	Section 8.1	Section references an appended list of commitments made in the ToR.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Provide a table with the list of commitments made during the ToR process to be appended to the formal ToR submission.</p> <p>Distinguish between environmental effects monitoring and EA compliance monitoring commitments in the ToR.</p>			
12				<p>Section 9.0 Consultation on the Terms of Reference / page 110 Record of Consultation</p> <p>The ToR is a stand-alone document. Although the draft ToR record of consultation details the consultation activities that took place during the preparation of the ToR, section 9.0 of the ToR should include an overview of those activities, describe key comments received, and how the input was incorporated into the preparation of the ToR or how it will be addressed during the preparation of the EA.</p> <p>Section 5.3.1 of the ToR Code of Practice outlines the information that should be included the record of consultation. The ToR record of consultation should also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> describe of the proponent’s response and how concerns were considered in the development of the ToR; describe of any outstanding concerns; include minutes of any meetings held with interested persons; and include copies of written comments received from interested persons. <p>The record of consultation would also include correspondence from government ministries/agencies such as letters delegating the procedural aspects of the Crown’s duty to consult, and comment submissions.</p> <p>Summarize consultation activities, key comments received and how they were addressed by Hydro One in section 9.0 of the ToR.</p> <p>Include in the final record of consultation for the ToR copies of meeting minutes and correspondence/comment submissions from government ministries/agencies, Indigenous communities, and other stakeholders (including members of the public).</p>	<p>The ToR will include a summary of consultation undertaken during ToR process. The RoC will include key correspondence that occurred with government ministries/agencies, Indigenous communities, and other stakeholders (including members of the public).</p>	Section 9	Summary of consultation undertaken is included, as well as relevant correspondence and references to the RoC.
13				<p>Section 10 Environmental Assessment Consultation Plan</p> <p>Figure 10-1 Overview of the EA Regulatory Process and High-Level Consultation Activities / page 114</p> <p>Figure 10-1 notes that there is a minimum of seven-week comment period for the EA. The seven-week comment period is a fixed regulated timeline. There is flexibility for the comment period for the draft EA. Is there a timeline for draft EA review?</p> <p>The ministry carries out consultation after the submission of the EA. The last three steps in Figure 10-1 (MECP Review onwards) would be led by the ministry. The ministry publishes the Notice of Completion of Ministry Review which outlines the 5-week Ministry Review comment/hearing request period. However, Hydro One assistance would be requested to circulate this Notice to the project contact list. At the end of the 5-weeks, the Minister has 13 weeks to make a decision. The Notice of Approval to Proceed with the Undertaking is published on the Ontario.ca website after Cabinet approval of the Minister’s decision. Hydro One would also be asked to assist in notifying the project contact list of EA approval.</p> <p>Include a timeline for draft EA review. Clarify Hydro One’s role for the last three steps in Figure 10-1.</p>	<p>A timeline for draft EA review process will be included in the ToR. Hydro One’s role in the last three steps of Table 10-1 will be clarified.</p>	Section 10	Section 10 revised to include timeline for draft EA review. Hydro One’s role clarified.
14				<p>Section 10.5 Indigenous Engagement Plan</p> <p>Overall the Indigenous Consultation Plan for the EA is well-written and comprehensive. Please make sure for the final ToR that all key issues raised, including thorough comments on the draft ToR, are summarized in the main body of the ToR in one section or in each relevant section. For example, a summary of input that helped inform the consultation plan for the EA could be included as part of section 9.0 or 10.0 (e.g., page 111). At minimum, a cross-reference to the section of the record of consultation (RoC) that contains this information should be provided wherever needed to help guide the reader to see how consultation has informed the ToR, including specific section/page numbers where relevant information can be found in the ToR.</p>	<p>The ToR will include a summary of key issues raised by Indigenous communities during the ToR process.</p>	Section 9	Section 9 updated to include a summary of key issues raised by Indigenous communities during ToR process.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
15				<p>Summarize key issues raised and comments with proponent responses in section 9.0 or 10.0 of the ToR with cross-references to the RoC.</p> <p>Section 10.4 Monitoring and Follow-up / pages 113- 124</p> <p>It is good to include a mechanism for measuring/monitoring the effectiveness of the consultation and engagement program, but it is not clear if the approach referenced here will be applied to the Indigenous Engagement Program as well as the Stakeholder Consultation Program, and if the same criteria would apply to Indigenous Engagement Program.</p> <p>Clarify in the ToR if Hydro One will be monitoring the effectiveness of the Indigenous Engagement Program during the preparation of the EA using the approach in Section 10.4 of the draft ToR.</p>	The monitoring and follow-up program outlined in the draft ToR applies to both the Indigenous Community Engagement Plan as well as the Stakeholder Consultation Plan. Section 10.4 Monitoring and Follow-up will be moved to after Section 10.5 Indigenous Engagement Plan.	Section 10.4	Section 10.4 Monitoring and Follow-up to be moved to after 10.5 Indigenous Engagement Plan.
16				<p>Section 10.5 / page 124</p> <p>Previously in the draft ToR, the plan was referred to as the Indigenous Community Engagement Plan and is now called the Indigenous Engagement Plan – suggest making sure terminology is consistent.</p> <p>Ensure consistent terminology in the ToR</p>	The ToR will be revised to include consistent terminology, as noted.	Section 10	Section 10 includes consistent use of Indigenous Community Engagement Plan.
17				<p>Section 10.5/ page 127</p> <p>Please identify the MNO Regional Consultation Committees and their role in the consultation program/representation of MNO rights-holders.</p> <p>Identify the MNO Regional Consultation Committees and describe their consultation role in the ToR.</p>	This will be provided to the MECP under separate cover.	Section 10.5	N/A
18				<p>Section 10.5 /pages128-129</p> <p>Please clarify that you will provide opportunities and work with potentially affected Indigenous communities as identified by the Crown or that have otherwise asserted their rights or <u>expressed interest in the project (or effects of the project)</u>.</p> <p>Clarify if Hydro One will provide opportunities to Indigenous communities that express interest in the project or project effects as well.</p>	The ToR will be revised to clarify that Hydro One will provide opportunities to Indigenous communities that express interest in the Project or project effects.	Section 10.5	Section 10.4 revised to include clarity that Hydro One will provide opportunities to Indigenous communities that express interest in the Project or project effects.
19				<p>Section 10.5, Table 10-2 / pages 134-135</p> <p>There is quite a gap in time between summer 2021 and fall 2022. Presumably during this time there will be ongoing communication/activities (e.g., newsletters) - please consider including in this table activities that will be ongoing throughout the EA and/or indicating the expected frequency of newsletters, etc. to engage communities throughout.</p> <p>Include engagement activities that will be ongoing throughout the EA and their frequency in Table 10-2.</p>	Table to be revised to indicate that there will be ongoing engagement and consultation activities between summer 2021 and fall 2022.	Table 10-3	Table revised to indicate that there will be ongoing engagement and consultation activities between summer 2021 and fall 2022.
20				<p>Section 10.5 /page138</p> <p>It is not clear if the intention is to include a summary of key issues raised and how they have been or will be addressed in the main body of the EA (either in one section or in each relevant section) or if this will be contained in the RoC with cross-references in the EA. It is generally preferred that a summary or summaries be included in the main body of the EA. It is important for the reader to be able to see how any input they provided has been incorporated or addressed in the EA, including references to specific section/page numbers where relevant information can be found in the EA.</p> <p>Indicate in the ToR how the consultation summary will be presented in the EA (see section 4.3.7 Consultation Summary in MECP's EA Code of Practice).</p>	Section 10.5 (now 10.4 following changes noted above) to be revised to indicate how the consultation summary will be presented in the EA per EA Code of Practice Section 4.3.7 Consultation Summary.	Section 10.4	Section 10.4 revised to indicate how the consultation summary will be presented in the EA per EA Code of Practice Section 4.3.7 Consultation Summary.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade							
1	August 17, 2020	Email	Michael Helfinger, Senior Policy Advisor Corporate Policy Unit, Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade Phone/Text: 416.434.4799, michael.helfinger@ontario.ca	<p>The document notes in the Introduction that "Industrial activities in northwestern Ontario, particularly in the mining sector, are expected to drive strong electricity demand growth in the coming decades."</p> <p>Expansion in the mining sector has potentially positive supply-chain impacts extending beyond the immediate region; for example, creating opportunities for the mining equipment, steel, construction, and business/financial services sectors across Ontario and Canada.</p> <p>It could also assist certain manufacturers in securing access to strategic metals, for example, lithium for lithium-ion batteries powering electric vehicles.</p> <p>Our one suggestion is that the ToR's discussion of Land, Economy and Resource Use (Section 4.2.3.3) include a brief acknowledgment and commitment to describe/quantify broader supply-chain impacts of expansion mining and other resource sector activities in northwestern Ontario that would be facilitated by construction of the Waasigan Transmission Line.</p>	<p>The EA will identify potential cumulative effects with other reasonably foreseeable developments that may have effects that overlap spatially and temporally with the Project's effects. Reasonably foreseeable developments will include industrial, manufacturing and other projects that are under application review or that have officially entered a regulatory application process (i.e., where information is publicly available). It is beyond the scope of the EA to speculate on potential positive and negative effects of hypothetical developments or potential developments that are not yet in a public planning process. Further, new mining and resource sector activities will be required to secure their own regulatory approvals, which will include an assessment of potential environmental and socio-economic effects.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Jim Antler, Policy Advisor, Tourism Policy Unit, Heritage, Tourism and Culture Division, Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries							
1	August 14, 2020	Email	Jim Antler Policy Advisor Tourism Policy Unit Heritage, Tourism and Culture Division Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries 447 McKeown Avenue, Suite 203 North Bay, ON P1B 9S9 Tel/Cell: (705) 493-0880 Email: james.antler@ontario.ca	<p>Section 4.2.2.10 – Acoustic Environment</p> <p>This section states that specific acoustic/noise studies are not anticipated to be required as potential effects from the project are likely to be confined to the construction period and be temporary and transitory in nature.</p> <p>While acoustic impacts are predominately expected during the construction period, it is suggested that the project should identify sensitive receptors on the landscape and assess noise at those sites.</p> <p>This would be consistent with what normally happens during environmental assessments for mining projects.</p> <p>From a tourism perspective, if there are any tourism facilities or important tourism values located in proximity to the project (depending upon how the local and regional study areas are designated), there would be the option to assess potential noise concerns at those locations and develop mitigation if necessary.</p>	<p>As noted in Section 4.2.2.10 (Acoustic Environment), sensitive noise receptors will be identified as part of the EA. This includes any tourism facilities and any other important uses (e.g., residential, recreational, etc.). A net effects assessment will also be completed and will take into account any potential noise effects on these receptors as well as identify suitable mitigation measures to minimize the potential effects.</p> <p>“Temporary and transitory increase in noise emissions at human receptors during construction” is identified as a potential effect in Table 4.5 (Summary of Preliminary Potential Effects to Natural Environment).</p> <p>The potential for increased noise in the Project Footprint that may affect nearby residents and/or other sensitive land uses is also listed in the list of criteria and indicators and will form part of the alternative route assessment.</p> <p>Section 4.2.2.10 will be revised to clarify approach to the assessment of noise effects.</p> <p>Also note a noise work plan for the EA will be developed in consultation with Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations, to describe the approach for the acoustic assessment and supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities. It will describe the type of data that will be gathered and the assessment methodology with respect to the acoustic environment.</p>	Section 4.2.2.10	Section updated to indicate that a noise work plan will be developed in consultation with Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations.
2				<p>Section 4.2.3.1 – Provincial Policy</p> <p>This section advises consideration of Crown land activities in the EA will include users like mining claim holders, trapline holders and other Crown land tenure holders.</p> <p>Tourism operators are identified elsewhere in the draft EA as a stakeholder of interest, but not all tourism operators are Crown land tenure holders. This should be clarified in the final ToR.</p>	Clarification regarding Crown land tenure holdings will be made to the ToR.	Section 4.2.3.3	Section 4.2.3.3 revised as follows: Approximately 20 tourism operators have been identified as potentially having overlapping operating areas within the Study Area. <i>It is recognized that not all tourism operators are Crown land tenure holders.</i>
3				<p>Section 4.2.3.3 – Economy, Land and Resource Use</p> <p>The draft EA quotes tourism statistics from 2013 for Tourism Region 13c. Related 2017 statistics are as follows for the region as per the Ministry’s Regional Tourism Profiles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total person visits – 1.67 million; Person visits relating to any outdoor/sport activity – 779,218, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing – 292,717 Camping – 232,852 Canoeing – 186,433 Hunting – 29,741 Total visitor spending (pleasure) - \$141.19 million. <p>Note that the 2017 data only includes visitor and spending data for Ontario residents, other residents of Canada and Overseas visitors. The quality of the data describing the characteristics of US visitors to Ontario is particularly low and as such the ministry will not be releasing this information at the sub-provincial level after 2014.</p> <p>It is important to note that visitors from the United States are a key market for many resource-based tourism operations in Northwestern Ontario. Many establishments across the northwest traditionally have over 90% of their guests coming from the United States.</p> <p>This section also indicates that the proponent has identified about 20 tourism operators whose operating areas may overlap with the project study area. However,</p>	<p>As noted in the draft ToR, additional detail related to the economy, land and resource use will be provided in the EA as new information becomes available. The EA will include statistics, planning information, non-government sources and, if applicable, geospatial data. This information will be used to profile the general economy and its key sectors and will also include information on the United States, which is a key market for many resource-based tourism operators.</p> <p>Twenty was an approximation based on the information available at the time of ToR preparation. All identified potentially affected tourism stakeholders will be notified as part of the EA.</p> <p>The ToR will be updated to specify intent to map the locations of tourism stakeholders and their facilities in relation to the Project area.</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	Section 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) under the Tourism and Outfitters Operations sub-heading revised to include: These canoeing destinations as well as any others that are identified for tourism purposes, will be thoroughly reviewed and described in the EA along with any potential effects as a result of the Project.





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>only about 14 tourism operations are listed in the Other Stakeholders List in Appendix A of the associated draft EA Record of Consultation.</p> <p>All identified tourism stakeholders should be included in project-related correspondence by the proponent unless the stakeholders have indicated they do not need to be contacted further about the project.</p> <p>In addition, the final ToR should specify an intent to map the locations of tourism stakeholders and their facilities in relation to the project area.</p>			
4				<p>Section 4.2.4 – Summary of Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Table 4-4 provides an overview of the anticipated additional studies that will be carried out during the EA to better define existing environmental conditions.</p> <p>Under Economy, Land and Resource Use, the table outlines that key informant interviews will be undertaken (as possible) along with stakeholder engagement. We would encourage interviews with tourism businesses with an interest in the project so the proponent can directly understand the nature of business interests in the area and any related concerns about the project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Hydro One will be reaching out to tourism operations and businesses during the EA to complete interviews with those that are willing to participate.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered as part of the EA.</p>
5				<p>Section 4.3.2 – Potential Preliminary Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment</p> <p>Table 4-6, under Economy, Land and Resource Use, notes a potential project effect may be changes to access and resource availability. The final ToR and the EA should recognize that adding road access into areas previously road inaccessible could be a concern to tourism stakeholders if there are remote tourism interests in the area.</p>	<p>The ToR will be revised to indicate that adding road access into areas previously inaccessible by road could be a concern to tourism stakeholders if there are remote tourism interests in the area.</p>	Section 4.2.2.3	<p>The following was added to this Section 4.2.2.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) under the Tourism and Outfitters Operations sub-heading:</p> <p>It is also recognized that adding road access into areas previously inaccessible by road could be a concern to tourism stakeholders if there are remote tourism interests in the area.</p>
6				<p>Section 5.1.1.2 – Access Roads</p> <p>This section outlines that access roads related to the project will be assessed under the EA. The above comment is reinforced regarding potential of increased road access to impact remote tourism.</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to new access roads.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered as part of the EA.</p>
<p>Bob Freeman, Senior Program Advisor, Policy Branch, Sport, Recreation and Community Programs Division, MHSTCI</p>							
1	August 14, 2020	Email	<p>Bob Freeman Senior Program Advisor Policy Branch, Sport, Recreation and Community Programs Division, MHSTCI Freeman, Bob (MHSTCI) Bob.Freeman@ontario.ca 416 783-8878</p>	<p>We are pleased that Indigenous Knowledge (IK) will be used to support and strengthen the EA as it has relevance to all aspects of the environment and, as a result, obvious linkages to the assessments of all disciplines (e.g., fish and wildlife, water, culture, archaeology, etc.). (as noted on page 47 and following sections)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
2				<p>We note that potentially affected First Nation communities include Couchiching First Nation, Eagle Lake First Nation, Fort William First Nation, Mitaanijigamiing First Nation, Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation, Ojibway Nation of Saugeen, Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation, Lac La Croix First Nation, Lac Seul First Nation, Seine River</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
3				First Nation, and, Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation (Figure 4-1). Two of these communities are also listed below under the discussion of the CARA Program.			
4				The Division is pleased to note that two of its stakeholder groups participated in a working in June 2019 regarding Socio-economic impacts of the projects: Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs and Ontario Parks (noted on page 77)	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
5				The Division also notes that a number of northern Ontario Indigenous Communities are to be Engaged (page 127). A number of these are listed too under the discussion of the CARA Program	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
5				<p><u>Community Aboriginal Recreation Activator Program (CARA):</u></p> <p>Staff in the division administer The Community Aboriginal Recreation Activator (CARA) Program which provides First Nation communities with community-driven sport, recreation, and physical activities to enhance the quality of life for community members. Participating communities are provided with funding to hire an Activator. Each Activator creates a recreation plan to meet the needs in their local community, and facilitates and implements the plan, with the goal of enhancing the community's participation in sport and recreation. Some of the communities have received funding under the program since 2008.</p> <p>In 2016, approximately 21,000 participants attended programming in the following communities:</p> <p>CARA Communities 2019-21:</p> <p>ALDERVILLE FIRST NATION ALGONQUINS OF PIKWAKANAGAN FIRST NATION AUNDECK OMNI KANING FIRST NATION BATCHEWANA FIRST NATION OF OJIBWAYS CHIPPEWAS OF NAWASH UNCEDED FIRST NATION CHIPPEWAS OF SAUGEEN FIRST NATION CHIPPEWAS OF THE THAMES FIRST NATION CONSTANCE LAKE FIRST NATION CURVE LAKE FIRST NATION EABAMETOONG FIRST NATION GRASSY NARROWS FIRST NATION (ASUABPEESCHOSEEWAGONG NETUM ANISHINABEK) KINGFISHER LAKE FIRST NATION LAC SEUL FIRST NATION*** LONG LAKE # 58 FIRST NATION MISSISSAUGA FIRST NATION MITAANJIGAMING FIRST NATION*** MOHAWKS OF THE BAY OF QUINTE MOOSE CREE FIRST NATION NIBINAMIK FIRST NATION NIPISSING FIRST NATION OJIBWAYS OF ONIGAMING FIRST NATION ONEIDA NATION OF THE THAMES SACHIGO LAKE FIRST NATION SHESHEGAWANIING FIRST NATION (not currently registered) WASAUKSING FIRST NATION WEBEQUIE FIRST NATION</p>	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
6				These communities also receive ongoing support and mentorship from staff from the Ministry of Heritage, Tourism Sport and Culture Industries to support capacity building. We recognize the importance of having a stable and reliable source of power in order to provide programming such as that provided by CARA, as well as schools and other facilities. While most of the communities in the CARA Program fall well outside the jurisdiction outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference, at least two do, including LAC SEUL FIRST NATION and MITAANJIGAMIING FIRST NATION.	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
7				We would hope that considerations of potential routes for the hydro electric line include an assessment of the (positive) impacts of the project on these communities, and perhaps other area communities that cannot deliver such programming due to the lack of stable hydro-electric power. A precondition for a community offering a	The EA will identify and assess both positive and negative potential environmental Project effects (including net effects) on existing conditions and will identify mitigation measures to eliminate or minimize any adverse effects, and identify measures to enhance potential positive effects. This includes effects to Indigenous communities.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				program such as CARA is a stable power supply.	The Waasigan Transmission Line is a transmission project and the scope does not include upgrades to the distribution system. However, the Project will provide added capacity and reliability with respect to 230 kV transmission lines by providing contingencies during an outage which will benefit all existing and future customers in the area.		
Rosi Zirger, A/Heritage Advisor, Heritage Planning Unit, MHSTCI							
1	August 17, 2020	Emailed Letter Attachment to Emailed Letter	Rosi Zirger A/Heritage Advisor rosi.zirger@ontario.ca Heritage Planning Unit Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries Programs and Services Branch 401 Bay Street, Suite 1700 Toronto, ON M7A 0A7 Tel: 416. 314-7159	4.2.3.7 Cultural Heritage Resources As general comment and as we advised in our July 8, 2019 letter, under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (S&G), prepared pursuant to Section 25.2 of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA), which came into effect on July 1, 2010, all Ontario government ministries and public bodies that are prescribed under Ontario Regulation 157/10 must comply with the S&Gs. These S&Gs apply to property that is owned or controlled by the Crown in right of Ontario or by a prescribed public body. In addition to property owned or controlled (now or in the future) by Hydro One, it would also include, Provincial Parks (MECP), unpatented "Crown" lands (MNRF), Provincial Crown Land and/or Provincially Owned Private Land (IO).	The Project will adhere to all applicable laws and regulations, including Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (S&G).	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
2				4.2.3.7 Cultural Heritage Resources Archaeology This section states that a Stage 1 archaeological assessment is to be completed for the Project to identify areas of archaeological potential, and to provide recommendations for additional assessment (e.g., Stage 2 and Stages 3/4 assessments as necessary) for areas that display archaeological potential. While this addresses terrestrial (e.g. land-based) archeological assessment, the EA should also address areas where marine archaeological assessment may be necessary. If a marine archaeological assessment is warranted the marine archaeologist will require a separate license.	The Project is not expected to affect areas with marine archaeological potential; however, this will be further reviewed as part of the EA once additional Project-specific information becomes available.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered as part of the EA.
3				4.2.3.7 Cultural Heritage Resources Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes The heading should be revised to read: Built Heritage <u>Resources</u> and Cultural Heritage Landscapes. Additionally, the language throughout the Draft ToR (and subsequent EA reports), should be revised to read: Built Heritage <u>Resources</u> and Cultural Heritage Landscapes	The title change to Built Heritage Resources will be made to the ToR and will be incorporated into the EA.	Section 4.2.3.7	The heading changed to: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes Wording was also updated in other applicable sections of the ToR.
4				4.2.3.7 Cultural Heritage Resources Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes The first paragraph states that the anticipated that cultural heritage study reports will document known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, and will include information available from Indigenous communities, municipal officials and/or interested stakeholders (e.g., municipal heritage committees). • Please revise to read: built heritage resources (see comment #2) • In general, we concur with this approach. However, since the study area is largely in unorganized Districts heritage organizations or municipal heritage committees may be limited or not exist. Therefore, the cultural heritage study reports cannot rely only on available information. The technical study must include a field survey e.g. windscreen survey.	The suggested wording changes will be incorporated into the ToR. A windshield survey to support any cultural heritage study reports will be undertaken in the EA once additional Project-specific information becomes available and study areas are confirmed.	Section 4.2.3.7	Section 4.2.3.7 revised with wording changes related to 'built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes' will be made throughout the ToR. Commitment to complete a "windshield survey" in the EA also made.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
5				<p>4.2.3.7 Cultural Heritage Resources Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</p> <p>The second paragraph outlines the proposed cultural heritage assessment activities that will document any known and potential cultural heritage resources (this should read: built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes) which include, Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions report (CHEC) and a preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA).</p> <p>The preliminary HIA may include additional recommendations for further property-specific Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs) and/or property-specific HIAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please revise the language to refer to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. "Cultural heritage resources" is an umbrella term which would also include archeological resources. 	<p>The suggested wording changes related to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will be incorporated into the ToR.</p>	Section 4.2.3.7	Section 4.2.3.7 revised in relation to wording changes related to 'built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes'.
6				<p>4.2.3.7 Cultural Heritage Resources Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes</p> <p>It appears that the proposed Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions (CHEC) report and a preliminary Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be undertaken as two separate reports. We refer to our comments of July 8, 2019, and acknowledge that at that time, we recommended that the existing conditions could be completed to inform corridor selection, with the preliminary impacts report completed at the EA phase. However, at that time Hydro One advised that it was impractical to undertake that level of study for corridor selection phase.</p> <p>Therefore, consistent with our July 8, 2019 advice we recommend that a Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment report be undertaken, as a single report, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Identify existing baseline cultural heritage conditions</u> which would include a historical summary of the development of the study area and will identify all known or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes in the study area. MHSCTI screening criteria should be used to assist with this identification: Criteria for Evaluating for Potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes. • <u>Identify preliminary potential project-specific impacts</u> on the known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes that have been identified. The report should include a description of the anticipated impact to each known or potential built heritage resource or cultural heritage landscape that has been identified. • <u>Propose and recommend measures to avoid or mitigate potential negative impacts</u> to known or potential built heritage resource or cultural heritage landscape. The proposed mitigation measures are to inform the next steps of project planning and design. <p>Where a known or potential built heritage resource or cultural heritage landscape are present and may be directly and adversely impacted¹, and where it has not yet been evaluated for Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI), completion of a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) will be required to fully understand its CHVI and level of significance. If a built heritage resource or cultural heritage landscape is found to be of CHVI, then a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be undertaken by a qualified person, and in consultation with MTCS and the proponent.</p> <p>We note that the Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment report is consistent with Hydro One's Cultural Heritage Identification and Evaluation Process (Dec 2019) approved by MHSTCI in Feb 2020. If Hydro One or its consultant would like have guidance on the content or level of</p>	<p>Comment noted. Scope of technical heritage studies will be discussed with MHSTCI during the EA.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered as part of the EA.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>detail to be include in this report, we would be happy to provide further guidance.</p> <p>Additionally, technical heritage studies would be undertaken by a qualified person(s) who has expertise, recent experience, and knowledge relevant to the type of cultural heritage resources being considered and the nature of the activity being proposed. For example, a licensed archaeologist would undertake the archaeological assessments; whereas the consultant(s) undertaking the Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment would be expected to demonstrate expertise and knowledge related to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.</p> <p><i>1 A direct adverse impact would have a permanent and irreversible negative effect on the cultural heritage value or interest of a property or result in the loss of a heritage attribute on all or part of the property. Examples include but are not limited to: removal or demolition of a heritage attribute, land disturbance, alterations that are not sympathetic to the CHVI of the property, introduction of new elements that diminish the integrity of the property, changing the character of the property, intensification of the property without conservation of heritage attributes.</i></p>			
7				<p>Section 4.2.4 – Summary of Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Table 4-4 provides an overview of the anticipated additional studies that will be carried out during the EA to better define existing environmental conditions.</p> <p>Under Aesthetics, the table outlines how visual impacts of the project are to be considered as they relate to viewpoints, aesthetic appeal and character of a specific area. We note that in some cases, the cultural heritage value or interest of built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes, may be related to a viewpoint, vista or other visual connection e.g. a landmark. In these cases, we would encourage that the “Aesthetic” criteria be applied to applicable built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes.</p>	<p>The potential for visual impacts will be considered in the assessment of effects on built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes and landmarks. This will be addressed as part of the net effects assessment to be completed in the EA.</p> <p>Reference to the consideration of visual impacts as part of the assessment of effects on cultural resources will be noted in the ToR.</p>	Table 4-4	Table 4-4 updated.
8				<p>Section 4.2.4 – Summary of Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Under Cultural Heritage Resources, the language in the table should be edited or revised as necessary to reflect revisions to section 4.2.3.7 related to the reports related to built heritage resources and cultural.</p>	<p>As previously noted in the responses, wording in the ToR will be edited as recommended.</p>	N/A	<p>As previously noted, wording in the ToR to be edited as recommended.</p>
9				<p>4.3.2 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment</p> <p>Table 4-6 under Cultural Heritage Resources, we suggest revising the language as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to, or the loss of, archaeological or built heritage resources and cultural heritage resources landscapes. <p>11.1.5 Other Relevant Provincial Legislation, Permits, Approvals and Authorizations</p> <p>Table 11-1 under Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, the language should be revised to more accurately reflect the ministry’s role regarding archaeology and/or built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes.</p> <p>MHSTCI reviews archaeological assessments for compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2010) and the terms of conditions of the archaeologist’s licensing requirements. Once an archaeological assessment has been accepted by MHSTCI, it is entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological</p>	<p>This wording change will be made.</p> <p>This wording change will be made.</p>	<p>Section 4.3.2</p> <p>Section 11.1.5</p>	<p>The following change made to Section 4.3.2 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment, Table 4-6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to, or the loss of, archaeological or built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. <p>The following added to Table 11-1 under Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MHSTCI reviews archaeological assessments for compliance with the <i>Standards and</i>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Reports</p> <p>For technical reports relates to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, we have a review and advisory role under environment assessments.</p>			<p><i>Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists</i> (2010) and the terms of conditions of the archaeologist's licensing requirements. Once an archaeological assessment has been accepted by MHSTCI, it is entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For technical reports related to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, MHSTCI has a review and advisory role under EAs.
10				<p>Glossary: As an overall comment we suggest cutting/pasting definitions from the PPS 2020. Please be aware that the 2020 PPS updated it definitions from the previous 2014 version.</p>	<p>These changes will be made per the definitions provided in subsequent comments below. See comments 11 through 16.</p>	N/A	<p>Updates made.</p>
11				<p>Term: Archaeology (Archaeological Resources)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity we suggest having separate entries for these two terms: The term "Archaeology" is not defined in either the PPS 2020 or in MHSTCI Glossary of Ontario Terms (2017a). That said, it could be defined as follows: <p>Archaeology: The study of past human cultures through the investigation of archaeological sites resources.</p>	<p>Definition change will be made.</p>	Glossary	<p>Updated glossary definition to the following:</p> <p>Archaeology:</p> <p>The study of past human cultures through the investigation of archaeological resources.</p>
12				<p>Term: Archaeological Resources</p> <p>The definition provided is from MHSTCI Glossary of Ontario Terms (2017a). For consistency with the PPS 2020 source for other definitions in this glossary, we suggest including the following:</p> <p>Archaeological resources: includes artifacts, archaeological sites, marine archaeological sites, as defined under the Ontario Heritage Act. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act.(PPS 2020)</p>	<p>Definition change will be made.</p>	Glossary	<p>Updated definition to the following in the glossary:</p> <p>Archaeological Resources:</p> <p>Includes artifacts, archaeological sites, marine archaeological sites, as defined under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> (PPS, 2020).</p>
13				<p>Term: Archaeological Potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Term should be revised to be consistent with the definition and read: "Area of Archaeological Potential" While the definition provided from MHSTCI Glossary of Ontario Terms (2017a) is not incorrect, for consistency with other definitions in this glossary, we suggest including the following cutting/pasting the definition from the PPS 2020: 	<p>Definition change will be made.</p>	Glossary	<p>Updated definition to the following in the glossary:</p> <p>Areas of Archaeological Potential:</p> <p>Means areas with the likelihood to contain archaeological resources.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Areas of archaeological potential: means areas with the likelihood to contain archaeological resources. Criteria to identify archaeological potential are established by the Province. The Ontario Heritage Act requires archaeological potential to be confirmed by a licensed archaeologist.</p>			Criteria to identify archaeological potential are established by the Province. The <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> requires archaeological potential to be confirmed by a licensed archaeologist.
14				<p>Term: Built Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Term should be revised to read: Built Heritage Resource • The definition provided appears to be from the 2014 PPS. We suggest using the following definition from the PPS 2020: <p>Built heritage resource: means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community. Built heritage resources are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers.</p>	Definition change will be made.	Glossary	<p>Updated definition to the following in the glossary:</p> <p>Built Heritage Resource:</p> <p>Means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community. Built heritage resources are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers.</p>
15				<p>Term: Cultural Heritage</p> <p>It is not clear what this term is intended defined. If provide with further information, we would be happy to provide some wordind.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the glossary could include the term</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Resources: an umbrellas term that includes archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes.</p>	Definition change will be made.	Glossary	<p>Updated definition to the following in the glossary:</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Resources:</p> <p>An umbrella term that includes archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes.</p>
16				<p>Term: Cultural Heritage Landscapes</p> <p>The definition provided appears to be from the 2014 PPS. We suggest using the following definition from the PPS 2020:</p> <p>Cultural heritage landscape: means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act, or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms.</p>	Definition change will be made.	Glossary	<p>Updated definition to the following in the glossary:</p> <p>Cultural Heritage Landscape:</p> <p>Means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning</p>





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							or association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act, or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Londa Mortson, Manager, NW Regional Resources Manager, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (Letter)							
1	August 7, 2020	Emailed Letter	Londa Mortson, Manager, NW Regional Resources Manager, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry	<p>Thank you for providing the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) the opportunity to review the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Waasigan Transmission Line project that were released on June 29, 2020. MNRF has completed its review and is providing this letter and accompanying attachment as the ministry's comments to the document.</p> <p>MNRF understands that the draft ToR is intended to provide the framework for the preparation of the Environmental Assessment (EA). As a part of the government review team we appreciate providing information and advice that will support the EA's evaluation of MNRFs mandated interests. To date this has included our participation in the June 24 -26, 2019 transmission line siting workshop; our understanding is that the information obtained as a result of the workshop was used to develop the suite of alternate route options described in the draft ToR.</p> <p>We have attached a table with our detailed comments and, where possible, have recommended an action for each comment. Furthermore, highlighted below are several of the overarching themes that we would like to draw your attention to.</p>	<p>Correct. As detailed in Section 6.0 (Identification and Evaluation of Alternatives) of the draft ToR, a variety of factors were used to identify the preliminary alternative routes including input and data received during the Corridor Workshops, the general character of the area, the type and location of existing, previously disturbed ROWs that could potentially be paralleled, and a preference for co-location with existing infrastructure when possible, as outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2020).</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
2				<p>Access roads MNRF will require detailed information about access roads proposed to support the project. This includes location and timing of use for all roads that will be used to facilitate the project, length and width of new roads and upgrades to existing roads, ownership, authority to use, permanency and plans for decommissioning. This information informs the complete assessment of the effect of the project on the natural, social and economic environment in the study area. MNRF strongly recommends that an Access Plan be developed and included in the EA as a way of providing a comprehensive, coherent depiction of the access needs for the project. The Access Plan may be informed by / will need to take into account existing road use management strategies, including those found within Forest Management Plans for the six forests that the project is anticipated to cross. As such, the Ministry also recommends that Hydro One engage early on with Sustainable Forest License holders to understand these road use strategies, discuss potential impacts and to find synergies that would minimize long-term impacts to the natural environment (e.g., using a planned forestry road to access the right of way instead of creating a new road).</p>	<p>Section 5.1.1.2 (Access Roads) indicates that known access roads will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA. This will form part of a preliminary Access Plan to be developed during the EA as more detailed project information becomes available and a preferred route is identified.</p> <p>Hydro One has, and will continue to, work with applicable stakeholders (including the MNRF and SFL holders during the EA to further review and discuss access and will take into account existing road use management strategies, including those found within Forest Management Plans for the forests that the Project is anticipated to cross, as well as to better understand road use strategies, discuss potential impacts and to find synergies that would minimize long-term impacts to the natural environment (e.g., using a planned forestry road to access the right of way instead of creating a new road).</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, construction access roads are typically identified by the Project constructor and finalized during detail design. As Hydro One has been directed by the IESO to develop the Project only and has not yet been directed to construct the Project, construction access roads that are presented in the EA Report would be considered as preliminary subject to refinement based on future project design and project constructor input.</p>	Section 5.1.1.2	<p>The following was added to this section (italics):</p> <p>Access roads will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA and will form part of a larger preliminary Access Plan that will be developed based on available information. This plan will identify the general road improvements for the Project, the need for new access roads, the general watercourse crossing types to be considered for the Project and identify potential impacts of the roads and associated mitigation measures (such as decommissioning or access restrictions). Construction access roads that are presented in the EA Report would be considered preliminary subject to refinement based on detailed design and Project</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
3				<p>Supporting infrastructure As the EA process progresses, MNRF will require detailed information about supporting / ancillary infrastructure required to construct the project (e.g., number and location of work camps, laydown yards, etc.) to enable assessment of any associated impacts and facilitate efficient permitting at the project implementation stage.</p>	<p>Section 5.1.1.3 (Equipment/Material Laydown Areas) indicates that these areas will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA, as available. Hydro One intends to include this information in the EA at a concept design level once a preferred route is identified.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, note that supporting temporary infrastructure is typically identified by the Project constructor and finalized during detail design. As Hydro One has been directed to only develop the Project and has not yet been awarded construction rights, ancillary infrastructure required for project construction that is presented in the EA report would be considered as preliminary subject to revision based on project design and project constructor input.</p> <p>Note that when siting temporary supporting/ ancillary infrastructure, the following criteria will be used to minimize environmental and socio-economic effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify locations within previously disturbed areas; • Select locations close to the area of construction to minimize ground disturbance; • Avoid areas with native vegetation and other natural features, where possible; • Avoid known locations of SAR and SAR habitat, where possible; • Avoid sloped and poorly drained areas; • Avoid areas with known cultural heritage/archaeological resources; and, • Avoid sensitive land uses and/or receptors, to the extent possible. 	N/A	<p><i>constructor input.</i> Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
4				<p>Aggregates The draft ToR does not indicate that the EA will identify and describe how Hydro One intends to secure aggregate resources that will be required to carry out the project, nor that the effects associated with accessing, applying/using and, as applicable, rehabilitating of aggregate source areas will be evaluated. This information must be included in the EA in order to enable a full accounting of impacts and to enable efficient issuance of any authorizations that may be required from MNRF in relation to aggregates.</p>	<p>Hydro One intends to use existing licensed sources of aggregate for the Project to the extent possible.</p> <p>The need for new pits and/or quarries to support the Project will be discussed with MNRF during the EA should a need for them be identified. If new sources of aggregate are needed, they will be included as part of the Project Footprint and assessed as part of the EA.</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) under Pit and Quarry Operations/Active Aggregate Sites (italics):</p> <p>Aggregate resources may also be required for Project infrastructure, such as construction access roads. <i>Should this be required, Hydro One intends to use existing licensed sources of aggregate to the extent possible. The EA will include information related to securing aggregate resources for the Project, along with any potential effects related to accessing and using it as it relates to the Project and based on available information at the time. Any</i></p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
5				<p>Tree clearing MNRF will require detailed information about Hydro One's plans for tree clearing including identification of areas to be cleared permanently vs. areas to be reforested, timing of and methods for clearing, management of cleared timber and brush, etc. MNRF strongly recommends that a timber clearing and renewal plan be developed and included in the EA as a way of providing a comprehensive, coherent depiction of the clearing needs for the project. Forest Management Plans can also provide HONI with valuable information about forestry activities, values that may be affected by those activities, and the interests and perspectives of area stakeholders.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) describes the applicable forest management units/plans and references the SFL holders and indicates that the Project's potential effects to these plans will be identified and considered.</p> <p>In addition to this, a commitment will be included in the ToR and EA for Hydro One to develop a Timber Clearing/Harvest and Renewal Plan in consultation with applicable stakeholders, including the MNRF and SFL holders. The clearing plan will consider project components that are identified in the EA report.</p> <p>Hydro One will make their best effort to determine clearing needs; however, clearing is typically completed by the Project constructor and Hydro One has been directed to only develop the Project and has not yet been awarded construction rights. As such, the information that is presented in the EA report would be considered as preliminary subject to revision based on project design and project constructor input.</p> <p>Applicable Forest Management Plans will be further reviewed as part of the EA.</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	<p><i>applicable authorizations, permits and/or notifications will be acquired from MNRF.</i></p> <p>The following was added to Section 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) under Forestry (italics):</p> <p>A Timber Clearing/Harvest and Renewal Plan will be prepared prior to construction in consultation with applicable stakeholders.</p>
6				<p>Field Studies The draft ToR provides limited information about the field studies that Hydro One intends to carry out in order to inform the EA. Please be aware that MNRF will require appropriate and sufficient information on natural values in order to evaluate the validity of predictions and conclusions made in the EA about potential effects and the efficacy of planned mitigations. MNRF will also require sufficient information to enable future permits and authorizations. To ensure values information is adequate to support these processes, MNRF strongly recommends Hydro One contact the Ministry as soon as possible to discuss field plans and /or protocols.</p>	<p>Information provided in the draft ToR in relation to proposed field work to support the EA is meant to provide an initial, high-level overview.</p> <p>A field work plan for the fall 2020 aerial reconnaissance survey and abandoned mine site survey referenced in Section 4.2 of the ToR was submitted in August 2020 to agencies and Indigenous communities for review and comment.</p> <p>Hydro One intends to continue consultation with MNRF and other applicable stakeholders related to the development of a separate, more detailed 2021-2022 field work plan, including survey protocols, for ground-based studies of the preferred route.</p> <p>Anticipated studies for the preferred route, subject to further consultation with MNRF and other applicable stakeholders as noted above, include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife field surveys to collect species-specific information along the preferred route; • Vegetation surveys, specifically Ecological Land Classification and botanical surveys with a focus on relevant SAR species, rare species, invasive plants, and traditionally used plants; • Fish and fish habitat field surveys to obtain site-specific field data at a subset of representative waterbody crossings to verify or augment the results and assumptions from the aerial reconnaissance and desktop review; and, • Surface water surveys to document observed waterbody conditions at a subset of representative waterbody crossings. 	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
7				<p>Consultation MNRF requires additional information within the Consultation Plan to better understand who will be consulted, how and at what points in the EA process. This information will help the ministry to evaluate whether the planned consultation will enable adequate consideration of stakeholder interests in the evaluation of alternatives in the EA.</p> <p>MNRF can work with Hydro One toward ensuring that ministry stakeholders are contacted through the consultation process. Please contact the Ministry as soon as possible to discuss stakeholder consultation.</p>	<p>Further detail will be provided in the 2021-2022 field work plan.</p> <p>A complete list of Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations, included in consultation to-date is provided in the accompanying Record of Consultation. This document describes who was contacted, how they were contacted and when they were contacted, along with tables that track all correspondence. The contacts listed in the Record of Consultation will form the base of the Contact List to be used to start the EA; however, Hydro One will contact MNRF in advance of EA commencement to ensure that all applicable ministry stakeholders are contacted as part of the EA.</p> <p>As a note, Hydro One has been contacting a wide variety of individuals and groups within the Study Area identified in Figure 4-1 using a variety of methods including direct mail, Canada Post Admail, telephone, email, social media, and through the Project website. Several in-person and virtual Corridor Workshops and Community information Centres were also held for the Project to-date. Consultation will continue throughout the EA using the contacts established during the ToR stage.</p> <p>Further, note that the draft ToR Tables 10-1 (Stakeholders) and 10-2 (Indigenous Communities) describe when contact will be made during the EA including at what EA</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Londa Mortson, Manager, NW Regional Resources Manager, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (Table)					milestone this contact will occur, the engagement activities associated with it, along with the anticipated timing during the EA.		
8	August 7, 2020	Emailed Table (Letter Attachment)	Londa Mortson Manager, NW Regional Resources Manager Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry	<p>Main Report, General Comment</p> <p>Comment The stated purpose of the project is to support anticipated increases to demand for power as directed by the IESO to support anticipated industrial growth (e.g., new mines/ hydroelectric/ wind power), yet the potential effects identified (subject of consultation) are short term only (construction related); the draft ToR does not identify long term, cumulative effects resulting from future development enabled by the transmission line. (e.g., new access, new grid capacity and the enabling of new industrialization).</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions As the EA is focused on the effects of the Waasigan project and not the effects of what the project might enable (i.e. new industrialization and cumulative effects), we recommend that an explicit statement to this effect be included in the draft ToR.</p>	Correct. A statement to this effect will be added to the ToR.	Section 7.0	Statement added to the ToR.
9				<p>Main Report; Executive Summary (Page iii); Section 2.1 (P.8)</p> <p>Comment The stated regulatory mechanism for the EA is confusing to readers.</p> <p>The text states: "The Project falls within Category C of the Electricity Projects Regulation (Ontario Regulation 116/01) and requires approval under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, 1990 (EA Act)."</p> <p>Note that Reg. 116/01 does not reference categories, it does however refer to the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities. Under this Class EA, category C projects (those > 115kV and >2km) require an Individual Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please clarify reference to 'Category C' as being within the Class EA for Minor Transmission and that this requires an Individual Environmental Assessment; please also refer to the process as an Individual EA throughout document for ease of understanding / clarity.</p>	<p>O. Reg. 116/01 is a regulation under the EA Act that outlines EA requirements for electricity projects. While O. Reg. 116/01 does not reference specific project categories, the MECP's Guide to EA Requirements for Electricity Projects (2011) provides direction on electricity project classification in Ontario and is intended to help proponents of electricity projects, consultants, the public and other interested parties understand the EA requirements for new electricity projects which are set out in the regulation. The Guide classifies transmission projects described in O. Reg. 116/01 based on voltage and length of transmission lines into three distinct categories.</p> <p>The purpose of the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities is to provide information that will enable the Minister of the MECP to approve certain types of frequently occurring transmission projects specified in the Guide which typically includes smaller scale projects with predictable environmental effects that can be mitigated.</p> <p>The text in the noted sections will be updated to provide additional clarity.</p> <p>Reference to "individual EA" was clarified in the introduction and referenced in relation to legislation to provide additional clarity.</p>	Executive Summary Section 2.1	<p>For additional clarity, the Executive Summary was updated to the following:</p> <p>The Project is identified as a Category C in the MECP's Guide to EA Requirements for Electricity Projects (2011) which provides direction on electricity project classification in Ontario based on Ontario Regulation 116/01 (also referred to as the Electricity Projects Regulation) and requires EA approval under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, 1990 (EA Act).</p> <p>Section 2.1 (Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, 1990) was updated to reflect the following:</p> <p>The Project is subject to the provincial EA approval process under the EA Act. Under the EA Act,</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
						<p>Ontario Regulation 116/01 (Electricity Project Regulation) sets out the requirements for a variety of electricity projects in Ontario, including transmission lines based on the type of fuel to be used, the size and, in some cases, the efficiency of the planned facility.</p> <p>While Ontario Regulation 116/01 does not reference specific project classifications, the MECP's Guide to EA Requirements for Electricity Projects (2011) provides direction on electricity project classification in Ontario and is intended to help proponents of electricity projects, consultants, the public and other interested parties understand the EA requirements for new electricity projects which are set out in the regulation. The Guide classifies transmission projects described in Ontario Regulation 116/01 based on voltage and length of transmission lines into three distinct categories.</p> <p>Based on the Guide, the Project is classified as a Category C project, which are large-scale,</p>	

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>complex projects which generally have the potential for significant environmental effects and require the completion of an Individual EA. Category C projects include transmission lines which are greater than 115 kV and less than 500 kV and are greater than, or equal to, 50 km in length.</p> <p>The Project category and need to complete an Individual EA is further noted on page 2 of the Class EA for Minor Transmission Facilities (2016), which provides information that would enable the Minister of the MECP to approve certain types of frequently occurring transmission projects specified in the Guide which are typically smaller scale projects with predictable environmental effects that can be mitigated.</p>
10				<p>Main Report; Section 3.0 (page 12); Section 6.2; Alternative Methods Identification (Page 73)</p> <p>Comment The draft ToR states that the 'alternative methods' being examined in the EA will be limited to alternative routes.</p> <p>In order to evaluate the level of impacts to the natural environment the EA should include a wider variety of alternative methods. Specifically, has HONI considered retro-fitting/upgrading existing structures as an alternative method? It might be expected that this option would have a significantly lower impact on natural environment values.</p> <p>The draft ToR does not speak to why reusing existing structures (adding the new line to existing 115 or 230 kV structures/ or upgrading existing structures to move larger amounts of electricity) is not being considered as an alternative method. The draft ToR (Section 1.3, p. 5) speaks to the potential for increasing the amount of westbound power up to 550 MW in the future using existing (and proposed) structures. Is it not possible to upgrade the existing structures to carry 350MW of power along the existing ROW?</p>	<p>The need and technical aspects of the transmission line were identified by the IESO as part of a previous planning process as described in Sections 1.1 through 1.3 of the draft ToR and is considered to be out of scope of this EA.</p> <p>The IESO is responsible for anticipating and planning for Ontario's electricity needs. The Order in Council (December 11, 2013) and associated letter of direction indicate the Project is to be composed of the expansion or reinforcement of a portion or portions of the electricity transmission network in the area west of Thunder Bay.</p> <p>Further and as specified in Section 1.3 (Background on the Project) of the draft ToR, to supply the area under the high growth scenario, the IESO indicated the Project must meet the following specifications:</p> <p>a) Consist of a new double-circuit 230 kilovolt (kV) line between Lakehead TS and Mackenzie TS (Phase One) with a thermal capacity that is equal to or greater than the existing double circuit 230 kV transmission line between these stations</p> <p>b) Consist of a new single-circuit 230 kV line from Mackenzie TS to Dryden TS (Phase Two)</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change required.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please address the possible use of existing structures as an alternative method to conduct this project. If this method is not to be included in the alternatives analysis, please provide a clear rationale for limiting the range of alternatives, including the social/environmental/economic factors considered in making that decision.	with a thermal capacity that is equal to or greater than the existing single-circuit 230 kV transmission line between these stations		
11				Main Report; 3.1 Comment Editorial: Numbering is off in this section. Missing section 3.1.	Comment noted; update will be made.	Section 3.1	Add subtitle for Section 3.1
12				Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Update numbering of headings in this section of the draft ToR Main Report; 3.0, 7.1 Comment The EA should assess project-level net effects but also describe site-specific environmental effects and mitigation measures. Site-specific environmental effects would include effects to values as identified in the baseline environmental conditions for the natural environment (e.g. Significant Wildlife Habitat, Provincially Significant Wetlands, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interests, Protected Areas, Species at Risk, Fish Habitat). For known values, the EA should identify whether negative ecological effects will occur, describe mitigation measures (including avoidance) to address these site-specific values, and identify whether site-specific negative effects will still occur. Broader project level effects to the natural environment should be characterized by the net effects at the site level, following mitigation measures, as well as broader natural environment effects (e.g. cumulative disturbance). Addressing site-specific effects and mitigation measures will make it clearer to the reader as well as regulators as to what site-specific impacts are expected and how that relates to the broader characterisation of project-level net effects. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please update the ToR to specifically identify that the EA will address site-specific effects and mitigation measures, as well as the cumulative net effects following mitigation measures at the project level.	Effects will be identified to the extent possible based on the status of the detailed design and public information about the known values at the time of the effects assessment. As Hydro One has been directed by the IESO to develop the Project only, and has not yet been directed to construct the Project, required construction infrastructure that are presented in the EA report would be preliminary and subject to refinement based on future project design and project constructor input. Thus, addressing site-specific effects in a precise or quantitative manner may not be feasible, whereas providing a broader characterization of project-level net effects is achievable. It is acknowledged that identification of site-specific environmental effects and the associated mitigation will be required for applicable permit applications to agencies. The EA will include mitigation that can be applied on a feature-specific or site-specific basis. For example, the EA will include mitigation to limit adverse effects to wetlands if any are crossed by the Project, but it will not identify mitigation, and ultimately net effects, on a wetland-by-wetland basis. Instead, a comprehensive list of mitigation will be identified to cover a broad range of potential Project effects so that specific mitigation can be selected and applied on a site-specific basis as required. This approach is consistent with previous environmental assessments of linear projects in northern Ontario and will meet the requirements under the EA Act.	Section 7.1	The following was added to Section 7.1 (Potential Effects Assessment): The net effects assessment will address project-level effects and consider appropriate mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce or avoid adverse Project effects. The EA will also assess the potential for the net effects of other approved projects to combine cumulatively with the net effects of the Project.
13				Main Report; Section 4.1; Alternative Route Assessment and Study Areas/page 18 Comment While the local and regional study areas are defined in the text, it is difficult to visualize the extent of these areas (i.e. LSA has a 500m buffer around proposed project footprint, and regional study area has a 5km buffer). Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please include a diagram in the TOR that visually defines the local study area and the regional study area.	A figure with these study areas will be developed and provided to interested persons during the EA once the general ROWs for each of the alternatives routes have been determined. These study areas will also be established for the construction access roads and other project components that are determined to be required as part of the EA.	Section 4.1	The following was added to Section 4.1 (Study Area) under Alternative Route Assessment and Evaluation Study Areas: Mapping related to the alternative route evaluation and effects assessment study areas will be provided during the EA.
14				Main Report; Section 4.1; Alternative Route Assessment and Evaluation Study Area (Page 18) & 5.1.1.3/5.1.1.4 (page 67); 5.2.1 (Page 69) Comment Description of the project footprint (bottom of p. 18): It is assumed that "supporting infrastructure" would be inclusive of temporary and permanent infrastructure related to the undertaking. It is acknowledged that laydown areas, which are temporary in nature are	Correct, the Project Footprint would include lands covered by the transmission line ROW, access roads and supporting infrastructure, which may include temporary construction camps, if needed. Temporary construction camps will be added to Section 5.1.1 (Preliminary Facility Design). Sections 5.1.1.3 (Equipment/Material Laydown Areas) and 5.1.1.4 (Construction Offices)	Section 5.1.1 Section 5.1.1.3 Section 5.1.1.4	The following was added to Section 5.1.1 (Preliminary Facility Design): Temporary construction

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>referenced as an example on p. 18.</p> <p>Temporary work camps (or construction camps) are mentioned for the first time in section 5.2.1 (p.69). If temporary work camps on Crown land are needed to support construction of this project, then this impact should be identified in section 5.1.1 and included within the assessment of impacts in the EA.</p> <p>Additionally, where Crown land is needed to erect supporting infrastructure (e.g. construction offices, laydown areas and/or work camps), approvals from the MNRF will be required. Sections 5.1.1.3 and 5.1.1.4 should mention this potential.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please provide further clarification of types of (temporary and permanent) supporting infrastructure associated with the project, such as those examples listed on page 67 (construction offices, stockpiling areas etc.).</p> <p>In addition, please identify in appropriate sections throughout the ToR whether work camps (which are not identified on p. 67) will be required as supporting infrastructure. If so, please include an assessment of their impacts within the EA. In addition, consider the avoidance of impacts (e.g., through use of existing facilities) where feasible.</p> <p>Please include wording in sections 5.1.1.3 and 5.1.1.4 of the ToR such that permits/authorizations will be obtained for any temporary supporting infrastructure located on Crown land prior to their creation, as applicable.</p>	<p>will be updated to include a sentence referencing that where Crown land is needed to erect supporting infrastructure (e.g. construction offices, laydown areas and/or work camps), permits and/or authorizations may be required from the MNRF.</p> <p>At the time of EA preparation, all known areas that are anticipated to be disturbed by the Project will be included in the net effects assessment, including the transmission line, access roads, equipment/material laydown areas, construction camps and offices, aggregate sources, and upgrades to existing transformer stations.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, temporary construction infrastructure are typically identified by the project constructor during detail design. As Hydro One has been directed by the IESO to develop the Project only and has not yet been directed to construct the Project, required construction infrastructure that are presented in the EA report would be considered as preliminary subject to refinement based on future project design and project constructor input.</p>		<p>camps</p> <p>Lodging and accommodation for construction workers will be required during the construction phase. Construction camps, if required, are expected to be established along the transmission line to provide accommodation to workers on a temporary basis in select locations along the preferred route. It is expected that each camp would occupy a space of approximately 400 m by 400 m and will be located at least 30 m from any waterbodies. The specific location, size and requirements of these areas will be based on site characteristics, environmental and socio-economic constraints and specific contractor requirements. Camp facilities will comply with the Ontario <i>Occupational Health and Safety Act</i> and required permits, authorizations and approvals will be acquired prior to their construction. It is anticipated that potable water for construction camps will be obtained from municipal sources where available or from groundwater wells. Permits to</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>take Water or Environmental Activity and Sector Registry will be required prior to taking or discharging groundwater. Municipal sewage disposal services will be used where available and where they are not, septic fields, on-site treatment and trucking off-site are options for sewage disposal. The appropriate approvals (e.g., Environmental Compliance Approvals, municipal approvals, etc.) will be acquired, as needed. Grey water will be discharged according to permit and/or authorization requirements. Electricity, if needed, will be supplied through the existing electrical grid or temporary diesel generators. Hydro One commits to progressively restoring temporary construction camp sites as the Project construction progresses and they are no longer needed.</p> <p>The following was added to Sections 5.1.1.3 (Equipment/Material Laydown Areas) and 5.1.1.4 (Construction Offices) (5.1.1.5 in updated ToR):</p> <p>Where Crown</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							land is needed to erect supporting infrastructure (e.g., construction offices, laydown areas and/or work camps), permits and/or authorizations may be required from the MNRF.
15				<p>Main report; 4.2</p> <p>Comment Field surveys will likely be required to confirm candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat and to consider ecological effects.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please include reference to the potential for such surveys when referencing planned fieldwork for the 2021 and 2022 field seasons.</p>	Please see previous response to # 6 (emailed letter) related to the development of a field work plan.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
16				<p>Main Report; S.4.2 (p20) and Table 4-4 (p55)</p> <p>Comment Paragraph 2 states an aerial reconnaissance of the alternate routes is planned for 2020 to collect data for surface water, fish and fish habitat and the terrestrial environment.</p> <p>MNRF does not consider aerial recon an adequate tool to assess the distribution and current state of fish and fish habitat.</p> <p>Ground-based field sampling for all water crossing sites where work in water, or work below the high-water mark may be required for permitting where work is to occur within the time period from September 1st to July 15th. Please see Ontario's guidelines for work in water (https://www.ontario.ca/document/water-work-timing-window-guidelines)</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Expand field collection programs for fish and fish habitat to include ground-based surveys of fish and fish habitat where work in water or below the high water mark is planned during the time period from September 1st to July 15th.</p>	<p>Please see previous response to # 6 (emailed letter) related to the development of a field work plan.</p> <p>Ground-based surveys of the preferred route are planned for 2021-2022 and further detail will be provided in the field work plan.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
17				<p>Main Report; Sec 4.2, page 20-21 & Table 4-4 (p55)</p> <p>Comment Paragraph 3 states: field studies will generally consist of spring, summer and fall floral and fauna investigations, as well as surveys at representative watercourse crossings.</p> <p>How will representative watercourse crossings be identified? What type of information will be collected during these surveys?</p> <p>Assessment of the natural environment using appropriate methodologies, including ground field surveys, will be required to accurately characterize the potential impacts of the project and ensure a complete EA.</p> <p>Text at the top of page 21 states that field workplans will be developed for the 2020 and 2021 programs in consultation with applicable agencies to confirm the type, location, timing and methodologies of field studies to be completed as part of this EA.</p> <p>Given the current date of mid-July, the field season is well underway and MNRF has not yet had the opportunity to comment on a field workplan. A comprehensive field program that will adequately identify many components of the natural environment will require more than aerial reconnaissance and ideally more than one season of field surveys particularly where surveys limited by seasonal constraints or are very time specific (For example, bird nesting periods)</p> <p>Note that Scientific Collectors Permits may be required by MNRF for any collection of fish and/or wildlife associated with field-based surveys.</p>	Please see previous response to # 6 (emailed letter) related to the development of a field work plan.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
18				<p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions MNRF strongly recommends Hydro One contact the ministry as soon as possible to discuss proposed field studies; this will help to ensure that the information and conclusions presented in the EA are well-supported. This will also help to ensure that sufficient information is available to enable future permitting/issuance of authorizations by MNRF. Main Report; Section 4.2.1 Table 4-1 p.21-22 and Appendix B- List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators; (B-5, socio- economic environment)</p> <p>Comment MNRF has recently reorganized the information available in LIO. Wildlife values can now be found under Wildlife Values Area and Wildlife Values Site. These layers represent areas and sites associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • breeding • calving and fawning • denning • feeding • staging • nesting • wintering • general habitat areas • nurseries • travel corridors <p>Consider updating the name of data sets in table 4-1 to reflect the data reorganization.</p> <p>MNRF recommends obtaining the following datasets to inform the EA:</p> <p>a) Data sources from Ontario’s data catalogue (https://geohub.lio.gov.on.ca/)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregate Site Authorized – Inactive • Ministry of Transportation Aggregate Sites • Ontario Trail Network (recreation features) • Trail segments (recreation features) • Fishing access points (recreation features) • Significant Ecological Area (contains regionally rare plant records that may indicate candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat) <p>b) Data sources from Natural Heritage and Information Centre (NHIC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species Observation, locally derived (contains regionally rare plant records that may indicate candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat) <p>c) Data sources from the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange (OGDE). The following layers will provide information related to whether Crown land already has commitments (leases, easements, land use permits etc.), and where private lands are.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crown Dispositions (LUPS, Leases, Easements, etc.) • Patent Land External (provides a visual between private lands and Crown lands) <p>These layers can be added as data sources to the socio-economic environment, land use criteria in appendix B.</p> <p>Obtaining access to these layers requires membership to the OGDE. MNRF was under the impression that HONI had already obtained access to these layers. Note that parcel information is available for purchase directly from Teranet or MPAC if needed.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please reference the updated wildlife values layer information in the ToR and EA, and use all available data sources to identify the existing environment and determine potential effects to values.</p>	<p>The referenced datasets to be used during the EA will be included in the ToR. All applicable available data sources will be used to describe baseline environmental conditions and determine potential effects to values of concern.</p> <p>Hydro One will request the referenced datasets from the MNRF as necessary for use during the EA.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.1 List of Draft Evaluation Criteria and Indicators</p>	<p>Section 4.2.1 (Records Reviewed as part of the ToR), Table 4-1 updated.</p> <p>The following along with an explanation was added to the ToR:</p> <p>Wildlife Values Area and Wildlife Values Site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • breeding • calving and fawning • denning • feeding • staging • nesting • wintering • general habitat areas • nurseries • travel corridors <p>List of Draft Evaluation Criteria and Indicators</p> <p>The following layers were added as data sources in the draft list of criteria and indicators:</p> <p>a) Data sources from Ontario’s data catalogue (https://geohub.lio.gov.on.ca/)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregate Site Authorized – Inactive • Ministry of Transportation Aggregate Sites • Ontario Trail Network (recreation features) • Trail segments (recreation features)

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							features) • Fishing access points (recreation features) • Significant Ecological Area (contains regionally rare plant records that may indicate candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat) b) Data sources from Natural Heritage and Information Centre (NHIC) • Species Observation, locally derived (contains regionally rare plant records that may indicate candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat) c) Data sources from the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange (OGDE). The following layers will provide information related to whether Crown land already has commitments (leases, easements, land use permits etc.), and where private lands are. • Crown Dispositions (e.g., LUPS, Leases, Easements, etc.) • Patent Land External (provides a visual



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
19				Main Report; S.4.2.1 (p21) and S.4.2.2.5 (p28) Comment The ToR identifies MNRF's LIO data layers as the source for fish nursery areas and spawning sites. Please note that these data layers are incomplete and should not be considered comprehensive. Ground-based field sampling for all water crossing sites where work in water, or work below the high-water mark may be required for permitting where work is to occur within the time period from September 1st to July 15th.	Please see previous response to # 6 (emailed letter) and # 9 (table attachment) related to the development of a field work plan and fisheries.	N/A	between private lands and Crown lands)
20				Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions As noted above, MNRF strongly recommends that HONI expand field collection programs for fish and fish habitat to include ground-based surveys of fish and fish habitat. Main Report; 4.2.2.7 Comment As per the SWHTG, and the 3W Ecoregional Criteria Schedule, provincially-rare species (S1, S2, S3, SH), Special Concern species on the Species at Risk list of Ontario (SARO), and federally-protected (i.e. Threatened and Endangered) species under SARA but not listed on SARO, are considered 'Species of Conservation Concern' and should be considered as candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions MNRF suggests that the ToR indicate that the EA will be identifying SWH of species of conservation concern.	The ToR will note that the EA will identify Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) of species of conservation concern.	Section 4.2.2.7	The following text was added to Section 4.2.2.7 (Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat): The EA will identify SWH of species of conservation concern.
21				Main Report; Sec. 4.2.2.5, page 28 Comment The draft ToR references MNRF datasets for walleye and small mouth bass nursery areas, yet neither of these species are identified as a characteristic fish species in the ecoregions according to Crins et al. 2009. The proposed transmission line intersects fisheries management zones (FMZ) 4, 5 and 6. Please use the fisheries management plans for these zones to support characterization of fish and fish habitat within the ToR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://www.ontario.ca/document/fisheries-management-plan-fisheries-management-zone-6 https://www.ontario.ca/page/fisheries-management-plan-fisheries-management-zone-5 https://www.ontario.ca/page/fisheries-management-plan-fisheries-management-zone-4 Identifying species of management interest for each FMZ will identify which fisheries management objectives the project, and any mitigation strategies, should align with. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please review the relevant FMZ plans and incorporate the species of management interest for each zone into the description of fish and fish habitat in the ToR.	The suggested fisheries management zones (FMZ) plans will be reviewed and the species of management interest for each zone will be incorporated into the EA once more project detail becomes available.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
22				Main Report; 4.2.2.6 Comment Locally Significant Wetlands are no longer a designation under the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System. However, that does not preclude a particular wetland that is not considered Provincially Significant based on scoring to be considered as a value for other purposes in this project. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The TOR and EA can consider these wetlands as locally significant values or non- significant wetlands.	"Locally significant wetlands" will be referred to as "other wetlands". The ToR will be revised to explain that this category includes wetlands that have not been evaluated under OWES and those that have been evaluated and did not score as a Provincially Significant Wetland (previously referred to as locally significant wetlands).	Section 4.2.2.6	The following change was made to Section 4.2.2.6 (Vegetation and Wetlands) (2 nd last para.): Change "locally significant wetlands" to "other wetlands" and add note that

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							that this category includes wetlands that have not been evaluated under OWES and those that have been evaluated and did not score as a Provincially Significant Wetland (previously referred to as locally significant wetlands).
23				Main Report; 4.2.2.7 Comment Wester painted turtle should be "western painted turtle" Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please correct spelling error	Spelling will be corrected.	Section 4.2.2.7	The following change was made in Section 4.2.2.7 (Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat): Change "Wester painted turtle" to "western painted turtle"
24				Main Report; Section 4.2.3.1 Provincial and Municipal Policy (Page 39 & 40) Comment Other types of resource management plans used by the MNRF and not mentioned in this section are Fisheries Management Plans and Lake Management Plans. These plans contain additional Crown land direction and should be referenced in this section. The Shebandowan Lake Management Plan, which includes a restricted area order (under the Public Lands Act) will have additional permitting requirements and may restrict the creation of new roads in this area. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please include reference to Fisheries Management Zone Plans (FMZ 4, 5 and 6 plans) and the Shebandowan Lake Management Plan within this section as well.	References to Fisheries Management Zone Plans (FMZ 4, 5 and 6 plans) and the Shebandowan Lake Management Plan will be included in the ToR.	Section 4.2.3.1	References to the following were made in Section 4.2.3.1 (Provincial and Municipal Policy): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries Management Zone Plans (FMZ 4, 5 and 6 plans) • Shebandowan Lake Management Plan
25				4.2.3.2 p. 41 Comment The description of the NWO demographic as "aging/ baby boomer cohort / out migration of youth" does not acknowledge the growth of the indigenous population nor the trends regarding the in-migration of indigenous people/youth to the region's urban centres (Thunder Bay / Fort Frances etc.) Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The ToR should recognize indigenous population trends in this section.	Additional demographic data has been included in Section 4.2.3.2. Note Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes) also includes information related to Indigenous communities and communities have been asked to provide comment on the draft ToR for consideration. Once received, their comments will be considered and further information on their specific demographics and/or related community trends will be provided in the EA as consultation with Indigenous communities is ongoing.	Section 4.2.3.2	Additional demographic data included.
26				Main Report; 4.2.3 socio- economic environment page 43 Comment MNRF needs to understand how trees / forest resources in temporarily used areas (e.g. laydown areas, temporary roads, work camps etc.) be harvested and, subsequently, renewed once construction is complete? This information will inform and enable more efficient / timely permitting. Note that seeds for renewal will need to be sourced from the appropriate seed zone area.	Please see previous response to comment # 5 (emailed letter) related to the development of a Timber Clearing/Harvest and Renewal Plan.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions MNRF strongly recommends that a harvest and renewal plan be included in the EA to enable the assessment of effects and planned mitigations associated with harvesting of Crown timber / forest resources. MNRF advises including the following information in this type of plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where harvesting will occur including how the areas will be accessed • Harvesting methods (e.g. mechanical vs. hand clearing) • Handling of cleared wood (chipping, fulltree, cut to length) • Where wood will be stored (wood to be hauled and slash piles) • Measures to reduce fire risk (e.g. burning or chipping of slash/debris, size and depth of chipper debris) • Renewal measures for temporarily used areas (e.g. laydown areas, temporary access roads, work camps, slash piles etc.) 			
27				<p>Main Report; Section 4.2.3.1/page 40</p> <p>Comment Paragraph 1</p> <p>Other Crown land users includes a wide range of situations. This includes commercial operations for harvesting natural resources (e.g. baitfish, trapline, bear management, tourism outfitters, forestry, mining, hydro-electric etc.) as well as non-commercial uses such as Crown land recreation (fishing, hunting, camping, canoeing, berry picking etc.) and general use of land (utility corridors). Some of these activities, particularly the commercial enterprises, are associated with a form of tenure or license.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Suggest rephrasing the last sentence to portray a more comprehensive depiction of Crown land users.</p>	<p>The last sentence will be revised in the ToR to portray a more comprehensive depiction of Crown land users.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.3.1</p>	<p>The following text was included in Section 4.2.3.1 (Provincial and Municipal Policy:</p> <p>Other Crown land users include commercial operations for harvesting natural resources (e.g., baitfish, trapline, bear management, tourism outfitters, forestry, mining, hydro-electric etc.) as well as non-commercial uses such as Crown land recreation (e.g., fishing, hunting, camping, canoeing, berry picking etc.) and general use of land. Some of these activities, particularly the commercial enterprises, are associated with a form of tenure or license.</p>
28				<p>Main Report; Section 4.2.3.2 Page 41</p> <p>Comment The first paragraph states: The Study Area includes the Thunder Bay, Red River and Kenora Districts of northwestern Ontario.</p> <p>Red River is incorrect. If the reference is to MNRF administrative districts, Red River should be the Fort Frances district. If the reference is to the northwestern economic region, then Red River should be Rainy River, and it appears that they are economic counties as opposed to economic districts. If the reference is to economic regions, please confirm with ENDM.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Clearly state what type of "district" is being referred to.</p>	<p>This change will be made. Refers to Census Divisions.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.3.2</p>	<p>The following change was made to Section 4.2.3.2 (Community Well-Being):</p> <p>The Study Area includes the Census divisions of Thunder Bay District, Rainy River District and Kenora District of northwestern Ontario.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
29				<p>Main Report; Section 4.2.3.3 Economy, Land and Resource Use - Hunting, Fishing and Trapping (Page 43) & 10.2.1/10.2.1.2</p> <p>Comment Text under Hunting, Fishing and Trapping heading is missing reference to other resource harvesting activities that MNRF regulates under the <i>Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act</i>, namely baitfish operations and bear management operations.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The project's potential to impact bait harvesters and bear management operations should also be identified and considered as part of the EA. Please add reference to these stakeholders in section 10.2.1.2 as well.</p>	The Project's potential to impact bait harvesters and bear management operations will be identified and considered as part of the EA and a reference to these stakeholders will be included in Sections 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use), 10.2.1 (Stakeholder Identification) and 10.2.1.2 (Interested Persons, Organizations and Other Stakeholders) of the ToR.	Section 4.2.3.3 Section 10.2.1 Section 10.2.1.2	Sections 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use), 10.2.1 (Stakeholder Identification) and 10.2.1.2 (Interested Persons, Organizations and Other Stakeholders) updated to reference: Baitfish operations and bear management operations.
30				<p>Main Report; Section 4.2.3.3 Economy, Land and Resource Use; Tourism and Outfitter Operations (Page 44)</p> <p>Comment Crown land camping is another large, non-consumptive tourism activity that occurs in the NW that is not mentioned in the text.</p> <p>While this is difficult to measure, impact and proximity of the project to MNRF access points and the Ontario Trail Network is suggested as a proxy. Please include these non-consumptive tourism activities in the description of the existing environment under 'Tourism and Outfitter Operations'.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The project's potential to impact Crown land camping (by way of impacts to Crown access points and trails) should also be identified and considered as part of the future EA.</p>	The Project's potential to impact Crown land camping will be mentioned in the ToR Section 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) (under Tourism and Outfitters) and considered as part of the EA. Potential effects to Crown access points and trails will be addressed in the EA.	Section 4.2.3.3	The following text was added to Section 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) under Tourism and Outfitters: Crown land camping is another large, non-consumptive tourism activity that occurs in northwestern Ontario for which access points and trails could potentially be affected.
31				<p>4.2.3.3; p. 44</p> <p>Comment The Steep Rock Mine property includes the historical Roberts, Hogarth, and Caland pits. The Steep Rock Mine property is being rehabilitated to address the potential for overflow impacts and is not simply being monitored anymore.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please remove reference to the historical Caland and Steep Rock pits and call them the former Steep Rock mine property. In addition, update the reference to reflect that the property is following a rehabilitation plan.</p>	<p>References in the ToR to the historical Caland and Steep Rock pits will be removed and replaced with the former Steep Rock mine property.</p> <p>The description in the ToR will also be updated to acknowledge that the property is currently following a rehabilitation plan to address the potential for overflow impacts.</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	Revised text to include: The former Steep Rock mine property is also in the Study Area. This mine has been abandoned and is currently following a rehabilitation plan to address the potential for overflow impacts.
32				<p>Main Report; Sec. 4.2.3.3, page 44</p> <p>Comment Under the heading Tourism and Outfitter Operations the text states approximately 20 tourism operators have been identified as potentially having overlapping operating areas within the study area.</p> <p>The English River Forest alone identifies, in the 2019 Forest Management Plan, that there are 89 resource-based tourism operators on the forest. While not all are in the vicinity of the</p>	A list of stakeholders, including tourism and outfitter operators contacted during ToR development, is included in the ToR Record of Consultation; however, Hydro One will contact MNRF in advance of EA commencement to ensure the appropriate outfitters are contacted as part of the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>project, given the importance of tourism to the NW economy it is expected that there would be more than 20 tourism operations that potentially overlap the Waasigan regional study area.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Consider reviewing the list of operators with MNRF planning staff to ensure all types of resources-based tourism operators have been considered to ensure a fulsome consideration of potential impacts and appropriate consultation in the EA.</p>			
33				<p>Main Report; Section 4.2.3.3 Economy, Land and Resource Use - Pit and Quarry Operations (Page 44); Table 11-1 (p.143)</p> <p>Comment The ToR does not identify where / how HONI plans to secure aggregate resources required to implement the project, including whether the creation of new aggregate pits will be required. The ToR should identify that the EA will address how aggregate will be secured and will identify associated impacts, including the impacts associated with any proposed new pits and quarries. Table 11-1 references aggregate permits under the aggregate resources act for the extraction of aggregate on Crown land, leading the reader to believe that new aggregate pits may be needed as part of the project.</p> <p>Note that any new pits and quarries HONI may propose will require additional approvals from the MNRF.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions More information is needed in the ToR on how HONI plans to obtain aggregate resources in order for impacts associated with accessing / transporting / applying / rehabilitating of aggregate sources, as applicable, can be evaluated in the future EA.</p>	Please see previous response to comment # 4 (emailed letter) related to aggregates.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
34				<p>Main Report; 4.2.3.6, p. 46</p> <p>Comment Indigenous community use of land for traditional purposes should refer to use of land to exercise S 35 rights.</p>	<p>ToR Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes) makes reference to Section 35 of the <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i>:</p> <p>"Aboriginal and treaty rights are recognized under Section 35 of Canada's <i>Constitution Act, 1982</i> (also referred to as Section 35 rights), which includes recognition of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights to hunt, trap, fish, gather and manage the lands for all First Nation, Inuit and Métis people of Canada. As part of these rights, the Government of Canada has the Duty to Consult Indigenous communities for this Project. Hydro One is currently engaging with Indigenous communities to better understand the communities' interests and to begin to identify potential Project effects."</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
35				<p>Main Report; 4.2.3 socio- economic environment (p. 43, Forestry); Table 4.4/page 57</p> <p>Comment The EA should consider how access is anticipated to change, or what measures would be taken to limit change to (i.e. increases or unwanted) access.</p> <p>As an example, Route 3A that intersects through the White Otter Enhanced Management Area (i.e. Route 3A) is anticipated to be of local public interest. This area possesses high tourism and recreation potential and is used extensively by local residents in all seasons and by guests of resource-based tourism operations seasonally. The role of the EMA area in controlling road access and preserving a certain level of remoteness that the area currently enjoys is considered to be critical to maintaining the quality of recreational and tourism values.</p> <p>As roads into the area are primarily constructed to facilitate forestry activities, remoteness is maintained by applying access restrictions on roads into the area as part of forest management planning and provisions for the abandonment of these roads once they are no longer required for forest management purposes are also contained in the Forest Management Plan.</p> <p>Note that sustainable forest license holders / forest resource license holders in the northwest are responsible for creating and maintain much of the road network in the project area (particularly where there is no local road networks or municipalities). Road use management strategies for these road networks are developed as part of the forest management planning process. These strategies provide insight into how roads in the forest are managed, and where timing restrictions and decommissioning commitments etc. have been made.</p> <p>Note that HONI may be required to enter into agreements with MNRF and/or third parties responsible for roads on Crown land that HONI intends to use to implement the project.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions</p>	<p>ToR Section 4.2.3.3 (Forestry) will be updated to include text that SLF/forest resource license holders in northwestern Ontario are responsible for creating and maintaining much of the road network in the Project area (particularly where there is no local road networks or municipalities) and that the EA will address, to the extent reasonably possible, the effects of the Project on existing roads/road use. Please also see previous response related to the development of an Access Plan during the EA.</p> <p>Please see previous response to comment # 2 (emailed letter) related to access roads. Hydro One will also work with applicable stakeholders (including MNRF and SLF holders) as part of the development of the Access Plan and will take into account how Hydro One intends to access the transmission corridor for construction, maintenance and decommissioning purposes. This plan will identify the general road improvements for the Project, the need for new access roads, the general watercourse crossing types to be considered for the Project and identify potential impacts of the roads and associated mitigation measures (such as decommissioning or access restrictions).</p>	Section 4.2.3.3	<p>The following text was added to Section 4.2.3.3 (Economy, Land and Resource Use) under Forestry:</p> <p>Sustainable forest license/forest resource licence holders in northwestern Ontario are responsible for creating and maintaining much of the road network in the project area (particularly where there is no local road network or municipalities). The EA will address, to the extent reasonably possible, the</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Please include in the text that sustainable forest license/forest resource licence holders in the NW are responsible for creating and maintaining much of the road network in the project area (particularly where there is no local road networks or municipalities). The EA should address the effects of the project on existing roads/road use. MNRF strongly recommends that a comprehensive access plan be created as part of the EA. This plan would describe how HONI intends to access the transmission corridor for construction, maintenance and decommissioning purposes. It would identify changes to existing access (new access and use of existing access), identify ownership of roads being used, and identify impacts of roads and associated mitigation measures (such as decommissioning or access restrictions).</p>			<p>effects of the Project on existing roads/road use. Agreements with MNRF and/or third parties responsible for roads on Crown land may be required for any that are used for the Project.</p>
36				<p>Main Report; Section 4.2.3.3 Economy, Land and Resource Use & 4.2.4 Summary of study to be completed during EA; Table 4-4: Economy land use and resource use.</p> <p>Comment Some roads may have access restrictions to protect tourism industry; HONI needs to be aware of this in planning how it will implement the project.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Where any changes in access are proposed to implement the project, effects of these changes on tourism operations (and other factors) must be addressed in the EA.</p>	<p>It is understood that some roads may have access restrictions to protect the tourism industry. A review will be completed during the EA for any changes in access that are proposed to implement the Project, including potential effects to tourism operations.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
37				<p>Main Report; 4.2.3 socio- economic environment Table 4.4/page 57</p> <p>Comment Will documentation of income and employment consider tourism and resource harvesters (for example: trapping, baitfish and bear harvesting)?</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions More detail may be needed in the economy, land and resource use section of the TOR to define the studies that would be undertaken to assess effects to tourism and resource harvesting. These industries are important contributors to the local economy and should be considered in the EA.</p>	<p>Tourism and resource harvesting will be documented in more detail during the EA as part of the regional economy and economic development based on available data and information, including income/employment for tourism/resource harvester, where data is available.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
38				<p>Main Report; 4.2.3 Aesthetics Table 4.4/page 57</p> <p>Comment Consider using viewshed/viewscape analysis as a means to depict impacts to aesthetics and find ways to mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions This would provide land users with an idea of the impacts to aesthetics as it relates to their individual uses, such as a tourism where natural aesthetics and remoteness are valued.</p>	<p>Viewshed and/or viewscape analysis will be used to determine potential visibility of the Project within the Study Area and identify key viewpoints along the preferred route.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.3.4 Table 4-4:</p>	<p>The existing text in Section 4.2.3.4 (Aesthetics) was revised to the following (see italics):</p> <p>Visual illustrations, where possible and appropriate, will be developed to illustrate the anticipated location, height and design of the Project in key areas, including identified sensitive landscape areas. The focus of the exercise will be existing viewpoints that are valued by the public, Indigenous communities, and those identified through consultation activities as playing a main</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>role in the aesthetic appeal and character of a specific area. Data used as part of this exercise may include aerial images and digital data (frames). <i>Viewsheds and/or viewscales analysis will be used to determine potential visibility of the Project within the study area and from recreational features within provincial parks and conservation reserves, as applicable, and to identify key viewpoints along the preferred route. Visual effects to built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes will also be reviewed in conjunction with the cultural heritage resources assessment. A description of the existing environment, an assessment of potential effects as a result of the Project, as well as mitigation measures will be developed and provided in the EA.</i></p> <p>The following bullet was added to Table 4-4: Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Visual illustrations using photos taken in the field will be developed to illustrate the</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>anticipated location, height and design of the Project in key areas, including any identified sensitive landscape areas, provincial parks and conservation reserves. Key areas may also include recreational facilities, such as canoe routes and campsites. The focus of the exercise will be on existing viewpoints that are valued by the public and those identified through consultation activities as playing a main role in the aesthetic appeal and character of a specific area.</p> <p>Viewshed and/or viewscape analysis will be used to determine potential visibility of the Project from recreational features within provincial parks and conservation reserves, and identify key viewpoints along the preferred route and from these features.</p> <p>The EA will also include consideration of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes including any potential visual effects from the Project.</p>
39				<p>Main Report; Section 4.2. Page 20</p> <p>Comment IK (Indigenous Knowledge) is not defined when first used in the text of the draft ToR.</p>	<p>IK will be defined when first used in Section 4.2 (Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology).</p>	Section 4.2	<p>The following change was made to Section 4.2 (Description of</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please define IK (Indigenous Knowledge) when it is first used in the text of the ToR.</p>			Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology): Indigenous Knowledge (IK)
40				<p>Main Report; Section 4.3.2; Preliminary Potential Effects Table 4-6 (Page 62)</p> <p>Comment The discussion in this section does not acknowledge that activities associated with the project that are proposed to occur on Crown lands must be consistent with the approved Crown land use policies for those lands.</p> <p>Note that where activities are not consistent, project modifications or other additional requirements (e.g., potential amendments to Crown land use policies) may apply.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions State in this section that activities associated with the project that are proposed for Crown lands must be consistent with the approved Crown land use policies so that readers of the document are aware of the relevance/significance of Crown land use policies to the project.</p>	Suggested wording will be added to Section 4.3.2 where Crown land use is discussed as well as a bullet to Table 4-6: Summary of Preliminary Potential Effects to Socio-Economic Environment.	Section 4.2.3.1 Table 4-6	<p>The following text was added to Section 4.3.2 (Preliminary Potential Effects): :</p> <p>Activities associated with the Project that are proposed for Crown lands must be consistent with the approved Crown land use policies.</p> <p>The following bullet was added to Table 4-6, Summary of Preliminary Potential Effects to Socio-Economic Environment in the Provincial and Municipal Policy row:</p> <p>Compatibility of the Project with existing Crown land use policies.</p>
41				<p>Main Report; 4.3.2 Table 4-6 p. 62</p> <p>Comment Preliminary potential effects table frames "changes" in an ambiguous way; change can be positive or negative and this should be explicit; this ambiguity applies to all cases where "changes" are referred to including the section addressing the effects to Indigenous community use of lands and resources.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please add sub note to the table to identify that changes can be either positive or negative.</p>	Comment noted. A note will be added to this section.	Section 4.3.2	<p>The following note was added to the ToR:</p> <p>Note, changes can be either positive or negative.</p>
42				<p>Main Report; Sec. 4.2.4, Table 4-4, page 55 and Appendix B</p> <p>Comment Table 4-4: Study to be Completed during the EA has numerous references to the need for field studies. However, Appendix B, the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators does not list field studies as a Possible data source.</p> <p>As noted in above comments, MNRF will be considering whether the data presented is appropriate and sufficient to support predictions of effects, and adequacy of any proposed mitigation measures where appropriate, to support EA conclusions and potential mitigation strategies.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Recommend that HONI contacts MNRF as soon as possible about their proposed field work,</p>	Please see previous response to comment # 6 (emailed letter) related to the development of a field work plan. Also note that additional net effects assessment criteria and indicators have been added to the ToR appendices.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
43				<p>and that the ToR describes the studies/field work that HONI proposes to undertake.</p> <p>Main Report; Section 4.0/page 43 Forestry</p> <p>Comment Information that HONI will require / will be of value to HONI for the Environmental Assessment is available within forest management plans (FMPs) associated with the six forests that the proposed transmission line passes through. These forests and associated FMPs include: Lakehead Forest (2020-2030 FMP), Boundary Waters Forest (2020-2030 FMP), Dog-River Matawin Forest (2019-2021 FMP extension), Wabigoon Forest (2019-2029 FMP), Dryden Forest (2011-2021 FMP), and the English River Forest (2019-2029 FMP).</p> <p>MNRF advises that HONI understand the direction within these plans and how the proposed project interacts with the direction in them. Where HONI is unable to align with the direction in a FMP, additional approvals/steps may be required (e.g. plan amendment).</p> <p>In addition, there may be opportunities to coordinate and find efficiencies between the Waasigan project and forest operations related to road construction, harvest, and investment into renewal that will reduce impacts on natural values. For example, there may be a planned forest access road that might be beneficial to the Waasigan project during the construction period – aligning the construction of this road to suit both purposes may be warranted.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions MNRF strongly recommends that HONI becomes familiar with the FMPs and reach out to the sustainable forest license holders early on to discuss potential impacts of the project on forest operations, including (but not limited to) road use management strategies, aggregates for forestry purposes, timing restrictions, areas of concern, permanent forestry plots, forest renewal and harvesting methods to accommodate needs of local mills.</p>	Hydro One is aware of the forest management plans currently in effect as noted in Section 4.2.3.3 under Forestry and will continue to work with applicable stakeholders including MNRF and SFL holders during the EA to further understand these plans and forestry activities in the study area and to discuss potential impacts of the Project on forest operations, including road use management strategies, aggregates for forestry purposes, timing restrictions, areas of concern, permanent forestry plots, forest renewal and harvesting methods to accommodate needs of local mills.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
44				<p>Main Report; Table 4-4 (p.56), 7.1</p> <p>Comment The Significant Wildlife Habitat Mitigation Support Tool should be referenced for assessing and mitigating effects to Significant Wildlife Habitat. This Tool works collectively with the Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide and the Ecoregional Criteria Schedule for 3W.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions This should be added to the ToR as a source of information for mitigation measures.</p>	The Significant Wildlife Habitat Mitigation Support Tool will be referenced for assessing and mitigating effects to Significant Wildlife Habitat.	Section 4.2.4	<p>The following bullet was added to Table 4-4:</p> <p>Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment for Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant Wildlife Habitat Mitigation Support Tool to support the assessment and development of mitigation measures. This tool works collectively with the Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide and the Ecoregional Criteria Schedule for 3W.
45				<p>Main Report; Table 4-1, section 4.2.1 (p.21)</p> <p>Comment The Forest Resource Inventory Wetland Layer in LIO can be used as a layer to identify potential</p>	The Land Information Ontario Forest Resource Inventory Wetland Layer will be added as a source to Table 4-1: Key Records Reviewed.	Table 4-1	The following resource was added to Table 4-1: Key Records



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
46				<p>wetlands as mapped for Forest Resource Inventory purposes to an Ecological Land Classification Ecosite that may not be mapped within the Wetland Layer.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions This could be added to the ToR as a source of information for the EA.</p> <p>Draft ToR Guide (p.4) and Main Report Sec. 5.1.1.1, page 64 -65</p> <p>Comment The width of the proposed transmission corridor RoW is inconsistently stated throughout the draft ToR and supporting documents.</p> <p>The Draft ToR guide states on p. 4 that the ROW width should range from 40 – 45 m. This is inconsistent with the Draft ToR where it states that the ROW is expected to range from 40-76m depending on terrain and distance between transmission structures. Note that the 40-76m range of ROW is a significant variation in width that could considerably increase the footprint of the project.</p> <p>In addition, the ToR states that additional ROW width may be required for general construction access, temporary working space, laydown areas and access roads.</p> <p>Note that authorization for temporary construction areas will be permitted separately from the ROW and are not justification for an increased ROW width. All new temporary construction areas and access roads will be required to be decommissioned and returned to natural forest cover in order to minimize the project footprint.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please provide consistent information on the width of the ROW in the ToR and EA to ensure an accurate and defensible assessment of potential impacts and adequacy of planned mitigations, and to avoid misperceptions among interested parties (including MNRF and its stakeholder groups) of the project impacts.</p> <p>One way to help the characterization of the ROW width is to map the geographic area of the ROW (to show where it is expected to vary from the 40m standard ROW width; for example, where additional width is needed when the ROW crosses an existing ROW, or to accommodate angles in the route).</p> <p>Minimizing the project footprint and scoping the area necessary to be cleared as a result of the project will be a key component of minimizing impacts to the terrestrial and aquatic environments.</p>	<p>The typical anticipated required ROW width is approximately 40-45 m. In some sections of the line, a wider ROW width may be required where, for example, larger towers are required for angles or turns or large water body crossings.</p> <p>The ROW width requirements will be described in the EA and confirmed during the design phase of the Project.</p> <p>Hydro One will provide further information on the ROW width and temporary use areas during the EA as more detailed project information becomes available; however, these areas are typically identified by the Project constructor and Hydro One has not yet been awarded the construction rights of the Project.</p> <p>Hydro One agrees that minimizing the Project Footprint to the extent possible including areas to be cleared is in the best interest of all parties and for minimizing potential effects to both the natural and socio-economic environment. Typically, areas that exhibit previous disturbance are more preferred than other areas for temporary use purposes.</p> <p>Hydro One understands that separate authorization may be required for areas to be used for temporary construction purposes and plans to discuss this further with MNRF.</p>	Section 5.1.1.1	<p>Reviewed for use during the EA:</p> <p>Forest Resource Inventory Wetland Layer (LIO)</p> <p>The following was included in Section 5.1.1.1 (Transmission Line):</p> <p>The proposed ROW for the Project is expected to be approximately 40 m to 45 m. In some sections of the ROW, additional width may be required depending on the specific location of the new transmission line, the local terrain, distance between the transmission structures and specific contractor requirements.</p>
47				<p>Main Report; Section 5.1.1.2 Access Roads (Page 66-67)</p> <p>Comment As temporary and permanent access roads are anticipated to be required for the construction and operation phases of the project, it should be noted that any new access roads, either temporary or permanent will require authorization by MNRF before construction takes place.</p> <p>Depending on the extent of the upgrade to any existing trails or roads, upgrades may also require authorization before upgrades occur.</p> <p>Discussion on access roads does not speak to the need for water crossings as part of the access road network, nor does it provide any insight as to what types of water crossings (bridges, culverts, ice bridges) will be required.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please include in the EA rationale for why, where, how and when these access roads and trails will be needed, and how temporary access roads will be decommissioned and restored. Minimizing the project footprint and scoping the area necessary to be cleared to implement the project and identifying restoration activities that HONI will carry out will be a key component of minimizing impacts to the terrestrial and aquatic environments.</p> <p>More information is needed about the type of water crossing being considering for this project so that the impacts of these structures can be identified and considered as part of the future EA.</p>	<p>As indicated in the draft ToR, temporary and/or permanent watercourse crossings may be required for the Project. However, given the Project is still in the early phases, the location and type of watercourse crossings are not yet known but may include a combination of bridges and culverts. Hydro One will provide more information on this during the EA once a preferred transmission route is selected and potential construction access road requirements can be determined. Hydro One also understands that authorization may be required from MNRF relating to use of and/or upgrades to existing access roads and any new access roads.</p> <p>Please also see previous response to comment # 2 (emailed letter) related to the development of an Access Plan. Hydro One will continue to work with applicable stakeholders (including MNRF and SFL holders) during the EA to further review and discuss access and will provide more information in the EA on the rationale for why, where, how and when these access roads and trails will be needed, and how temporary access roads will be decommissioned and restored.</p>	Section 5.1.1.2	<p>The following line was added to Section 5.1.1.2 (Access Roads) to refer to the approval requirement for road and water crossings on Crown land:</p> <p>Permits and/or authorization to construct access roads and water crossing on Crown land will be obtained prior to construction, as applicable.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				Add the following line to this section to refer to the approval requirement for road and water crossings on Crown land: "Permits and/or authorization to construct access roads and water crossing on Crown land will be obtained prior to construction, as applicable."			
48				Main Report; Section 5.1.1.5 Temporary Land Rights (Page 67) Comment The intent of this section is unclear. Is the intent of this section to speak to the potential temporary use of private lands for the project? Use of Crown lands for stockpiling equipment and materials will require appropriate approvals. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please clarify whether the 'temporary land rights' will be required on Crown lands, private lands, or both. If the use of Crown lands is anticipated for this purpose, please refer to the need to obtain appropriate approvals before Crown land can be used for construction activities.	The intent of this section is to indicate that areas along the ROW may be required on a temporary basis to accommodate construction activities, such as providing additional working space, stockpiling, and equipment/material laydown or to facilitate conductor pulling/tensioning and that these areas, if required, will be decommissioned and restored following construction. Given the early stage of the Project, these areas are not yet known; however, more detail will be provided in the EA once closer to identifying a preferred route. It is understood that authorization may be required before Crown land can be used for construction purposes.	Section 5.1.1.5	The following line was added to Section 5.1.1.5 Temporary Land Rights (now 5.1.1.6) to refer to temporary use of Crown land for construction purposes: Appropriate approvals and/or authorizations will be obtained for any Crown land required for construction activities.
49				Main Report; Section 5.1.1.6 Upgrades to Existing Transformer Stations (Page 68) Comment Upgrades to existing transformer stations may include expansion of the fenced-in area of the Lakehead, Mackenzie and Dryden transformer stations. It is not clear whether additional lands (Crown land or other private land) is needed for such expansions. Where additional Crown land is needed for these upgrades, appropriate approvals will be required from MNRF. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please clarify in the ToR whether the upgrades to existing Transformer Stations requires additional lands. Additional lands needed for upgrades to transformer stations should be considered as part of the project and its impacts assessed accordingly.	Given the early stage of the Project, details related to any upgrades to the existing transformer stations are not yet known; however, this will be shared with applicable stakeholders, including MNRF, during the EA once known. If additional lands are required to accommodate the transformer station upgrades, including Crown land or private land, this will be discussed with relevant parties and the appropriate approvals will be acquired beforehand. These required areas will be included in the Project Footprint and net effects assessment of the EA.	Section 5.1.1.6	The following was added to Section 5.1.1.6 Upgrades to Existing Transformer Stations (now 5.1.1.7): If acquisition of additional land is required to accommodate the upgrades, including Crown land or private land, this will be discussed with relevant parties and the appropriate approvals will be acquired beforehand.
50				Main Report; Section 5.2.3 Retirement (Page 70-71) Comment This section states that decommissioning will not be planned and assessed in this EA but will be planned and conducted in accordance with the relevant standards and regulatory requirements in effect at the time decommissioning is considered. As such, the retirement or decommissioning of the transmission line and associated supporting infrastructure (e.g. roads) is not being considered. MECP's Code of practice: ToR encourages all elements of the undertaking's life cycle to be assessed in order to appropriately protect the environment for current and future generations. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions While the project is not expected to require decommissioning in the near future, known elements of decommissioning (such as removing towers and cables and the creation of roads in order to remove these features from the landscape) should be included as part of the impact assessment of alternate routes in the EA.	Decommissioning of the Project is not contemplated at this time and, if required, would be undertaken in accordance with applicable standards and regulatory requirements in effect at that time as the regulatory regime will likely change over the next 50 to 100 years. Notwithstanding the above, the net effects assessment and mitigation measures to be identified during the EA for the construction of the Project will likely equally apply to the removal of the Project at a future point in time (50 to 100 years from now) and this can be further described in the EA based on available information. Details relating to the decommissioning and rehabilitation of temporary infrastructure (laydown yards, worker camps, access roads etc.) will be provided in the EA.	Section 5.2.3	The following was added to Section 5.2.3 (Retirement): The net effects assessment and mitigation measures to be identified during the EA for the construction of the Project will likely equally apply to the potential removal of the



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				Furthermore, details are required about decommissioning and rehabilitation of temporary infrastructure (laydown yards, worker camps, access roads etc.).			Project at a future point in time, should it ever be required, and this will be further described in the EA.
51				Main Report; Section 5.5.2/page 70 Comment The TOR doesn't appear to consider to how electric and magnetic fields would affect the natural environment (i.e. only human impacts are discussed on page 70) Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please address how electric and magnetic fields resulting from the project could impact the natural environment. Perhaps this could be considered under the terrestrial wildlife and wildlife habitat baseline component in section 4.0 (on page 56). It is acknowledged that acoustic effects of the transmission lines are included in baseline component to be assessed.	Hydro One looks to health agencies and a large number of reputable scientific organizations around the world to assess scientific studies and provide advice and guidance with respect to electric and magnetic fields (EMF) exposure and have concluded that the scientific research does not demonstrate that EMFs cause or contribute to adverse health effects nor have identified any concern or effects related to wildlife and/or wildlife habitat that Hydro One is aware of. Hydro One looks to Health Canada to provide guidelines on exposure to EMFs, and Hydro One designs its transmission lines to respect EMF exposure guidelines as established by international experts and organizations. Further resources can be found at www.hydroone.com/power-outages-and-safety/corporate-health-and-safety/electric-and-magnetic-fields .	Section 5.2.2	The following was added to Section 5.2.2 (Operation and Maintenance): The EA will include additional information related to the Project and EMF.
52				Main Report; 6.1; p.72 Comment In the description of alternatives to the Undertaking, the ToR pre-supposes that an analysis against the "do nothing" option will confirm the advantages of proceeding with the project. Language used in this section is biased towards an outcome before the analysis has been completed. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Suggest that the 2nd paragraph in 6.1 be deleted as it appears to pre-suppose the outcome of the evaluation of the Project against the "do nothing" alternative.	This paragraph will be deleted.	Section 6.1	The following was deleted: The comparative evaluation of the Project against the "do nothing" alternative will provide a final confirmation that, on balance, the advantages of proceeding with the Project exceed those of not proceeding with it and thus will confirm the rationale for the Project.
53				Main Report; Table 6-4 Comment The table discussing general route selection considerations doesn't contemplate a "rule" to minimize use of greenfield options by paralleling existing linear infrastructure. In the corridor workshop held in June 2019 it was discussed that minimizing effects and disturbance to existing built up areas defaults the project to prefer undisturbed areas, which increases environmental impacts. This is discussed in section 6.0 on page 78. Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Maximizing use of existing roads and infrastructure corridors (where appropriate) in order to minimize environmental impacts should be considered in the table.	This suggestion will be added to the table.	Section 6.2.2	The following was inserted into Section 6.2.2 (Alternative Route Evaluation) Table 6-4: General Routing Selection Considerations under Technical (note table moved to appendix): Maximize use of existing roads and infrastructure corridors (where appropriate) in order to minimize potential environmental effects.
54				Main Report; Section 6.2.2.1 Section 1 – City of TBay to Town of Atikokan (Page 88) Comment While the preceding text to this section speaks to the preference for twining with existing	See response to comment # 57.	N/A	N/A



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>infrastructure it does not state why the preference is to twin the existing 230 kV line only for the approx. 100 km stretch from West of the Kaministiquia River to Eva Lake.</p> <p>Twinning of both the 230 kV and of the 115 kV lines should be considered as options for consideration within this stretch.</p> <p>Consideration of alternatives is a key component of the EA and important in identifying and justifying the selection of the preferred route.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Evaluate additional alternative routes in Section 1 (Thunder Bay to Atikokan) within the section from the Kaministiquia River to Eva Lake, including the option of twinning along the existing 115 kV line where it deviates from the 230 kV line.</p>			
55				<p>Main Report; Figures 6.2 & 6.7 p.96</p> <p>Comment The rationale for why alternate routes 3b and 3c are included in the ToR needs to be clarified. The meaning of the statement “While the Highway 622/Snake Bay Road corridor did not show up in composite corridor map, it did present strongly from a natural heritage perspective” is not immediately clear.</p> <p>Is the point trying to be made that including these alternatives in the EA makes sense because there was only one route identified through/as a result of transmission line sighting workshop, and it happens to travel through multiple protected areas (Conservation reserve and Provincial Park) and an enhanced management area – so alternate routes 3b and 3c are included to provide viable options that minimize impacts to protected areas?</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please re-word this section to make it clear to the reader why routes 3b and 3c are being evaluated as alternate routes.</p>	<p>Correct. While routes 3b and 3c were not included as part of the top three percent of all possible routes identified in the siting model, they did present strongly within the Natural Environment perspective/corridor and provide an alternative crossing location of the potentially sensitive Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Park. This alternative route also avoids the crossing of the Campus Lake Conservation Reserve and White Otter Enhanced Management Area which have been identified as important features by Ontario Parks. This alternative route was thus included for further assessment during the EA which will be subject to more detailed assessment. The addition of these alternative routes allows for the consideration of a greater number of alternatives to be examined in the EA. Wording will be clarified in the identified ToR section.</p>	Section 6.2.2.3	<p>The following text will be added to Section 6.2.2.3 Section 3 – North Atikokan to Wabigoon Lake to clarify why these routes were included:</p> <p>The alternative routes identified in Section 3 are discussed below and illustrated in Figure 6-7. It is noted that for this section, some alternative routes were identified that are located outside of the composite corridor presented previously in Figure 6-2. The corridors represent the top three percent of all possible routes that the siting model generates. The corridors are intended to be used as a starting point to guide the Project team in route identification and selection. While the Highway 622/Snake Bay Road corridor did not show up in composite corridor map, it did present strongly from a natural heritage perspective and also provides an</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
56				<p>Main Report; Table 6-4 (Page 87)</p> <p>Comment Add Significant Wildlife Habitat to the list of bracketed examples.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Add Significant Wildlife Habitat to the list of bracketed examples.</p>	<p>The table will be updated accordingly.</p>	<p>Section 6.2.2</p>	<p>additional crossing location of the sensitive Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Park. These routes also avoid the crossing of the Campus Lake Conservation Reserve and the White Otter Enhanced Management Area. As such, to avoid potentially sensitive areas and to offer additional route alternatives for more detailed consideration in the EA, alternative routes along this road system were identified as described below.</p> <p>The following was updated in Table 6-4: General Routing Selection Considerations under Natural (<i>italics</i>) (note moved to appendix):</p> <p>Minimize potential disturbance to significant natural features (e.g., ANSIs, SAR, environmentally sensitive areas, wetlands, waterbodies, <i>Significant Wildlife Habitat</i>), critical Landform/Vegetation types and adhere to appropriate setback requirements.</p>
57				<p>Main Report; Section 6.2.2.1; Section 1 – City of TBay to Town of Atikokan; (Page 88) Section 6.3 Alternative Route Evaluation in the EA; (Page 103)</p> <p>Comment Section 6.3 speaks to future analysis ‘to select, on balance, the route alternatives that has more advantage than disadvantages.</p> <p>Given that this is a key goal of the EA, additional alternatives should be provided and evaluated in the EA in order to arrive at the preferred route and associated rationale for it.</p>	<p>The ToR will be updated to explain the consideration of route alternatives between Eva Lake to Kaministiquia River, and in particular the route section between Shebandowan Lake and Kashabowie Provincial Park.</p> <p>Local cottager associations as well as individual cottagers have been, and will continue to be, included in consultation efforts.</p>	<p>Section 6.2.2.1</p>	<p>Section 6.2.2.1 updated to include the following additional information:</p> <p>Between Thunder Bay to Atikokan,</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>It is acknowledged that the transmission line sighting workshop and associated preliminary modelling was used to narrow down the study area into a suite of potential alternative routes to evaluate within the EA. In some areas of the ToR, the modeling output provided only one route option, but in other areas, additional routes were added in order to provide a suite of alternatives (e.g. between Atikokan and the Trans-Canada Highway to provide an alternative that may have less impact on the provincial parks and conservation reserves).</p> <p>An area that would benefit from the addition of a second alternative route is around Shebandowan Lake (see Crown Land Use Policy Atlas, land use area # G2699). Uses in this area are governed by Crown Land Use Policies and the Shebandowan Lake Management Plan, which includes a Restricted Area Order under the Public Lands Act.</p> <p>The area is used substantially by cottagers; there will very likely be interest in the proposed development from individual cottagers as well as the local cottagers association.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Recommend that more alternatives be evaluated in sections where there is only 1 route proposed, in order to help substantiate route selections.</p> <p>Specifically, consider/evaluate additional alternative routes in Section 1 (T.Bay to Atikokan) within the section from the Kaministiquia River to Eva Lake.</p> <p>Recommend that local cottager associations as well as individual cottagers be included in consultation efforts.</p>			<p>particularly from Eva Lake to the Kaministiquia River, the siting model identified a single route that runs along the existing 230 kV transmission line. The section along the north side of Shebandowan Lake, just south of Kashabowie Provincial Park has been identified as a sensitive area. It is an area governed by CLUPA and the Shebandowan Lake Management Plan. The potential for other alternative routes around this area was reviewed; however, the presence of large waterbodies north and south of this area limits the feasibility of alternatives routes. To the north is Kashabowie Lake and the larger Lac des Mille Lacs Lake, including the lands dedicated to the Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation. To the south is Greenwater Lake which is also a lake of considerable size. To avoid these large water bodies would require the development of a new "greenfield" route that would need to be located a considerable distance away from the existing 230 kV transmission line. This would add to the route length</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<p>and increase potential effects, including the creation of new access into more remote lands. For these reasons, alternative routes in the Shebandowan Lake area were not identified.</p> <p>From the Shebandowan Lake area to Eva Lake, there is a rail line located to the north of the existing 230 kV transmission line ROW which was also examined. Following rail lines tends to be more challenging due to their winding nature. To minimize the length of the route, straighter sections of greenfield route would be required which would be located away from the rail line and which would contribute to greater impact. Considering no major significant natural features have been identified along the existing 230 kV transmission line ROW, following the rail line was not explored further as an alternative route.</p> <p>During the EA, Hydro One will consult with the MNRF, Indigenous communities, and local stakeholders, including local cottager associations and individual</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							cottagers to gather feedback, identify concerns, and make effort to minimize, if not avoid, adverse potential effects.
58				<p>Main Report; Section 6.2.2.1; Section 1 – City of T.Bay to Town of Atikokan; (Page 88)</p> <p>Comment While the model preference most strongly favours twinning, additional consideration must be given to the potential impacts of adding a 3rd RoW in places where the existing 230 kV line and 115 kV are already twinned.</p> <p>At what point does too wide of a linear corridor result in habitat fragmentation?</p> <p>The environmental impacts of twinning one existing line are different then adding a 3rd line to an already twinned section and therefore should be discussed and evaluated for potential impact separately.</p> <p>(Same comment could be applied to route Section 4 Page 99).</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The environmental impacts of twinning one existing line are different then adding a 3rd line to an always twinned section and, therefore, should be discussed and evaluated for potential impact separately.</p>	As noted in Section 6.2.1.2 (Calibrating the Siting Model with Internal and External Input) there are several benefits associated with co-location and Hydro One is encouraged to co-locate per the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) which states that co-location of infrastructure should be promoted. This was also consistent with feedback received at Corridor Workshops and others during the development of the ToR. The widening of the existing ROW in areas of co-location would only amount to an additional ROW expansion of approximately 40 to 45 m. Notwithstanding this, Hydro One will further review this as part of the EA once specific habitats are identified along the alternative routes.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
59				<p>6.2.2.2; Section 2 Town of Atikokan; 3rd paragraph</p> <p>Comment More Information is required to determine if the proposed routes, especially Alternate Route 2A encroach the Steep Rock property limits.</p> <p>The proposed transmission line location and transmission line infrastructure must consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the current site and future landscape of the former Pit Lakes (Roberts, Hogarth, and Caland) and adjoining waterbodies. Dam structures located within the Steep Rock site Hazard lands (current and future) identified by MNRF <p>Failure to recognize the current and future conditions may lead to costly impacts to Hydro One's transmission line infrastructure.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The proposed transmission line infrastructure will have to consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the estimated final pit lake elevations 394.00 m (2056 – 2072 depending on the MNRF rehabilitation strategy) the estimated lake outline, based on the contour 394.00 m, the proper flood hazard limit offsets (to be determined using MNRF flood limits policy documents). <p>MNRF strongly advises Hydro One to consult with the ministry as soon as possible regarding the former Steep Rock Mine site and the long-term strategic plan for the area.</p>	<p>The alternative routes provided in the draft ToR are considered preliminary and meant to provide a general context with respect to routing options. These alternative routes will be carried into the EA where they will be evaluated, including their impact (or not) on the former Steep Rock mine property and associated rehabilitation plan. Should a route in the vicinity of the former Steep Rock mine property be identified as the preferred, there will be further opportunities to refine it to minimize any potential effects to the former Steep rock mine property and associated rehabilitation plan. Hydro One will further engage the MNRF and other applicable stakeholders as part of the alternative route assessment to ensure that any route selected as preferred avoids and/or minimizes adverse effects to this area.</p> <p>During the EA, Hydro One will consult with the MNRF on the former Steep Rock mine property and the long-term strategic plan for the area as part of the alternative route evaluation during the EA to determine the feasibility of any routing options in this area.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
60				<p>Main Report; Section 6.2.2.3 Page 98</p> <p>Comment Section 3B and 3C are identified incorrectly on the map. Please change the labelling on the map.</p>	The route descriptions will be updated to reflect the route nomenclature on Figure 6.7 (Section 3: North of Atikokan).	Section 6.2.2.3	The following text replaced the current text for alternative routes 3B and 3C in Section 6.2.2.3 (Section 3 – North Atikokan to Wabigoon Lake):





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative Route 3B, Highway 622/Snake Bay Road • This route starts at the north of the Town of Atikokan and follows Highway 622 and Snake Bay Road until it terminates in the Wabigoon Lake area. This route provides an additional crossing alternative of the Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Park, and avoids crossing the Campus Lake Conservation Reserve and White Otter Enhanced Management Area; however, would require a crossing of the East Wabigoon Conservation Reserve. • Alternative Route 3C, Highway 622/230 kV Transmission Line • This route starts in the vicinity of the intersection of Highway 622 and Snake Bay Road and follows Highway 622 until it terminates at the 230 kV transmission line. This route

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							provides an additional crossing alternative of the Turtle River-White Otter Lake Provincial Park, and avoids crossing the Campus Lake Conservation Reserve and White Otter Enhanced Management Area.
61				<p>Main Report; Figure 6.4 (Page 91)</p> <p>Comment Mapping error in Figure 6.4 in the Eva Lake area.</p> <p>Figure 6.4 currently shows Route 1 as branching off to the 115kv line south of Eva lake. According to text and figure 6.5, this is route 1C as route 1 continue along the 230 kV line. (not shown as an alternative at all on Figure 6.4)</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Fix Figure 6.4 accordingly to match with text description and Figure 6.5. Please show alternate route 1c and route 1 around Eva Lake on figure 6-4.</p>	This will be updated in the ToR.	Section 6	<p>The following was updated in Figure 6.4 (Section 1: Lakehead TS to Mackenzie TS: Centre Section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust west end of Route 1 to follow existing 230 kV transmission line. Add Route 1C to the west end of this figure along the 115 kV transmission line.
62				<p>Main Report; Section 2: Atikokan; Figure 6.6; page 95</p> <p>Comment It is difficult to see how the alternate routes might intersect the Steep Rock site. Please include additional information in the map as the Steep Rock pit lakes and adjoining lakes not shown in enough detail.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please include maps to show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steep Rock limits; and outline of the Steep Rock pit lakes, current elevations and, if possible, the outline of estimated final pit lake contour elevations. 	<p>The alternative routes provided in the draft ToR are considered preliminary and meant to provide a general context with respect to routing options. These alternative routes will be carried into the EA where they will be evaluated, including their potential effects to the former Steep Rock mine property and associated rehabilitation plan. Should a route in the vicinity of the former Steep Rock mine property be identified as preferred, there will be further opportunities to refine it to minimize any potential effects to the former Steep Rock mine property and associated rehabilitation plan. Hydro One will further engage the MNRF and other applicable stakeholders as part of the alternative route assessment to ensure that any route selected as preferred avoids and/or minimizes adverse effects to this area.</p> <p>As part of the EA, Hydro One will also discuss the former Steep Rock mine property and the long-term strategic plan for the area as part of the alternative route evaluation during the EA to determine the feasibility of any routing options in this area. More detailed mapping can be provided as part of these discussions.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
63				<p>Main Report; Section 7.1 (potential effects assessment, p.105); Section 6.3 p.103; Appendix B.</p> <p>Comment Our understanding is that the effects assessment of the alternative routes will identify a preferred route. However, will the assessment only be based on the major infrastructure within the ROW (the transmission corridor)? Or will it take into consideration all project infrastructure and components (such as potential laydown yards, work camps, water crossings and roads)?</p> <p>Appendix B suggests that indicators are limited to the evaluation of impacts within the ROW (e.g. Number and area (ha) of unevaluated wetlands within the ROW).</p> <p>The ROW is only one component of this project and an assessment of all project components should be used as indicators when determining the route with the least amount of environmental</p>	<p>Section 7.1 (Potential Effects Assessment) provides a complete overview of the evaluation of alternative routes and the subsequent net effects assessment. As noted therein, the net effects assessment will include the preferred transmission line route, transformer station upgrades, the separation of existing circuits connecting with the Mackenzie TS, and major infrastructure required for Project construction (e.g., access roads and watercourse crossings). The net effects assessment will be completed using the effects assessment criteria and indicators that have been added to Appendix. The evaluation criteria and indicators will be used to complete the alternative route assessment.</p> <p>The EA will also document baseline conditions of any known areas outside of the transmission line ROW that will be required for the Project.</p> <p>Although this information is already stated in the Section 7.1 of the ToR, a further</p>	Section 7.1	<p>The following was added to the beginning of the third paragraph in Section 7.1 (Potential Effects Assessment):</p> <p>A draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators which will be used to</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>impacts (i.e. ROW and roads, and laydown areas) to properly assess the full impacts of that route alternative.</p> <p>In addition, will the alternative route effects assessment take into consideration all phases of the project (construction, maintenance and decommissioning)? Both these pieces should be considered in the effects assessment as cumulative effects of minor components (such as laydown areas, etc), or effects through time (e.g. roads that need to be re-built to enable decommissioning) are important considerations in weighting the various route options. The ToR includes criteria and indicators associated with the alternate route effects assessment (appendix B), but does not yet include a suite of criteria and indicators associated with the full net effects assessment for the preferred route.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please update Appendix B to include all project components (ROW + roads, laydown yards etc.) as the area for criteria/ indicator assessment as part of the alternative route assessment.</p> <p>Please provide added detail on the difference between the route effects assessment and the preferred route project net effects assessment in the ToR.</p>	<p>clarification will be provided.</p>		<p>complete the net effects assessment in the EA, is provided in Appendix D. The net effects assessment will include the preferred transmission line ROW, as well as any other identified known lands required for other Project components on either a temporary or permanent basis.</p>
64				<p>Main Report; Section 8.0 (project effects and compliance monitoring)</p> <p>Comment It is acknowledged that monitoring for compliance will occur in all phases of the project, however it is not very clear if monitoring will include the social/economic environments in addition to the natural environment.</p> <p>For example, the TOR could identify monitoring plans that will be in place (such as specific social/economic and environmental monitoring plans or another if known from similar projects) and how these plans will address commitments made during TOR process, as well as how any negative effects and benefit enhancement measures will be managed to ensure project success. The plans should include monitoring objectives, schedules and frameworks as developed during the EA.</p> <p>Some examples of monitoring might include – monitoring impacts to recreational use of Crown land due to any temporary road closures, or monitoring whether measures put in place to limit the creation of unwanted access to remote areas, or whether noise control measures are effective.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Further elaborate on what the monitoring will be conducted, and what the various monitoring plans will measure /monitor. For example, elaborate on whether activities are intended to measure / monitor mitigation effectiveness; compliance with applicable legislation/regulations/standards and permits; and compliance with commitments made in the EA. Also identify whether monitoring will include for activities to monitor commitments related to socio-economic environments in addition to the natural environment.</p>	<p>The noted recommendations are addressed in Section 8 (Environmental Commitments and Monitoring) of the ToR which states the following:</p> <p>Hydro One will develop a monitoring framework during the EA and will consider all phases of the Project, and a construction and post-construction monitoring plan will be developed and included in the EA to ensure environmental commitments are met. As described in this section of the ToR, the primary objective of the environmental monitoring program will be to confirm that the assumptions used in the assessment were correct and the effectiveness of mitigation measures; and, determine compliance with applicable environmental legislation, regulations, industry standards, Project permits and commitments made by Hydro One in both the ToR and EA. Monitoring during the construction and operation/maintenance phase will focus on confirming that the assumptions used in the assessment were correct, assessing the effectiveness of the mitigation measures implemented to reduce these effects and evaluating the need for any modified or new measures. Hydro One will also employ the services of an Environmental Inspector(s) during construction of the Project to assist with monitoring and will identify actual Project-related environmental effects, and the effectiveness of mitigation and reclamation measures.</p> <p>Additional wording can be added to indicate that both the natural and socio-economic environments will be included in monitoring plans.</p>	Section 8	<p>The following was added to this section:</p> <p>Both the natural and socio-economic environments will be considered when developing the monitoring framework.</p>
65				<p>Main Report; Section 8.2; Project Effect and Compliance Monitoring; (Page 109)</p> <p>Comment How does HONI intend to approach / manage the possibility of encountering previously unknown values during construction (e.g. previously undocumented bird nests, wetlands, water crossing etc.).</p> <p>As desktop data is sparse in places, HONI should be prepared for how it will protect/ mitigate impacts to new values that are encountered.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The ToR should speak to the preparation of plans / protocols for addressing a) actions HONI will take to check areas for values that may not have been previously known/identified prior to commencing construction (and/or operations) in a specific area; and b) actions that will be taken to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate any potential negative effects to those values.</p> <p>In addition, the EA should address protocols / contingencies that will be followed in the event that construction timelines (and associated assumptions about the avoidance of impacts) change.</p>	<p>This information will be provided in the EA, typically as part of pre-, during, and post-construction monitoring plans and once all baseline data, including field study results, are received and reviewed.</p>	Section 8.2	<p>The following was added to this section:</p> <p>In addition, the EA will address protocols/ contingencies that will be followed in the event that construction timelines (and associated assumptions about the avoidance of effects) change.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
66				<p>Main Report; Section 8.2; Project Effect and Compliance Monitoring; (Page 109)</p> <p>Comment Text states: 'The required duration of monitoring and/or follow-up programs will be established during the EA and will be based on environmental features and any conditions associated with approvals and/or permit received'</p> <p>This statement is incorrect as permits cannot be issued until <u>after</u> the EA is completed and approved.</p> <p>While general conditions for future approvals may be able to be determined in advance, the monitoring plans should not be based on them, but be flexible to incorporate them in the future once permits are received.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Edit text: The required duration of monitoring and/or follow-up programs will be established during the EA and will be based on environmental features and any conditions associated with approvals and/or permit required.'</p>	The suggested change will be made.	Section 8.2	<p>Section 8.2 (Project Effects and Compliance Monitoring) was updated to remove existing text and replaced with the following:</p> <p>The required duration of monitoring and/or follow-up programs will be established during the EA and will be based on environmental features and any conditions associated with approvals and/or permits required.</p>
67				<p>Main Report; Section 8.2 (project effects and compliance monitoring)</p> <p>Comment Suggest the addition of monitoring Forestry related commitments of the project</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please add the monitoring and compliance of forestry activities. Note that monitoring/compliance of the following activities should be identified in the EA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renewal- monitoring rehabilitated sites (plantations) to ensure they reach the Free-to- Grow stage (8 years post plant). The renewal agreement may include wording that the forest companies will take these areas back after planting is completed. 2. Access Roads- Roads will need to be inspected to ensure that all Road Use Management Strategies were followed. The water crossing installations and removals will need to be inspected during and after project is complete. 3. Harvesting and burning of slash piles 	Hydro One is committed to environmental protection and responsible environmental management. Project monitoring will be tailored to the preferred route (once selected) and areas of potential impact and thus the ToR only provides a high-level overview and commitment to develop detailed monitoring plans during the EA as more information becomes available. The information noted in the comment is more appropriate to be included in the monitoring plans to be developed during the EA once more project-specific information and baseline data becomes available.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
68				<p>Main Report; Section 8.2 (project effects and compliance monitoring)</p> <p>Comment Public health and safety is an important consideration that should be reflected in the EA and this section of the TOR is silent on this. How does Hydro One plan to monitor the effects of, and compliance with, factors related to public health and safety?</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please add a section in the TOR on how the EA will assess safety risks to directly affected stakeholders – i.e. stakeholders that are directly affected by construction on a daily basis—and how these risks will be avoided and/or mitigated. An example of this is the Turtle Lake Cottage Owners that would encounter construction traffic, dust, and noise on a daily basis during construction in that area should the route go through that area. MNRF recommends that that the EA includes a safety plan.</p>	<p>Construction nuisance effects are addressed under the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases and Acoustic Environment headings in the draft ToR with potential effects identified in Table 4-6: Summary of Preliminary Potential Effects to Socio-Economic Environment. Both construction nuisance effects and public safety will be addressed as part of the net effects assessment to be completed during the EA once a preferred route is selected and potential effects are identified. The net effects assessment will identify potential effects to communities to ensure that the appropriate mitigation measures are in place to address any safety-related construction concerns.</p> <p>Consultation with potentially affected stakeholders, including Turtle Lake cottagers, will be ongoing during the EA and will provide additional opportunities for comment so that Hydro One can better understand how the Project could potentially affect specific communities and the nature of any health and/or safety concerns that need to be addressed.</p> <p>A commitment to prepare a Safety Plan prior to construction will be made in the EA.</p>	Section 4.2.3.2 Table 4-6:	ToR updated to reflect revised wording related to health and safety.
69				<p>Main Report; 10.3.1</p> <p>Comment The newspaper identified as the Sioux Lookout Wawatay News is incorrect; there is the Sioux Lookout Bulletin (which is centered on Sioux Lookout proper), and then there is Wawatay News (which is centered on the Far North of Ontario)</p>	Clarification will be made in the ToR.	Section 10.3.1	Sioux Lookout Wawatay News will be changed to "Wawatay News".

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
70				<p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Decide if one or both are needed and use the proper name(s). Main Report; Section 10.2.1/page 115 10.2.1.2</p> <p>Comment The EA Consultation Plan loosely lists anticipated stakeholders but suggests that a project contact list has been created.</p> <p>Stakeholders commonly involved with MNRF include license and permit holders, tourism groups, cottagers and those not already identified that are involved in forest management planning. MNRF can assist with providing information to these stakeholders.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the project contact list may evolve as the EA progresses; however, the consultation plan should outline in more specific terms who will be consulted with during the preparation of the EA as per the Code of Practice (Preparing and reviewing term of reference for Environmental Assessment). For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will all known stakeholders within the RSA (5km) be identified? • Will stakeholders that use access within the 5km but are outside the RSA be notified? • Will stakeholder engagement identification include access for construction (e.g. road upgrades and use)? • Will this detailed analysis cover all of the identified alternate routes in the Draft TOR? <p>MNRF may have consultation requirements in order to issue permits and authorizations. Issuance could be delayed if adequate consultation has not taken place through the course of the EA</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The EA Consultation Plan should more fully describe who will be consulted, how and at what points in the EA process to: a) ensure that appropriate parties have the opportunity to provide input to the EA process; and b) the effects of stakeholder engagement/consultation on the evaluation of alternatives can be seen by MNRF and all parties interested in the EA / project.</p> <p>MNRF recommends that HONI contact the Ministry to discuss the consultation plan as soon as possible.</p>	Please see previous response to comment #7 (emailed letter) related to consultation.	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
71				<p>10.5</p> <p>Comment Indigenous Engagement Plan – consider including a reference to meeting the duty to consult through the delegation of procedural aspects of consultation at the beginning of the section in addition to the reference in 10.5.1</p>	A reference to the Duty to Consult will be provided in Section 10.5 Indigenous Engagement Plan.	Section 10.5 (10.4 in updated ToR)	Delegation of procedural aspects referenced in this ToR section.
72				<p>10.5; p.138</p> <p>Comment Consultation summary and link to record of consultation</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please include a summary of key issues raised/resolved in the main body of the EA as well as a cross reference to the record of consultation. This will provide a link from higher- level summaries used for general information dissemination to the details in the record of consultation.</p>	A summary of key issues raised/resolved will be provided in the main body of the EA with cross-reference to the Record of Consultation.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
73				<p>Main Report; Section 11.0; Other Permits, Approvals and Authorizations; (Page 140)</p> <p>Comment While text is correct that ‘some permits and approvals rely on more detailed engineering that is available during the EA process;’ the more information that is provided within the EA the faster and more efficiently future permits can be issued.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Note: the more information/studies/requirement provided earlier on within the EA, the faster and more efficiently future permits can be issued.</p>	Hydro One will endeavor to provide as much detail as early as possible during the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
74				<p>Main Report; Table 11.1/page 143</p> <p>Comment</p>	The noted updates will be made to the MNRF row in Table 11-1: Other Relevant Provincial Legislation, Permits, Approvals and Authorizations.	Section 11.1.5 Table 11-1	Table updated based on information



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>This section has additional MNRF permit/approval and authorization requirements and requires correction of some inaccuracies in permitting requirements.</p> <p>1) Not all land use occupational authority provides right, title or interest (for example LUPs). Temporary accommodation camps, laydown areas or other project requirements that cannot meet the requirements as set in O. Reg 161/17: Occupation of Public Lands under section 21.1 of the Public Lands Act generally require land use occupation authority.</p> <p>The first bullet seems to be largely capturing Public Lands Act work permit requirements for work on shorelands (on both Crown and private lands) or in- water work. Note that LRIA permits may be required for water crossings on private land.</p> <p>In addition, PLA work permits are also required for road/trail construction and water crossing construction. Please re-phrase the first bullet to accurately reflect MNRF's permitting requirements under the PLA (as opposed to the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act).</p> <p>2) Burning authorizations could take form of an approved prescribed burning plan (as part of an FMP as per previous comment re: harmonizing efforts and communications plan with Forest Industry) or through Aviation Forest Fire and Emergency Services as per the Forest Fire Protection Act.</p> <p>3) Amendments to CLUPA policies for general use areas may also be required.</p> <p>4) As of April 1, 2019, the Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves portfolio was transferred for MECP and is no longer the mandate of the MNRF. However, note that the White Otter Enhanced Management Area is still under MNRF's mandate. Please remove bullets 9 and 10 from MNRF and move to MECP.</p> <p>5) Travel permits may be required for the use of restricted roads.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Suggest change wording of bullet 7 (under MNRF agency row) to effect of use of Crown land under authority of appropriate tenure.</p> <p>Under the MNRF heading, the following additions to required permits should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LRIA permits requirements for water crossings on private land. • PLA permits for water crossings on Crown land • PLA (Work Permits) for construction of roads and trails <p>Move authorizations required for Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves to the appropriate agency in the table (i.e. MECP)</p>			provided in the comment.
75				<p>Main Report; Table 11.1/page 143</p> <p>Comment Clearing trees on Crown land OR Crown trees on private lands may require approval under the Crown Forest Sustainability Act. Potential authorizations include a Forest Resource License, Permit to Remove, B-License (for trees reserved to the Crown on patent land).</p> <p>Additional documentation may also be required as part of the permitting process for tree clearing e.g. Renewal Agreement and Overlapping Agreement (with Sustainable Forest Licensees).</p> <p>[Note also that where the area proposed for clearing is already licensed to another party under a Forest Resource License or Sustainable Forest Licence (SFL) and is allocated for harvest in accordance with an approved Forest Management Plan (FMP), the FRL or SFL holder should be offered the opportunity to harvest the forest resources (trees).]</p> <p>Additional authorizations that may be required include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burn permits (i.e. submission of prescribed burn plan as a revision to the applicable Annual Work Schedule for approved FMPs) 	These additional approvals will be added to the list.	Section 11.1.5 Table 11-1:	Table updated based on information provided in the comment.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
76				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Maintenance Agreements (with appropriate SFL holder for use of roads covered by an FMP that are under custodianship of an SFL holder e.g., the Ann Bay Road in MNRF's Fort Frances district). <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please add these approvals to the table. Main Report; Table 11.1/page 143</p> <p>Comment As noted elsewhere in these comments, many of the existing roads in the project area are under custodianship of the SLF holder in the relevant Forest Management Unit, or may be under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Crown and another party.</p> <p>For example, the Plateau Lake Road, which could be used to access alternative route 1C, is subject to an MOU.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to parties that hold MOUs with the Crown for road custodianship. A list of these roads can be provided.</p> <p>Additionally, any new roads/water crossings to be constructed as part of this project outside of the hydro corridor would need to have a Use Management Strategy addressing maintenance, monitoring, reporting of hazards, access control and decommissioning. Assignment of road responsibility to Hydro One through an MOU with the Crown, which scopes responsibilities (i.e. maintenance), insurance requirements, performance guarantees, permits and approvals as well as ownership of structures (i.e. water crossings) would be required.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions The table should include the possibility of Hydro One engaging in Memorandum of Understanding, or a road maintenance agreement with the Crown for road responsibility and maintenance for roads required for the project, or agreements with existing MOU holders on Crown Roads.</p>	<p>Comment noted; this information will be incorporated into the ToR.</p> <p>A list of roads that parties hold MOUs with the Crown for road custodianship will be requested from the MNRF.</p>	<p>Section 11.1.5 Table 11-1:</p>	<p>The following bullet was added to the MNRF row in Table 11-1 (Other Relevant Provincial Legislation, Permits, Approvals and Authorizations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or a road maintenance agreement, with the Crown for road responsibility and maintenance for roads required for the Project or agreements with existing MOU holders on Crown roads.
77				<p>Main Report; Section 11.1.1; Other Provincial Environmental Assessment Process; (Page 140)</p> <p>Comment This section identifies that dispositions of rights to Crown resources may be subject to MNRF's Resource Stewardship and Facility Development (2015) Class EA.</p> <p>HONI should be aware that the Individual EA for the project should cover all components of the project including any dispositions required from MNRF, including evaluating the effects of the disposition and associated activities. In this case, the IEA process precludes the need for additional / subsequent application of the RSFD Class EA (section 2.6.2 of the RSFD Class EA – Page 13).</p> <p>If not (including if the need arises for a disposition of rights to Crown resource after the IEA has been approved) then additional EA Act requirements may apply, including possibly application of the Class EA RSFD. Note that 2002 is the last approved version of the Class EA RSFD, not 2015.</p> <p>In addition, note that scientific collector's permits (i.e. to conduct fieldwork in advance of completion of the Individual EA for the project) are no longer subject to MNRF's Class EA RSFD. MNRF may still have Indigenous consultation requirements associated with these permits.</p> <p>MNRF advises that HONI check with MECP regarding other recent changes to EA that affect the Class EA PPCR (reference to this in the first paragraph will likely also need to be changed).</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that scientific collector's permits (i.e. to conduct fieldwork in advance of completion of the Individual EA for the Project) are no longer subject to MNRF's Class EA RSFD and that MNRF may still have Indigenous consultation requirements associated with these permits. The potential need for this permit will remain in Table 11-1 (Other Relevant Provincial Legislation, Permits, Approvals and Authorizations).</p> <p>Note that this section does state that "should any of the above-noted requirements be determined to be applicable, it is Hydro One's intention that they will be met through the EA process for the Project." Wording in this section will, however, be updated for clarity. It is further noted that several upcoming changes are expected to these Class EA processes as a result of the MECP's proposed changes to the EA process in Ontario.</p> <p>The reference to the document will be updated to 2002 as noted. The 2015 version includes MNRF's request for amendments which will be removed per the comment.</p>	<p>Section 11.1.1</p>	<p>Section 11.1.1 (Other Provincial Environmental Assessment Processes)</p> <p>Reference List</p> <p>Changed reference to MNRF's Resource Stewardship and Facility Design Development to 2002 from 2015. Adjust reference for Class EA for Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves (2015a) to remove the 'a.'</p> <p>Updated Section 11.1.1 (Other Provincial</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				Please modify this section to clarify and update EA requirements for the project.			<p>Environmental Assessment Processes) to the following (1st and 2nd paragraph):</p> <p>The Project may also be subject to the MNRF's Class EA for Resource Stewardship and Facility Development Projects (2002) for the disposition of rights to Crown resources for sections of the Project that traverse public lands, the Class EA for Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves (2015) for crossings of provincial parks and/or conservation reserves, and the Ministry of Infrastructure's Public Work Class EA (2012) for any public lands transactions under the jurisdiction of IO. Hydro One intends to meet the requirements set out in these Class EAs, as applicable, through the Individual EA process. Given that the Province of Ontario is currently in the midst of reviewing and changing these Class EA processes at the time of preparation of this ToR, Hydro One will further consult with the applicable agencies prior to the commencement of the EA to determine their</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							applicability to the Project (and once changes to the Class EA have been formalized).
78				<p>Appendix B- List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators; General comment</p> <p>Comment The list of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators does not cover the full range of MNRF interests as related to our mandate.</p> <p>Specifically, the following criteria/indicators do not appear to be included: soils and sediment quality; sedimentation; water quality (as it relates to habitat for aquatic species and communities); aquatic species, communities and their habitats; terrestrial wildlife and habitat linkages or corridors (e.g., fragmentation, alteration and/or critical loss); drainage or flooding; access (new or different); noise (as related to effects on wildlife); increased demands on government services; local, regional and provincial economies; and public health and safety. It is noted that some of these appear to be considered in the potential effects table in section 4.3.1- how will these effects be tied to criteria and indicators?</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please incorporate additional criteria in the evaluation of effects to demonstrate how MNRF's mandated areas of interest will be affected by the project.</p>	As described in Section 7.1 (Potential Effects Assessment) of the draft ToR, the evaluation criteria and indicators provided in Appendix B will be used to complete the alternative route evaluation to select a preferred route. These evaluation criteria and indicators were selected because measurable data is available. Following this, a net effects assessment will be completed using a separate, but related, set of effects assessment criteria and indicators which have been added to the appendix.	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
79				<p>Appendix B; List of Prelim. Evaluation of Criterial and Indicators</p> <p>Comment For the "soils" criteria (under Natural Environment) the only indicator considered is the area of agricultural lands within the ROW. Given that heavy machinery will be used for clearing, the potential impacts of clearing on all areas within and outside of the ROW (e.g., for laydown yards, or any temporary worker camps) should be considered.</p> <p>The EA should address actions to minimize adverse effects to soil throughout the project area, as this would result in benefits to both the terrestrial and aquatic environment and the associated flora and fauna.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Expand the criteria for soils to consider impacts of clearing on all types of lands to be cleared.</p>	<p>The EA will address potential effects to soils and recommend mitigation measures. As described in Section 7.1 (Potential Effects Assessment) of the draft ToR, the criteria and indicators provided in Appendix B will be used to complete the alternative route evaluation to select a preferred route. These criteria and indicators were selected because measurable data is available. Soil is included as a criterion with the indicator 'Area (ha) of agricultural lands in the ROW.</p> <p>Following completion of the alternative route evaluation, a net effects assessment will be completed using a separate, but related, set of effects assessment criteria and indicators which have been added to the appendix. These criteria and indicators, which include soil, will cover potential effects of all known areas to be disturbed by the Project, including for temporary construction purposes providing this information is available. Table 7-1 (List of Key Natural and Socio-Economic Environment Considerations) provides an overview of the key natural and socio-economic features to be considered as part of the net effects assessment during the EA of which soil is included. The EA will address actions to minimize adverse effects to soil throughout the Project area.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
80				<p>Appendix B</p> <p>Comment Better explanation is needed on the method of the route effects assessment process.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please clarify whether the indicator is counted when effects will occur despite / after applying mitigation measures, or whether it based on no mitigation being applied.</p>	<p>As described in Section 7.1 (Potential Effects Assessment) of the draft ToR, the criteria and indicators provided in Appendix B will be used to complete the alternative route evaluation to select a preferred route. Other than the assumption of standard mitigation and best management practices being implemented for the Project, specific mitigation will not be explicitly considered in the evaluation of the alternative routes as it is expected that similar, if not the same, mitigation would be available and equally effective for all the alternative routes and so it would not assist in the identification of differences among the alternatives.</p> <p>Following the route evaluation, a net effects assessment will be completed for all identified project components using a separate, but related, set of effects assessment criteria and indicators which have been added to the appendix. Specific mitigation recommendations will be made as part of this effects assessment. Table 7-1 (List of Key Natural and Socio-Economic Environment Considerations) provides an overview of the key natural and socio-economic features to be considered as part of the net effects assessment during the EA. The net effects assessment will identify the potential effects of the Project on the natural and socio-economic environments, propose mitigation, identify the net effects (effects remaining following implementation of mitigation measures) and then determine the significance of the net effects.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
81				<p>Appendix B- List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators; B-8 (recreation and tourism)</p> <p>Comment Recreation and tourism are important contributors to the local economy of the project area. Current Forest Management Plans offer valuable information on areas of concern and associated prescriptions that have been identified through the FMP planning process to protect</p>	The suggested additions will be incorporated into the ToR.	Draft List of Evaluation Criteria and Indicators (Recreation and Tourism)	The following was added to the "Possible Data Sources" column for Recreation and Tourism:



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
82				<p>recreation and tourism values.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions MNRF advises that the ToR identify FMPs and, specifically, areas of concern and associated prescriptions, as an information source for the EA.</p> <p>Further, MNRF recommends that the following indicators be added to the Recreation and Tourism Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Area (ha) of AOC with an associated tourism and recreation prescriptions in the FMP (Area Of Concerns) in the ROW. 2. Number (ha) of cabins and cottages in the ROW. 3. Area (ha) of tourism AOCs in the ROW. <p>Appendix B- List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators; B-8 (Aesthetics)</p> <p>Comment Related to the above comment: Current Forest Management Plans can offer valuable information about the impacts of clearing of land to visual aesthetics (these have been identified through FMP planning processes).</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Add the following indicator to the Visual Landscape (Aesthetics) Criteria: Area (ha) of visual Aesthetics AOCs in the ROW (as opposed to only including the number of scenic viewpoints).</p>	<p>The suggested additions will be incorporated into the ToR.</p>	<p>Draft List of Evaluation Criteria and Indicators (Aesthetics)</p>	<p>Forest Management Plans including areas of concern (AOC) and associated prescriptions.</p> <p>The following indicators were added to the Recreation and Tourism criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area (ha) of AOC with an associated tourism and recreation prescription in the Forest Management Plan in the ROW. • Number (ha) of cabins and cottages in the ROW • Area (ha) of tourism AOCs in the ROW <p>The following was added to the "Possible Data Sources" column for Visual Landscape (Aesthetics):</p> <p>Forest Management Plans</p> <p>The following was added as an indicator to the Visual Landscape (Aesthetics) criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area (ha) of visual Aesthetics AOCs in the ROW
83				<p>Appendix B- List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators; B-11 (technical - project size)</p> <p>Comment The project size does not include any project-related infrastructure/indicators that are located outside of the ROW, such as laydown areas, wood landing areas, chipping pads as well as construction and maintenance access roads.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions It is important to consider the full scope of effects of the project, which will include any</p>	<p>Please see previous response provided for comment # 73.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
84				<p>temporary or permanent infrastructure requirements that are located outside of the powerline ROW. MNRF will require this information at the permitting stage (i.e. road construction). Some examples of project-related indicators that are located outside of the ROW are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Laydown areas 2. Wood landing areas 3. Chipping pads 4. Access roads 5. Construction offices 6. Worker camps (i.e. forest harvesting, line construction) <p>Consultation; 2.1.4</p> <p>Comment The Path of the Paddle organization will need to be included in all planning and correspondence associated with the EA.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Ensure other Crown land users are included in the EA process and are provided with all consultation materials.</p>	The Path of the Paddle Association will be included in planning and correspondence in the EA. Other Crown land users identified and contacted to date are included in the Record of Consultation. If additional contacts should be included and are not currently identified in the Record of Consultation, please provide them and they will be added to the contact list.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
85				<p>General Comment</p> <p>Comment MNRF administers the Forest Fire Prevention Act and is responsible for responding to wildland fires. The construction of the Waasigan transmission line and associated supporting infrastructure may increase the probability of human-caused wildland fires. Despite good fire prevention legislation, accidents happen. New all-season transportation infrastructure may provide access to more areas for more people. Where people go, human caused fires happen. Linear assets like electrical transmission lines that span hundreds of kilometers have a much higher probability of exposure to wildland fires than a point-based asset such as a house or mine.</p> <p>What are the considerations that HONI is proposing to mitigate the increased probability of human-caused wildland fires or the impact of fire on its infrastructure? Mitigation measures may include but are not limited to access restrictions, decommissioning temporary roads and following the Industrial Operation Protocol (https://files.ontario.ca/mnrf-industrial-operations-protocol-2018-en-13-01-2020.pdf), other measures to reduce the impact of fire on infrastructure.</p> <p>Recommendations/Preliminary Conclusions Please include reference to the development of mitigation measures related to wildland fire within the ToR.</p>	This information will be incorporated into the EA. Mitigation measures will be developed during the EA as part of the net effects assessment, including for wildland fires. This potential effect will be added to the ToR.	Section 4.3.1: Table 4-5:	The following potential effect was added to Table 4-5 (Summary of Preliminary Potential Effects to Natural Environment) in the Vegetation and Wetlands row: Change in potential for wildland fire risk.
Londa Mortonson, Manager, NW Regional Resources Manager, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (Letter)							
86	September 29, 2020	Emailed Letter	Londa Mortonson Manager, NW Regional Resources Manager Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry	<p>Thank you for providing the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) with Hydro One Networks Inc.'s (HONI) responses to the ministry's comments on the draft Terms of Reference for the Waasigan Transmission Line Project. We appreciated having the opportunity to discuss the comments with you and other HONI representatives on September 4th and to receive HONI's revised responses to our comments (attached, dated September 4th) following that discussion.</p> <p>The MNRF has completed its review of the Sept. 4th response table and is providing comment via this letter to assist HONI in finalizing its Terms of Reference submission to the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks. The points below draw attention to matters of particular interest to MNRF; however, we wish to make clear that all of the original comments the ministry submitted on the draft ToR (documented in HONI's response table) continue to stand as matters the ministry would like to see addressed by HONI as the EA progresses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MNRF welcomes the commitments HONI has made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o work with the ministry to ensure that our clients and other interested parties who may be impacted by this project will be properly notified about this project (comment #7, 32, 37, 70); and to o create an access plan (comment #2), timber clearing/harvest renewal plan (comment # 5), and field work plan (comment #6). We look forward to providing input to these plans as their 	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>development progresses.</p> <p>A number of our comments (#12, 63, 83) pertain to the provision of greater detail in the EA about the project design in order to support future permitting requirements. MNRF continues to strongly recommend that HONI provide the additional information requested during the EA, as lack of project details will result in more information being required at the permitting stage and, potentially, the need to carry out additional consultation with First Nations and with other potentially affected parties. This will lengthen the permitting process and could have implications to construction scheduling. Providing greater detail in the EA will also enable interested parties to more clearly understand potential impacts of the project on sites / areas that are of interest to them.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
				<p>While the ministry appreciates the information that HONI shared during our Sept. 4th discussion about its approach to the alternatives analysis, we reiterate that more information should be provided in the TOR about the rationale for not addressing alternative methods in the future EA (comment #10).</p> <p>HONI's response to #54 is 'TBC' is not clear. Please explain what 'TBC' means/refers to.</p>	<p>Please refer to response # 10. The IESO can be contacted for further information.</p> <p>This has been addressed in a subsequent update made to the table. Please see response to # 54 and # 57.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p> <p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
				<p>MNRF continues to strongly recommend that HONI expand the list of evaluation criteria (Appendix B) for selecting the preferred route to include the specific suggestions provided in our initial comment (comment 78). We may be able to suggest data sets to support the inclusion of these criteria (i.e. in terms of the 'measurable data sets' HONI requires) and would welcome an opportunity to explore this idea further with HONI to ensure that the preferred alternative is selected with consideration of the full range of MNRF interests.</p> <p>Based on the response HONI provided to comment #65, it appears that the point the ministry intended to convey may not have been understood by HONI. The comment was seeking a commitment from HONI to commit to creating plans/protocols as part of the EA to address instances where previously undocumented natural heritage values are discovered in the field during future stages of the project (e.g., construction and operation) of the project. HONI's response was about reevaluation of project impacts due to construction delays and did not address the intent of the comment.</p>	<p>In addition to previous responses provided in this table above, this can be explored further with MNRF during the EA.</p> <p>As noted in response # 65, this type of information is typically provided in the EA, typically as part of pre-, during, and post-construction monitoring plans and once all baseline data, including field study results, are received and reviewed.</p> <p>Hydro One will however commit to creating plans/protocols as part of the EA to address instances where previously undocumented natural heritage values are discovered in the field during future stages of the Project (e.g., construction and operation).</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Section 8.2</p>	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p> <p>The following was added to this section:</p> <p>The EA will include a plan/protocol to address instances where previously undocumented natural heritage values are discovered in the field during future stages of the Project (e.g., construction and operation) based on available information.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Treasury Metals Inc.							
1	July 30, 2020	Email	Mac Potter Environmental and Community Manager Treasury Metals Inc. Goliath Gold Project P.O. Box 783	Question 1: Can Hydro One please confirm that plans include the installation of a new series of towers supporting a single circuit 230 kV line, as described in the draft ToR?	Yes, the project will involve the installation of new support towers for the transmission line.	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
2				Question 2: What is the anticipated ROW required for the installation of these towers as it sits adjacent to a previously created ROW?	The width of the ROW will vary depending on the location and/or section of the transmission line. For the purposes of the draft ToR, we have assumed a width of approximately 45 metres. This will vary at certain locations, including sharp turns and major water crossings. The final ROW width requirements will be confirmed during the design phase of the Project.	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
3				Question 3: When does Hydro One anticipate identifying the preferred route south or north of the current infrastructure? ROW needs directly impact infrastructure plans related to water management at the Goliath Gold Project to the north of the current line, and processing plant and waste rock storage to the south.	The preferred route for the transmission line will be determined in the future EA phase of the Project. Subject to ToR approval by the MECP, the EA is expected to commence in early 2021. Hydro One will engage with interested stakeholders, including Treasury Metals Inc., as part of the process to select the preferred route.	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
4				Question 4: As indicated in the Record of Consultation, Treasury Metals provided shapefiles to the Hydro One team on May 28, 2019. Can you confirm who sent the shapefiles, and what was provided? Treasury Metals would like to ensure Hydro One has the correct information, and the considerations put forth in the finalization of the federal Environmental Assessment approved in August 2019 is considered.	Hydro One received shapefiles from Treasury Metals on May 28, 2019. The email was sent by Robyn Gaebel, P.Eng., Environmental Superintendent of Treasury Metals Inc. Several shapefiles were provided in three folders: 2017 Proposed Site Layout, Mineralized Zones at Surface, and Property Boundary. If you required additional information, please let us know.	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
5				Question 5: Can you confirm who the primary contact person for Hydro One will be for engagement moving forward, and please issue all communications related to the undertaking to Mark Wheeler and myself: Mark Wheeler, mark@treasurymetals.com, Title: Director, Projects and Mac Potter, mac@treasurymetals.com, Title: Environmental and Community Manager.	For all project-related inquiries, please contact: - Sarah Cohanim, Environmental Planner – Sarah.Cohanim@HydroOne.com - Steven Mantifel, Senior Manager, Community Relations – Steven.Mantifel@HydroOne.com As requested, future project-related correspondence will be directed to the above-noted individuals at Treasury Metals.	N/A	Comment noted; no change required.
6				Comment 1: Within the draft ToR the location of the Goliath Gold Project is in error it should read the Project is east of Dryden and north of Wabigoon Lake.	Thank you for this information. The ToR will be revised to include the correct reference to the location of the Goliath Gold Project.	Section 4.2.3.3	Revised ToR accordingly.
7				Comment 2: Consideration of the Cameron Lake Gold Project held by First Mining Gold Corp. is likely an error as it is out of the area of the undertaking. The Goldlund Project located northeast of Lola Lake Provincial Nature Reserves formerly held by First Mining Gold Corp. and pending closing held by Treasury Metals should be considered in the EA.	Thank you for this information. We will review and confirm the location reference to these other mining projects and adjust our mapping in the ToR accordingly.	Section 4.2.3.3	Revised ToR accordingly.



Appendix M-2

*Indigenous Communities Draft
Terms of Reference Comment and
Response Tables*



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Stacy Gan, Project Biologist, Pinchin Ltd., Kenora/ Maawandoon (for Gwayakocchigewin LP (GLP))							
1	August 31, 2020	Letter	Stacy Gan, project biologist Pinchin Ltd., Kenora/ Maawandoon (for Gwayakocchigewin LP (GLP))	<p>Chapter 3.0, Section 3.4 – Providing Flexibility to Accommodate New Circumstances :</p> <p>Preamble: The draft ToR indicates that additional consultation and engagement with Indigenous communities and others will be undertaken during the EA process, specifically with respect to facility routing, as well as the approach used to evaluate alternative routes for the Project.</p> <p>Comment: This is an important commitment for Indigenous communities. The GLP would like to have the commitment upheld and executed throughout the life of the Project. Advance notification of proposed changes as a result of new circumstances must be provided to ensure adequate time to review and engage within each community.</p> <p>Further, the review time and the engagement approach as it relates to the Project in general, must acknowledge and respect each community's stance regarding the current health pandemic of COVID-19.</p>	<p>Consultation and engagement with Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations, will be ongoing throughout the EA. Engagement will continue throughout the life of the Project.</p> <p>During engagement opportunities, the GLP will be notified of any significant changes to the Project during the EA from what is described in the ToR.</p> <p>Hydro One will continue taking into account the challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure the health and safety of all communities. As such, continued teleconferences and virtual/online meetings and/or workshops will continue to be offered during the EA. In-person meetings will only be re-initiated once it is determined to be safe to do so.</p> <p>Hydro One has staff stationed in Thunder Bay who may be able to attend local in-person meetings if it is deemed safe and desirable by communities.</p> <p>A sentence indicating that EA engagement will be sensitive to COVID-19 restrictions will be included in the ToR.</p>	Section 10.4	<p>The following was added to Section 10.4:</p> <p>Engagement activities during the EA will comply with the COVID-19 protocols and restrictions of each community.</p>
2				<p>Chapter 4, Section 4.2 – Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology:</p> <p>Preamble: This section outlines the existing sources of desktop information and baseline environmental conditions that are to be used characterizing the alternative route options in the EA evaluation. An aerial reconnaissance and ground-based survey is planned in Fall 2020 to evaluate historic mine workings identified in the Abandoned Mine Information System and determine the potential of bat hibernaculum habitat. Further field studies are planned to occur in 2021 and 2022 once a preferred route is determined. Consultation with agencies and engagement with Indigenous communities are to occur during the development of the field work program.</p> <p>Comment: It is recommended that during the aerial reconnaissance the following baseline information be gathered, to the extent feasible, to support the evaluation of the preferred route. These baseline environment factors and features do directly and indirectly contribute to both Natural and Social- Economic Environment values of Indigenous communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetland complexes – bog/fens, wild rice stands, seeps and springs; • Wildlife features – raptor stick nest, waterbird colonies, mineral licks; • Wildlife corridors and concentration areas for ungulates and waterbirds; • Geology – outcrops, cliffs; • Forest composition– areas of potential old growth, specifically pine in super-canopy; and • Existing linear disturbance to facilitate access that may be commercial or privately owned. 	<p>Where available and accessible during the aerial reconnaissance, instances of a number of the features identified may be recorded. Additional details on the planned aerial reconnaissance are provided in the 2020 field program shared with Indigenous communities and agencies for review and comment in August 2020.</p> <p>The EA baseline will document natural and socio- economic environment values and features identified through available traditional knowledge and land use studies to complement field-based data.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered as part of the EA.</p>
3				<p>Chapter 4, Section 4.2.2 – Natural Environment:</p> <p>Preamble: The section provides an overview of the desktop review and describes the collection methodology that will occur during field studies for each natural environment factor in support of the EA.</p> <p>Comment: The draft ToR should clearly define and commit to the type of baseline field studies that will be conducted for the Project. Surveys for environmental features, such as wildlife and wildlife habitat or Species at Risk that have the potential to occur in the vicinity of the Project, will not significantly differ among the alternative routes. As written in sub-section 4.2.2.2, 4.2.2.5, to 4.2.2.7, statements relating to conducting field study "as necessary", "as applicable" or "as required" do not provide Indigenous communities with confidence that the appropriate field studies will be undertaken. We would require a commitment to collect baseline data on sensitive species as well as species used for Indigenous traditional purposes, such as medicines. Within the Vegetation and Wetland natural environment factor in sub-section 4.2.2.6, field data should be collected for hemlock, sweet grass, sage and cedar and other medicine plant species as identified</p>	<p>Information provided in the draft ToR in relation to proposed field work to support the EA is meant to provide an initial overview. The ToR provides further information regarding planned studies to support the EA. Wording such as "as necessary" and "as applicable" included in the ToR as it is not yet confirmed what field studies will be required given the early stage of the Project.</p> <p>A field work plan for the fall 2020 aerial reconnaissance survey and abandoned mine site survey referenced in Section 4.2 of the ToR was submitted in August 2020 to agencies and Indigenous communities for review and comment.</p> <p>Hydro One intends to continue discussion with MNRF and interested Indigenous communities on the development of a separate, more detailed 2021-2022 field work plan, including survey protocols, for ground-based studies of the preferred route.</p> <p>Anticipated studies for the preferred route, subject to further discussion with Indigenous communities, applicable agencies and other applicable stakeholders as noted above, include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife field surveys to collect species-specific information along the preferred route; 	Section 4.2	<p>List of additional field studies was included in the ToR.</p> <p>The following was also added:</p> <p>The baseline will include as much information about culturally sensitive plants (e.g. traditional medicines) as available. Hydro One will work with Indigenous communities to obtain this information for</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>through Indigenous community engagement and studies. All baseline field studies should be conducted within the Project right-of-way (ROW) and the existing ROW where the Project is co-locating or paralleling.</p> <p>We would request that when the Project's field program is developed, that Hydro One shares it with Indigenous communities for review. Indigenous communities want to have clear information regarding what baseline field surveys will be conducted for the Project in advance and would like to participate in gathering this information. Indigenous communities should be advised directly when Project activities are planned to commence to ensure opportunity for participation and avoid potential disturbance to those members that are active on the land in the vicinity of the Project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation surveys, specifically Ecological Land Classification and botanical surveys with a focus on relevant SAR species, rare species, invasive plants, and traditionally used plants; Fish and fish habitat field surveys to obtain site-specific field data at a subset of representative waterbody crossings to verify or augment the results and assumptions from the aerial reconnaissance and desktop review; and, Surface water surveys to document observed waterbody conditions at a subset of representative waterbody crossings. <p>Further detail will be provided in the 2021-2022 field work plan.</p> <p>It is agreed that it is very important that the baseline include as much information about culturally sensitive plants as available. As identified above, vegetation surveys will include botanical surveys which will identify traditional use plants. In addition, Hydro One will work with communities to incorporate Indigenous knowledge that identifies the species and integrate Indigenous knowledge and values into the EA.</p> <p>Indigenous communities will be advised when Project activities are planned to commence to ensure opportunity for participation and avoid potential disturbance to those members that are active on the land in the vicinity of the Project Footprint.</p>		<p>consideration in the effects assessment.</p>
4				<p>Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3. – Socio-Economic Environment:</p> <p>Preamble: In the draft ToR, baseline environmental conditions were organized into the Natural Environment and the Socio-economic Environment. There are three areas under the Socio-economic Environment category that are of concern to Indigenous peoples: 1) Community Well-Being; 2) Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; and 3) Cultural Heritage Resources</p> <p>Comment: The draft ToR should include clear and appropriate definition of criteria and indicators to be used for the evaluation. In sub-section 4.2.3.2, Community Well-Being is not defined, nor is it listed in the list of preliminary evaluation criteria and indicators in Appendix B. Community Well-Being is used in relation to communities such as Dryden and Atikokan. We would like to see it defined in terms of Indigenous communities as well and developed into one of the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>Information as it relates to Indigenous community's well-being should be provided in Section 4.2.3.2. The Canadian Index of Wellbeing's Profile of northern Ontario is listed as a source for this factor however, it may not be relevant regarding Indigenous communities in the Study Area.</p> <p>Further, many of the Key Records Reviewed are at a regional scale, which may work for the requirements of the draft ToR but are not appropriate at the Local level for baseline data.</p>	<p>Community well-being will be further documented in the EA as noted in Section 4.2.3.2 and Table 4-4 of the ToR. This will include information relating to the well-being of Indigenous communities.</p> <p>Potential effects to Indigenous community well-being will be assessed as part of the net effects assessment to be completed as part of the EA for the preferred route, as noted in Section 7 of the ToR, and will be included as part of the draft list of net effects assessment criteria and indicators that will be added to the ToR. Specific criteria and indicators associated with community well-being can be further reviewed with the GLP at the onset of the EA.</p> <p>Baseline information provided in the ToR is meant to be high-level and provide the reader with a general idea of the Project location. More detailed information and sources will be used during the EA to better define the existing environment. A preliminary list of net effects assessment criteria and indicators has been added to the ToR, along with suggested data sources. For community well-being data sources include input shared through engagement with Indigenous communities and municipalities.</p>	<p>Appendices</p>	<p>A draft list of net effects assessment criteria and indicators has been added to the ToR, along with suggested data sources. For community well-being data sources include input shared through engagement with Indigenous communities and municipalities.</p>
5				<p>In sub-section 4.2.3.3, there are commitments for collecting additional data in the EA for non-Indigenous communities but is silent when it comes to Indigenous communities specifically. A description of economic activities undertaken in the area is provided, however there is little said about how Indigenous communities contribute to the economy.</p> <p>Indigenous communities are attempting to become more integrated into the overall economic activities of the region through provision of goods and services and have a history of becoming involved in various stages of project development.</p> <p>In extracting desktop information from sources for the Study Area, it is requested that this information is shared with Indigenous communities. Specifically sharing a comprehensive list of all known harvesting activities and locations, such as traplines and bait licence sites, from desktop review sources would be a valuable cross-referencing exercise with Indigenous communities.</p>	<p>A commitment will be included in the ToR to collect available data in the EA that reflects how Indigenous communities and businesses contribute to the economy.</p> <p>The information and data that is collected as part of the EA can be shared with the GLP subject to permission from the communities and provided it is not bound by data sharing agreements and/or confidentiality clauses.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.3.3</p>	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.3.3 of the ToR:</p> <p>The EA will also include the collection of available data that describes economic activities undertaken in the area by Indigenous communities and businesses and how they contribute to the economy.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
6				<p>In sub-section 4.2.3.6, review of any land claims against Canada, Ontario or a past grievance on the existing ROW where the Project is co-locating or paralleling should be included in the assessment. Within the draft ToR, Hydro One repeatedly states that IK (Indigenous knowledge) will be integrated in the EA and encourages the Indigenous communities to participate in the IK engagement. Hydro One recognizes the sensitivity of this information and indicates flexibility on mode of engagement on a per-community basis, if needed. This commitment should be upheld throughout all Project phases, respected for each Indigenous community and must be considerate of the COVID-19 public health crisis and how it affects each of the Indigenous communities.</p>	<p>Ontario and Canada are responsible for all negotiations related to land claims. Hydro One would appreciate being advised of any outstanding claims that communities are willing to share.</p> <p>Although not specifically part of the EA process, Hydro One will continue to work closely with GLP to discuss and address Hydro One related matters of interest to GLP communities.</p> <p>Hydro One is engaging with each Indigenous community to help them gather and share IK information as well as any other information communities choose to share.</p> <p>Hydro One recognizes and respects the protocols communities have put in place to protect health and safety during the COVID-19 pandemic. Alternate methods of engagement including virtual meetings and teleconferences have been relied on during this period and will continue throughout all phases of the Project until such time as it is considered safe to resume in-person engagement sessions.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
7				<p>In sub-section 4.2.3.7, with respect to the archaeological program, Indigenous communities should be involved in all stages and studies of the program. Hydro One's archaeologist should contact GLP to ask if community members have knowledge and skills that could contribute to the study. Several communities do have members trained to conduct and participate in such programs. As the Project will likely co-locate or parallel an existing ROWs, the program should include the existing ROW in the scope of work. It is highly probable that IK information or archaeological studies has not been gathered for existing ROW the Study Area given their dates of construction. Therefore, undocumented areas or features of value may be present on the existing ROW that should be considered in the Project's EA evaluation.</p> <p>Indigenous Traditional Land Use studies for the Project will require assessment of the Project Study Area. Fort William First Nation has specifically identified that the western portion of their traditional territory, where the Project is proposed, has not been fully assessed in order to provide traditional land use and IK for inclusion in the EA evaluation.</p>	<p>Hydro One fully intends to obtain assistance from community members to participate in archaeological field studies. Hydro One's archaeologist will contact GLP and other communities during the EA process to ask if community members have knowledge and skills that could contribute to the study.</p> <p>As noted in Section 4.2.3.6 of the ToR, Hydro One has outlined an extensive IK collection program during the EA as engagement with Indigenous communities continues.</p> <p>Further, Section 4.2.3.7 notes that the EA will consider potential effects of the Project to cultural heritage resources (built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources) and to do this, the EA will draw on archaeological assessments and cultural heritage resource studies, IK gathered from Indigenous communities and information from stakeholders.</p> <p>It is understood that Indigenous Traditional Land Use studies for the Project will require the review and confirmation of the Project Study Area and that some communities, including Fort William First Nation have specifically identified the need to collect additional IK information. Hydro One is currently working closely with the GLP to identify Traditional Land Use gaps that communities have identified. Capacity funding will be provided to communities that choose to collect additional information.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered as part of the EA.
8				<p>Chapter 4, Section 4.3 – Potential Project Effects:</p> <p>Preamble: Preliminary Potential Project effects are summarized in Table 4-5 and Table 4-6 of this sub-section and it is anticipated that the Project will have a net benefit on the socio-economy of northwestern Ontario and the province as a whole.</p> <p>Comment: With respect to the Natural Environment, Indigenous peoples would be concerned to see any loss of fish, wildlife or species at risk populations and their habitat or anything that would change the availability of these populations for use by the community.</p> <p>With respect to the Socio-economic Environment, Indigenous peoples would be concerned to see any negative changes to their communities. This would include more than just nuisance effects such as noise and visual changes. We prefer the approach taken in the new Impact Assessment Act, where the impact of a large construction workforce on local and Indigenous communities are considered. The draft ToR doesn't specifically address the requirements for temporary accommodation, food, transportation and other services for the construction workforce of this Project and the impact of these people on local customs and traditions.</p> <p>Additional preliminary potential effects that should also be considered to the Project undertaking and route selection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil and Surface Water - Potential for contamination due to accidental release; • Acoustic Environment – Temporary disruption to wildlife movement and habitat use; and • Community Well-Being – Changes to community well-being from influx of worker population in rural locations. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The EA will consider the impact of the construction workforce on local and Indigenous communities, including the requirements for temporary accommodation, food, transportation and other services for the construction workforce of this Project and the potential impact of the workforce on the community. The potential for these types of effects will be added to the draft list of net effects assessment criteria and indicators that are to be included as part of the ToR.</p>	Section 4.3.2 Appendices	<p>Section 4.3.2 updated to include the following:</p> <p>The EA will consider the impact of the large construction workforce on local and Indigenous communities, including the requirements for temporary accommodation, food, transportation and other services for the construction workforce of this Project.</p> <p>A draft list of net effects assessment criteria and indicators has been added to the ToR.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
9				<p>Chapter 5 – Project Construction:</p> <p>Preamble: An overview of the Project description including design components and anticipated activities during construction, operation and maintenance is provided. The description of the Project and all phases are preliminary in the draft ToR and are subject to change based on further detailed designs, detailed surveys and engagement and consultation activities.</p> <p>Comment: Indigenous communities should be provided a list of possible employment/procurement opportunities and discussions regarding employment on the Project should be conducted in advance of planned Project activities. Hydro One should conduct a skills assessment of each community to present opportunities, identify individuals with existing skills and develop access to advance training and employment opportunities for the life of the Project. Several communities have members that are trained and skilled to conduct and support baseline studies and various construction, operation and maintenance activities associated with such a Project.</p> <p>Indigenous communities should be advised directly when any Project activities (surveying, ROW preparation and construction activities) are planned. A list of possible employment/procurement opportunities are provided in this section and Indigenous communities welcome early discussions with Hydro One regarding opportunities for employment.</p> <p>To reduce strain on local services and community well-being during the construction phase, consideration to develop temporary work camps in the vicinity of the preferred route may be warranted. This is currently not discussed in the draft ToR. Any station footprint expansions that require new lands should be included in the EA process; it is not clear if additional land will be required for the proposed activities outlined in the draft ToR regarding line separation or station changes. Co-locating the new transmission lines adjacent to existing, already disturbed ROWs is supported. It is requested that where possible, the ROW width is reduced to the maximum extent feasible, leveraging currently disturbed land and existing ROW.</p>	<p>Construction of the Project will not be certain until Leave to Construct (pursuant to Section 92 of the OEB Act), is authorized. However, in anticipation that the Project does proceed to the construction stage, Hydro One is already engaging with Indigenous communities on economic participation that will include training, employment and procurement opportunities. Additionally, Hydro One is reaching out to communities to identify members that are interested in employment on EA-related activities such as monitoring and field studies. Training activities to help prepare community members to participate in employment for these activities will be conducted in the coming months, in coordination with interested Indigenous communities.</p> <p>Also, throughout the EA process, Hydro One will seek to maximize the involvement of Indigenous businesses who can provide services such as (but not limited to) transportation, guiding, lodging, food services, etc.</p> <p>Indigenous communities will be made aware of planned and upcoming Project activities related to the EA well in advance of the activity being undertaken.</p> <p>The ToR will include a description of potentially required temporary work camps.</p> <p>Should additional land outside of Hydro One’s existing property be required as part of the station upgrades, this will be identified in the EA.</p> <p>Additional land may also be required to facilitate the separation of the existing transmission lines in the Atikokan area; however, this will be confirmed in the EA. Any disturbed lands will be included in the net effects assessment to be completed during the EA. It is understood that co-locating the new transmission lines adjacent to existing, already disturbed ROWs is supported and Hydro One will minimize the required ROW width where possible.</p>	Section 5	Description of temporary work camps has been included in the ToR.
10				<p>Chapter 6, Section 6.2. – Alternative Methods Identification:</p> <p>Preamble: One of the objectives of the draft ToR, is to identify the preliminary alternative routes for the Project. A detailed review of the alternative routes and the selection of the preferred route will be conducted during the EA. Hydro One conducted a number of external information gathering sessions called Corridor Workshops to consider specific indicators and criteria for the Project.</p> <p>Comment: While it is mentioned that workshops were held with Indigenous communities (Mitaanijigamiing First Nation and Metis Nation of Ontario), most Indigenous communities have not had a local workshop conducted to-date. While Indigenous communities welcome the opportunity to participate in the Corridor Workshops, it is not possible given the current public health situation. While three “rules” stated for Indigenous factors in Table 6-4 are agreeable, most Indigenous communities did not contribute to alternative route selection in terms of providing IK. Additional time and effort to hold in-person workshops and engagement activities regarding Project details and activities are required for Indigenous communities understand how this knowledge will contribute to route evaluation and selection of a preferred route.</p>	<p>As part of engagement supporting the EA Hydro One will continue to offer workshops and other community engagement activities (in-person or virtual) to Indigenous communities to better understand how they can contribute information to route evaluation, selection of a preferred route and understanding of potential impacts of the preferred route.</p>	Section 6.2.1	<p>A commitment to hold additional in-person workshops (as the current pandemic permits) was included in Section 6.2.1:</p> <p>Hydro One will be offering workshops and other engagement activities (in-person or virtual) to Indigenous communities throughout the EA process to better understand how their knowledge can contribute to route evaluation, selection of a preferred route and understanding of the potential effects of the preferred route.</p>
11				<p>Chapter 6, Section 6.3 – Alternative Route Evaluation in the EA:</p> <p>Preamble: The section discusses the evaluation of alternative methods (routes) by the general routing principals, criteria and indicators for the natural and socio-economic environment.</p>	<p>The inclusion of the list of evaluation criteria and indicators in an appendix was done primarily due to the length of the table and to improve the readability of the ToR. An additional list of draft net effects assessment criteria and indicators will also be included in the ToR as an additional appendix. Comments have been received on the criteria from Indigenous communities as well as government agencies to-date, which have since been incorporated. Hydro One is also continuing to invite communities to participate in workshops to further discuss criteria and indicators, their</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Comment: Appendix B should be directly included in the body of the draft ToR for submission versus as an appendix. Criteria and indicators will be the foundation of the EA and when presented as an appendix, their importance is easily overlooked and under-valued. During the course of the EA, additional criteria through IK may be identified from engagement activities and/or community studies. Indigenous communities and interested persons should have the opportunity to suggest a level of significance that should be attributed to the criteria.</p>	relative importance, and methodology for evaluation of alternative corridors and selection of a preferred corridor, as well as assessment of potential effects from the preferred route.		
12				<p>Chapter 7, Section 7.1 – Potential Effects Assessment:</p> <p>Preamble: The section provides a generalized overview of the assessment and how the evaluation will assess all major project components and both positive and negative effects. There is no clear methodology provided on how net and cumulative effects will be quantified and at what spatial scales.</p> <p>Comment: Given the undertaking of the Project to support growth and future energy demands of the region, the assessment of cumulative effects should take account of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future effects to the Regional Study Area of the Project and this should be expressed within the draft ToR.</p>	<p>Section 7.1 will include further details regarding the net effects assessment approach including a draft list of net effects criteria and indicators.</p> <p>The following information is included in Section 7.1 of the ToR which states the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine the net effects that overlap temporally and spatially with effects from all other past, present and reasonably foreseeable developments and activities which then result in cumulative effects; Determine the significance of net effects and cumulative effects; <p>The EA will assess the potential for cumulative effects with other projects that have been announced and which could overlap with the effects of the Waasigan Transmission Line Project. The cumulative effects assessment of these other projects will also be dependent on the amount of information available on these other projects.</p>	N/A	A draft list of net effects assessment criteria and indicators has been added to the ToR.
13				<p>Chapter 7, Section 7.2 – Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>Preamble: Few mitigation measures are presented in the draft ToR and the section suggests that both standard and site-specific measures based on industry best practices will be implemented to avoid or minimize potential adverse Project effects. Mitigation measure will be developed in consultation with Indigenous communities and others, as necessary.</p> <p>Comment: Indigenous communities should be informed if it is not possible to suspend construction during sensitive periods (such as breeding bird period, fisheries windows, etc.) and what mitigation measures might be taken in lieu of avoidance. Specific mitigation should be listed in the draft ToR that will be included in the Project's Environmental Management Protection Plan. The following mitigation and monitoring activities should be included for the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A commitment to use Indigenous Monitoring for all planning phases – baseline studies, preparation, construction, operation and maintenance; A requirement to have Indigenous Monitors On-Site during any excavation activities; Prohibit the use of pesticide or herbicide application for maintenance activities and use mechanical maintenance activities instead; Training of Indigenous Monitors for the Project should be conducted by local Indigenous Trainers; and Cultural sensitivity training should be mandatory for all Project personnel. 	<p>Section 3 of the ToR also provides a net effects assessment process figure.</p> <p>As the Project is still not fully developed including knowing the location of the Project components and their potential for effects, it is premature to make specific mitigation commitments in the ToR, such as vegetation management methods during operations and maintenance. Hydro One is committed to engaging with Indigenous communities in the development of the mitigation plan as well as the Environmental Management Plan during the EA to help with the identification of mitigation measures that will avoid or minimize potential environmental effects of the Project.</p> <p>As discussed previously, Hydro One is committed to engaging Indigenous community members as monitors and/or field assistants during various phases of the Project, including during EA stage field studies.</p> <p>Hydro One is open to participating in cultural sensitivity training, especially for Hydro One team members who will be working within the study area and with community members.</p>	Section 7.2	<p>The following was added to Section 7.2:</p> <p>Mitigation measures, as well as environmental management and monitoring plans to be developed as part of the EA, will be developed in consultation with Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations, as necessary, and will be provided in contract specifications to be adhered to by Hydro One staff and contractors.</p>
14				<p>Chapter 8, Section 8.1 – Environmental Commitments:</p> <p>Preamble: Hydro One aims to integrate Indigenous community feedback and concerns to strengthen Project monitoring efforts. Hydro One has committed in the draft ToR to Indigenous community consultation, however, has not defined what is meant by this.</p> <p>Comment: It is recommended that in the fifth bullet point following “Indigenous” be inserted when discussing “work cooperatively with governments, customers, suppliers and other stakeholders...”</p>	This change will be made.	Section 8.1	<p>Fifth bullet in ToR Section 8.1 (second set of bullets) updated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work cooperatively with governments, customers, suppliers, <i>Indigenous communities</i> and other stakeholders to develop programs that contribute to the achievement of Hydro

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
15				<p>Chapter 10, Section 10.5 – Indigenous Engagement Plan:</p> <p>Preamble: Chapter 10 is a discussion on the consultation plan for the EA. Hydro One acknowledges that there may be a need to update the consultation plan to meet the needs of individual Indigenous communities with respect to how they want to be engaged. This is especially true now with the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Comment: Relative to the Indigenous community's engagement plan for the Project, the below should be incorporated into the draft ToR to ensure successful engagement practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In supporting and facilitating participation with community members, it is recommended that Community Consultation Coordinators positions be renamed to Community Engagement Coordinators moving forward. It may also be necessary to produce more frequent newsletters and information sheets for the Consultation Engagement Coordinators to distribute within the communities. The Consultation Engagement Coordinator should be well educated in the EA process so that he can act as a liaison between Hydro One and the community during the time when face to face meetings are not possible. Indigenous communities prefer personal engagement over such techniques as virtual or digital Zoom meetings so there is much to consider in order to effectively engage them. Current and future engagement with Indigenous communities should remain as in-person and face-to-face activities to meaningful and successful participation. Given the ongoing COVID-19 public health situation, engagement activities will be dependent on when restrictions for communities are lifted and communities are prepared to commence in-person engagement activities. To ensure an inclusive process, and mitigate future challenges in the EA, ongoing dialogue with Indigenous communities is required prior to moving forward with key stages of the Project. <p>In addition, Hydro One has referred to guiding principles for engaging Indigenous Communities of which is a commitment to Hydro One's Indigenous Policy. It is requested that Hydro One should share this "Indigenous Policy" with the GLP and Indigenous communities in the early stages of Project planning.</p>	<p>Hydro One no longer refers to Community "Consultation" Coordinators, having changed the position title during preparation of the draft ToR to Community "Engagement" Coordinator.</p> <p>Hydro One is engaging with Community Engagement Coordinators about the timing and frequency of newsletters during the EA, as well as preferred methods of engagement during the COVID-19 pandemic. Hydro One has and will continue to offer training about the EA process to interested communities, including Community Engagement Coordinators.</p> <p>Hydro One is sensitive to community protocols that restrict in-person engagement meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic. Hydro One is also committed to continuing to engage with Indigenous communities through the course of the EA and is optimistic that methods of engagement can be undertaken that meet community protocols during the period of COVID-19 restrictions. Hydro One is working with Community Engagement Coordinators to help with the implementation of the community engagement program during the EA process, including the challenging period of the COVID-19 pandemic. Once it is considered safe to do so, Hydro One will work with communities to identify opportunities for in-person meetings.</p> <p>Hydro One's Indigenous Relations Policy is available for review on-line at: https://www.hydroone.com/abouthydroone/indigenousrelations/Documents/Hydro%20One%20Indigenous%20Relations%20Policy.pdf</p> <p>The Policy will be added to the ToR.</p>	N/A	<p>One's environmental objectives and targets</p> <p>The Hydro One Indigenous Relations Policy was added to the ToR:</p> <p>Hydro One's Indigenous Relations Policy is available for review online at:</p> <p>https://www.hydroone.com/abouthydroone/indigenousrelations/Documents/Hydro%20One%20Indigenous%20Relations%20Policy.pdf</p> <p>This has also been included as an appendix.</p>
Stacy Gan, Project Biologist, Pinchin Ltd., Kenora/GLP – Source: Shared Value Solution (for Eagle Lake First Nation)							
16	August 31, 2020	Letter	Stacy Gan, project biologist Pinchin Ltd., Kenora/ GLP – Source: Shared Value Solution (for Eagle Lake First Nation)	<p>Please note that the following comments and recommendations were provided by Shared Value Solution on behalf of Eagle Lake First Nation for the Project. Comments were presented and discussed with the GLP Protection Committee members. The below Shared Value Solution comments and recommendations are presented in this letter to allow a direct and single source of review submission regarding the Projects draft ToR.</p> <p>Purpose and Rationale of the Proposed Undertaking and EA Study (Section 1.4):</p> <p>Preamble: The draft ToR provides conflicting and unclear definition of the "Project". The ToR must provide a clear definition of the Project, and the scope of the Proponent's involvement in the Project. A clear definition of the Project will then enable a clear definition of the purpose of the study, and the scope of the Project related to undertaking an EA "to select and confirm the preferred route and conceptual design for the Project and to identify potential environmental effects that could result from the construction, operation, maintenance, and retirement of the Project." A clear definition of the Project will also enable a clear definition of the scope of HONI's role as a proponent limited only to this specific phase of environmental assessment work, and make it clear that other proponents, including Indigenous proponents, may emerge for subsequent phases of the Northwest Bulk Transmission line identified in the 2017 LTEP.</p> <p>Comment: The ToR should include a precise and unambiguous definition of the "Project", it is not clear if the "Project" is:</p>	<p>The description of the Project is included in ToR Section 1.1:</p> <p>Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One), the proponent, is completing an environmental assessment (EA) for the Waasigan Transmission Line (the Project or undertaking), a proposed new double-circuit 230 kilovolt (kV) transmission line between Lakehead Transformer Station (TS) in the Municipality of Shuniah and Mackenzie TS in the Town of Atikokan, and a new single-circuit 230 kV transmission line between Mackenzie TS and Dryden TS in the City of Dryden.</p> <p>Further detail on what the Project entails is provided in Section 5 Description of the Undertaking.</p> <p>Although it is acknowledged that construction of the project cannot proceed until the IESO confirms that additional transmission capacity is required, and until Leave to Construct (pursuant to Section 92 of the OEB Act) is authorized by the OEB, a full assessment of the potential effects of constructing the project is required to meet provincial EA requirements.</p> <p>As the EA process proceeds to identification of a preferred route, and design advances, additional details will be provided, such as a description of lay down areas and access roads.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to ensure an adequate, safe, reliable and affordable supply of power to enable future growth in northwestern Ontario – OR - the Northwest Bulk Transmission line identified in the 2017 LTEP which includes: “Phase Three, a line from Dryden to the Manitoba border, could be needed after 2035 (or earlier if recommended by the IESO) to enable the better integration of provincial electricity grids” – OR- limited to the Ministry of Energy’s and IESO’s recommendation to construct a new double-circuit and a new single-circuit 230 kV overhead transmission line from Thunder Bay to Dryden – in other words the Project is restricted to the planning and project approval work required in advance of implementing the Ministry of Energy’s and IESO’s recommendation to construct a new double-circuit and a new single-circuit 230 kV overhead transmission line from Thunder Bay to Dryden. 			
17				<p>Proponent (Section 1.5):</p> <p>Preamble: The ToR should be clear on the scope and duration of the HONI’s role as a proponent. We understand that HONI is the proponent ONLY for work with the IESO to establish the scope and timing of the Project, and to develop and seek approvals for Phases One and Two of the Northwest Bulk Transmission Line identified in the 2017 LTEP. HONI is not putting itself forward in the draft ToR as the proponent for the construction and operation of the Northwest Bulk Transmission Line, or the entity to develop and seek approvals for Phase Three of the Northwest Bulk Transmission Line. The ToR does not make this scope and duration of HONI’s role clear. It is possible that another proponent may emerge for construction of one or more phases of the Northwest Bulk Transmission Line identified in the 2017 LTEP. The OEB and ENDM have not designated HONI as the proponent for the entire undertaking of the Northwest Bulk Transmission Line. HONI has only been designated as the proponent to work with the IESO to establish the scope and timing of the Project, and to develop and seek approvals. Should the EA be approved, alternative proponents, including Indigenous proponents, may emerge to undertake the project under the approved EA for Phases One and Two of the Northwest Bulk Transmission Line Project, or advance Phase Three of the Northwest Bulk Transmission Line Project.</p> <p>Comment: The ToR should include a precise and unambiguous determination of the scope and duration of HONI’s role as a proponent in relation to a precise and unambiguous definition of the Project, including a statement that the Project may be constructed and operated by a proponent other than HONI.</p>	As stated above, it is acknowledged that construction of the Project cannot proceed until Leave to Construct (pursuant to Section 92 of the OEB Act) is authorized by the OEB, and until the IESO commits to providing the additional capacity. The IESO must also identify the preferred method of procuring construction services (e.g., who and how). Until that time, and at the direction of IESO, Hydro One has been directed to prepare an EA and conduct other engineering/design work that is necessary to complete the development phase of the Project. In the event that another company is awarded the construction contract, they will be bound to the commitments of the EA that is currently under development as well as the terms and conditions of the EA approval. Any substantive changes would likely require approval of an EA amendment.	Section 1.5	The following extension was added to the first sentence of Section 1.5: Hydro One is the proponent of the Project, following direction from the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO), is responsible for the development of the ToR and subsequent EA.
18				<p>Environmental Assessment Approach (Section 3):</p> <p>Preamble: If the “Project” is to ensure an adequate, safe, reliable and affordable supply of power to enable future growth in northwestern Ontario as stated in Section 1.4, then a “focused” EA in accordance with subsections 6(2)(c) and 6.1(3) of the EA Act is not appropriate. Instead, the EA should be conducted under subsections 6(2)(a) and 6.1(2) of the EA Act to include an assessment of both “alternatives to” and “alternative methods” for carrying out the undertaking.</p> <p>Comment: A precise definition of the “Project” is required to determine if the EA can be a “focused” EA in accordance with subsections 6(2)(c) and 6.1(3) of the EA Act, or should be conducted under subsections 6(2)(a) and 6.1(2) of the EA Act to include an assessment of both “alternatives to” and “alternative methods” for carrying out the undertaking.</p>	Please see response to comment # 16.		Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
19				<p>Existing Environment and Potential Effects (Section 4):</p> <p>Preamble: In Section 4.1, Hydro One indicates that the determination of appropriate Study Area boundaries was based on the need to capture areas most likely to be directly, or indirectly, affected by the Project, avoiding areas with known significant natural and/or socio-economic constraints. Given that a proponent other than HONI may emerge, it is entirely possible that another proponent may determine different geographic locations for supporting infrastructure (e.g. laydown areas or sources of aggregate supply and related haul routes and access roads).</p>	<p>The study areas identified in the ToR for use in the EA were developed on the basis of Hydro One’s current understanding of the Project. Discipline specific study areas may be considered for some disciplines where the general study areas are not appropriate. While it is possible that the constructor may make changes to the Project should Hydro One not be awarded the construction rights, they would be required to obtain approval of an EA Addendum that addresses any significant changes. The EA Addendum process would require engagement with Indigenous communities.</p> <p>At this time, Hydro One does not expect to locate project components outside of the Study Area. Should Project components be identified during the EA that are outside of the current identified</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Comment: The Project Footprint and Local Study Area should be expanded to include the City of Dryden, Eagle Lake First Nation, all of Wabigoon Lake and adjacent shoreline areas – these areas may include Project supporting infrastructure (e.g. laydown areas or sources of aggregate supply and related haul routes and access roads) that the ultimate construction and operations proponent may choose, including locations at First Nations in the case that the construction and operations proponent is wholly or in part an Indigenous entity.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Regional Study Area should be expanded to include all potentially impacted First Nations for the same reasons.</p>	<p>Study Area, then these areas would also be assessed, and potentially altered during the EA process.</p>		
20				<p>Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodologies / Potential Effects Assessment (Section 6 / Section 7.1):</p> <p>Preamble: The ToR has a traditional Western science scoping of the natural and socio-economic environments that relegates Indigenous interests to only the Traditional Knowledge section of the ToR. Section 6 and Section 7.1 of the ToR should be inclusive of Indigenous interests in scoping the natural and socio-economic environments as integral to the description of the existing environment and the determination of data collection methodologies.</p> <p>Comment: Natural environment should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous cultural landscapes; • Indigenous harvesting, cultural and spiritual sites; and • Indigenous determinations of species at risk for harvesting, cultural and spiritual purposes. <p>Socio-economic environment: should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Nation government policies for potentially impacted First Nation communities; • Indigenous community well-being; • Indigenous community economy, land and resources; and • Indigenous infrastructure and community services. 	<p>During the EA, Hydro One is open to discussing with Indigenous communities the criteria and indicators to be considered in the route evaluation and effects assessment.</p> <p>Specific to the comment provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where cultural landscapes and harvesting, cultural and spiritual sites are shared by communities, these will be included as part of the effects assessment stage of the EA. • “Species at Risk” is tied to federal and provincial legislation and regulation. Other species of importance as identified by Indigenous communities can be considered in the EA subject to input received from Indigenous communities. For example, Hydro One will consider IK and values of species of importance for harvesting, cultural and spiritual purposes in the assessment of impacts to the natural environment. • The suggested socio-economic considerations can be added to the baseline conditions description subject to the information being available from interested communities. 	Section 4	<p>The suggested list was included in Table 4-4 Study to be Completed during the EA) under Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes:</p> <p>The following will be characterized as part of the EA, including potential effects:</p> <p>Natural environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous cultural landscapes; • Indigenous harvesting, cultural and spiritual sites; and • Indigenous determinations of species of importance for harvesting, cultural, medicinal and spiritual purposes. <p>Socio-economic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous community well-being; • Indigenous community economy, land and resources; and, • Indigenous infrastructure and community services.
21				<p>Alternative Route Evaluation in the EA (Section 6.3):</p> <p>Preamble: The ToR states that the evaluation of alternative methods (routes) will take into account the general routing principles as described in Section 6.2.2, as well as the preliminary evaluation criteria and indicators as provided in Appendix B. First Nations</p>	<p>The alternative route evaluation criteria and indicators provided in the ToR are preliminary. Hydro One will engage with Indigenous communities at multiple points during the alternative route evaluation. This will include initial engagement to discuss the overall method and the criteria and indicators as well as subsequent engagement to present the results of the alternative route evaluation and the complete project footprint to be assessed in the EA.</p>	Section 6.3	<p>Section 6.3 has been updated with the following:</p> <p>The evaluation and net effects assessment</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
22				<p>have not yet been adequately consulted on evaluation criteria, indicators and routing principles for evaluating alternative methods (routes), and the ToR is not the appropriate vehicle for this consultation.</p> <p>Comment: The evaluation criteria, indicators and routing principles for evaluating alternative methods (routes) must be subject to detailed consultation with potentially impacted First Nations, during the EA.</p> <p>Preamble: The ToR states that in “regards to the approach to the alternatives evaluation, it is reasonable to assume that the type and effectiveness of mitigation that can be applied to avoid or minimize effects will be the same for all the alternative routes being evaluated; however, the need for site-specific mitigation measures will be evaluated and applied to the Project, as required.” This approach does not provide clarity on the role of potentially impacted First Nations in providing detailed inputs on the type and effectiveness of mitigation, or on site-specific mitigation. Section 7.2 references that mitigation measures will be developed in consultation with Indigenous communities, but this is not explicit in Section 6.3.</p> <p>Comment: Section 6.3 should be revised to include specific reference to detailed consultation with potentially impacted First Nations in providing detailed inputs on the type and effectiveness of mitigation, or on site-specific mitigation.</p> <p>Project Effects and Compliance Monitoring (Section 8.2):</p> <p>Preamble: Section 8.2 does not make reference to the now common approach for inclusion of Indigenous Environmental Monitors or Guardians on linear corridor projects. Furthermore, it is not enough to simply include Indigenous community “feedback” in developing monitoring of Project-related effects and compliance monitoring.</p> <p>Comment: Section 8.2 should make explicit reference to the need for, and approaches for full inclusion, of Indigenous Environmental Monitors or Guardians during the Environmental Assessment process, and during construction and operation/maintenance phases of the Project. Furthermore, the ToR should provide explicit commitment to comprehensive collaboration with potentially impacted Indigenous communities in developing and implementing monitoring of Project-related effects and compliance monitoring for all project phases.</p>	<p>Hydro One will also engage with Indigenous communities after the preferred route is selected to discuss mitigation important to Indigenous communities.</p> <p>Hydro One will employ Indigenous Environmental Monitors and/or Guardians during the EA and will collaborate with Indigenous communities in developing and implementing monitoring of Project-related effects and compliance monitoring for all project phases.</p>	<p>Section 8.2</p>	<p>criteria and indicators, routing principles, and mitigation (type and effectiveness) will be discussed with Indigenous communities throughout the EA process.</p> <p>Section 8.2 updated to note the following:</p> <p>Hydro One will employ Indigenous Environmental Monitors and/or Guardians during the EA, and will collaborate with Indigenous communities in developing and implementing monitoring of Project-related effects and compliance monitoring for all project phases.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Grand Council Treaty #3							
1	September 7, 2020	Letter	Lucas King, TPU Director Lucas.king@treaty3.ca Territorial Planning Unit, Grand Council Treaty #3 P.O. Box 1720 , Kenora, Ontario, P9N 3X7	<p>Studies and Ground Work:</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The studies undertaken to address the Natural, Socio-Economic, Indigenous Communities (Cultural) and Technical (Policy/Institutional), (Appendix B, Draft Terms of Reference), considerations are the very foundation of an Environmental Assessment. As such, they should be incorporated into the main body of the Draft Terms of Reference. The studies related to these factors must be subject to flexibility to adequately capture the necessary information, i.e. extending a timeline if required to complete a study, adjusting the criteria to ensure the environment is adequately studied, i.e. potential for an additional of scope of study to fully consider the impact of the Project. Where possible, we would like to see the impacts mapped for visual comprehension.</p>	<p>Appendix B in the draft ToR provides a preliminary list of criteria and indicators to be used to select a preferred route for the Project. Data sources are also listed in this table. As noted in Section 6.3 of the ToR including Table 10.2 and 10-3, opportunities will be provided to Indigenous communities during the EA to review and discuss these draft evaluation criteria before they are applied.</p> <p>Hydro One agrees that the baseline studies are important and required to assess potential effects the Project may have on the existing environment.</p> <p>A list of baseline studies to be completed during the EA is provided in Section 4 of the ToR and summarized in Table 4-4. Results of these studies will be included in the EA Report and used to predict potential effects of the Project.</p> <p>As noted in the ToR, additional opportunities will be provided to Indigenous communities during the EA to discuss the scope and results of these studies, including the integration of IK.</p> <p>Additional mapping will also be provided as part of the EA and this can be further discussed to ensure it captures the appropriate data (e.g., study areas, routing, potential effects, etc.)</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
2				Access roads constructed for the studies, operation and maintenance of the line should be held to a minimum and a process put in place to review their schedule for decommissioning and restoration with the communities wherever they are no longer essential. Every effort should be made to reduce and restrict the footprint of the project, both in the studies, and in the work completed on the existing Right-of-Way land base to protect the existing habitat.	<p>Hydro One agrees and will make reasonable efforts to minimize the overall Project Footprint and overall ground disturbance, including within and beyond the ROW to protect existing habitat and other potentially sensitive features.</p> <p>Access roads will be included in the Project Footprint to be assessed during the EA and will form part of a larger preliminary Access Plan that will be developed based on available information. This plan will identify the general road improvements for the Project, the need for new access roads, the general watercourse crossing types to be considered for the Project and identify potential impacts of the roads and associated mitigation measures (such as decommissioning or access restrictions).</p> <p>Hydro One will make this plan available to Indigenous communities and is open to discussing a schedule for decommissioning and restoration that works for all parties involved.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
3				To mitigate environmental impacts to the ground and surface water and relevant watersheds, we request that there be a strong reliance on a "Spill Prevention and Response Plan", should a spill occur throughout the construction process.	The potential for spills will be addressed as part of the net effects assessment to be completed during the EA. A commitment to complete a Spill Prevention and Response Plan prior to construction will be included in the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
4				The clearing and maintenance of the Right-of-ways of the transmission lines must be done without the use of herbicides (glyphosate, or other similar chemical agents). These chemicals compromise the life of animals and humans alike, as well as our vegetation (blueberries, medicines, etc.) which are a vital aspect of Treaty #3 culture.	Operation and maintenance activities are described in Section 5.2.2 of the ToR and are generally anticipated to be similar to those activities currently being undertaken by Hydro One in the area for existing transmission lines. Commitments regarding operations and maintenance activities will be examined in the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
5				A Human Health Risk Assessment must be conducted to address concerns related to pollutants, air quality and electromagnetic exposure.	The ToR will be updated to indicate a quantitative air quality assessment of construction activities will be completed in the EA.	Section 4.2.2.9	Section 4.2.2.9 and Table 4-4 updated to indicate a quantitative air quality assessment to be completed in the EA.
6				We request that special care be given to Species at Risk in this Project, and that efforts be made above and beyond the requirements set out in Ontario's Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the federal Species At Risk Act (SARA). It is common knowledge that the Precautionary Principle is not practiced as intended and the legislators are not following their own guidelines to protect these vulnerable species.	The EA will include the study and documentation of SAR and SAR habitat, as well as the identification of potential effects from the Project and application of mitigation measures to address them, as noted in Section 4.2.2.8 and Table 4-4. Opportunities will be provided for communities to provide input/information they might have that could benefit this assessment.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
7				We request that any Intellectual Property provided by the First Nations in digital and hard-copy format be protected by policy, especially as it relates to their cultural knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge) of the land.	Hydro One will protect sensitive data or other information provided for the purposes of the Project and is open to using data sharing agreements with participating Indigenous communities to ensure the proper use of any data provided for use as part of the Project.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
8				We understand that the guidelines set out by the Ministry require, at minimum, a Stage 1	Hydro One agrees and will adhere to all provincial laws and regulations relating to the	N/A	Comment noted; no

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
9				<p>Archaeological Assessment for those locations along the transmission corridor that are determined to have archaeological potential, which in turn may progress to Stages 2, 3 and 4, should any additional assessment be required based on the findings. It is important that all Stages undertaken for Archaeological work not be given anything less than the full attention it deserves.</p> <p>We request that any Archaeological work (research, fieldwork, field camps, reporting) more directly involve the communities; especially the youth, and that additional resources be provided for their involvement. This provides an opportunity for Hydro One to help the youth connect with their historical past and provide an educational element to the work.</p> <p>If any archaeological sites of significance (potential for developing to Stage 2, Stage 3 or Stage 4 are discovered while disrupting the ground, that the First Nation communities be provided with adequate financial resources to hire their own Archaeologist to conduct further study, as required for their direct involvement), (p.54).</p>	<p>documentation of cultural heritage resources during the EA.</p> <p>A net effects assessment will be completed as part of the EA to minimize any potential effects to cultural heritage resources.</p> <p>Hydro One will include Indigenous communities and IK in any archaeological assessments to be completed for the Project and recognizes the importance of providing these opportunities.</p> <p>Funding to support the hiring of consultants will be provided through the Phase 2 Capacity Funding Agreements.</p>	N/A	<p>change to ToR required.</p> <p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
10				<p>We also request that the archaeologist chosen for this work be based in this region, and have significant experience in this geographical area, as they have a better understanding of where these potential locations are based and are familiar with working in the boreal forest. This is of particular importance to the outcome of the work undertaken.</p>	<p>Preference will be given to archaeological firms and firms with experience in northwestern Ontario that are able to accommodate a project of this size and complexity.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
11				<p>On the basis that there has been very little engagement of communities for corridor workshops to contribute to the alternative route selection, we would expect the time and effort be made for in-person workshops and engagement opportunities to provide Project details for those GCT#3 communities interested. In addition, we would expect that the training opportunities be extended to any GCT#3 community interested.</p>	<p>Corridor Workshops have been held with several Indigenous communities to-date with results incorporated into the corridor model. Additional opportunities (in-person if COVID-19 permits; and virtual/online) will be provided during the EA process to provide input to the evaluation of alternative routes including the confirmation of the evaluation criteria, as well as the assessment of effects from the preferred route.</p> <p>Hydro One is currently providing various types of training opportunities aimed at providing general knowledge of the EA process as well as training community members to participate in EA-related activities, such as field studies. Interested communities are encouraged to contact Hydro One for more information.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
12				<p>Questions:</p> <p>Why is the route between Thunder Bay and Atikokan a double-circuit transmission line, while the line between Atikokan and Dryden, a single-circuit?</p>	<p>The IESO has determined the capacity of the different line segments based on their long-term energy planning which is based on their estimation of potential load growth in different areas of the province.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
13				<p>Does the choice between a single circuit and double circuit impact the 'footprint' and resulting potential environmental implications of the Project? (p.iii, paragraph 1)</p>	<p>Single-circuit and double-circuit transmission lines typically require similar ROW widths but this can depend on factors such as terrain. Transmission lines structures (e.g., towers, poles, etc.) with double-circuits typically just have twice as many conductors (wires) than single-circuits.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
14				<p>Why was the Electric Power Research Institute-Georgia Transmission Corporation (EPRI-GTC), a USA-based company used to develop the Electric Transmission Line Siting Methodology for the Corridor Workshops, as opposed to the Canadian Energy Research Institute, or another Canadian source of research capacity? (p.v, paragraph 2)</p>	<p>The EPRI-GTC Siting Methodology is an electronic tool for combining information in a GIS system that was developed and documented by EPRI and used by Dillon Consulting Limited/Hydro One. It is not a project-specific process developed by EPRI. Hydro One selected as the basis for identification and selection of alternative routes because it is a proven methodology that offers a structured decision-making process and allows transparent documentation of the reasons for the decisions that were made, as well as input from Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations, to be factored in early on in the planning process. It is an approach that has been used previously in Canada, including for example the Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba-Minnesota Transmission Project.</p> <p>The Canadian Energy Research Institute is a valuable source of information; however, we are not aware of any models or methodologies that they have that are comparable to those that have been developed by EPRI-GTC.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
15				<p>Why does Hydro One need a Research Institute to site a transmission line?</p>	<p>Hydro One does not require a Research Institute to site the Project. Hydro One implemented a siting approach developed by EPRI-GTC that matched the size and complexity of the Project. EPRI-GTC is a proven methodology that offers a structured decision-making process and allows transparent documentation of the reasons for the decisions that were made, as well as input from Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations, to be factored in early on in the planning process.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
16				<p>What technology gaps and/or broader needs were identified from this work done with EPRI-GTC besides the siting methodology (p.74)?</p>	<p>No technology gaps have been identified to-date.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
17				What procurement process was used that Canada didn't satisfy?	Dillon Consulting Limited was hired through a competitive procurement process to support Hydro One during the ToR. Dillon Consulting Limited selected the EPRI-GTC siting model to support the siting of the transmission line as it is a proven methodology that offers a structured and transparent decision-making process that allows for input from Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations to be factored in early on in the planning process. We are not aware of any models or methodologies that have been developed that are comparable to those that have been developed by EPRI-GTC.	N/A	required. Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
18				What preparations are being made for waste disposal from waste that accumulates as a result of this project?	Waste management will be included in the net effects assessment to be completed during the EA. Mitigation measures will also be identified to ensure waste is managed in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements in a manner which does not result in significant effects to the environment.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
19				Transparency: Comments: Any processes developed for monitoring environmental impacts of the Project, including additions and adjustment should be shared with the all those GCT#3 First Nations and agencies interested.	The EA will commit to the development of environmental monitoring plans as noted in ToR Section 8 and will be shared with Indigenous communities, including GCT #3 communities, regulatory agencies and other stakeholders.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
20				Effects monitoring consisting of activities carried out by Hydro One after approval of the Environmental Assessment to determine the environmental impacts of the Project should also be shared with all those First Nations and agencies interested.	The EA will commit to the development of environmental monitoring plans, including effects monitoring, as noted in ToR Section 8 and will be shared with interested Indigenous communities, regulatory agencies and other stakeholders.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
21				We request access to the preliminary baseline environmental studies that were accessed from available secondary sources in preparation of the draft Terms of Reference, (pp.21-22).	Records reviewed as part of the development of the ToR are referenced in Table 4-1 and are publicly available, with the exception of sensitive SAR data for which an agreement with MNRF will be required. Specific references and links to these resources are provided in the references list at the end of the ToR. The EA document will document details of data that are collected for the environmental baseline, compliant with any agreements related to sensitive data.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
22				Engagement with community members revealed that they are eager to engage and they have a number of questions that the provided material did not answer. The Community Engagement sessions led to questions relating to Phase 3 and the opportunities that may be pursued in relation to renewables and connection to the grid. Concerns arose that Hydro One may have future plans that are not disclosed in the provided material, and that those future plans will alter the outcomes for the communities.	The need for the Project has been determined by the IESO and the IESO has asked Hydro One to begin development work on Phases 1 and 2 as outlined in the Long-Term Energy Plan. Hydro One is not aware of the 'future plans' being referred to.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
23				We request full disclosure of the Commitments that Hydro One will be making in relation to the Terms of Reference and the Environmental Assessment as they are developed.	A commitments table will be included in the ToR to list commitments made in this document. A separate commitments table will be included in the EA. The list is to be read in conjunction with the ToR.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
24				Questions: What is the full role of the Ontario Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines in this Project, leading up to, throughout the Project and after completion?	The Ontario Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines or ENDM has played several roles on the Project: 1) ENDM oversees many activities in Ontario related to electricity (the regulator); 2) ENDM was involved in establishing the need and scope for the Project with the IESO; 3) ENDM is a member of the Government Review Team and as such reviews documents prepared in support of the Project and provides comments, as required; 4) ENDM is responsible for regulating any activities that could affect mining and northern development; 5) ENDM provided Hydro One the list of Indigenous communities whose Section 35 rights could potentially be affected by the project and delegated procedural aspects of consultation to Hydro One for this project; 6) ENDM provided baseline data; and, 7) Following completion, ENDM may be involved with providing continued guidance during construction as well as in implementation of any monitoring plans or conditions of EA approval.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
25				What is the full role of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry in this Project?	The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry or MNRF has provided data to be used to assist with defining baseline conditions and also provides guidance on any areas of the Project that fall within their mandate (e.g., natural environment, etc.). The MNRF is also a member of the Government Review Team and as such reviews documents prepared in support of the Project and provides comments, as required.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
26				What is the full role of the Ontario Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines in this Project?	Please see response to comment # 24.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
27				What is the full role of the Ontario Ministry of Infrastructure in this Project?	Infrastructure Ontario has been contacted as part of the Project for information relating to better defining baseline conditions and also provides guidance on any areas of the Project that fall within their mandate (e.g., identifying lands where they have an interest and associated approval requirements, easements, etc.). Infrastructure Ontario is also a member of the Government Review Team and as such reviews documents prepared in support of the Project and provides comments, as required.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
28				What other Ministries and Agencies, provincial or federal, are involved in this Project, and what are their full roles in this Project?	A list of government agencies, as well as other stakeholders, that have been included in Project-related circulations is available in the Record of Consultation (Appendix A) as there are too many to note here. Their roles are similar to those described above; however, focus primarily on interests that lie specifically within their mandate. All government agencies noted in the Record of Consultation have been circulated with Project notices and provided with opportunities to provide comments.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
29				Consultation Comments: The peoples of Grand Council Treaty #3, having a sacred connection to the land and the water and carrying an inherent role as stewards of the land, to protect and preserve the environment for future generations, collectively use the land that is being considered for the Project. As a result of this Project, their Aboriginal and Treaty Rights are impacted with reduced access to wildlife and land for hunting, fishing, trapping foraging and cultural and ceremonial purposes. As the Environmental Assessment progresses, Hydro One has a responsibility to ensure that their Rights are being protected to the greatest extent possible, and their access to the land and water in the Project area is accommodated throughout the life of the Project.	Hydro One understands that GCT #3 has an inherent and sacred connection to the land potentially affected by the Project. As noted in Section 10.4 (Indigenous Community Engagement Plan), Hydro One will collaborate with Indigenous communities to better understand their rights and asserted rights as well as their concerns for the people affected by work in the areas where Hydro One may operate. Collaboration is also supported for the collection and use of IK during the EA. Section 10.4.2 states that communities will be provided with information, and will be engaged in a direct dialogue, in order to allow both Hydro One and each Indigenous community to understand the potential effects (if any) of the Project on any Aboriginal and treaty rights or interests. It is intended that this will be completed during the EA. Where impacts cannot be avoided, GCT #3 will be engaged in the identification of mitigation, and if necessary, accommodation measures to offset impacts.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
30				As a signatory to a Capacity Funding Agreement with Hydro One where Grand Council Treaty is the Traditional Government of 28 communities and traditional territories, are working under customary law, 'Manito Aki Inakonigaawin', where all our communities are impacted by the Project, and are working collaboratively to address the Draft Terms of Reference, we must ensure all our Rights holders have a fair opportunity to partake in the engagement process, and not just those identified by a provincial ministry, (p.46).	Hydro One will continue to engage and consult with GCT #3 throughout the EA process. Hydro One is aware of the customary law, 'Manito Aki Inakonigaawin.' and is working with GCT #3 Environmental Chiefs and the Territorial Planning Unit to better understand it and how it relates to the EA process.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
31				As a result of Treaty #3 member engagement, community member input gave very strong direction regarding the approach GCT#3 should take to address concerns. Manito Aki Inakonigaawin was identified as the "law of the people", due to the inherent connection the Great Earth Law has to the history, ideology and connection to the land. The engagement related to the Waasigan Transmission Line needs to be guided by Manito Aki Inakonigaawin. A strong example of a former infrastructure project that was guided by Manito Aki Inakonigaawin is the fibre optic line infrastructure (Bell FOTS), where GCT#3 gave their authorization for the project to pass through their territory after much consideration at the Chiefs' Assembly and in the communities. The Waasigan Transmission Line engagement must proceed with this same level of consideration (addendum #1). Considering that the Bell FOTS agreement is now being challenged by the original proponent, it is critical that this Project be given due consideration and follow processes guided by Anishinaabe Law. It was identified proponents do not respect the Resource Law and the Anishinaabe people, and it is important for Anishinaabe Law and protocols to guide the process for all projects. It was agreed that all processes going forward to address this Project, will follow the guide posts and principles as identified by Manito Aki Inakonigaawin.	Hydro One will continue to engage and consult with GCT #3 throughout the EA process. Hydro One is aware of the customary law, 'Manito Aki Inakonigaawin' and is working with GCT #3 Environmental Chiefs and the Territorial Planning Unit to better understand it and how it relates to the EA process.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
32				We request that any trap line holders be fully informed of the Project and fully engaged in the Consultation process.	Hydro One will work with GCT #3 to ensure applicable Project-related information is provided to identified trap line holders in an effort to keep them informed during the EA.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
33				The consultation record identifies significant engagement with the Metis organizations. Grand Council Treaty #3 would like to register a statement of concern related to their	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				(Metis) aggressive engagement strategy in relation to the Waasigan Project, as they do not have a land base in the Treaty #3 territory and their over-involvement erodes our Treaty Rights. At a Chiefs' Assembly in the fall of 2017, a Resolution was passed related to concerns over Metis Consultation with the Province of Ontario (addendum #2), which in turn resulted in a meeting between Ogichidaa and the Premier of Ontario. Over-engagement of the Metis by government and proponents is perceived as a 'divide and conquer strategy'.			
34				Interest of any First Nation in Treaty #3 related to the training provided for the Waasigan Transmission Line, should be accommodated, regardless of the location of their community.	Hydro One is currently providing various types of training opportunities aimed at providing general knowledge of the EA process as well as training community members to participate in EA-related activities, such as field studies. Interested communities are encouraged to contact Hydro One for more information.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
35				The formal consultation record should acknowledge Grand Council Treaty #3 as a signatory to a Capacity Funding Agreement, rather than just receiving correspondence and information.	This will be updated in the Record of Consultation.	Record of Consultation	Update made.
36				Questions: Is it the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks or the Ontario Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines that governs the consultation process?	Both ministries have a role in the consultation process for the Project. The Project is subject to the provincial EA approval process under the EA Act, 1990. This process, including consultation requirements, is overseen by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks. The Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines was also involved in establishing the need and scope for the Project with the IESO, as well as the delegation of the Crown's Duty to Consult.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
37				In a COVID-19 lens, how will the Duty to Consult be met safely and effectively?	Hydro One has been continuing to engage Indigenous communities since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in mid-March 2020 through teleconferences and opportunities for virtual/online engagement activities. It is Hydro One's intention to continue engagement in this manner during the EA; however, is open to more traditional in-person meetings (with safety measures in place) when communities and Hydro One determine it is safe to do so.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
38				Decision-Making Process Comments: We request the environmental assessment must give due consideration to the impacts to GCT#3 traditional territory as well as the 'Lands Taken Up' by this project in terms of the Project's contribution to the 'cumulative impact' on the natural and built up environment at this point and time, and that a written statement be made in relation to this consideration. This request is directly related to our Aboriginal and Treaty Rights under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.	Hydro One intends to work with GCT #3 to better understand their concerns regarding how the Project might impact exercise of Section 35 rights. Hydro One intends to reflect those concerns regarding impacts to rights and values within the EA. Hydro One is not in a position to provide baseline statements on Section 35 rights, but will rely on, and help support, efforts by GCT #3 to clearly articulate its rights early in the process and to subsequently work with GCT #3 to understand how the Project could impact the exercise of these rights.	Section 4.2.3.6	The following will be added to Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Use): The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.
39				In the interests of collective efforts to identify and resolve, to the greatest extent possible, any issues raised before the final environmental assessment is submitted, we request that a draft Environmental Assessment be presented for review to the Chiefs in Assembly for consideration before it is formalized, and that the timeline be adjusted to allow for this factor.	A draft EA Report will be made available for review and comment to Indigenous communities as noted in throughout Section 10 of the ToR.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
40				First Nation communities should be given first opportunity to contract for provision of workers, equipment, economic development opportunities and partnerships with Hydro One throughout the project.	Hydro One has been directed by the IESO to develop the Project only and has not yet been directed to construct the Project; however, will engage Indigenous communities when appropriate as part of the EA process.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
41				Should Hydro One not be granted the approvals to proceed after completing the Environmental Assessment, and a 'Plan B' be required to execute this Project, we request that the communities be involved in the planning of a 'Plan B' in the very early stages of	Comment noted.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				discussion.			
42				A process must be put into place to address any past grievances between the communities and Hydro One before proceeding with the project.	Although not specifically part of the EA process, Hydro One will continue to work closely with GCT #3 to discuss and address Hydro One related matters of interest to GCT #3.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
43				Questions: How is Northwestern Ontario's electricity forecast tied into the Market Renewal Program that is currently in development?	Electricity forecasts and Market Renewal Programs fall under the responsibility of the IESO. Hydro One suggests contacting them for further information.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
44				Hydro One provides good information related to the background of the project and purpose and rationale of the proposed undertaking. We do not see any reference to the potential or planned retailing of Hydro to the USA. Does this Project facilitate Hydro One's intentions for potential or planned retailing of electricity to the USA?	Connections to the United States or "retailing" are not within the scope of the Project.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
45				To what extend will the larger infrastructure support the development of new nuclear sources of power, whether they're a full nuclear reactor or a series of small modular reactors (SMRs)?	New nuclear sources of power, or any other energy and/or developments, are not being contemplated as part of this Project.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
46				Has Hydro One given consideration to a 'Plan B' should the Permit to proceed, not be granted after completing the Environmental Assessment?	The IESO is responsible for making system planning decisions in the event the Waasigan transmission line is not approved for construction.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
47				Hydro One provides good information in relation to Ontario's Environmental Assessment Act, 1990, and the requirements at that time, (p.8). How does Ontario's Bill 197 change the requirements related to environmental projections for this Project, and what considerations were given to determine if the Canadian Impact Assessment Act applies to this Project, especially with the recent changes made, both at a provincial and federal level.	The EA changes noted in Bill 197 have not been finalized and thus the Project will continue under the current approval regime. Once these changes have been finalized, Hydro One will review any potential impacts to the EA process with guidance from the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks. As noted in Section 11.2.1 of the ToR, a review of the Physical Activities Regulations associated with the federal Impact Assessment Act, 2019, was completed and it was determined that the Project is not considered a "designated project," and does not meet the requirements or threshold as stipulated in the regulation designating physical activities and as such the federal impact assessment process does not apply to this Project.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
48				Does Hydro One intend to reduce or change their efforts in any way, at any time in the future, due to the outcomes of the Omnibus Bill 197: COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act, 2020? The GCT#3 Territorial Planning Unit has developed comments for consideration (Addendum #3), by the Ontario government in relation to the impending Omnibus Bill 197-19 Economic Recovery Act, 2020.	Please see response to comment # 47.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.
49				Assessment and Evaluation: Criteria, Indicators and Methodology Using the Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing Terms of Reference for Environmental Assessments in Ontario, 2014, The TPU has identified criteria to consider as impacts, above and beyond the chart included in the Draft Terms of Reference. There is some possibility of overlap, in which case, we are preparing this document in the course of due diligence.	A draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators will be included in the ToR which will take these into account. There will be opportunity during the EA for Indigenous communities to review and provide input on these criteria.	N/A	A new appendix has been added to the ToR for potential effects assessment criteria and indicators.
50				We submit these statements and questions after due consideration of the material provided and learning more about the project and the potential outcomes. Overall, the documentation provided by Hydro One Networks Inc. related to the Waasigan Transmission Line Project is informative, even though many questions arise in the reading. We would like it stated that while we are in full support of Gwayakochiigewin LP, and will make every effort to support them in their efforts to succeed, we are still mandated to support the 28 communities we represent, which is reflected in the comments and questions we submit. We would also like to make a statement about how COVID-19 has hampered the ability to proceed as originally planned. The most effective means of engaging communities is in person. Unfortunately, this has, and will continue to slow down the work to move forward. It is imperative, however that the engagement does take place. We will work cooperatively with everyone involved to move the process forward as expediently as circumstances allow. In conclusion, the above statements and questions are intended to help us understand the process better, protect the interests of the member communities of Grand Council Treaty #3 and to work towards the best outcome possible for everyone concerned. We	Comment noted. Hydro One looks forward to continued engagement and consultation with the GTC #3 during the EA and will be sensitive to COVID-19 restrictions.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				appreciate your consideration of our input. If any further information or questions are required please contact our Regulatory Specialist, Michelle Shephard at Michelle.Shephard@treaty3.ca.			



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
Germaine Conacher, Adena Vanderjagt, MNP (for MNO)							
1	August 2020	Presentation	Germaine Conacher, Adena Vanderjagt - MNP	<p><u>Métis Specific Criteria</u></p> <p>The Métis Nation of Ontario Region 1 and 2 undertook a scoping process for the selection of Métis-specific Criteria related to the Project.</p> <p>It was anticipated that the information would be reflected in the draft ToR. This was not the case.</p>	Comment noted. Please see responses related to this further below.	N/A	N/A
2				<p><u>Indigenous Knowledge and Indigenous Rights</u></p> <p>Draft ToR appears to refer to Indigenous Knowledge and Indigenous Rights interchangeably.</p> <p>An understanding, description and acknowledgement of Indigenous rights and interests is needed to accurately capture what information must be collected for the EA.</p> <p>Indigenous Knowledge is also important, but cannot be used as a proxy.</p>	<p>It is not Hydro One's intent to use IK as a proxy and both are described in the draft ToR per below.</p> <p>As noted in Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes), IK includes traditional ecological knowledge and traditional land and resource use and this information would be incorporated into the EA as Hydro One believes that the Project will benefit greatly from it and with the active engagement of Indigenous communities that hold it. For the purposes of the ToR, IK is considered to be a holistic body of knowledge containing information and records collected by Indigenous communities that is of social, economic, cultural, spiritual, and/or historical significance to its members.</p> <p>With respect to Indigenous Rights, Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes) further states the Project is located within the boundaries of Treaty #3 (1905-1906) and the Robinson Superior Treaty (1850) and that Aboriginal and treaty rights are recognized under Section 35 of Canada's Constitution Act, 1982 (also referred to as Section 35 rights), which includes recognition of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights to hunt, trap, fish, gather and manage the lands for all First Nation, Inuit and Métis people of Canada.</p> <p>Section 4.3.2 (Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment) further states under the Preliminary Potential Effects to Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes heading that the Project has the potential to result in effects to the natural environment, including wildlife, vegetation and water resources and that potential effects to the natural environment may affect the Aboriginal and treaty rights of communities.</p> <p>As noted in Section 10.4 (Indigenous Community Engagement Plan), Hydro One will collaborate with Indigenous communities to better understand their rights and asserted rights as well as their concerns for the people affected by work in the areas where Hydro One may operate. Collaboration is also supported for the collection and use of IK during the EA.</p> <p>Note Section 10.4.2 (Indigenous Communities to be Engaged) states that communities will be provided with information, and will be engaged in a direct dialogue, in order to allow both Hydro One and each Indigenous community to understand the potential effects (if any) of the Project on any Aboriginal and treaty rights or interests. It is intended that this will be completed during the EA.</p>	Section 4.2.3.6	<p>The following text has been added to Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes):</p> <p>With accurate and comprehensive IK available, Hydro One will seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests related to use of the lands.</p>
3				<p><u>46 specific comments within the review</u></p> <p>Range from Comments on Rights to Comments on the Consultation Process undertaken and articulated within the draft ToR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA must include assessment of Section 35 rights and interests • Maps need to be updated to reflect R1 and R2 (e.g., First Nations Treaty Boundary, Métis are signatories) • Baseline conditions do not include a description of Métis rights and interests • Biophysical assessments should be completed in consultation with R1 and R2 • Perception and sense of place should be considered for some biophysical components • Acoustic/Noise studies should be required for construction noise and operation noise (e.g., construction vehicles, corona discharge, line hum) • Crown land is a high priority to Métis harvesters • Tiering of Consultation is inappropriate 	These comments are acknowledged. Specific comments provided are documented and responded in the rest of this table.	N/A	N/A
Germaine Conacher, MNP, Indigenous Services (for MNO)							
1	August 10, 2020	Letter	Germaine Conacher	<u>Métis Specific Criteria</u>	As noted in the comments, MNO completed two Corridor Workshops during the course of the draft ToR. These sessions were documented in two reports (one for each region) and a	Appendices	The MNO-specific criteria was added to



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
			MNP Consulting, Indigenous Services	<p>In November 2019, the Métis Nation of Ontario, Regions 1 and 2, undertook a scoping process for the selection of Métis-specific Criteria related to the Hydro One Project. Following the production of this document, the MNO Regions 1 and 2 submitted a report to Hydro One titled:</p> <p>Métis Nation of Ontario Preliminary Criteria Report – Waasigan Transmission Line – Region 1 and Region 2. It was anticipated that the information set out in the Preliminary Criteria Report (2019) would be considered by Hydro One in the development of the dTOR and in the execution of the Environmental Assessment (“EA”) including reference to the three identified Criteria of Loss of Land/Change in Priority Rights, Harvesting/Sites and Cultural Identity and the suggested measurable parameters/units of measurement within the dTOR.</p> <p>Once approved, the dTOR acts as an outline for the EA. This presented an opportunity for Hydro One to highlight Métis-specific Criteria and ensure that the Criteria could be assessed and evaluated as part of the EA.</p> <p>There are examples where Métis-specific Criteria could have been included for assessment in the dTOR: within 4.2.2 Natural Environment, 4.2.3 Socio-Economic Environment as a standalone assessment or where there is overlap (e.g., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas and the Harvesting [change in physical attribute] Criteria). Additionally, the dTOR lacks mention that this information was being collected and would be entered at a later date (Appendix B – List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators) beyond a generic placeholder in a table for Indigenous information.</p> <p>It is important to note, that if the Criteria are included in the dTOR, Hydro One will be required to assess that Criteria within the EA; therefore, the MNO Regions 1 and 2 must be comfortable with providing the required baseline information either to Hydro One and their consultants or through a MNO Regions 1 and 2 specific data collection process. The proposed Metis-specific Criteria: Harvesting and Cultural Identity require the collection of additional information from MNO Regions 1 and 2 citizens such as: their perceptions related to air, noise and visual quality; identification of culturally critical species; harvesting timing windows; teaching / transmittal protocols; perception of the harvesting experience; perception of Métis sites; conditions required for territorial connection; and identification of cultural practices.</p> <p>At minimum, the Métis-specific Criteria which could be assessed without additional information collected from the MNO Regions 1 and 2 should be included (Loss of Land/Change in Priority Rights or Harvesting [specifically - change in physical attributes]).</p>	<p>follow-up call was held with the MNO to discuss them. These reports summarized the workshop findings, including the identification of sensitive areas in the study area, which were incorporated into the EPRI-GTC siting model, and used to select the alternative routes.</p> <p>A separate report prepared in November 2019, as referenced in the comment, was produced by the MNO to document MNO-specific preliminary criteria to be used for the net effects assessment during the EA.</p> <p>A draft set of effects assessment criteria and indicators has been added to the ToR appendix which considers the criteria provided by the MNO in their November 2019 report.</p> <p>Any additional MNO-specific baseline, or other information, provided by MNO will be incorporated into the EA.</p>		the newly created appendix (Draft List of Effects Assessment Criteria and Indicators).
2				<p>Indigenous Knowledge and Rights</p> <p>The dTOR also appears to refer to Indigenous Knowledge interchangeably with Indigenous Rights. For example, in Section 4.3.2 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment the sub-section is called Preliminary Potential Effects to Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes. Within that section there is an acknowledgement that potential effects to the natural environment may affect Aboriginal and treaty rights of communities (nations); but throughout the natural environment description of the existing environment and data collection methodology, there is no reference to collection or assessment of rights related to natural environment components, rather it states that desktop studies will be supplemented by Indigenous Knowledge gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities.</p> <p>An understanding, description and acknowledgement of Indigenous rights and interests is needed to accurately capture what information must be collected for the EA; and what must be assessed by Hydro One in order to provide the Crown the information it needs.</p> <p>The information required includes: the nature of rights being exercised within the vicinity of the Project, and how the Project may impact those rights. Indigenous Knowledge is also important – as it is holistic and can inform social, economic, cultural, spiritual and historical aspects of importance to a nation - this information can be woven throughout the assessment to enhance the western science lens that EAs are typically viewed through;</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to MNO’s Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>Hydro One reaffirms their commitment to continued engagement with MNO Regions 1 and 2 during the EA towards developing a mutually acceptable consultation process and increased collaboration.</p>	Section 4.2.3.6	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes):</p> <p>With accurate and comprehensive IK available, Hydro One will seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests related to use of the lands.</p>





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
<p>however, natural environment components or Indigenous Knowledge cannot be used as a proxy for an assessment on Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>Based on our review, there is a strong commitment to engagement throughout the dTOR and Hydro One acknowledges the procedural delegation of the Duty to Consult. We feel that, provided the MNO Regions 1 and 2 has the capacity and confidence to provide the required baseline information, the Final Terms-of-Reference can be updated to include the Métis-specific Criteria and rights and ensure assessment of the same.</p> <p>It is our recommendation that the issues contained in this letter and table be submitted to Hydro One to ensure the MNO Regions 1 and 2 and Hydro One can continue to work towards a mutually acceptable consultation process and increased collaboration.</p>							
<p>Germaine Conacher, MNP, Indigenous Services (for MNO)</p>							
1	August 10, 2020	Comment table (attachment to August 10, 2020 letter)	Germaine Conacher MNP Consulting, Indigenous Services	<p>Executive Summary; Page iii</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The first step of the EA process is the preparation of a ToR for review by Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations. Ultimately, approval is required by the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (the Minister) for the Project to proceed."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The terminology used to refer to the MNO Regions is diverse and varied. This should be reflected in the dTOR and subsequent EA.</p> <p>Region 2 prefers the use of the term Nation rather than community as the Metis peoples, as Indigenous peoples of Canada, have the right to self determination. While some aspects of this governance have been impaired through imposition of colonial structures, the Métis Nation of Ontario has a democratic, province-wide governance structure and has embarked on a path to self-government.</p> <p>Region 1 prefers the use of the term Community as it is representative of the Northwestern Ontario Métis Community; descriptive of the outstanding claims of the Northwestern Ontario Métis Community, including any Métis collective claims relating to the Treaty 3 Adhesion of 1875.</p>	<p>It is understood that terminology used to refer to the MNO Regions is diverse and varied and will be reflected in the ToR and subsequent EA. Hydro One has updated its definition of "Indigenous communities" in the Glossary to mean: Those communities, nations and organizations identified in the Constitution Act, 1982, including First Nations, Inuit and Métis Groups of Canada. Indigenous community is also now defined as such the first time it is used in the document. It is also noted that MNO Region 2 prefers the use of the term Nation. Region 1 will continue to be referred to as "Community".</p>	Glossary	<p>The definition of "Indigenous communities" has been revised as follows:</p> <p>Those communities, nations and organizations identified in the Constitution Act, 1982, including First Nations, Inuit and Métis Groups of Canada.</p>
2				<p>3.2 Environmental Assessment Preparation and Submission; Page 13</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The EA will include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the purpose of and need for the Project (reference to the applicable section in the approved ToR where this is described); • Description and statement of the rationale for the undertaking; • Description of alternative methods of completing the Project; • Identification of the advantages and disadvantages of the Project; • Description of the environment that will be affected, or might reasonably be expected to be affected, directly or indirectly by the Project and the alternative methods of carrying out the undertaking; • Identification and assessment of potential positive and negative environmental Project effects (including net effects) on existing conditions and the development of mitigation measures to eliminate or minimize adverse effects; • Description and documentation of the results from the EA consultation and engagement program; • Monitoring, follow-up programs and commitments; and, • Supporting documentation that includes technical reports completed to support the Project." <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of the Project's potential impacts on MNO's Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>Through its engagement, Hydro One seeks to better understand the Metis Nations' concerns regarding potential impacts to Section 35 rights and interests, as will work to reflect these concerns in the EA wherever appropriate.</p>	Section 3.3	<p>The following has been added to Section 3.3:</p> <p>The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>The EA must also include an assessment of potential positive and negative effects on the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2's Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>The requirement for this information is on the 'Preparing environmental assessments' website for the government of Ontario which indicates the Crown may delegate certain aspects of consultation such as gathering information about the impact of a proposed project on the potential or established Aboriginal or treaty rights.</p>			
3				<p>4.1 Study Area; Page 16</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The Study Area was presented and made available for comment to Indigenous communities, municipalities, and government agencies during the pre-consultation period (see Record of Consultation for more information related to specific activities)."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Please include a bulleted listing of Indigenous nations that were presented the Study Area during the pre-consultation period to allow for quick reference.</p>	<p>Hydro One undertook pre-consultation activities with all Indigenous communities as identified in the provincial delegation letter. The study area was presented to communities during pre-consultation once it was available.</p>	Section 4.1	<p>Section 4.1 revised to indicate:</p> <p>The Study Area was presented and made available for comment to Indigenous communities (as identified in the provincial delegation letter), municipalities, and government agencies during the pre-consultation period (see Record of Consultation for more information related to specific activities).</p>
4				<p>4.1 Study Area; Page 17</p> <p>Draft ToR Details Map</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Please update this map to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include the Métis Nation of Ontario Councils in the legend. • update the language to state "First Nation and Métis Treaty Boundaries" rather than "First Nation Treaty Boundaries" as the Métis are signatories to Treaty No. 3. • Update Atikokan and Area Métis Council to be 'Atikokan Métis Council'. 	<p>Figure will be updated.</p>	Figure 4.1	<p>Figure updated.</p>
5				<p>4.2 Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology; Page 19 and 20</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Baseline environmental conditions are described in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 and are organized based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Physiography, geology, surficial geology and soils; o Surface water; o Groundwater; o Provincial parks, conservation reserves, and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI); o Fish and fish habitat; o Vegetation and wetlands; o Terrestrial wildlife and wildlife habitat; o Species at risk; o Air quality and greenhouse gases; and, o Acoustic environment. 	<p>Hydro One intends to work with MNO to better understand MNO's concerns regarding how the Project might impact Métis rights and interests. Hydro One intends to reflect those concerns regarding impacts to rights and values within the EA.</p> <p>Hydro One is not in a position to provide baseline statements on Métis rights and interests, but will rely on, and help support, efforts by MNO to clearly articulate its rights early in the process (2017 SCC 54), and to subsequently work with MNO to understand how the Project could impact these rights.</p>	Section 4.2	<p>Section 4.2 (Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology) revised to include the following:</p> <p>Indigenous Knowledge (IK) received from Indigenous communities will be incorporated into aspects of the EA, including information on Section 35 (Constitution Act, 1982) rights and interests, in consultation with Indigenous</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-economic environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Provincial and municipal policy; o Community well-being; o Economy, land and resource use; o Aesthetics; o Infrastructure and community services; o Indigenous community use of land and resources for traditional purposes; and, o Cultural heritage resources.” <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The baseline conditions do not include a description of Métis rights and interests or Indigenous rights more broadly. Without an understanding of the baseline conditions that exist for rights and interests, there is no way for Hydro One to assess change or impact to those rights and interests.</p> <p>Use of land and resources for traditional purposes is a component of rights, specifically the exercise of harvesting rights and does not encompass the entirety of rights that may be impacted by this project. Rights and interests must be added as a component of the socio-economic environment and baseline information must be described.</p>			communities.
6				<p>4.2 Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology; Page 20</p> <p>Draft ToR Details “IK received from Indigenous communities will be incorporated into aspects of the EA, in consultation with Indigenous communities.”</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Information on Section 35 rights and interests must also be incorporated into aspects of the EA, in consultation with Indigenous nations. Incorporation of Indigenous Knowledge cannot be assumed to be a substitute for the assessment of effects to Indigenous rights – both concepts are important, yet distinct and should be included within an EA.</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of MNO’s Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>Hydro One seeks to better understand MNO concerns regarding how the Project may impact Métis rights and interest will seek to reflect these concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.</p>	Section 4.2	<p>Section 4.2 (Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology) revised to include:</p> <p>Indigenous Knowledge (IK) received from Indigenous communities will be incorporated into aspects of the EA, including information on Section 35 (Constitution Act, 1982) rights and interests, in consultation with Indigenous communities.</p>
7				<p>4.2 Description of Existing Environment and Data Collection Methodology; Page 20</p> <p>Draft ToR Details “An aerial reconnaissance of the alternative routes is planned for 2020 to collect data for surface water, fish and fish habitat and the terrestrial environment (e.g., vegetation and wildlife) to support the alternative route evaluation. Further, a ground-based survey is planned for fall 2020 to evaluate the physical characteristics of historic mine workings identified in the Abandoned Mine Information System spatial data layer to determine if they have potential to support bat hibernaculum and may be a constraint to development.”</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Some field work, either aerial reconnaissance or ground-based survey, should be completed to collect specific data related to Métis rights and interests for, at minimum, the preferred route. This should be discussed with the Métis Nation of Ontario through the Regional Consultation Committees and Lands, Resource and Consultation Branch to</p>	Hydro One is providing the MNO the opportunity to review and comment on the field program.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				identify the preferred method of data collection and discuss aspects of rights to be considered (e.g., Métis-specific Criteria supportive information).			
				<p>4.2.1 Records Reviewed as Part of the Terms of Reference; Page 21</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Table 4-1 outlines some of the key secondary source information used in preparation of this draft ToR (references are included at the end of this document). These sources, as well as any new sources identified during the EA, will be included in the EA Report, as appropriate."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The MNO Regions 1 and 2 should be engaged to discuss the potential of secondary source information related to the MNO Regions 1 and 2 and Métis rights, where the information is available.</p>	<p>Hydro One intends to work with MNO to better understand MNO's concerns regarding how the Project might impact Metis rights and interests. Hydro One intends to reflect those concerns regarding impacts to rights and values within the EA.</p> <p>Hydro One will rely on, and help support, efforts by MNO to clearly articulate its rights early in the process, and to subsequently work with MNO to understand how the Project could impact these rights.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
9				<p>4.2.2.6 Vegetation and Wetlands; Page 31 and 32</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Anticipated field studies to be completed during the EA include Ecological Land Classification (ELC) and botanical surveys and are subject to consultation with regulatory agencies and Indigenous communities."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The wording within this section is appropriate and should be applied to other identified sections (throughout table) to supplement the incorporation of Indigenous Knowledge. Both concepts are important, yet distinct, and should be included within an EA.</p>	Similar wording to what was suggested will be used where appropriate in Section 4.2.	Section 4.2	Updates made as noted below for other related comments.
10				<p>4.2.2.6 Vegetation and Wetlands; Page 32</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The EA will identify and document wetlands potentially affected by the Project using desktop studies (including GIS mapping) supplemented with field studies, as necessary. Desktop and field studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section should be updated to reflect the wording identified as appropriate in comment #9. Wetland desktop and field studies should be subject to consultation with Indigenous nations, specifically, the Métis Nation of Ontario.</p>	Section 4.2.2 revised to reflect the wording identified as appropriate in comment #9 that wetland desktop and field studies should be subject to consultation with Indigenous communities.	Section 4.2.2.6	<p>The following has been added to Section 4.2.2.6 (Vegetation and Wetlands):</p> <p>Wetland desktop and field studies will be subject to consultation with Indigenous communities for their input and the studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities.</p>
11				<p>4.2.2.7 Terrestrial Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat; Page 33</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "A preliminary desktop review of aerial photography, information provided by the MNRF (and other secondary sources), and review of the draft Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules for Ecoregion 3W (MNRF, 2017), was undertaken to determine the potential for Significant Wildlife Habitat to occur within the Study Area. Some of these potential habitats include, but are not limited to, bat maternity colonies, amphibian breeding habitat, turtle wintering areas, snake hibernaculum, bald eagle and osprey nesting habitat, woodland raptor nesting habitat, turtle nesting areas, and mineral licks."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Consultation must be undertaken with the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 to identify Significant Wildlife Habitat to Métis Harvesters. This may differ from the habitats identified through the typical EA methods. For example, significant habitat to Métis</p>	Hydro One will further engage the MNO Regions 1 and 2 during the EA related to the identification of Significant Wildlife Habitat to Métis Harvesters.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
12				<p>harvesters may be habitat that supports abundant, returning populations of wildlife rather than maternity colonies or nesting areas, which Métis harvesters may avoid.</p> <p>4.2.2.8 Species at Risk; Page 37</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Consultation with the MECP will be undertaken to determine the need for SAR field studies to be completed in support of the EA. Desktop and field studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section should be updated to reflect the wording identified as appropriate in comment #9. Species at Risk desktop and field studies should be subject to consultation with Indigenous nations, specifically the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2.8 revised to indicate: SAR desktop and field studies will be subject to consultation with Indigenous communities for their input.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2.8</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2.8 (SAR and SAR Habitat) revised as follows:</p> <p>SAR desktop and field studies will be subject to consultation with Indigenous communities for their input and the studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities.</p>
13				<p>4.2.2.9 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases; Page 38</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Given the nature of this Project, only temporary construction-related air emissions are anticipated. A quantitative assessment of air quality emissions is not anticipated to be required for the EA."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Air quality emissions from construction-related activities has the potential to displace Métis harvesters due to disruption of sense-of-place or through increased negative perceptions and a quantitative assessment of these potential effects should be undertaken for the EA as identified in the Métis-specific Criteria.</p>	<p>Hydro One will work with the MNO during the EA to determine how construction-related activities and associated effects could potentially displace Métis harvesters due to disruption of sense-of-place or through increased negative perceptions related to air quality. Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria. The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.</p>	<p>Appendices</p>	<p>The provided MNO-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators that are appended to the ToR.</p>
14				<p>4.2.2.9 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Desktop studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section should be updated to reflect the wording identified as appropriate in comment #9. Air quality desktop and field studies should be subject to consultation with Indigenous nations, specifically the Métis Nation of Ontario, Regions 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Hydro One will further discuss with the MNO any potential effects related to air quality once additional project information is available. The suggested wording was included. The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2.9</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2.9 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases) revised to indicate:</p> <p>Desktop and field studies will be subject to consultation with Indigenous communities for their input and the studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities.</p> <p>The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
15				4.2.2.10 Acoustic Environment; Page 38 Draft ToR Details "The Study Area includes several communities, recreational areas and other potentially sensitive receptors."	Section 4.2.2.10 to be revised to include Indigenous harvesters as potentially sensitive receptors.	Section 4.2.2.10	processes. Section 4.2.2.10 (Acoustic Environment) revised to include Indigenous harvesters.
16				MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section should explicitly identify Métis harvesters as types of potentially sensitive receptors which will be assessed in the EA. 4.2.2.10 Acoustic Environment; Page 38 and 39 Draft ToR Details "however, specific acoustic/noise studies are not anticipated to be required as potential effects are likely to be confined primarily to the construction period (e.g., vibration) and to be temporary and transitory in nature. If long-term noise effects are identified from the addition of station equipment, noise emission levels will be determined through modelling and evaluated against regulatory guidelines." MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Acoustic/noise studies must be required as the potential noise of construction from the operation of machinery could result in the displacement of Métis harvesters due to disruption of sense-of-place or through increased negative perceptions. Further, it is unclear from the dTOR whether implosive sleeves will be used during conductor stringing; or whether general line hum during operation or corona discharges will be assessed in the EA. Noise can also be a deterrent to Métis harvesters during maintenance activities and can also result in the displacement of wildlife during ongoing maintenance activities (e.g., helicopter overflights or mechanical vegetation management). The EA must consider noise effects based on the above noted potential effects.	The EA will consider an assessment of all applicable noise effects during both the construction and operations periods. Section 4.2.2.10 wording to be revised to reflect the comments, including the identification of Métis harvesters as potential receptors. Hydro One will further discuss with the MNO any potential effects related to the acoustic environment, and potential mitigation, during the EA once additional information is available. It is unknown at this time whether implosive sleeves will be used during conductor stringing. This will be reviewed during the EA.	Section 4.2.2.10	Section 4.2.2.10 (Acoustic Environment) revised to include Indigenous harvesters.
17				4.2.2.10 Acoustic Environment; Page 39 Draft ToR Details "Desktop studies will be supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities." MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section should be updated to reflect the wording identified as appropriate in comment #9. Acoustic Environment desktop and field studies (should they be assessed) should be subject to consultation with Indigenous nations, specifically the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2.	A noise work plan for the EA will be developed in consultation with Indigenous communities, government officials and agencies, and interested persons and organizations, to describe the approach for the acoustic assessment and supplemented by information from stakeholders and IK gathered through engagement with Indigenous communities.	Section 4.2.2.10	Section 4.2.2.10 wording revised to include commitment to develop a noise work plan in consultation with Indigenous communities and other stakeholders.
18				4.2.3.1 Provincial and Municipal Policy; Page 40 Draft ToR Details "CLUPA will be used to understand the applicable land use designations for the portions of the alternative routes that are located on Crown land. Additional consideration of activities on Crown land will include forest management plans and other Crown land users, such as mining claim holders, trapline holders and other tenure holders." MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Crown land is high priority to Métis harvesters as it is land available for the Métis to exercise their rights and interests. The project footprint will include various approvals which convey priority rights to Hydro One. Therefore, considerations of activities on Crown land must include use by Métis harvesters.	Section 4.2.3.1 to be revised to include reference to Métis harvesters on Crown land.	Section 4.2.3.1	The following update made to Section 4.2.3.1 (Provincial and Municipal Policy) (italics): CLUPA will be used to understand the applicable land use designations for the portions of the alternative routes that are located on Crown land. Additional consideration of activities on Crown



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
							land will include forest management plans and other Crown land users, such as mining claim holders, trapline holders, <i>Indigenous harvesters</i> and other tenure holders.”
19				<p>4.2.3.2 Community Wellbeing; Page 41</p> <p>Draft ToR Details “This assessment will include a characterization of existing municipalities and communities in the area using primary and secondary sources, including Statistics Canada census data, government publications and reports, and input received from stakeholder consultation.”</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This assessment should include the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 as specific sources for community wellbeing as the indicators described in general within this section are not reflective of Métis-specific wellbeing such as Métis-owned business investment, Métis employment, youth engagement, trust, community programming, perception of the environment, stewardship and environmental enhancement. In order to identify Métis specific indicators and Métis specific data sources, input should be gathered from the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2.</p>	Data sources for community well-being will include MNO Regions 1 and 2. Hydro One will work with MNO during the EA to better understand which specific indicators and data sources are recommended to be considered in the EA.	Section 4.2.3.2	The following has been added to Section 4.2.3.2 (Community Wellbeing): Data sources for community well-being will include Indigenous communities. Hydro One will work with Indigenous communities during the EA to better understand which specific indicators and data sources are recommended to be considered in the EA.
20				<p>4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 46</p> <p>Draft ToR Details “Aboriginal and treaty rights are recognized under Section 35 of Canada’s Constitution Act, 1982 (also referred to as Section 35 rights), which includes recognition of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights to hunt, trap, fish, gather and manage the lands for all First Nation, Inuit and Métis people of Canada. As part of these rights, the Government of Canada has the Duty to Consult Indigenous communities for this Project. Hydro One is currently engaging with Indigenous communities to better understand the communities’ interests and to begin to identify potential Project effects.”</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section is specifically titled “Indigenous Community Use of Lands and Resources for Traditional Purposes” but includes reference to Section 35 rights. The section then narrows the consideration of rights to the exercise of harvesting rights including hunting, trapping, fishing and gathering. In order to better clarify this section, it is recommended that the title be amended to: “Indigenous nation Section 35 rights” and that Hydro One continue to engage with the MNO Regions 1 and 2 to fully understand Métis rights and interests. Some additionally asserted rights of the Métis Nation of Ontario include the right to continue to exist as a distinct Métis community within their traditional territories; the right to the protection of Métis culture, language, traditions and way of life within their territories; the right to continue to rely on the sustenance, cultural, social and economic resources within their traditional territories; and the right to share in the benefits flowing from the development and use of Métis traditional territories.</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of the project’s potential impacts on MNO’s Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>Hydro One intends to work with MNO to better understand MNO’s concerns regarding how the Project might impact Métis rights and interests. Hydro One intends to reflect those concerns regarding impacts to rights and values within the EA.</p> <p>Hydro One notes that the section referenced specifically refers to use of land and resources for traditional purposes. Other rights-based concerns will be recorded and potentially responded to through the Record of Consultation.</p>	N/A	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria.</p> <p>Indigenous Knowledge (IK) received from Indigenous communities will be incorporated into aspects of the EA, including information on Section 35 (Constitution Act, 1982) rights and interests, in consultation with Indigenous communities.</p>
21				<p>4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 46</p> <p>Draft ToR Details “Potentially affected First Nation communities include Couchiching First Nation, Eagle Lake First Nation, Fort William First Nation, Mitaanjigamiing First Nation, Nigigoonsiminikaaning First Nation, Ojibway Nation of Saugeen, Lac des Mille Lacs First</p>	The terms “potentially affected” and “may be potentially affected” were not intended to represent a tiering of consultation as noted in the comment. There is no intention to limit the scope of involvement of any of the identified Indigenous communities that may have an interest in the project. The ToR wording will be revised to address this concern.	Section 4.2.3.6	Section 4.2.3.6 revised to update references to MNO per comment.



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
22				<p>Nation, Lac La Croix First Nation, Lac Seul First Nation, Seine River First Nation, and, Wabigoon Lake Ojibway Nation (Figure 4-1)."</p> <p>"Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) communities that may be potentially affected by the Project include Atikokan and Area Métis Council, MNO Northwest Métis Council, and MNO Thunder Bay Métis Council. Four additional MNO communities have expressed an interest in this Project – MNO Kenora Métis Council, MNO Sunset Country Métis Council, MNO Superior North Shore Métis Council and MNO Greenstone Métis Council."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The tiering of consultation by designating 'potentially affected' and 'may be potentially affected' is an outdated mode of narrowing the scope of consultation by limiting involvement of groups deemed lesser affected. This was largely done based on proximity or by type of Nation. The Métis Nation of Ontario holds constitutionally protected rights within the Project area and is owed the same duty as the above listed First Nations.</p> <p>4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 46</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) communities that may be potentially affected by the Project include Atikokan and Area Métis Council, MNO Northwest Métis Council, and MNO Thunder Bay Métis Council."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The characterization of the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 does not include sufficient detail. The Métis people of Ontario joined together to form the MNO, a representative body promoting a common cultural, social, political and economic well-being. The Métis Nation of Ontario, as the representative government of the Métis people and rights-bearing Métis communities in Ontario, negotiate and enter into Community Charter Agreements with Community Councils to represent MNO citizens.</p> <p>As part of these Community Charter Agreements, the MNO asserts that the Crown's constitutional duties are owed to the entire regional rights-bearing Métis community, which is not defined, limited or constrained by the geographic areas identified within MNO Community Council Charter Agreements or by the MNO Regions.</p> <p>Therefore, while the geographic location of the identified Councils may be in proximity to the Project, the Lakehead/Nipigon/Michipicoten traditional territory (Region 2) and Treaty #3, Lake of the Woods/Lac Seul and Rainy Lake/Rainy River (Region 1) traditional territories have the potential to be affected by the Project. This is why the Métis Nation of Ontario is engaged through the Regional Consultation Committees, so that the entire territory is represented and the RCC can work to ensure that all potentially affected MNO citizens are engaged and communicated with in a fair, transparent and open manner.</p> <p>Please update the description to be more reflective of the operations of the Métis Nation of Ontario as per above and within consultation protocols available on the Métis Nation of Ontario website. We recommend using the following text:</p> <p>"Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) communities that may be potentially affected by the Project include the Northwestern Métis Community (also referred to as MNO Region 1) and the Métis community in MNO Region 2. These Regional communities are made up of local community councils. In the Northwestern Métis Community, this includes the Northwest Métis Council, Atikokan Métis Council, Kenora Métis Council and Sunset Country Métis Council. In MNO Region 2, it includes the Thunder Bay Métis Council, Superior North Shore Métis Council, and Greenstone Métis Council."</p>	Section 4.2.3.6 to be revised to include the change in wording provided.	Section 4.2.3.6	Wording revised to update references to MNO per comment.
23				4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page	It is intended that Hydro One will work closely with MNO to identify IK information that	N/A	Comment noted; no

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>47</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "IK will be used, as applicable and available, to identify cultural or heritage uses and will assist in determining health, abundance and distribution of species and their habitats, including seasonal variations and historical fluctuation"</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Please identify how Hydro One will identify what IK is 'applicable' for use in the assessment.</p>	<p>already exists. Together, MNO and Hydro One will then determine areas where the Project alternatives (and later, the preferred route) could have potential impacts on MNO Section 35 treaty rights and interests and traditional land uses. It is expected that MNO and its representatives, with capacity funding provided by Hydro One, will then fill any "gaps" that are identified. This exercise will help both parties understand the best way to ensure the IK information is complete, and that all relevant IK information is properly incorporated into the assessment of potential impacts.</p>		<p>change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
24				<p>4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 47</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "IK will be used, as applicable and available, to identify cultural or heritage uses and will assist in determining health, abundance and distribution of species and their habitats, including seasonal variations and historical fluctuation"</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment IK availability is often directly proportional to the availability of capacity funding for nations to gather and disseminate that information to Hydro One. The Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 will require sufficient capacity to gather and provide IK to Hydro One, if the MNO Regions 1 and 2 determines it is comfortable providing this information.</p>	<p>Hydro One will continue to work with the MNO on the provision of capacity funding to support involvement in the EA, including the collection of additional IK information, as identified.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required.</p>
25				<p>4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 47</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "IK will also help to establish the current use of land and resources for traditional purposes by Indigenous communities. IK will be particularly valuable as it will help to supplement and inform the data gathered through Western scientific means."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment See Comment #6</p> <p>While Indigenous Knowledge is valuable, there must also be assessment of potential project impacts on Section 35 rights and interests to provide adequate information to the Crown for consideration in the duty to consult.</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of the Project's potential impacts on MNO's Section 35 rights and interests.</p>	Section 4.2.3.6	<p>Section 4.2.3.6 revised as follows:</p> <p>IK information will help to establish the historic and current use of land and resources for traditional purposes by Indigenous communities. The IK information will be particularly valuable as it will help to supplement and inform the data gathered through Western scientific means. With accurate and comprehensive IK available, Hydro One will seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests related to use of the lands.</p>
26				<p>4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 47</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Hydro One will continue to engage Indigenous communities to determine their interest in participating in the IK Program. Project timelines will proactively be communicated with Indigenous communities so that IK information can be received in a timely manner for</p>	<p>The noted ToR reference also applies to the MNO Regions 1 and 2. Hydro One will further engage MNO Regions 1 and 2 during the EA to determine interest in providing specific information about their Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>Revisions to Section 4.2.3.6 to be made to reflect this.</p>	Section 4.2.3.6	<p>Section 4.2.3.6 (Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes) (italics) revised as follows:</p>





ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>proper consideration in the EA.”</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment A similar engagement must be undertaken to determine the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2’s interest in providing specific information about their Section 35 rights and interests. Project timelines must be proactively communicated so that information on rights can be received in a timely manner for fulsome integration into the EA.</p>			<p>Hydro One will continue to engage Indigenous communities to determine their interest in participating in the IK program and to receive IK information. Project timelines will proactively be communicated with Indigenous communities so that this information can be received in a timely manner for proper consideration in the EA.</p> <p>The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.</p>
27				<p>4.2.3.6 Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 47 and 48</p> <p>Draft ToR Details “The EA will document identified features and traditional land use activities in proximity to the alternatives routes, to the extent possible. This will include a consideration of traditional use, current uses and other relevant socio-economic aspects of the community. Hydro One supports each interested Indigenous community conducting their own IK Study or utilizing Project consultants to assist them in this undertaking.”</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section highlights the concerns raised in Comment #6 as it uses IK and traditional land use interchangeably. IK and traditional land use are not representative proxies for an assessment of effects to Section 35 rights and interests. Both concepts are important, yet distinct, and should be included within an EA.</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of the Project’s potential impacts on MNO’s Section 35 rights and interests.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
28				<p>Table 4-4: Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment; Page 55</p> <p>Draft ToR Details All</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The bullets related to IK gathered through Indigenous engagement should be updated to reflect the appropriate language in Comment #9 integrated with the information related to Indigenous Knowledge. All instances of ‘if warranted’ should be removed.</p>	<p>Table 4-4 to be revised to indicate that surveys and data collection activity programs are subject to consultation with Indigenous communities for their input.”</p>	Section 4.2.4	<p>Wording revised in Table 4-4 under Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes.</p> <p>The following was also included at the beginning of this section:</p> <p>Hydro One has committed to</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
29				<p>Table 4-4: Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Indigenous Community use of Land and resources for Traditional Purposes; Page 58</p> <p>Draft ToR Details</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Document based on additional desktop study through traditional land and resource use studies by or with Indigenous communities. • Secondary sources may be used to supplement these studies, particularly concerning socio-economic aspects of these communities." <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment</p> <p>This section title should be updated, and a bullet added to reference an assessment of Section 35 rights and interests.</p>	<p>Hydro One intends to work with MNO to better understand MNO's concerns regarding how the Project might impact Métis rights and interests.</p> <p>Hydro One is not in a position to assess Métis rights, but will ensure MNO concerns, including concerns regarding impacts to rights and interests, are reflected and available for the Crown decision-maker's assessment.</p>	Section 4.2.4	<p>consultation with Indigenous communities and applicable government agencies regarding the planned studies to be completed in the EA.</p> <p>Section 4.2.4 (Summary of Study to be Completed during the Environmental Assessment) Table 4-4 revised as follows:</p> <p>Title changed to "Indigenous Community Rights/Interests and Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes"</p> <p>Bullet added: The EA will also seek to understand Indigenous community concerns regarding how the Project may impact their rights and interests and reflect those concerns within the appropriate documentation and processes.</p>
30				<p>4.3.1 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Natural Environment; Page 59</p> <p>Draft ToR Details</p> <p>"Project activities throughout the lifecycle of the Project (e.g., construction, operation and maintenance, and retirement) have the potential to affect the natural environment. Potential effects to the natural environment features described in Section 4.2.2 (e.g., soils, surface and groundwater, wetlands, terrestrial wildlife and wildlife habitat, fish and fish habitat, SAR, etc.) resulting from Project activities will be identified and evaluated in the EA. Potential effects to the natural environment may be positive, negative, neutral, short-term, long-term, and/or cumulative. The EA will propose mitigation measures to address potential effects to the natural environment, as applicable."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment</p> <p>The description of the preliminary potential effects to the natural environment and the potential effects listed in table 4-5 do not include specific detail on effects to Métis rights which integrate with the natural environment, and do not reference the provided Metis-specific Criteria (2019).</p>	<p>Section 4.3.1 is an outline of potential effects to the natural environment, it is not intended to be a description of how effects to the natural environment could impact Indigenous communities which Hydro One understands is a concern. Section 4.3.2 Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment describes the potential for effects to Section 35 rights and interests of Indigenous communities and community use of land and resources. We note that in this section, there is a recognition that impacts to the natural environment could impact Indigenous people through the following statement:</p> <p>"The Project has the potential to result in effects to the natural environment, including wildlife, vegetation and water resources. Potential effects to the natural environment may affect the Aboriginal and treaty rights of communities."</p> <p>The provided Metis-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators that are to be appended to the ToR.</p>	Appendices	<p>The provided MNO-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators that are appended to the ToR.</p>
31				<p>4.3.2 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment; Page 61</p> <p>Draft ToR Details</p> <p>"The Project has the potential to result in socio-economic benefits and negative effects to the communities and land users in the area."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment</p>	<p>This section of the ToR will be revised to identify the potential for both positive and negative socio-economic impacts to Indigenous communities.</p>	Section 4.3.2	<p>Section 4.3.2 was updated to reflect the comment.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
32				<p>The Project has the potential to result in socio-economic effects to Indigenous nations in the area, including the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2. This section should be updated to specifically reference this context.</p> <p>4.3.2 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment</p> <p>Preliminary Potential Effects to Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes</p> <p>Page 62</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The Project has the potential to result in effects to the natural environment, including wildlife, vegetation and water resources. Potential effects to the natural environment may affect the Aboriginal and treaty rights of communities."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This section indicates an understanding that the project could impact Section 35 rights and interests; although still with a misinterpretation of biophysical or natural environment components as proxies for the rights themselves. Natural environment components must not be used as a proxy and the assessment of effects to Section 35 must be explicit. This can be completed through consideration of the Métis-specific Criteria provided to Hydro One which represent a sample of Métis rights which could be impacted by this Project.</p>	<p>Section 4.3.2 includes the following statement:</p> <p><i>The assessment will also consider changes to environmental factors, such as potential effects to wildlife populations, where relevant.</i></p> <p>This statement does not suggest that changes to environmental conditions are to be used as a proxy for impacts to Indigenous rights. It is information that would be considered in the assessment of effects of the Project on the Section 35 rights and interests of Indigenous communities and harvesters, and their use of the land. This information will be provided to Indigenous communities for their consideration during the EA process.</p> <p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of MNO's Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>Section 4.3.2 will be revised to make reference to the potential for impacts to Section 35 treaty rights and interests and the use of land by Indigenous communities and harvesters.</p>	Section 4.3.2	<p>Section 4.3.2 revised to include additional text (in italics):</p> <p>The assessment will also consider changes to environmental factors, such as potential effects to wildlife populations, where relevant. <i>It is recognized that potential effects to the natural environment may impact the Section 35 rights and interests, and the use of land by Indigenous communities and harvesters.</i></p>
33				<p>4.3.2 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment</p> <p>Preliminary Potential Effects to Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes</p> <p>Page 62 and 63</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The potential effects to Aboriginal and treaty rights include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to access to resource harvesting and cultural sites within and beyond the area of the Project from effects on features, such as trails and waterways and camps/cabins; • Changes to subsistence hunting, trapping, fishing and gathering as protected under Aboriginal and treaty rights; • Changes to Indigenous landscape features, such as Place Names, Boundary Markers and Orientation Points, through disturbances to the land within the area of the Project; • Changes to the environmental conditions, such as vegetation, wildlife, fish and water resources, that may influence traditional activities within the area of the Project; and • Change to spiritual and cultural sites, such as ceremonial, grave, sacred, gathering and worship areas, that may occur in the area of the Project." <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The potential effects listed do not account for or represent the Métis-specific Criteria which had identified effects including: loss of land and/or a change in priority rights, change in physical attributes, changes to harvesting of culturally critical species, changes to harvesting practices, changes in teaching/transmittal, changes in perception, disruption of sense of place, reduction in cultural practices and changes in teaching/transmittal to the next generation.</p> 	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of MNO's Section 35 rights and interests.</p>	Appendices	<p>The provided MNO-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators that are appended to the ToR.</p>
34				<p>4.3.2 Preliminary Potential Effects to the Socio-Economic Environment</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of MNO's Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>The provided Metis-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria</p>	Appendices	<p>The provided MNO-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects</p>



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Preliminary Potential Effects to Indigenous Community Use of Land and Resources for Traditional Purposes</p> <p>Page 63</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Indigenous communities will be encouraged to share IK on key topics, issues and concerns to further "identify, inform, and refine the criteria and indicators."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Please update the dTOR to include the Métis-specific Criteria and Indicators provided to Hydro One to ensure their consideration in the Environmental Assessment.</p>	and indicators that are to be appended to the ToR.		assessment criteria and indicators that are appended to the ToR.
35				<p>5.1.1.1 Transmission Line; Page 64</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The ROW width will be confirmed based on the final route, design of the structures, the sag and span between structures, and location of the ROW (e.g., greenfield route or adjacent to an existing, previously disturbed ROW)."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The ROW width must also consider the potential effect of loss of land and/or change in priority rights for the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 as a change in the legal designation of land can impair the exercise of Métis rights in the vicinity. This should be reflected in the dTOR.</p>	<p>Section 5.1.1.1 provides a description of the planned transmission line as a project component. This section does not describe potential effects of the line as this is covered in the previous Section 4.3.</p> <p>The transmission line is part of the Project Footprint which would be considered in the assessment of the Project's potential effects.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
36				<p>5.1.1.5 Temporary Land Rights; Page 67</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Temporary land rights may be required at some locations along the ROW to accommodate construction activities, such as providing additional working space, stockpiling, and equipment/material laydown or to facilitate conductor pulling/tensioning. These sites, if required, are anticipated to be decommissioned and restored following construction."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Should temporary land rights be required, they must be assessed in term of the potential loss of land and/or change in priority rights for the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 as the change in legal designation of land can impair or displace the exercise of Métis rights in the vicinity. This required assessment should be reflected in the dTOR.</p>	Yes the EA will assess impacts to both temporary and permanent project components	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
37				<p>5.2.1 Construction; Page 69</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The Project is expected to generate both local and regional employment and procurement opportunities, as well as economic spinoffs during the construction period, including, but not limited to, the following:</p> <p>Equipment and Related Rentals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truck and car rentals; • All-terrain vehicle rental (e.g., Argos, side-by-sides, quads/4-wheelers, snowmobiles, boats, etc.); • Construction equipment and supplies (e.g., helicopters, aggregates, etc.);" <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment It should be noted that there are local Métis contractors who can supply local aggregate to the project during construction and where required.</p> 	Hydro One understands the importance of involving Indigenous community members and businesses in the economic aspects of the Project. This will be discussed at some length with the MNO during the EA process and beyond.	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
38				<p>5.2.2 Operation and Maintenance; Page 70</p>	Procedures to be followed and methods to be adopted during the operations and maintenance phase of the Project will be examined and assessed during the EA and design	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
				<p>Draft ToR Details The operation and maintenance phase would include transmission line condition assessments and vegetation maintenance, which would be completed on a regular basis. Ongoing vegetation management activities are required to manage and mitigate safety and reliability risks by maintaining clearances between transmission lines and vegetation on, and along, the ROW.</p> <p>The anticipated operating services include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure climbing and helicopter inspections; • Line hardware and insulator thermography; • ROW inspections; • Visual ground patrol; • Vegetation management; and, • Ongoing repairs and maintenance activities. <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The listed helicopter inspections were not referenced in the assessment of the acoustic environment. Helicopter traffic can be disruptive and unpredictable and can change the physical attributes of harvesting or sites for the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2.</p> <p>Further, the method and frequency of vegetation management should also be described and assessed as various types of vegetation management methods could result in increased avoidance behaviors by Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 harvesters.</p>	process and will be discussed with the MNO.		required. Will be considered in the EA.
39				<p>6.2 Alternative Methods Identification; Page 73</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "It is anticipated that the identified alternative routes will be further refined as part of draft ToR review along with input on the criteria and indicators to be used to evaluate the alternative routes to select the preferred route in the EA. Section 10.0 of this draft ToR describes the planned consultation and engagement activities to be undertaken during the EA that will inform the alternative route valuation and preferred route effects assessment."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment In a meeting held on July 22, 2020, it was noted by the R2CC and R1CC representatives that there is a critical area of Métis use in the vicinity of an identified alternative route. On the east side of highway 622, near the TransCanada canoe route, there is sacred land for the Métis people who use this area in the exercise of their rights. This requires flagging for additional follow-up and will be documented as part of the Project specific TKLUS the Region 1 and Region 2 hope to complete.</p>	<p>The interest and concerns regarding the area east of Highway 622 is noted in the Section 9 that summarizes comments expressed during ToR preparation.</p> <p>Hydro One will discuss this concern further with the MNO during the EA as part of route evaluation and effects assessment work.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
40				<p>Table 6-4: General Routing Selection Considerations; Page 87</p> <p>Draft ToR Details Socio-Economic >> "Minimize the use of private properties (e.g., use of existing ROW is favoured to minimize disruption to property owners, primarily dwellings)."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment This is in direct contradiction to the direction provided by the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 which directed minimization of use of Crown land to minimize disruption to Métis harvesters.</p> <p>Further, within the Indigenous Factor there is no mention of this or other routing considerations to be taken into account.</p>	<p>The following of existing corridors will result in impacts to both private and Crown land. The siting process attempted to minimize overall effects including to dwellings such as residences which are located on private land. The siting process also identified as a general siting criterion: "Minimize effects to traditional use of land and resources". How the use of Crown land affects Métis uses of Crown land will be assessed in the EA.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.
41				<p>6.4 Refinement of the Preferred Route; Page 104</p>	<p>Comment noted. Hydro One will work with the MNO to identify different ways for their representatives to provide meaningful input into the EA process. The opportunity for a fly-over will be discussed in the context of COVID-19 restrictions.</p>	N/A	Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be



ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
42				<p>Draft ToR Details "Refinement of the preferred route may be made on the basis of any field data that may be collected to support the alternative route evaluation and effects assessment. Section 4.2 provides a commitment to prepare a field work plan with agency and Indigenous community input."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2 require a helicopter flyover of the preferred route, once selected.</p> <p>Table 7-1: List of Key Natural and Socio-Economic Environment Considerations; Page 106</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Table 7-1 presents a preliminary list of the natural and socio-economic features that will be considered in the EA and that will be used to develop the criteria and indicators used in the net effects assessment."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The preliminary list of natural and socio-economic features to be considered in the EA do not include Section 35 rights and interests. As previously noted, use of land and resources for traditional purposes is a component of the exercise of Indigenous rights and not a holistic or comprehensive measure by which to assess potential effects to Métis rights and interests.</p>	<p>Table 7.1 is a high level preliminary listing of preliminary issues to be examined in the EA. As previously noted the ToR is to include a draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators.</p> <p>Wording to be revised in Table 7-1 to reflect Indigenous community rights and interests as well as the use of land and resources for traditional purposes.</p> <p>Also please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of MNO's Section 35 rights and interests.</p>	Table 7.1	<p>considered in the EA.</p> <p>Table 7.1 revised to: Indigenous community rights and interests and use of land and resources for traditional purposes</p>
43				<p>10.5 Indigenous Engagement Plan; Page 124</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "The term "engagement" is used in this plan to represent activities that Hydro One will undertake to inform and receive input from Indigenous communities. These activities may contribute to the consultation activities that the Crown may undertake to fulfill its "Duty to Consult" obligations."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment Engagement activities alone, will not assess potential project impacts on Indigenous rights and interests. The EA should include assessment of potential positive and negative effects on the Métis Nation of Ontario Regions 1 and 2's constitutionally protected section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>The requirement for this information is on the 'Preparing environmental assessments' website for the government of Ontario which indicates the Crown may delegate certain aspects of consultation such as gathering information about the impact of a proposed project on the potential or established Aboriginal or treaty rights. This means that Hydro One must complete the delegated procedural aspects of consultation and fulfill those delegated aspects of the Duty to Consult.</p>	<p>Please see previous responses related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of the projects potential effects on MNO's Section 35 rights and interests and the use of land and resources.</p> <p>Hydro One intends to work with MNO to better understand MNO's concerns regarding how the Project might impact Métis rights and interests.</p> <p>This input and feedback will be reflected in the Record of Consultation.</p> <p>Hydro One is not in a position to assess Métis rights, but will ensure MNO concerns, including concerns regarding impacts to rights and interests, are reflected and available for the Crown decision-maker's assessment.</p> <p>Hydro One acknowledges that it is seeking to gather information from MNO about the potential impact of the Project on Métis rights, in accordance with the delegation obligations.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>
44				<p>10.5.1 Indigenous Communities to be Engaged; Page 128</p> <p>Draft ToR Details "Communities will be provided with information, and will be engaged in a direct dialogue, in order to allow both Hydro One and each Indigenous community to understand the potential effects (if any) of the Project on any Aboriginal and treaty rights or interests."</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment While it is encouraging that the dTOR acknowledges an understanding that potential effects of the Project on any Aboriginal and treaty rights or interests is required, there is little information on how this will be assessed. Specific details of how this project may affect Aboriginal and treaty rights must be assessed. Specific guidance on how this will be undertaken (similar to other Criteria) should be set out in the dTOR to ensure a complete assessment is undertaken.</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of MNO's Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>The provided Metis-specific criteria are reflected in the list of draft criteria and indicators that are to be appended to the ToR.</p> <p>Hydro One is not in a position to assess Métis rights, but will ensure MNO concerns, including concerns regarding impacts to rights and interests, are reflected and available for the Crown decision-maker's assessment.</p> <p>To this end, Hydro One intends to work with MNO to better understand MNO's concerns regarding how the Project might impact Métis rights and interests.</p> <p>This input and feedback will be reflected in the Record of Consultation.</p>	Appendices	<p>The provided MNO-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators that are appended to the ToR.</p>

ID #	Comment Received - Date	Event Type	Name of Commenter & Contact Information	Comment Description	Proposed Response	Applicable Terms of Reference Section	Proposed Revision to Terms of Reference
45				<p>Appendix B List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators</p> <p>Draft ToR Details Various</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment There are instances of Criteria where the Métis-specific Criteria could have been incorporated, including:</p> <p>Socio-Economic Environment >> Land Use >> Indicator >> Conversion of Unoccupied Crown Land to Occupied Crown land</p> <p>Socio-Economic Environment >> Visual Landscape (Aesthetics) >> Removal of required conditions for territorial connection for the Métis</p> <p>In addition to these instances, the ‘other applicable criteria and indicators identified by communities’ should include the additional effects and measures outlined in the MNO Regions 1 and 2 Preliminary Criteria document.</p>	<p>Please see previous response related to the inclusion of MNO-specific criteria, as well as information related to an assessment of MNO’s Section 35 rights and interests.</p> <p>The provided Metis-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators that are to be appended to the ToR.</p>	Appendices	The provided MNO-specific criteria are reflected in the draft list of effects assessment criteria and indicators that are appended to the ToR.
46				<p>Appendix B List of Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Indicators; Page B-13</p> <p>Draft ToR Details “Safety and Compatibility with Electricity Grid”</p> <p>MNO Region 1 and 2 Comment The Métis Nation of Ontario Region 1 and 2 requires consideration of siting and reliability in case of an accident or malfunction with a route that may parallel existing infrastructure; as well as consideration of response constraints which may occur.</p>	<p>Technical considerations, such as design requirements to ensure system reliability, will be considered in the EA.</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted; no change to ToR required. Will be considered in the EA.</p>