

APPENDIX

B-8 *SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED*



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
TELEPHONE INQUIRIES						
T1	01-Apr-22	Jerry Lannigan	General Public	Owns property near the PUC ROW - the rear portion of his land crosses the PUC easement. He wanted to know if the powerline would prevent him from building a road across the easement to develop a subdivision either side of the powerline. Also asked if the lines make noise.	Yes, he can put a road across the easement but cannot build any permanent structures on the easement. Yes there is a slight buzzing sound but it is very low noise level that is negligible at the edges of the easement.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted, on the call 1-Apr-22
T2	01-Apr-22	Mohamed Ahmed	General Public	Just purchased a house on Letcher St and wanted know if the new arc furnaces would eliminate the pollution coming from the steel plant. He was very happy to hear this would greatly improve air quality.	PUC advised that according to Algoma, the arc furnaces would greatly reduce GHG emissions	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted, on the call 1-Apr-22
T3	01-Apr-22	Pat Steward	General Public	She wants to be added to the mailing list. She has a book from the days when the PUC easement was established on her fathers property. She will bring it to the open house to show us.	She will get notification of the open house in May.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted, on the call 1-Apr-22
T4	04-Apr-22	Jay Ferguson	General Public	Owns 28 acres between him and his neighbour (Taylors at 506 Third Line) between Moss Rd and Goulais Ave running from Third Line and 2000 feet back. Wanted to know what the poles will look like and how tall. Is there a hum?	I referred him to the EA website to see the picture at bottom of home page and explained the poles would be about 40m tall and about 200m apart. Yes there is a hum or buzz but it is quite faint and will not be noticeable at the edge of the easement limits.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted, on the call 4-Apr-22



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
T5	04-Apr-22	Susan Taylor	General Public	Owns property all the way back to the drainage culvert. Opposed to anything that will devalue her property. Is going to talk to her lawyer to see what she can do about this.	Thanked her for her inquiry and advised her she could submit comments at the first PIC in May and that she would get notice of date and time in the mail.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted, on the call 4-Apr-22



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
T6	05-Apr-22	n/a	General Public	Wanted to know if the line is overhead or underground and how tall the poles will be. She said she will have to sell before it's built because does not want to see the poles towering over the trees.	Explained they would be overhead, approx. 130 feet tall.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted, on the call 5-Apr-22
T7	05-Apr-22	Joseph Cheesman	General Public	Hi, Jeremiah, it's Joe Cheesman calling. I live in Sioux St. Marie at 864 Third Line West and I'm interested in this new PUC transmission 230kV line that's going by my house. I'd like to be involved in whatever is going on. Thank you. And I was kind of wondering about the timeline. When are they doing this or plan to do it?	Jeremiah returned Joe's call on April 14th, 2022 at 9:43AM. Left a voicemail offering to set-up a call to respond to his questions.	WSP received the voicemail on April 5th, 2022.
T8	06-Apr-22	Henry Eshkibok	General Public	why are you running these lines through residential areas. He is opposed to any HV lines through his neighbourhood and wants to be on the record as such. Asked why we don't run the line further west to avoid all residential areas.	I commented to him that we are looking a several route options and that his comments would be taken into consideration in evaluating the different options.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted, on the call 6-Apr-22



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
T9	10-May-22	Jerry Lannigan	General Public	purchased property about 1.5 yrs ago and is now very upset that PUC is now planning to put transmission line along his property. He noted that he bought the property for investment and the powerline will severely reduce the value of his property - wants to know who will compensate him for the loss of value. Just spent \$150K to improve his property. Also bought property behind him. The subdivision (Greenfield Sub) is going towards him. Also asked about health concerns and whether there's noise from the lines.	I pointed out that we are conducting this EA to seek input from property owners and advised him of the first PIC coming May 26th. I explained Health Canada's position on EMF concerns. Also explained the buzz or hum from the lines is minimal and pointed to the existing 230kV lines along Berkshire Sub as an example that he could check out. I told him I would send him the Health Canada pamphlet by email as well as the PIC#1 notice.	PUC received the phone call and provided the verbal response as noted herein on 10-May-22. Also sent an email as noted in the verbal response.
T10	15-May-22	Van Henson	General Public	Asked whether the driveway he built on the easement would conflict with the pole locations.	I advised that WSP is preparing a drawing that would provide this detail and that they would be contacting him soon to discuss this with him. I also mentioned that based on the preliminary drawing that I had, it appeared there would not be any conflict.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted herein on May 16th.
T11	15-Jun-22	Lina Porco	General Public	Lina explained the gas company made a mess of their property last year and they are going to fix it now and was concerned about what PUC was going to do there.	I made an appointment for 2pm the next day to see the property and talk to her and her husband about the plans for this area.	PUC received the phone call and responded noted herein on June 15th.
T12	16-Jun-22	Jerry Lannigan	General Public	Jerry expressed concern with potential for the wires to break and electrocute someone. He indicated "everyone" is really concerned about this and that there will be "a lot of opposition at the next open house". He also expressed concern over confusion about how many wires there are.	I acknowledged his comments and pointed out that the line will be built and maintained to all applicable standards. I also pointed out that his comments would be taken into consideration. I also explained the number of wires that would be on the poles. I also pointed out that he and his neighbours could go to the website and review the maps that show that proposed location of poles relative to their properties. And I confirmed the next PIC will be in August.	PUC received the phone call and provided the response as noted herein on June 16th.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
EMAIL INQUIRIES						
E1	01-Apr-22	Dennis Gagne	General Public	I am looking at the proposed map and it appears that this line would be going through my property and I wanted to know if that is what is being proposed.	Yes, the proposed line would be running down the centre of the PUC easement on your property as indicated by the yellow line in the clip below. The attached letter was mailed out today to all property owners where PUC's easement crosses their property, for information. The letter includes information about the steel poles and also includes a picture of what the poles will look like. We have not yet done the detailed engineering to know exactly where the poles would go but they would be spaced quite far apart, about 200 m. The first public open house will be held some time in May and you will receive notification by mail of the time and location several weeks in advance.	1-Apr-22 - PUC by email
E2	01-Apr-22	Raumo Maenpaa	General Public	We live at 4 Palomino Drive and the side of our property is along Allen's Side Road. Would you please tell me which side of Allen's Side Road (east side or west side) the transmission line is proposed to run along. I look forward to hearing your response to this question.	Thank you for your email and for your interest in PUC's Class Environmental Assessment Study for the 230 kV Transmission Project in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. Please note that in the area you noted, the transmission line is proposed to run down the East side of Allen's Side Road. This is proposed as there is a major distribution line on the West side that prevents us from situating the transmission line there. Please let me know if you have any additional questions, and feel free to visit the project website for project information and updates.	April 18th, 2022 - WSP
E3	01-Apr-22	Brian Jennings	General Public	I had received a letter as per the subject above. I am 161 Old Goulais Bay Rd in Sault Ste. Marie Are there any enlarged details or plan drawings available showing property line offsets and pole placement in the area of our house?	N/A	No response necessary - PUC provided a response for the same inquiry on April 7th (Comment ID #E7)



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
E4	02-Apr-22	Marcy King	General Public	As property owners/joint owners of over 100 acres between Allen's Side Road and Chippewa Street, the proposal concerns both our west and east boundaries. We have 1465.35 foot frontage on Allen's Side Road which would affect future property values/development whether it be an under/above ground installation. That would be Route 1-2. Option 3-4 running along our easterly undeveloped corridor would be preferable.	Thank you for the information and your comments. We will definitely take them into consideration in assessing the various route options to determine a final preferred route. The first public information centre will be held in May and will be held both in-person and virtual. You will receive notice well in advance.	2-Apr-22 - PUC by email as noted.
E5	06-Apr-22	Maggie McAuley, Community Services Department, City of Sault Ste. Marie	Municipal	CSD staff have identified parks within the vicinity noted below. Please have the PUC confirm that there are not any plans for infrastructure to be placed within any of the parks identified. If there is please ask them to provide details whether it be poles and or lines crossing and the location within each park applicable. Green Field Park – 24 Beaumont, 150/154 Greenfield Brookfield Park – 15/23 Eden Sq Mike Zuke Park – 216/237 Spadina Ave, 211/215 Pittsburgh Ave Rosita Park – 32 Rosita St Green Acres – 32 Ea Perth Bay Arden Park – 60 Arden St Glasgow Park – 89 Glasgow Ave	We will follow up on Brent's comments and advise if there are any potential impacts to these parks.	6-Apr-22 - PUC by email as noted.
E6	06-Apr-22	Allen Woolsey	General Public	I am writing to ask you to keep us up to date via email on the expansion of lines to Algoma Steel. We live quite near the route at 696 Third Line West. I did try to utilize the email service from the website (WWW.PUCTransmissionLP.com) but it would not confirm my application so I have no idea if it worked or	Thank you for pointing this out. I will ensure you are on the mailing list.	6-Apr-22 - PUC by email



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				not. I did leave a message to that affect but have had no reply as of this date.		
E7	06-Apr-22	Susan Lindstedt	General Public	I just received the letter and YES I would like to be kept in the loop during this project. Firstly what does this mean to myself; such as power interruptions?	Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie. This is to confirm receipt of your message. We will add you to our mailing list. In response to your question, we can advise this project will not affect reliability of electrical service to residential customers in Sault Ste. Marie.	19-Apr-22 - PUC by email
E8	06-Apr-02	John Halucha	General Public	I am curious why PUC Transmission LP has chosen a route that veers north rather than taking a more direct course to Algoma Steel: from the Third Line Hydro Station south across Third Line for perhaps 50 to 200 metres, then directly west to meet up with the published proposed route mid-way between Goulais Avenue and Allens Sideroad. By my rough reckoning, this would save some 1200 metres. Using your information that the proposed route would be approximately 14 km, this more-direct path would be about 12.8 km. Why would PUC want to add almost 10 per cent to the length of the line with commensurate extra initial construction costs, ongoing maintenance costs, and wasteful line losses for as long as these cables carry huge amounts of electricity to Algoma Steel? The longer route is a curious choice, especially for a project whose avowed goal is environmental benefit. In addition, it looks to me as though the more-direct route I described would affect fewer neighbouring residences	Thank you for your comments and interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station. With reference to the attached drawing of the study area, please note the black line shown running west from the Hydro One Third Line Station to the westerly limit, where it turns south and crosses Third Line until it meets the yellow and orange alternatives, is covered by existing PUC easements that have been in place since the early 70's for eventual construction of such a powerline. Therefore, the black line represents the most cost-effective way to reach the west end of the city. In order to reach the Algoma Steel site, south of the existing PUC easements, there are a number of alternative routes being considered, as indicated by the various coloured options on the attached study area map. The purpose of the Class EA process is to provide the public and stakeholders the ability to engage and be consulted as part of the EA process. We value your feedback and input. As such, a Public	24-Apr-22 - PUC by email with 2012 Health Canada Fact Sheet attached



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				largely because it does not go some 1.2 kilometres extra in a roundabout course. I would be grateful if you could explain this to me or suggest whom I could contact for the reasoning that led to an inefficient proposal with extra costs and extra environmental impact.	Information Centre / Open House will be held in person late in May. A virtual information session will also be held the week after the in-person session. More details about the project will be provided at the open houses. There will additionally be a second round of in-person and virtual engagement activities at a later stage in the study. For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com	
E9	07-Apr-22	Brian Jennings	General Public	I had received a letter as per the subject above. Are there any enlarged details or plan drawings available showing property line offsets and pole placement in the area of our house?	No, drawings are not available yet. I will look into this and let you know when you can expect to see something.	7-Apr-22 -PUC by email
E10	08-Apr-22	Nadia Sator	General Public	N Sartor inquired by telephone. She wanted to know where the line was proposed to cross.	As we discussed, PUC holds an easement across your property at 819 Third Line West that was originally acquired in the early 70's. I placed a yellow line on the Google Earth View image below to give you a better indication of the proposed location of the powerline. Also, further below, I have included an image of similar steel poles that are on Second Line in the area of North Street to give you an indication of what the poles will look like. The proposed PUC poles will be similar to that shown in this image below.	8-Apr-22 - PUC by email
E11	08-Apr-22	Harvey Benford	General Public	In regard to the PUC transmission line assembly I guess I have a few questions more than any concern. 1. Is the feed that runs from Third Line to the recently upgraded station at Gate Three not a Hydro One maintained Transmission Line? If so would they not have rights or first dibs on the proposed circuit to Station Options 1&2? 2. Could the Clerque HG be tied into Algoma's state of	In regard to the PUC transmission line assembly I guess I have a few questions more than any concern. 1. Is the feed that runs from Third Line to the recently upgraded station at Gate Three not a Hydro One maintained Transmission Line? If so would they not have rights or first dibs on the proposed circuit to Station Options 1&2? Response: Yes, that line is a Hydro One line; however, it does not	8-Apr-22 - acknowledgement email provided by PUC 24-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>the art Co-Gen then to Sta. Option one or two?</p> <p>3. Has or will PUC ever have considered getting into the Generation Side of small Hydro Generation like single turbine reliable units ie. Sultan, Spanish River and Lake Hope. Create reliable power with small infrastructure investment tied to your owned(PUC) transmission lines.</p> <p>4. The biggest question is why the City and whatever partnership did they could form not chase one of the Liberal cancelled gas plants being built in Mississauga and Oakville.</p> <p>The City and their partners of the day were throwing money into a scheme to burn garbage that of course had to be trucked from the dump before converting it through the heat/steam/turbine process to electricity. Ill fated and bogus leadership from all involved in that venture.</p> <p>Now that Natural Gas is be recognized as being "Green" it would be very appropriate to advocate to all levels of Government for PUC, Corporation of SSM, Endridge (Trans Canada) and whoever else to build a plant similar to the two that ended up in Napanee and Lampton County.</p> <p>All the elements are in place for a short feet to Station one or two and with ample property already designated along Baseline PUC would win by transmission to Third Line and Algoma's Trans West directly to Station Option Two.</p> <p>This may never happen but a spur or future junction point in Baseline and Allen's Sideroad could've considered in this Study.</p>	<p>have the capacity to supply the new additional load of the new electric arc furnaces (EAFs). Also, the line cannot be upgraded while it is in service. A new 230 kV line and station are required, which PUC Transmission is proposing to build.</p> <p>2. Could the Clerque HG be tied into Algoma's state of the art Co-Gen then to Sta. Option one or two?</p> <p>Response: Generation alone cannot address the problem. New transmission lines are required to get existing generation to the new EAFs.</p> <p>3. Has or will PUC ever have considered getting into the Generation Side of small Hydro Generation like single turbine reliable units ie. Sultan, Spanish River and Lake Hope. Create reliable power with small infrastructure investment tied to your owned(PUC) transmission lines.</p> <p>4. The biggest question is why the City and whatever partnership did they could form not chase one of the Liberal cancelled gas plants being built in Mississauga and Oakville.</p> <p>The City and their partners of the day were throwing money into a scheme to burn garbage that of course had to be trucked from the dump before converting it it through the heat/steam/turbine process to electricity. Ill fated and bogus leadership from all involved in that venture.</p> <p>Now that Natural Gas is be recognized as being "Green" it would be very appropriate to advocate to all levels of Government for PUC, Corporation of SSM, Endridge (Trans Canada)and whoever else to build a plant similar to the two that ended up in Napanee and Lampton County.</p> <p>All the elements are in place for a short feet to Station one or two and with ample property already designated along Baseline PUC would win by transmission to Third Line and Algoma's Trans West directly to Station Option Two.</p> <p>This may never happen but a spur or future junction point in</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					Baseline and Allen's Sideroad could've considered in this Study. Response: Please note that PUC Transmission is undertaking this new local transmission infrastructure in order to address the local area transmission system constraints. Information about other PUC undertakings can be found at https://ssmpuc.com/	
E12	11-Apr-22	Kelvin Bordin	General Public	<p>I received the notice regarding the proposed transmission line that's said to be built directly beside my house and neighborhood.</p> <p>Is this project confirmed or is it still to be determined? Neighbors and I are concerned. We are frustrated because there seems to be other options that can be considered, options that won't directly disrupt the community.</p> <p>This Powerline should not be in such close proximity to family dwellings. That is not safe for families and their children. The area is not zoned as such. It's zoned as rural agricultural. Also, to my understanding the entire area that you are intending to build is reserved for conservation.</p> <p>As hard working tax payers of this city it is disheartening that a project like this can be decided without any say from the people who will be directly effected.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and I Hope to discuss this further in order to come to an alternative, less community disruptive option.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>The purpose of the Class EA process is to provide the public and stakeholders the ability to engage and be consulted as part of the EA process. We value your feedback and input. As such, a Public Information Centre / Open House will be held in person late in May. A virtual information session will also be held the week after the in-person session. We will provide you with notification of the date, time, and location well in advance. More details about the project will be provided at the open houses. There will additionally be a second round of in-person and virtual engagement activities at a later stage in the study.</p> <p>The powerline is proposed for construction, starting in mid-2023 and anticipated for completion by end of 2024. The PUC holds easements for a powerline corridor, 125 feet in width, across the northerly area of the city, which is adjacent to your property. The powerline is proposed to be built along the center line of those easements. In regard to zoning, please note that electricity transmission facilities are exempt from zoning restrictions. Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-</p>	<p>12-Apr-22 -PUC by telephone in response to his phone call.</p> <p>25-Apr-22 -PUC responded by email as indicated and included a copy of the 2012 Health Canada EMF Fact Sheet.</p>



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					<p>electrical-appliances.html.</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada that includes the following statement at the center-bottom of page 2: "Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELF's. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors."</p>	
E13	21-Apr-22	Dennis Gagne	General Public	<p>I am writing this email today in regard to the 230kv line that is planned to go through my property at 840 Third Line West in Sault Ste Marie, Ontario. As a Father, Husband, Property owner, and resident I have the following concerns:</p> <p>These are health concerns taken from epidemiological studies done on living near high voltage lines</p> <p>Short Term: Headaches; Fatigue; Anxiety; Insomnia; Prickling/burning skin; Rashes; Muscle pain</p> <p>Long Term: Leukemia; Brain Tumours i.e. Glioblastoma; DNA Damage; Neurodegenerative; Disease i.e. Alzheimer's, Parkinson's; Heart Arrhythmia; Tinnitus.</p> <p>Some other concerns</p> <p>Significantly reduces property value due to fear of negative health effects, unpleasant view of 40m steel post, and constant hum from 230kv line. The property will be rendered useless. I will be paying taxes on nearly 4 acres of land that I can no longer use.</p> <p>I have received permits to develop that part of that land and work was done. Just last year a large section was</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in responding, it is our objective to respond to all inquiries within 10 business days.</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback in relation to the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV transmission line and station.</p> <p>Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada that includes the following statement at the center-bottom of page 2: "Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELF's. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors."</p> <p>Please note, the only restriction related to use of the easement</p>	<p>21-Apr-22 - PUC provided acknowledgement email as noted.</p> <p>4-May-22 - PUC responded by email as noted.</p>

ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>rototilled to enhance the agriculture. My family's quality of life is going to be affected by this These are some of the concerns that I have. Please reply via this email address. If there is anyone else that should be receiving this email please let me know.</p>	<p>lands is that no permanent buildings that are subject to the Ontario Building Code are permitted within the easement boundaries and that access to power poles must not be impeded.</p>	
E14	24-Apr-22	Jack Flint	General Public	<p>May I ask you to answer a couple questions on the new the new 230-kV line that will provide increased power to Algoma Steel for the new electric arc furnaces. Type of pole or tower, number, size and height of wires, etc. that will be used ? Have they looked at running the new line along the rail line right of way ? When does the in-person open house take place ?</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie. The in-person open house will be held May 26th at the West End Community Centre, 556 Goulais Ave, from 4:30 to 7:30 pm. A virtual open house will also be held May 31st from 4:30 to 7:30 pm. The image below, taken from Google StreetView, provides an example of the type of steel monopole that is planned for use on this project. This image is taken on Second Line immediately west of North Street. The steel monopoles planned for this project are in the order of 40 m. tall and will be spaced up to 200 m. apart. They will carry 7 conductors, 3 on each side and 1 at the top of the pole, as in the image below. For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com</p>	24-Apr-22 -PUC by email as noted
E15	25-Apr-22	Jack Flint	General Public	<p>Thank you for the provided information, could you provide me with the specifications on the existing nine wire high voltage line that currently runs on the west side of Allen's Side Road, south of the Second Line ?</p>	<p>With reference to the image below, taken from Google Street View, at the intersection of Allen's Side Rd and Ransome Dr - the poles are 55 foot western red cedar poles (approx. 45 feet above ground to the top of the poles). The top three wires in a triangular configuration are operating at 34.5 kV, while the six wires below that (three on each side of the pole, on standoff insulators) are</p>	25-Apr-22 - PUC by email as noted



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
E16	25-Apr-22	John Halucha	General Public	<p>I am seeking clarification from the PUC Transmission LP Project Team about any Sault Ste Marie Region Conservation Authority input into the proposed 230 kV transmission route, and am also contacting you directly since time is of the essence.</p> <p>The proposed route runs north of the Third Line Hydro Station, then west across Peoples Road, Moss Road and Goulais Avenue, then turns south mid-way between Goulais Avenue and Allens Sideroad before crossing Third Line. I have asked PUC whether it has considered or is considering a more-direct route along Third Line or south of Third Line.</p> <p>I have also asked whether SSMRCA has given input into the EA process, especially regarding the wetlands, stream, beaver pond and beaver dam between Goulais Avenue and Allens Sideroad where the proposed route turns south. Since this area is included in the SSMRCA Administration of Ontario Regulation 176/06 it seems obvious that your input would be integral to the Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>PUC has indicated that this part of the route has been an existing PUC easement since the 1970s, and I have asked for clarification whether that means it is not subject to the current EA. Since time is short before the first Public Information Centre / Open House will be held in person late in May, I am seeking information directly from the SSMRCA on</p> <p>- any input the SSMRCA is making to the current Environmental Assessment, and</p>	<p>operating at 12.47 kV. Let us know if we can be of any further assistance.</p> <p>Further to your inquiry of the Conservation Authority, please find below the comments we received from them in relation to this Study. Also, please note we will be providing responses to the questions you submitted on April 24th within 10 business days of that submission date.</p>	<p>3-May-22 - PUC responded to Mr. Halucha's email to the SSMRCA as noted.</p>



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>- any input the SSMRCA may have made to the PUC about the “existing PUC easements” in the 1970s or since that time until the present.</p> <p>Thank you for your earliest response. I apologize for the hurry, but I just today received a first response from the PUC to inquiries I made April 6 and I need this information so that I can meaningfully engage and be consulted as part of the EA process. Because timing is crucial I am happy to receive any documentation electronically. However, if it is more convenient for you to use the post you may send it to.</p>		
E18	14-Apr-22	Marlene McKinnon (SSMRCA)	Conservation Authority	<p>The setbacks for infrastructure such as high voltage power transmission lines, towers and stations are 15 metres from the regulatory flood line and top of stable slope. To place infrastructure within the 15 metres setbacks or slope area, a geotechnical study will be required. The 15 metres setbacks from the top of stable slope may be reduced based on geotechnical study if the Factor of Safety (FS) is 1.4 -1.5 or greater for the proposed infrastructure. This minimum value of F.S is generally required for developments which are designed close to valley slopes. The study must be prepared by a qualified professional engineer attesting the stability of slopes to support the structure/s. The study should include global slope stability analysis.</p>	No response required.	
E19	26-Apr-22	Jack Flint	General Public	<p>Thank you again for the provided information, if the Route option 2 were to be selected, would the installation of the line be installed on the east or the west side of Allen’s Side Road ?</p>	<p>Route Option 2 would be located on the east side of Allen’s Side Rd. since there is already a significant distribution powerline on the west side of the roadway. The proposed new transmission line would operate at 230 kV.</p> <p>Let us know if we can be of any further assistance.</p>	26-Apr-22 - PUC by email as noted



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				As well, what voltages will each of the seven conductors on the new line be carrying ?		
E20	26-Apr-22	Christopher Witkowski	General Public	<p>I live about 250 meters from the proposed location of the power line. But, Wallace Terrace is not that far south of me and there are houses on the north side of Wallace Terrace. The way it's drawn on the map the power line would run along Wallace Terrace and that seems way too close to the houses. I don't know what Algoma owns just south of Wallace Terrace and, unfortunately, it's not shown on the map. Algoma property should be coloured on the map to better see what suitable options might be. Since this is for Algoma's benefit it seems that the power line should be run as much inside Algoma's property as possible - I would think at least 100 meters south of Wallace Terrace. Some distance is also required in case towers are toppled.</p> <p>If there's no way around running the power line close to houses then there's the question of whether the use of coax has been considered for those sections of the power line.</p> <p>I also have to wonder about the potential for RFI/EMI. How much interference can an arc furnace produce? What measures will be taken to keep it off the power line? I like to listen to AM and shortwave from time to time and I get more interference coming in on the power line than I care for. I've walked around the neighbourhood with a radio, but, haven't determined the source.</p> <p>About all I can be reasonably sure of is that it's being carried on the power lines. I'm probably sufficiently far away from the proposed power line that any interference</p>	<p>This project is still in the early phases and, as such, a number of route options are being considered. The location of the proposed route option along Wallace Terrace is on the south side of the roadway, south of the existing powerline. The property in that area is primarily City of Sault Ste. Marie property that was planned for industrial development. The proposed transmission line is planned as overhead construction that will meet all regulatory requirements for clearances from buildings.</p> <p>The electric arc furnaces proposed by Algoma Steel are not in the scope of this Environmental Assessment. For further information on Algoma Steel's project, please contact Brenda Stenta Manager Corporate Communications, Algoma Steel Inc. at brenda.stenta@algoma.com</p> <p>As part of the Class Environmental Assessment process, several criteria will be considered and evaluated as part of this route and station options selection process. These criteria typically include natural environment, socio-economic environment, and cultural heritage environment components. These criteria will typically consider the impacts to components such as wildlife species and habitat, as well as proximity to residences and businesses. Further information on these criteria and the work being undertaken will be further discussed at Public Information Centre #1 (In person on May 26th, 2022 and virtually on May 31st, 2022) and PIC #2 (July 2022).</p>	11-May-22 - WSP responded as indicated.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				on it may not affect me, but, those living closer could be. The dearth of information on this project is not good. You need to disclose all the issues you are aware of and your decisions and reasons for decisions regarding those issues.		
E21	05-May-22	Tom Feifel	General Public	I have received a call from Mr. Tom Feifel regarding the below noted property. He has received a notice that PUC is looking at building electrical infrastructure to support Algoma Steel over this property. As the property is currently set up for a residential subdivision, he would like to understand the impacts of this and whether he should proceed with the subdivision or not. If you or a PUC representative could please contact him to discuss in further detail, it would be greatly appreciated.	Further to your inquiry, the location of the proposed PUC powerline, as indicated by the red east-west line shown below is approx. 160 meters north of the north property line of 115 Old Goulais Bay Rd. which appears to be the north limit of your proposed subdivision property. Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions.	6-May-22 - PUC responded as indicated.
E22	05-May-22	Mike Kresin, Kresin Engineering	Private Consultant	Attached is a letter in response to the Notice of Study Commencement for the above project. We look forward to being involved in this EA process.	Thank you for your submission, we will take your comments and concerns into consideration in evaluating a final preferred route. Also, we will add you and your client to the mailing list.	9-May-22 - PUC responded as indicated.
E23	23-May-22	Jon Pasiak	General Public	I am interested in attending the PIC at the Northern Community Centre on May 26th. I received a letter in the mail and the time is listed as 4:30-7:30pm. I am wondering if there is a formal presentation or if it is just a drop-in session between those hours.	This is an informal drop-in session, come by anytime between 4:30 and 7:30pm.	23-May-22 -PUC responded as indicated.
E24	27-May-22	John Halucha	General Public	Thank you once again for your informative responses to many of my questions at the Public Information Centre / Open House on Thursday. I look forward to answers to my other questions as the Environmental Assessment process unfolds. In the meantime, I have attached a	Thank you for your comments below and at the Public Information Centre, it was a pleasure meeting you at the PIC May 26th. I would just like to confirm that I have your email and we are doing a thorough review and consideration of the points you raise.	8-June-22 - PUC responded as indicated. 11-June-22 - PUC



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>couple of Google Earth satellite images to illustrate one point that I attempted to convey regarding an alternative to the “common elements” route. These are necessarily approximate since I don’t have access to your detailed images, but I submit they demonstrate proof of concept and provide a compelling argument that your team should take a closer look at the advantages. You stressed to me that although cost is a factor, environmental considerations are paramount and encroachment on residential buildings is a major component of that. I believe you will find that the route I have shown here does not intrude on the 125-foot (38.1-metre) width of an easement at any point. The closest it comes to any residences is: - 43 metres north of an isolated residence east of Peoples Road (but there is more than 125 metres between this house and residences on the south side of Third Line so considerable flexibility) - 61 metres between residences on the east side of Peoples Road - 50 metres north of isolated buildings east of Moss Road - 60 metres south of a home on the west side of Moss Road</p> <p>Contrast this with the existing “common elements” route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80 metres between residences on the east side of Old Goulais Bay Road - 60 metres between residences on the west side of Old Goulais Bay Road - 38 metres between residences on the east side of Peoples Road - 41 metres between residences on the west side of Peoples Road - 45 metres between a residence on the west side of Brule Road and the middle of the existing easement - 80 metres between residences on the east side of Moss Road - 65 metres between residences on the west side of Moss Road - 33 metres north of an 	<p>Our objective is to respond to all inquiries within 10 working days. We will provide a comprehensive response to your questions and comments as soon as possible.</p> <p>----- (June 11th)</p> <p>We are thinking that we can best address the comments and questions you have through a live exchange of information. We would like to do a virtual meeting with you next week, if you are agreeable. Would you be available Wednesday June 15th for an hour, from 3pm to 4pm?</p> <p>We could do a Teams meeting, if that works for you. Or, if you prefer, we could do a Zoom meeting. Please let me know your preference.</p>	<p>responded as indicated.</p>



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>isolated residence east of Goulais Avenue - 83 metres between residences on the east side of Goulais Avenue - 49 metres between residences on the west side of Goulais Avenue - 50 metres between residences on the north side of Third Line</p> <p>The alternative portion through the uninhabited Fort Creek area offers a lot of flexibility. In the example offered here, it runs as close as about 65 metres behind residences on Third Line. That is about 15 metres more distant than the existing "common elements" route that is as close as 50 metres from homes north of Tallack Boulevard, especially on Kent Crescent, which you told me is not a problem. Similarly, there is a lot of flexibility in the alternative path north of Chippewa street and the rough line drawn here is about 120 metres away from the nearest residence. Note that the straight line drawn through the industrial property on the west side of Peoples Road would actually require some shifting of transmission lines and/or buildings to abide by the 10-metre minimum clearance. It should also be noted that the existing "common elements" route extends largely through what the Sault Ste Marie Region Conservation Authority deems Medium Intrinsic Susceptibility of the aquifer, an important source of drinking water in the city. In fact, this route either crosses or is very near to a small area listed as High Intrinsic Susceptibility. The alternative proposed route south of Third Line would be entirely in the Low Intrinsic Susceptibility area. This may have bearing on drinking-water quality due to PUC maintenance of easements, particularly if herbicides or other noxious chemicals are used. I hope this will help convince you that exploring the more-direct route is</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>warranted for several environmental considerations: less encroachment on existing residences, lower risk to the aquifer and drinking water, lower greenhouse gas emissions with the reduction of manufacture, transportation, installation and maintenance of about 1.25 km of line and poles, and ongoing efficiency of energy use by avoiding an extra 1.25 km of line loss. As you verified at the information centre, that perpetual line loss would be doubled if and when electricity transmission is doubled for future industrial use. Though environmental concerns are properly paramount, you pointed out that cost is a factor. PUC Transmission LP says the proposed line would be approximately 14 km long and cost about \$100 million, which points to a cost per kilometre of \$7.1 million or \$8.9 million for the extra 1.25 km of the published “common elements” route. No doubt some project costs are not directly tied to purchase of materials and construction, so let us cut that about in half to be generous. This back-of-the envelope calculation indicates a minimum cost saving of \$4.5 million using a more-direct alternative route such as the one illustrated in the attached. Shouldn’t that be taken into account for “cost effectiveness” in addition to the paramount environmental improvement? This project will serve the people and industry of Sault Ste Marie for many decades, and it seems unconscionable to construct such a long-lasting and important project using a route that is environmentally inferior on many grounds just because it was chosen by well-meaning planners half a century ago, when knowledge and concern about the environment was not as well developed as today. It seems obvious that at the very least the alternative</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>should be studied rather than dismissed out of hand. Upper levels of government have given strong support to the electrification of Algoma Steel furnaces, and implicitly the transmission of more electricity, on environmental grounds including reduction of greenhouse gases. Building an extra 1.25 km of transmission lines runs contrary to that goal and is more expensive besides. At the Thursday open house, staffer Lina ElSethony said in answer to my queries that the “common elements” route is subject to this environmental assessment but no alternatives were considered because the PUC was satisfied with existing easements. When I said that sounded as though PUC had already made up its mind and would not consider alternatives even though an extra 1.25 kilometres of line was inherently anti-environmental, she assured me that changes to the “common elements” could still be made because you are very early in the assessment process. Her colleague Jairus Patterson joined our conversation part-way through and echoed those assurances. I took their affirmations as sincere, and trust they reflect the general PUC stance. Because of our face-to-face discussion of this topic, I feel it is only fair to bring this analysis to your personal attention before I submit it for publication on the record in a week or so. That allows some time for you and other professionals on your team to point out flaws in my reasoning. Although I am passionate about the environment and efficiency, I assure you that I have an open mind and am willing to adjust my stance when presented with compelling facts. PS: At the open house, several staffers who noticed me photographing exhibits kindly informed that the placards and maps were to be posted online later Thursday. I</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				haven't been able to find them as of 11:30 am today and would be grateful if you or one of your team could tell me where they are. Thanks yet again for your help.		
E25	29-May-22	Mario Bressan	General Public	I realize the overhead transmission lines are cheaper to install but has there been any considerations for a underground line. Clearly marked similar to the oil lines around Simpson street; and not exposed to weather elements ;it could be a more reliable and longer life system. High voltage lines in the plant are underground feeding the blast furnace. Just a thought .	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>The Project Team did consider an underground option. However, underground construction at 230 kV is much more expensive than overhead construction. Also, as the line would cross multiple private and public properties, there would be significant risk of unintentional damage by others. Furthermore, any failure of the underground line would be much more disruptive, requiring significantly more time and resources to repair. In addition, the environmental impact of underground construction is much more significant than overhead. Therefore, an underground option was not considered to be a viable option.</p> <p>For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please visit our website at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com</p>	15-June-22 - WSP responded as indicated.
E26	02-Jun-22	John Flint	General Public	<p>Could you please confirm that if the Allen's Side Road route is chosen for the new power line, that it would require the removal of all the trees on the east side of Allen's Side Road south of the Second Line to Wallace Terrace.</p> <p>Also, what would the measurement, from the road center line,</p>	<p>Please note that we recently posted copies of the large-scale property maps that were on display at the public information centre May 26th, on the project website at this link... https://puctransmissionlp.com/project-plan/ There are 17 maps posted on the "Project Plan" page.</p> <p>Maps 10, 11, 12 and 13 cover the area on Allen's Side Road between Second Line and Wallace Terrace. This clip below is taken from Map 11. The solid red/pink line represents the</p>	04-June-22 - PUC responded as indicated.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>for the required vegetation removal.</p> <p>And finally, what would the measurement be from the center of the Third Line intersection south to the point where the power line would come out onto Allen's Side Road and what civic numbers would be in that area ?</p>	<p>centerline of the powerline and the green dots represent the poles. The dotted violet line is located at 10 m. either side of the poles and represents the minimum limits of the easements required to meet regulatory clearances from any occupied buildings. The dotted line also represents the extents to which all trees would have to be removed. (This information applies to all the drawings.)</p> <p>The clip below is taken from Map 7 and indicates the proposed route where the powerline would intersect Allen's Side Road and turn south. This location is approx. 20 m. south of the south property line of civic 728 Allen's Side Road. The distance from the center of Third Line to the turn point at Allen's Side Road is approx. 430 m.</p> <p>I trust this addresses your questions. Please let me know if I can provide anything further.</p>	
E27	05-Jun-22	John Halucha	General Public	<p>Please place in the public record my comments, included in the attached .doc file and copied below. I have also pasted them into the form at https://puctransmissionlp.com/submit-a-question/ If you would prefer this in another format or wish clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>John Halucha</p> <p>PUC (Transmission) LP is doggedly defending a round-about northern section to link the Third Line Hydro One substation with Algoma Steel, refusing to consider a shorter and greener alternative to the route chosen 50 years ago.</p> <p>This will create extra environmental damage during construction in addition to wasting energy every day that</p>	<p>A response to this request was included in the Team's response to Mr Halucha June 17th which confirmed his comments would be included in the public record. (See below)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Thank you for the alternative route suggestion.</p> <p>We reviewed your proposed route and have determined that it is not feasible due to property impacts and technical constraints. This is primarily because the aerial imagery on which your route was depicted is outdated and current imagery of the area looks quite different.</p> <p>The image below shows the area of most concern along your alternate route. This is the area of Sherbrook Drive and Peoples Road.</p>	17-June-22 - WSP responded as indicated.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>a needlessly long line delivers electricity to Algoma Steel and perhaps other industry over the next century or longer.</p> <p>PUC (Transmission) LP has set a tight timeline for environmental assessment of this vital infrastructure but has squandered two months of opportunity to study a shorter route south of Third Line, drawn to their attention multiple times beginning April 6, 2022.</p> <p>On that date, I responded to the Notice of Study Commencement by emailing the undersigned Dominic Parrella, Executive Lead, Special Projects PUC Transmission LP: "I am curious why PUC Transmission LP has chosen a route that veers north rather than taking a more direct course to Algoma Steel: from the Third Line Hydro Station south across Third Line for perhaps 50 to 200 metres, then directly west to meet up with the published proposed route mid-way between Goulais Avenue and Allens Sideroad. By my rough reckoning, this would save some 1200 metres. Using your information that the proposed route would be approximately 14 km, this more-direct path would be about 12.8 km. Why would PUC want to add almost 10 per cent to the length of the line with commensurate extra initial construction costs, ongoing maintenance costs, and wasteful line losses for as long as these cables carry huge amounts of electricity to Algoma Steel?"</p> <p>I did not get a response from Mr. Parrella but 18 days later, April 24, "PUC Transmission LP Project Team" replied that: "The study team will consider a number of</p>	<p>To further investigate this area, D Parrella visited the site to verify the current status of residential development in the area and found that it is now almost fully developed. As such, we prepared the summary image below noting current development not shown on the map that you had provided.</p> <p>As shown in the above images, based on the degree of current housing development and other restrictions, we have determined that the newly proposed alternate route is not feasible.</p> <p>As well, the proposed common elements route presented at PIC #1 is, to a large extent, clear of trees and vegetation that would need to be cleared to accommodate the powerline. This newly proposed route would require significantly more vegetation and tree clearing, which is one of the factors being taken into consideration in the Class Environmental Assessment (EA).</p> <p>We can confirm that all of your comments will be included in the Public Information Centre #1 Summary Report and in the consultation summary of the Environmental Study Report.</p> <p>We very much appreciate your input and will be happy to answer any additional questions that you might have.</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>factors in assessing the preferred route, line losses will be one of those factors. This will be discussed further at PIC #1, which is planned for the end of May.” When I asked Mr. Parrella about it at the May 26 meeting, he said those calculations had not been done. However, he did verify that if and when electricity use doubled for future industrial development, those extra line losses would double also.</p> <p>PUC Transmission LP Project Team also said on April 24 that the “common element” line drawn in black on their map “is covered by existing PUC easements that have been in place since the early 70’s for eventual construction of such a powerline. Therefore, the black line represents the most cost-effective way to reach the west end of the city.”</p> <p>I replied the next day to ask whether that northerly portion was a fait accompli and had already been subject to an EA process of which I was unaware, and added: “Your own web site estimates that poles will be approximately 200 metres apart, which means at least an extra six or seven towers that would need to be manufactured, installed and maintained. It also means an extra 1200 metres of multiple wires that would need to be manufactured, installed and maintained. Please explain how using the round-about proposal would be more “cost-effective”. Moreover, since environmental concerns are presumably the focus of an Environmental Assessment such as this, please explain how manufacture, transport, installation and maintenance of these extra towers and lines is more environmentally friendly than a direct route. Also, please outline how</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>much perpetual extra line loss there would in the extra 1200 metres of lines ...”</p> <p>It wasn’t until May 5 that PUC Transmission LP Project Team responded, “Please note that all proposed routes are included in this EA process. The existing easements that run across the northerly area of the city comprise part of the common element route (the black lines) that are common to all coloured line options.” If that meant the PUC considered the old path a “proposed route” subject to this EA, alternatives should still be open to study.</p> <p>The May 5 note continued, “In order to replace the northerly route (as represented with the black line), extensive quantities of new easements would be required. PUC’s real estate representatives will work closely with directly impacted property owners to acquire easements that would affect their property. As such, the existing PUC easements provide the most feasible option at this time. This will be discussed further at PIC #1, which is planned for the end of May.”</p> <p>When I sought clarification at the May 26 PIC #1, staffers told me that the “common elements” route is subject to this environmental assessment but no alternatives were considered because the PUC was satisfied with existing easements. I said that sounded as though PUC had already made up its mind and would not study alternatives even though an extra 1-1/4 kilometres of line was inherently anti-environmental. I was assured by staff that changes to the “common elements” could still be made because the environmental assessment process</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>was in early stages.</p> <p>However, when I spoke at that meeting with Mr. Parrella about whether a shorter, greener, cheaper route was being considered he said no, because environment was paramount and encroachment on existing residential buildings was a major consideration though cost was also a factor. I pointed out that the old route in fact encroached more closely on more residential buildings than a route south of Third Line would. He disagreed.</p> <p>The next day, May 27, I sent Mr. Parrella a note illustrated with satellite images similar to the ones attached here showing he was mistaken. I said the lines were approximate but demonstrate proof of concept providing a compelling argument for a closer look at the advantages of a shorter path, and invited him to point to flaws in my analysis before it went into the public record. More than week later there still is no reply disputing any points made, nor has there been any indication that a shorter alternative was or will be studied.</p> <p>The closest the more-efficient southern route would come to any residences is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 50 metres north of an isolated residence east of Peoples Road (but there is more than 125 metres between this house and residences on the south side of Third Line so there is flexibility)- 61 metres between two residences on the east side of Peoples Road- 133 metres between isolated buildings east of Moss Road		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>The 50-year-old “common elements” route encroaches closely on five times as many homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 80 metres between two residences on the east side of Old Goulais Bay Road - 60 metres between two residences on the west side of Old Goulais Bay Road - 38 metres between two residences on the east side of Peoples Road - 41 metres between two residences on the west side of Peoples Road - 45 metres between a residence on the west side of Brule Road and the middle of the existing easement - 80 metres between two residences on the east side of Moss Road - 65 metres between two residences on the west side of Moss Road - 33 metres north of an isolated residence east of Goulais Avenue - 83 metres between two residences on the east side of Goulais Avenue - 49 metres between two residences on the west side of Goulais Avenue - 50 metres between two residences on the north side of Third Line <p>The alternative southern portion through the uninhabited Fort Creek area offers flexibility. In the example it is drawn about 50 metres behind one residence on Third Line, similar to the distance the old route is from several homes north of Tallack Boulevard (especially on Kent Crescent), which Mr. Parrella said is no problem. Similarly, there is a lot of flexibility in the alternative path</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>north of Chippewa street where the rough example line is more than 80 metres away from the nearest residence.</p> <p>The path through the industrial property on the west side of Peoples Road would require some shifting of transmission lines and/or buildings to abide by the 10-metre minimum clearance.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the old route extends largely through what the Sault Ste Marie Region Conservation Authority deems Medium Intrinsic Susceptibility of the aquifer, an important source of drinking water in the city. In fact, it either crosses or is very near a small area listed as High Intrinsic Susceptibility. The alternative southern route would be entirely in the Low Intrinsic Susceptibility zone. This may have bearing on drinking-water quality due to PUC maintenance of easements, particularly if herbicides or other noxious chemicals are used.</p> <p>Summing up, exploring the shorter route is warranted for several environmental reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- less encroachment on existing residences- lower risk to the aquifer- lower greenhouse gas emissions with the reduction of manufacture, transportation, installation and maintenance of about 1.2 km of line and poles- long-term energy efficiency by avoiding an extra 1.2 km of perpetual line loss that would be doubled if and when electricity transmission is doubled for future industry. <p>Cost savings also favour the southern alternative. PUC Transmission LP says the proposed line would be</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>approximately 14 km long and cost about \$100 million, which works out to \$7.1 million per kilometre or \$8.6 million for the extra 1.2 km of the old route. Some costs are not directly tied to specific site engineering, materials and installation, but cutting that in half would still mean saving about \$4 million using the shorter route.</p> <p>This project should serve the people and industry of Sault Ste Marie well into the future. It is unconscionable to construct such an enduring and important project along an environmentally inferior route. Rather than staying stuck 50 years in the past when environmental awareness was low, planners would be wise to look forward 50 years when environmental concern is likely to be even stronger than today.</p>		
E28	06-Jun-22	John Flint	General Public	<p>After attending the May 26, 2022 In-Person PIC #1 Details meeting, I spoke with several Allen's Side Road residents and we have decided to circulate a Petition to oppose the selection of the Allen's Side Road route and recommend that the Route #4 option be chosen.</p> <p>The main concern of the Residents was that 40 large majestic trees would have to be removed along the east side of Allen's Side Road south of the Second Line as well as countless other smaller ones in order to install the new power line.</p> <p>I have contacted the Great Lakes Forestry Center to acquire additional information on this unique stand of trees which have become a prominent west end community landmark for the past several decades.</p>	Thank you for your email. Please submit the petition to my attention. An electronic copy would be sufficient for now. If we require the original hard copy, I will let you know.	06-June-22 - PUC responded as indicated.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>Also being looked into is having these trees designated as Heritage Trees with the Ontario Urban Forest Council.</p> <p>As well, following that process and in conjunction with the The Ontario Heritage Act, I have been in contact with our Ward 5 Councillor to request his assistance in having this matter presented to Council for their approval to have the trees in question protected under the Municipal Planning Act, as covered in Sections 135-141.</p> <p>Please advise as to whom, where and when the above mentioned Petition should be submitted to.</p> <p>I may be contacted at if required and again thank you for providing all the requested information in such a timely fashion.</p>		
E29	08-Jun-22	Brian Jennings	General Public	<p>Missed last weeks public information session as I was on vacation.</p> <p>Checked the web site and found little.</p> <p>Were there any minutes taken and or info from the meeting that you can share? Is PUC still proposing a summer information session?</p>	<p>Updated documentation is posted at this link: https://puctransmissionlp.com/project-plan/</p> <p>The presentation from the virtual information session that was held May 31st, which is essentially the same as the presentation boards that were on display at the in-person session on May 26th, is posted at this link as well as all the maps that were on display at the in-person session. Please see Map 3 for proposed pole locations relative to your property (clip from Map 3 included below for reference)</p> <p>The easement is identified in light yellow shading and the pole</p>	08-June-22 - PUC responded as indicated.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					<p>locations are shown as green dots. Let me know if you have any concerns with the proposed location. There is some latitude to move the location along the easement, but it would have to remain in the middle of the easement width.</p> <p>Yes, there will be a second Public Information Session (both in-person and virtual) later this summer, around the end of July or early August. You will be notified of the date, time and location, both by mail and email.</p> <p>Let me know if I can provide anything further.</p>	
E30	09-Jun-22	Brian Jennings	General Public	<p>Thank you for the quick response and the attached link to the project. Somehow I missed that on the website. Was hoping that the pole placement would be staggered about the centre line of Old Goulais Bay eliminating the view of the poles. (Similar to Brule Rd.)</p> <p>Guessing there will be no underground service trenches on the project.</p> <p>Is there a typical section of the lines at the pole locations showing number of lines and offset to property lines?</p>	<p>Sorry, I don't have a cross-section drawing, but I note that the PUC easement is 125 feet in width and that the powerline would be placed at the center of the easement width. As I mentioned, there is some latitude to move the pole location along the easement length in the area of your house. This can be considered in more detail when we get to the detailed engineering phase (over the next month or two). I can confirm however, there will not be any underground service trenches associated with this. I will discuss your request with WSP and get back to you with a more detailed drawing to discuss your preferred pole location with you in more detail.</p> <p>Also, I may have already mentioned this, but the steel poles will resemble the single steel poles on Second Line east of North St. as in the GoogleEarth image below.</p> <p>Let me know if I can provide anything further.</p>	14-June-22 - PUC responded as indicated.
E31	11-Jun-22	John Halucha	General Public	<p>Thank you for your generous invitation to participate in a hour-long virtual meeting with you and apparently</p>	<p>Thank you for the alternative route suggestion.</p>	11-June-22 - PUC responded as



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>members of your team to discuss comments I submitted June 5 for the Environmental Assessment public record. However, I am uncomfortable at the imposition on your valuable time along with the format and humbly decline. As detailed in my June 5 note, it appears a shorter, more-direct transmission line would be better on every environmental parameter in the immediate term and in the long term. In addition, as outlined, the direct option promises to provide net cost savings. I hope that your undertaking to do a thorough review and consideration of the points I raised will result in a shorter, greener and cheaper route being explored without further delay. If PUC Transmission LP remains single-mindedly dedicated to the 50-year-old plan then an explanation would be welcome when you provide the comprehensive response to my questions and comments to which you committed. Since you were prepared to meet virtually on June 15, I trust it will not be a problem to send an email by then.</p>	<p>We reviewed your proposed route and have determined that it is not feasible due to property impacts and technical constraints. This is primarily because the aerial imagery on which your route was depicted is outdated and current imagery of the area looks quite different.</p> <p>The image below shows the area of most concern along your alternate route. This is the area of Sherbrook Drive and Peoples Road.</p> <p>To further investigate this area, D Parrella visited the site to verify the current status of residential development in the area and found that it is now almost fully developed. As such, we prepared the summary image below noting current development not shown on the map that you had provided.</p> <p>As shown in the above images, based on the degree of current housing development and other restrictions, we have determined that the newly proposed alternate route is not feasible.</p> <p>As well, the proposed common elements route presented at PIC #1 is, to a large extent, clear of trees and vegetation that would need to be cleared to accommodate the powerline. This newly proposed route would require significantly more vegetation and tree clearing, which is one of the factors being taken into consideration in the Class Environmental Assessment (EA).</p> <p>We can confirm that all of your comments will be included in the Public Information Centre #1 Summary Report and in the consultation summary of the Environmental Study Report.</p>	<p>indicated. ----- --- 17-June-22 -WSP responded as indicated.</p>



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					We very much appreciate your input and will be happy to answer any additional questions that you might have.	
E32	01-Sept-2022	Laura hatcher, MTCS	Provincial	<p>Thank you for circulating MTCS on this notice. I have reviewed the document and find that the ESR includes the appropriate due diligence with respect to cultural heritage resources for this stage of project planning.</p> <p>I have one additional comment. On page 98 of the report it says that, following the Stage 2 archaeological assessment:</p> <p>“Where recommended by the MTCS, complete further archaeological studies in areas with archaeological potential prior to construction.”</p> <p>Please note this does not exactly describe what happens with the archaeological assessment review process after the completion of the ESR, and the role that MTCS will play in this project. MTCS will review the Stage 2 archaeological assessment and, once it is complete, accept it onto the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. The licensed archaeologist who prepares the report will make recommendations about whether additional study is required. If the report recommends further work (Stage 3) it will be the proponent’s responsibility to ensure this work is completed prior to construction.</p> <p>I hope these comments of assistance. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>Please note that I have replaced Jeremiah as the Consultation and Engagement Lead for this project.</p> <p>My contact information is included in the signature below.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP’s proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>As well, thank you for your review of the draft ESR. We will address your comment as part of the final ESR.</p> <p>If you have any additional comments, please do not hesitate to reach out.</p>	02-Sept-2022 – WSP responded as noted.
E33	16-Sept-2022	Kady Kaurin, MECP	Provincial	Thank you for providing the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (ministry) with an opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Study Report	Thank you for providing MECP’s comments, we will work to incorporate these in the final ESR.	20-Sept-2022 – WSP responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>(ESR), for the PUC 230 kV Transmission Project, being completed in accordance with the Class Environmental Assessment for Minor Transmission Facilities (Class EA). The ministry comment letter is attached.</p> <p>Please note this is Part 1 of the comments and does not include a full groundwater or species at risk review. I will update you when I receive the groundwater comments from our Tech Support team.</p> <p>For SAR, an email has been sent to Jenny Enoae from our SAR Biologist for the area, regarding further steps needed for SAR review.</p> <p>Should you have any questions or concerns regarding the material provided, please contact me.</p>	<p>Do you have an estimated time for when part 2 of the comments will be ready, as we are hoping to finalize the ESR at the end of this week?</p>	
E34	21-Sept-2022	Kady Kaurin, MECP	Provincial	<p>haven't got a response back about the groundwater review. I asked the reviewer if I could just get an update if there is anything of concern I should let you know about but just no response yet, they are just so busy. I will let you know, but I am leaving Sept 30th for maternity leave so someone else will be covering me. I don't know who that is yet, but you will see their contact in my away email if I cannot get you an answer by next week. I apologize for the inconvenience, hopefully I will get you a response soon.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing the update. Unfortunately, today is the last day we would be able to incorporate new comments into the ESR. Could you please follow up with groundwater Tech Support Team to see if they have any comments ready?</p> <p>Best wishes for your maternity leave! I will keep an eye out for the contact covering you.</p>	26-Sept-2022 – WSP responded as noted.
E35	26-Sept-2022	Kady Kaurin, MECP	Provincial	<p>Coincidentally I just received groundwater comments, and am sending them now, haha. Hopefully it is not too late to incorporate.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing MECP's comments, we will work to incorporate these in the final ESR.</p>	26-Sept-2022 – WSP responded as noted.
PROJECT WEBSITE INQUIRIES						



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
W1	01-Apr-22	Kyle McNichol	General Public	<p>Four issues I can think of immediately . I live in the 500 m radius. 1. A 230 KV line gives off radiation levels not safe for human exposure. A distance of 300 ft is considered a “safe zone”. I cannot believe that a line like this is being run in a new subdivision I need to be notified of proper safety distances and what this will do to my families health and environmental well being ? 2. My home value is going to drop. I want to know what your response is to lowering home values in one of the newest subdivisions in the city. 3. I pay some of the highest taxes in the city. Will our taxes be adjusted based on this electrical exposure ? Will PUC BE REIMBURSING ME for my high tax rate when I live beside this line ? 4. Power bumps ? How much will this tie in with Algoma steel and effect our reliable power supply ?</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP’s proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station. The powerline is proposed for construction along the black line shown on the Study Area map that you received (copy attached for reference). The northerly black line route is contained within PUC easements that are already in place. This is well north of the Greenfield Subdivision.</p> <p>Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada that includes the following statement at the center-bottom of page 2: “Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELFs. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors.”</p>	14-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted and included a copy of the Health Canada fact sheet.
W2	04-Apr-22	John Yukich	General Public	<p>what are the health issues for this plan to people in Bayview .I see where in that circle.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP’s proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station. Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada that includes the following statement at the center-bottom of page</p>	14-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted and included a copy of the Health Canada fact sheet.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					2: "Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELF. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors."	
W3	04-Apr-22	Kyle Palaro	General Public	Hey there, I'm very curious about the structure/tower style. Is it possible to see proposed pictures/design. Thank you.	Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station. Detailed drawings are not available yet as the project is in the early stages of planning. However, the Google StreetView clip below provides an example of the type of steel mono-pole that is planned for use on this project. This image is taken on Second Line immediately east of North Street. Also, attached are preliminary pole specification drawings, as contemplated at this time, for your information.	18-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted and included a simplified copy of the 230 kV line pole design drawings.
W4	05-Apr-22	Pamela Carson	General Public	What steps are being taken to ensure that there will not be impact to wildlife or residential subdivisions?	Thank you for your email and for your interest in PUC's Class Environmental Assessment Study for the 230 kV Transmission Project in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. As part of the Class Environmental Assessment process, several criteria will be considered and evaluated as part of this route alternative selection process. These criteria typically include natural environment, socio-economic environment, and cultural heritage environment components. These criteria will typically consider the impacts to components such as wildlife species and habitat, as well as proximity to residences and businesses. Further information on these criteria and the work being undertaken will be further discussed at Public Information Centre #1 that is currently planned for May 2022. For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com Please let us know if you have any further questions.	27-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
W5	06-Apr-22	Robert Chistopher Cormier	General Public	In looking at the study map, which property are you planning to cross between Moss Road and Goulais Avenue?	Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station. The image below, taken from GoogleEarth, shows the approximate location of the proposed powerline, which is represented by the yellow line. The PUC holds easements for a powerline corridor, 125 feet in width, through this area. The yellow line is approximately along the center line of those easements.	19-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.
W6	06-Apr-22	Sue	General Public	I went to the mailing list and provided my email address as requested. I then hit the subscribe button ... and nothing happened. There was no confirmation that I had been successful in my quest. Does this lack of confirmation indicate that I made an error or that this portal is not actually functioning?	Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie. This is to confirm receipt of your message, you have been added to the mailing list. There was a problem with the input form which has been corrected.	19-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.
W7	07-Apr-22	Rob DiRenzo	General Public	What are the dates of the virtual and in-person open houses? Will the line be installed under ground or above ? Can you provide an pic and description of a similar tower if applicable? thanks Rob.	Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie. The in-person open house will be held May 26th at the West End Community Centre, 556 Goulais Ave, from 4:30 to 7:30 pm. The virtual open house will be May 31st from 4:30 to 7:30 pm. The powerlines are proposed to be installed overhead. The image below, taken from GoogleStreetView, provides an example of the type of steel monopole that is planned for use on this project. This image is taken on Second Line immediately west of North Street. For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com	19-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.

ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
W8	07-Apr-22	Steve St. Jean	General Public	I live on Brookfield Ave. and I notice on the route option map as per option 4 (green) concerns me as this follows almost wholly on Conservation right of way which is directly behind my residence. The question I have is would this be an above ground (on poles) application or buried, there are currently no above ground lines on any of that proposed route and I think that if this is the plan that it would be a terrible eye sore as well as a hazard to the abundant wildlife and birds that use that area. Are the options in a preferred order by number Steve St. Jean	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station. Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada that includes the following statement at the center-bottom of page 2: "Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELFs. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors." The various route options are not listed in any specific order or preference. The powerline is proposed to be installed overhead. The image below, taken from GoogleStreetView, provides an example of the type of steel monopole that is planned for use on this project. This image is taken on Second Line immediately west of North Street.</p> <p>For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com</p>	21-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted and included a copy of the Health Canada fact sheet.
W9	07-Apr-22	Kathryn Fleming	General Public	It's hard to tell where this route goes on Winfield Drive, without labelling of the actual streets and lots, can you elaborate on that?	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>The image below, taken from Google Earth, indicates the proposed location of the "green line" option shown on the Study Map (represented here by the yellow line) which is about 330</p>	19-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					meters west of the end of Winfield Drive. For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com	
W10	11-Apr-22	Geoffrey Alfred Truscott	General Public	Question1: Are the current plans to replace existing poles along the planned route on Allen's side road with the new steel poles or are there additional poles to be installed. Question 2: if the answer to #1 above is additional poles, will these poles be placed on existing right of ways	Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie. For the potential route option along Allens Side Road within your area, the proposal would be to install new steel poles along the east side of the road within the municipal road right-of-way. The image below, taken from Google StreetView, provides an example of the type of steel monopole that is planned for use on this project. This image is taken on Second Line immediately west of North Street. For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com	19-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.
W11	18-Apr-22	Allan Frederick	General Public	Will there be any benefits to PUC distribution customers, to shareholders? How is debt structured What is expected rate of return on investment subject to OEB approval	Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie. This proposed transmission project may provide benefit to PUC Distribution customers in the near future. PUC Transmission's current station design includes the ability to provide several 34.5 kV feeders for PUC Distribution. These feeders will provide new 34.5 kV source in the westerly area of the city that will facilitate the LDC's reconstruction of its existing transformer stations. PUC Transmission is partnering with Axium Infrastructure Inc. to finance the project. However, the final debt structure is yet to be	20-Apr-22 - PUC responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					<p>determined.</p> <p>The rate of return will be determined once the OEB approves PUC Transmission's cost of service application, which is anticipated to be filed and approved prior to the in-service date of December 2024.</p> <p>For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com</p>	
W12	21-Apr-22	Dennis Gagne	General Public	<p>I am writing this email today in regard to the 230kv line that is planned to go through my property at 840 Third Line West in Sault Ste Marie, Ontario. As a Father, Husband, Property owner, and resident I have the following concerns:</p> <p>These are health concerns taken from epidemiological studies done on living near high voltage lines</p> <p>Short Term</p> <p>Headaches</p> <p>Fatigue</p> <p>Anxiety</p> <p>Insomnia</p> <p>Prickling/burning skin</p> <p>Rashes</p> <p>Muscle pain</p> <p>Long Term</p> <p>Leukemia</p> <p>Brain Tumours i.e. Glioblastoma</p> <p>DNA Damage</p> <p>Neurodegenerative Disease i.e. Alzheimers, Parkinsons</p> <p>Heart Arrhythmia</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in responding, it is our objective to respond to all inquiries within 10 business days.</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback in relation to the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV transmission line and station.</p> <p>Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada that includes the following statement at the center-bottom of page 2: "Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELFs. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors."</p> <p>Please note, the only restriction related to use of the easement lands is that no permanent buildings that are subject to the Ontario Building Code are permitted within the easement boundaries and that access to power poles must not be impeded.</p>	4-May-22 - PUC responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>Tinnitus</p> <p>Some other concerns</p> <p>Significantly reduces property value due to fear of negative health effects, unpleasant view of 40m steel post, and constant hum from 230kv line. The property will be rendered useless. I will be paying taxes on nearly 4 acres of land that I can no longer use.</p> <p>I have received permits to develop that part of that land and work was done. Just last year a large section was rototilled to enhance the agriculture.</p> <p>My family's quality of life is going to be affected by this</p> <p>These are some of the concerns that I have.</p> <p>Please reply via this email address. If there is anyone else that should be receiving this email please let me know.</p>		
W13	22-Apr-22	Carol Irvine	General Public	<p>Hi; This letter is in regard to the Notice of Study Commencement Class Environmental Assessment Study for the 230kV Transmission Project. I would very much like to make my choice known. I choose route 4 (the green line) that would go through the vacant, wooded property along Allen's Side Road as my first choice. My second choice would be route 1(the orange line) that goes along Allen's Side Road. As for the station; I choose option 2. This is to supply Algoma Steel ASI EAF Station and should be nearest that location.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>This is to confirm receipt of your message. Your comments have been noted and will be taken into consideration in completing this study.</p> <p>For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com</p>	28-Apr-22 - PUC responded as indicated.
W14	25-Apr-22	John Halucha	General Public	<p>Dear PUC Transmission LP Project Team,</p> <p>Thank you for your response to the email I sent Mr. Parrella April 6. Thank you also for your invitation to sign up for your mailing list. Please note that I did sign up for it</p>	<p>By way of this email, we confirm that john.halucha@outlook.com is on the mailing list. Please note that all proposed routes are included in this EA process. The existing easements that run across the northerly area of the city comprise part of the common</p>	5-May-22 - PUC responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>April 1. I would be grateful if you could send a note to verify that this address, from which I wrote to Mr. Parrella and from which I am replying today, is on that mailing list because I am interested in both the in-person and virtual information sessions.</p> <p>When you refer to “existing PUC easements that have been in place since the early 70’s for eventual construction of such a powerline” are you saying this stretch is a fait accompli and is not part of the current EA? If so, I do not recall any public consultation for that section and am asking for documentation of any EA process connected to it. Since the first Public Information Centre / Open House will be held in person late in May, I would appreciate a timely response so that I can meaningfully engage and be consulted as part of the EA process.</p> <p>Because time is of the essence, it would be most efficient if you could share this documentation electronically. However, if the post is your best option then you could send it to. Your explanation that the “black line” of existing PUC easements “represents the most cost-effective way to reach the west end of the city” is puzzling. As I said in my email to Mr. Parrella, the round-about path seems to be some 1200 metres longer than a direct route. Your own web site estimates that poles will be approximately 200 metres apart, which means at least an extra six or seven towers that would need to be manufactured, installed and maintained. It also means an extra 1200 metres of multiple wires that would need to be manufactured, installed and maintained. Please explain how using the round-about proposal would be more “cost-effective”.</p>	<p>element route (the black lines) that are common to all coloured line options.</p> <p>In order to replace the northerly route (as represented with the black line), extensive quantities of new easements would be required. PUC’s real estate representatives will work closely with directly impacted property owners to acquire easements that would affect their property. As such, the existing PUC easements provide the most feasible option at this time. This will be discussed further at PIC #1, which is planned for the end of May.</p> <p>The study team will consider a number of factors in assessing the preferred route, line losses will be one of those factors. This will be discussed further at PIC #1, which is planned for the end of May. PUC does not have easements along existing municipal road rights-of-way since distribution lines on the streets do not require additional building clearances to the extent that 230 kV transmission lines do. The comments above regarding the cost of acquiring such easements apply here as well.</p> <p>Please note that electrical transmission lines are not incompatible with conservation lands or associated uses. We do not have any input that SSMRCA provided in the 1970s; however, please find attached the comments provided by SSMRCA as part of this EA. These comments will also be included as part of the Consultation Record that will be developed in the later stages of this project.</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>Moreover, since environmental concerns are presumably the focus of an Environmental Assessment such as this, please explain how manufacture, transport, installation and maintenance of these extra towers and lines is more environmentally friendly than a direct route. Also, please outline how much perpetual extra line loss there would in the extra 1200 metres of lines, showing how much per line and how many lines are planned for this initial 300 MW stage and how many would be needed for an additional 300 MW in the future. Such line loss seems to be a waste of energy and contrary to environmental considerations, so please explain how the round-about route is environmentally superior as well as more cost-effective.</p> <p>If the lines are to resemble the lines your web site cites on Lyons Avenue, why could they not run directly along Third Line west to Allens Sideroad? Does the PUC not have easements for existing PUC lines on that route? Surely a thorough Environmental Assessment should include alternatives to the existing round-about PUC easement, including along Third Line and another route through mostly undeveloped lands south of Third Line. Your response does not indicate whether such routes were considered by the PUC Transmission LP Project Team. Clarification would be appreciated.</p> <p>The round-about route includes wetlands under Sault Ste Marie Region Conservation Authority (SSMRCA) Administration of Ontario Regulation 176/06, including a stream, beaver pond and beaver dam mid-way between Goulais Avenue and Allens Sideroad where the east-west portion turns south to cross Third Line. In your package for me, could you please include any SSMRCA</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				input into the Environmental Assessment, whether in the 1970s or the current EA process or at any time between. I am confident you will expedite this information under the tight time line you described, but will contact SSMRCA directly as well.		
W15	09-May-22	Dennis Gagne	General Public	<p>I have read the information you have sent and the effects or lack of effects from living near EMF/ELF sources is not 100% conclusive either way. See below.</p> <p>"In the past 30 years the concern that daily exposure to extremely low-frequency magnetic fields (ELF-EMF) (1 to 300 Hz) might be harmful to human health (cancer, neurobehavioral disturbances, etc) has been the object of debate, and has become a public health concern. This has resulted in the classification of ELF-EMF into category 2B, ie, agents that are "possibly carcinogenic to humans" by the International Agency for Research on Cancer."</p> <p>The placement of the 40m metal pole is also a concern and the "hum" that I mentioned earlier was not mentioned in the reply. Nor was the property value and taxes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback in relation to the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV transmission line and station.</p> <p>Information provided by Health Canada at this link (https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html#a) includes the following:</p> <p>Your comments regarding property value impacts have been noted and will be considered as part of the decision-making process.</p> <p>Please note, as mentioned earlier, the property underneath the transmission line and within the limits of the easements, with the exception of where poles are being proposed, can continue to be used for agricultural purposes or any other use that does not involve permanent buildings subject to the Ontario Building Code.</p> <p>Also, typically there will be negligible hum or buzz audible from the transmission line. There may be a faint hum during wet weather conditions, however any hum that may result is not expected to be noticeable within your home.</p>	26-May-22 - PUC responded as noted.
W16	15-May-22	John Halucha	General Public	Thank you for confirmation that this address is on your mailing list. Please note that I have not yet received direct notice of your Public Information Centre #1	N/A	Response not required since inquiry was



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>scheduled for May 26, 2022, as published in your Sault Star advertisement May 12, 2022.</p> <p>You write, "The existing easements that run across the northerly area of the city comprise part of the common element route (the black lines) that are common to all coloured line options." Does this mean that the existing easements (the black lines) are subject to this EA?</p> <p>I am disappointed that you are not able to tell me why manufacture, transport, installation and maintenance of an extra 1200 metres of towers and lines is more environmentally friendly than a direct route and how much perpetual extra line loss there would be, in advance of the public information centre. With respect, the response, "The study team will consider a number of factors in assessing the preferred route, line losses will be one of those factors." is not substantive.</p> <p>Thank you for sharing the input from SSMRCA. I would still be grateful to know how close the proposed line route would be to the stream, beaver pond and beaver dam mid-way between Goulais Avenue and Allens Sideroad where the east-west portion turns south to cross Third Line. According to Google Earth, the dam is at 46°33' N, 84°23' W.</p> <p>Depending on how precise your published map is, it appears that the route would be very near if not directly over the stream, dam and pond. In anticipation of that, I have been in contact with the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry to ask if it is giving input into this EA. I am still awaiting a fulsome response to questions that I raised with NDMNRF but any clarification you could provide in</p>		addressed in other correspondence.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				advance of the May 26 session would be greatly appreciated		
W17	19-May-22	Gary Schryer	General Public	<p>Hello, I live on Kent Crescent and the new high voltage lines will be run behind our property. I plan to attend the Zoom session on May 31, but the two questions I have are: 1. How far away from my property line will the new power lines be constructed? I have plans to construct a garage in my back yard in the next few years and I am concerned that the location I want to build may become limited due to minimum clearance requirements to overhead power lines described in the Ontario Building Code. 2. Are there plans to construct a maintenance road or access road for the power lines? I do not have great access to my back yard to store my travel trailer in winter and I'm curious if there is an opportunity to have an access road brought in from Peoples Road that would give my neighbours and I access to our rear yards.</p>	<p>Apologies for the delay in responding, it is our objective to respond to all inquiries within 10 business days. Further details, including the presentation that was provided during the virtual meeting on May 31st and detailed maps of the project, are provided at this link: https://puctransmissionlp.com/project-plan/ Map 4 provides details on the location of the proposed powerline relative to your property. An extract of Map 4 is provided below for your reference. The line is proposed approximately 18 meters north of your northmost property line. This will not impact any construction on your property under the Building Code. With regards to your question about an access road – yes, an access road for construction and ongoing maintenance of the powerline is proposed from Peoples Road along the easement. The road is proposed to be more of a cross-country trail than a roadway. It will likely not be of any use for access to the rear lots of abutting properties. Let us know if we can provide anything further.</p>	6-June-22 - PUC responded as noted.
W18	05-Jun-22	John Halucha	General Public	<p>PUC (Transmission) LP is doggedly defending a round-about northern section to link the Third Line Hydro One substation with Algoma Steel, refusing to consider a shorter and greener alternative to the route chosen 50 years ago. This will create extra environmental damage during construction in addition to wasting energy every day that a needlessly long line delivers electricity to Algoma Steel and perhaps other industry over the next century or longer. PUC (Transmission) LP has set a tight timeline for environmental assessment of this vital</p>	<p>Note: this message from Mr Halucha is the same message sent to Jeremiah Pariag June 5 and responded to on June 17. See Email Inquires tab item E25 for details.</p>	17-Jun-22- WSP responded as indicated in E25, Email Inquires tab.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>infrastructure but has squandered two months of opportunity to study a shorter route south of Third Line, drawn to their attention multiple times beginning April 6, 2022. On that date, I responded to the Notice of Study Commencement by emailing the undersigned Dominic Parrella, Executive Lead, Special Projects PUC Transmission LP: "I am curious why PUC Transmission LP has chosen a route that veers north rather than taking a more direct course to Algoma Steel: from the Third Line Hydro Station south across Third Line for perhaps 50 to 200 metres, then directly west to meet up with the published proposed route mid-way between Goulais Avenue and Allens Sideroad. By my rough reckoning, this would save some 1200 metres. Using your information that the proposed route would be approximately 14 km, this more-direct path would be about 12.8 km. Why would PUC want to add almost 10 per cent to the length of the line with commensurate extra initial construction costs, ongoing maintenance costs, and wasteful line losses for as long as these cables carry huge amounts of electricity to Algoma Steel?" I did not get a response from Mr. Parrella but 18 days later, April 24, "PUC Transmission LP Project Team" replied that: "The study team will consider a number of factors in assessing the preferred route, line losses will be one of those factors. This will be discussed further at PIC #1, which is planned for the end of May." When I asked Mr. Parrella about it at the May 26 meeting, he said those calculations had not been done. However, he did verify that if and when electricity use doubled for future industrial development, those extra line losses would double also. PUC Transmission LP</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>Project Team also said on April 24 that the “common element” line drawn in black on their map “is covered by existing PUC easements that have been in place since the early 70’s for eventual construction of such a powerline. Therefore, the black line represents the most cost-effective way to reach the west end of the city.” I replied the next day to ask whether that northerly portion was a fait accompli and had already been subject to an EA process of which I was unaware, and added: “Your own web site estimates that poles will be approximately 200 metres apart, which means at least an extra six or seven towers that would need to be manufactured, installed and maintained. It also means an extra 1200 metres of multiple wires that would need to be manufactured, installed and maintained. Please explain how using the round-about proposal would be more “cost-effective”. Moreover, since environmental concerns are presumably the focus of an Environmental Assessment such as this, please explain how manufacture, transport, installation and maintenance of these extra towers and lines is more environmentally friendly than a direct route. Also, please outline how much perpetual extra line loss there would in the extra 1200 metres of lines ...” It wasn’t until May 5 that PUC Transmission LP Project Team responded, “Please note that all proposed routes are included in this EA process. The existing easements that run across the northerly area of the city comprise part of the common element route (the black lines) that are common to all coloured line options.” If that meant the PUC considered the old path a “proposed route” subject to this EA, alternatives should still be open to study. The May 5 note continued,</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>“In order to replace the northerly route (as represented with the black line), extensive quantities of new easements would be required. PUC’s real estate representatives will work closely with directly impacted property owners to acquire easements that would affect their property. As such, the existing PUC easements provide the most feasible option at this time. This will be discussed further at PIC #1, which is planned for the end of May.” When I sought clarification at the May 26 PIC #1, staffers told me that the “common elements” route is subject to this environmental assessment but no alternatives were considered because the PUC was satisfied with existing easements. I said that sounded as though PUC had already made up its mind and would not study alternatives even though an extra 1-1/4 kilometres of line was inherently anti-environmental. I was assured by staff that changes to the “common elements” could still be made because the environmental assessment process was in early stages. However, when I spoke at that meeting with Mr. Parrella about whether a shorter, greener, cheaper route was being considered he said no, because environment was paramount and encroachment on existing residential buildings was a major consideration though cost was also a factor. I pointed out that the old route in fact encroached more closely on more residential buildings than a route south of Third Line would. He disagreed. The next day, May 27, I sent Mr. Parrella a note illustrated with satellite images showing he was mistaken. I said the lines were approximate but demonstrate proof of concept providing a compelling argument for a closer look at the advantages of a shorter path, and invited him to point to</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>flaws in my analysis before it went into the public record. More than week later there still is no reply disputing any points made, nor has there been any indication that a shorter alternative was or will be studied. The closest the more-efficient southern route would come to any residences is: - 50 metres north of an isolated residence east of Peoples Road (but there is more than 125 metres between this house and residences on the south side of Third Line so there is flexibility) - 61 metres between two residences on the east side of Peoples Road - 133 metres between isolated buildings east of Moss Road The 50-year-old "common elements" route encroaches closely on five times as many homes: - 80 metres between two residences on the east side of Old Goulais Bay Road - 60 metres between two residences on the west side of Old Goulais Bay Road - 38 metres between two residences on the east side of Peoples Road - 41 metres between two residences on the west side of Peoples Road - 45 metres between a residence on the west side of Brule Road and the middle of the existing easement - 80 metres between two residences on the east side of Moss Road - 65 metres between two residences on the west side of Moss Road - 33 metres north of an isolated residence east of Goulais Avenue - 83 metres between two residences on the east side of Goulais Avenue - 49 metres between two residences on the west side of Goulais Avenue - 50 metres between two residences on the north side of Third Line The alternative southern portion through the uninhabited Fort Creek area offers flexibility. In the example it is drawn about 50 metres behind one residence on Third Line, similar to the distance the old route is from several</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>homes north of Tallack Boulevard (especially on Kent Crescent), which Mr. Parrella said is no problem. Similarly, there is a lot of flexibility in the alternative path north of Chippewa street where the rough example line is more than 80 metres away from the nearest residence. The path through the industrial property on the west side of Peoples Road would require some shifting of transmission lines and/or buildings to abide by the 10-metre minimum clearance. It should also be noted that the old route extends largely through what the Sault Ste Marie Region Conservation Authority deems Medium Intrinsic Susceptibility of the aquifer, an important source of drinking water in the city. In fact, it either crosses or is very near a small area listed as High Intrinsic Susceptibility. The alternative southern route would be entirely in the Low Intrinsic Susceptibility zone. This may have bearing on drinking-water quality due to PUC maintenance of easements, particularly if herbicides or other noxious chemicals are used. Summing up, exploring the shorter route is warranted for several environmental reasons: - less encroachment on existing residences - lower risk to the aquifer - lower greenhouse gas emissions with the reduction of manufacture, transportation, installation and maintenance of about 1.2 km of line and poles - long-term energy efficiency by avoiding an extra 1.2 km of perpetual line loss that would be doubled if and when electricity transmission is doubled for future industry. Cost savings also favour the southern alternative. PUC Transmission LP says the proposed line would be approximately 14 km long and cost about \$100 million, which works out to \$7.1 million per kilometre or \$8.6 million for the extra 1.2 km of the</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>old route. Some costs are not directly tied to specific site engineering, materials and installation, but cutting that in half would still mean saving about \$4 million using the shorter route. This project should serve the people and industry of Sault Ste Marie well into the future. It is unconscionable to construct such an enduring and important project along an environmentally inferior route. Rather than staying stuck 50 years in the past when environmental awareness was low, planners would be wise to look forward 50 years when environmental concern is likely to be even stronger than today.</p>		
W19	18-Jun-22	John Halucha	General Public	<p>Thank you for addressing some of the concerns that I posted for the public record June 5, 2022 to https://puctransmissionlp.com/submit-a-question/ and emailed the same day to Jeremiah Pariag with copies to Dominic Parrella and Katie Elliott. However, several aspects of my June 5 message have been missed in your reply, perhaps because it is not to my message submitted for the record June 5 but to a partial preview I sent as a courtesy to Mr. Parrella's personal attention on May 27. Another explanation might be that PUC Transmission LP is tacitly accepting the accuracy of all points that it has ignored. Before earlier comments and questions not yet addressed by PUC Transmission LP are itemized, has another alternative route yet been considered more or less as sketched in PUC 230 kV alternative route2.jpg, attached: following existing PUC large-line easements from the Hydro One Third Line Station south along Sackville Road to Second Line, then west along Second Line either on the south side where there are no residences (preferred) or the north side as</p>	<p>Thank you for your continued interest in the PUC Transmission LP Class EA and for your suggestion of alternative routes. The routes that you have suggested were considered; however, they were not carried forward as options as they were determined to be unfeasible. Some of the factors that were considered in this decision for each of those routes are below:</p> <p>Alternative Route 1 (Northern route suggestion – May 27th email):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Line losses: One of the benefits of this route is a shorter line; however, as discussed below, the route is not a feasible option. ○ Construction cost: Though this route is shorter than the Common Elements Route, the overall cost is expected to be significantly higher due to the shorter span lengths and numerous additional poles required to accommodate the additional turns in the route. ○ Feasibility: Due to conflict with existing development including new residential development in the area of 	07-Jul-22 - PUC responded as noted.



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>an option, then south along Carmen's Way (either side; I have drawn it on the west side here) and across rail and industrial properties to Station Option 2 near Algoma Steel.</p> <p>This direct route has many minor adjustments readily available to avoid impediments that PUC Transmission LP experts may identify. It also has so many advantages that PUC Transmission LP should be motivated to make accommodations such as expanding existing easements or acquiring new easements if needed: a) A length of less than 7 km, roughly half the 14 km using the round-about old path plus one of the Options. b) Very little, if any, existing residential construction encroached; certainly much less than using the old northern route. c) No need to further explore Options 1 through 4, all of which involve encroaching on yet more existing residential construction in addition to possible future residential development. Also, the need for many new easements along any of those Option routes would be avoided, saving much time and expense. d) Reduced compromise of aquifer safety that the old northern route threatens. In light of these advantages, references to the 1.2 km of transmission line savings under the first alternative proposal are amended below to 7 km. It seems so obviously and vastly superior that I have no explanation why I did not propose it in the first place. I appreciate that Mr. Parrella personally visited the Sherbrook Drive - Peoples Road site and prepared an update, but am disappointed that many of my points were not addressed despite Mr. Parrella's June 8 assurance of "thorough review and consideration of the points you raise ... We will provide a comprehensive response to</p>	<p>Peoples Road and Sherbrooke Drive, we have determined that this route is not a technically viable option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Socio-Economic Factors: The total number of structures required to accommodate the additional turns in the route is expected to result in a more significant environmental impact. It is expected that these new residents would identify new social impacts as there is no existing easement protecting the land for such a utility corridor. <p>Alternative Route 2 (Most recent suggestion – June 18th email):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Factors: Due to conflict with existing development including residential, commercial, and utility infrastructure, the route was determined not to be a technically viable option. • Environmental and Socio-Economic Factors: Similar to Alternative Route #1, it is expected that these new residents would identify new social impacts as there is no existing easement protecting the land for such a utility corridor. <p>We are pleased to provide more detailed responses to your specific comments or questions below where we have inserted our responses in red italicized text following each item.</p> <p>1a. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that manufacturing, transporting, installing and maintaining 7 km of extra lines and poles would produce extra greenhouse gases, contrary to the stated purpose of substantial public investment in switching Algoma Steel to electric steelmaking?</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>your questions and comments as soon as possible.” I have used a numbered format here with hope it will assist you to satisfy that assurance.</p> <p>1a. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that manufacturing, transporting, installing and maintaining 7 km of extra lines and poles would produce extra greenhouse gases, contrary to the stated purpose of substantial public investment in switching Algoma Steel to electric steelmaking? 1b. While environmental considerations have been termed paramount, PUC has said that cost is a factor. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that manufacturing, transporting, installing and maintaining 7 km of extra lines and poles means extra costs in the immediate construction phase and for as many decades as the transmission line is in service? 1c. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that these cost savings could be applied to mitigate any costs of developing a shorter and greener route? 2. Mr. Parrella has already acknowledged that an extra 1.2 kilometres of transmission line means extra line losses in perpetuity for every day the current flows, and those losses would be doubled if electricity use were to be doubled for future industrial development. That applies even more significantly if there is an unnecessary extra 7 km of lines. However, PUC Transmission LP has yet to detail the extent of this extra line loss. Please note that I first asked about this on April 6 and was told by you on April 24 that the answer would come at the PIC #1, planned for the end of May. When I asked Mr. Parrella about it at the May 26 meeting, he said those calculations had not been done. I would still appreciate a response to this question, since the extra line loss would be an ongoing</p>	<p>Answer: Algoma Steel has committed to transitioning its manufacturing process from the integrated basic oxygen steelmaking route to electric arc steelmaking. This process change will shrink Algoma’s environmental footprint dramatically, with an expected reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by up to 70%, positioning Algoma as one of the leading producers of green steel in North America.</p> <p>Length of the new line is a consideration and shorter lines are favored wherever possible. The Common Elements Route and alternative route options presented at the PIC #1 comprise the shortest feasible routes required to service Algoma’s electric Arc Furnace Station. Other factors considered include number of infrastructure crossings (roads, residences, etc.), constraints on future capital works, existing continuous right-of-way, and other biophysical and socio-economic constraints. The full list of factors and criteria included in the evaluation process will be presented during the upcoming PIC.</p> <p>1b. While environmental considerations have been termed paramount, PUC has said that cost is a factor. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that manufacturing, transporting, installing and maintaining 7 km of extra lines and poles means extra costs in the immediate construction phase and for as many decades as the transmission line is in service?</p> <p>Answer: The selection of the preferred route requires a combination of environmental, social and technical criteria applied to feasible route options. Factors include number of infrastructure crossings (roads, residences, etc.), constraints on future capital works, existing continuous right-of-way, and other biophysical and socio-economic constraints. The full list of factors and criteria included in the evaluation process will be presented during the upcoming PIC.</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>waste of energy for generations. 3a. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that the 50-year-old route would encroach closely on at least 20 residences? If so, please explain precisely how the old route is superior “based on the degree of current housing development”.</p> <p>3b. If the satellite photo used in the draft proof of concept does not show subsequent housing development as illustrated by Mr. Parrella, perhaps it does not show subsequent housing development along the old route. Has that been investigated by PUC Transmission LP?</p> <p>3c. After assertions about extra effects on existing housing were demonstrated to be incorrect, Mr. Parrella introduced two future houses plus a “future Residential Subdivision” as a consideration. Has PUC Transmission LP examined whether any future residential construction is being planned along the round-about route?</p> <p>4. Please address my June 5 notes about the aquifer: “It should also be noted that the old route extends largely through what the Sault Ste Marie Region Conservation Authority deems Medium Intrinsic Susceptibility of the aquifer, an important source of drinking water in the city. In fact, it either crosses or is very near a small area listed as High Intrinsic Susceptibility. The alternative southern route [including the Carmen’s Way alternative] would be entirely in the Low Intrinsic Susceptibility zone. This may have bearing on drinking-water quality due to PUC maintenance of easements, particularly if herbicides or other noxious chemicals are used.” 5a. You write, “As well, the proposed common elements route presented at PIC #1 is, to a large extent, clear of trees and vegetation that would need to be cleared to accommodate the powerline. This newly proposed route would require</p>	<p>1c. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that these cost savings could be applied to mitigate any costs of developing a shorter and greener route?</p> <p>Answer: As mentioned, please note that route length is only one factor when determining cost, and cost is only one criterion when selecting a preferred route. Please refer to answers provided for questions 1 and 2 for further information.</p> <p>2. Mr. Parrella has already acknowledged that an extra 1.2 kilometres of transmission line means extra line losses in perpetuity for every day the current flows, and those losses would be doubled if electricity use were to be doubled for future industrial development. That applies even more significantly if there is an unnecessary extra 7 km of lines. However, PUC Transmission LP has yet to detail the extent of this extra line loss. Please note that I first asked about this on April 6 and was told by you on April 24 that the answer would come at the PIC #1, planned for the end of May. When I asked Mr. Parrella about it at the May 26 meeting, he said those calculations had not been done. I would still appreciate a response to this question, since the extra line loss would be an ongoing waste of energy for generations.</p> <p>Answer: The Environmental Assessment (EA) process is a comprehensive process that evaluates routes based on a number of factors such as number of infrastructure crossings (roads, residences, etc.), constraints on future capital works, existing continuous right-of-way, and other biophysical and socio-economic constraints. As such, the line losses may differ between routes, but this is not indicative of the overall environmental impact.</p> <p>3a. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that the 50-year-old route would encroach closely on at least 20 residences? If so, please explain precisely how the old route is superior “based on the degree of current housing development”.</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>significantly more vegetation and tree clearing, which is one of the factors being taken into consideration in the Class Environmental Assessment (EA).” Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that the old route was largely cleared artificially of trees and vegetation prior to the Class Environmental Assessment? Certainly, in the satellite image much of that “clear” corridor seems to be surrounded by trees and vegetation rather than being clear in its natural state.</p> <p>5b. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that whatever route is chosen, the vegetation will have to be controlled for the lifetime of the transmission line, whether that is half a century or a century or longer? Wouldn't maintaining a shorter easement over that extended period mitigate any extra costs of clearing a more-direct route one time? 6a. Thank you for confirming that, “all of your comments will be included in the Public Information Centre #1 Summary Report and in the consultation summary of the Environmental Study Report.” Can you confirm that the comments to be included will be the ones I posted and emailed for that purpose June 5, not the ones I sent in a private email to Mr. Parrella May 27? 6b. Please include your June 17 response and my June 18 reply (this note) in the Public Information Centre #1 Summary Report and in the consultation summary of the Environmental Study Report. I realize it is past your commenting period ending June 9, but it would be unfortunate if these exchanges were to be excluded due to delays not of my doing. I have generally replied to messages the next day since beginning our correspondence April 6 but the same cannot be said for PUC Transmission LP. If necessary, I</p>	<p>3b. If the satellite photo used in the draft proof of concept does not show subsequent housing development as illustrated by Mr. Parrella, perhaps it does not show subsequent housing development along the old route. Has that been investigated by PUC Transmission LP?</p> <p>3c. After assertions about extra effects on existing housing were demonstrated to be incorrect, Mr. Parrella introduced two future houses plus a “future Residential Subdivision” as a consideration. Has PUC Transmission LP examined whether any future residential construction is being planned along the round-about route?</p> <p>Answer: The existing PUC easements were put in place decades ago based on foresight that development would eventually necessitate additional utility infrastructure. The easements preclude any residential or commercial development within the easement limits; thereby preserving the land for the exact purpose that is now being proposed, while also protecting other lands from such a use. Furthermore, the existing easements satisfy regulatory requirements for clearances to any existing or future buildings subject to the Ontario Building Code.</p> <p>4. Please address my June 5 notes about the aquifer: “It should also be noted that the old route extends largely through what the Sault Ste Marie Region Conservation Authority deems Medium Intrinsic Susceptibility of the aquifer, an important source of drinking water in the city. In fact, it either crosses or is very near a small area listed as High Intrinsic Susceptibility. The alternative southern route [including the Carmen’s Way alternative] would be entirely in the Low Intrinsic Susceptibility zone. This may have bearing on drinking-water quality due to PUC maintenance of easements, particularly if herbicides or other noxious chemicals are used.”</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>can provide a dated and itemized list of our exchanges. I hope that PUC Transmission LP is seriously considering the most energy-efficient route possible for crucial infrastructure that will serve Sault Ste Marie residents and industry for generations rather than relying on a wasteful round-about route proposed a half-century ago.</p>	<p>Answer: The Project Team is aware of the aquifer and is completing an assessment of groundwater impacts. Effects and mitigation measures will be noted in the draft Environmental Study Report (ESR). Mitigation measures may include avoiding designated vulnerable areas and continuous discharge monitoring. PUC will be consulting with appropriate regulators to ensure that construction and maintenance of the proposed transmission line is compatible with the city of Sault Ste. Marie's and the Sault Ste. Marie Region Conservation Authority's groundwater recharge or protection zones, and other regulatory requirements.</p> <p>5a. You write, "As well, the proposed common elements route presented at PIC #1 is, to a large extent, clear of trees and vegetation that would need to be cleared to accommodate the powerline. This newly proposed route would require significantly more vegetation and tree clearing, which is one of the factors being taken into consideration in the Class Environmental Assessment (EA)." Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that the old route was largely cleared artificially of trees and vegetation prior to the Class Environmental Assessment? Certainly, in the satellite image much of that "clear" corridor seems to be surrounded by trees and vegetation rather than being clear in its natural state.</p> <p>Answer: The Class EA considers impacts to the current existing conditions. It is preferable to choose an option that is on previously disturbed land (i.e., on the existing right-of-way) than to disturb new lands with existing environmental features.</p> <p>5b. Does PUC Transmission LP acknowledge that whatever route is chosen, the vegetation will have to be controlled for the lifetime of the transmission line, whether that is half a century or a century or longer? Wouldn't maintaining a shorter easement over that extended period mitigate any extra costs of clearing a more-direct route one time?</p>	



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					<p>Answer: Maintaining a shorter line is preferable. The length of the line is a consideration and shorter lines are favored wherever possible; however, as mentioned, there are several other factors that determine the feasibility of routes. The options presented at the PIC #1 comprise the shortest feasible routes.</p> <p>6a. Thank you for confirming that, “all of your comments will be included in the Public Information Centre #1 Summary Report and in the consultation summary of the Environmental Study Report.” Can you confirm that the comments to be included will be the ones I posted and emailed for that purpose June 5, not the ones I sent in a private email to Mr. Parrella May 27?</p> <p>6b. Please include your June 17 response and my June 18 reply (this note) in the Public Information Centre #1 Summary Report and in the consultation summary of the Environmental Study Report. I realize it is past your commenting period ending June 9, but it would be unfortunate if these exchanges were to be excluded due to delays not of my doing. I have generally replied to messages the next day since beginning our correspondence April 6 but the same cannot be said for PUC Transmission LP. If necessary, I can provide a dated and itemized list of our exchanges.</p> <p>Answer: All correspondence to and from you in relation to this EA will form part of the public record.</p>	
W20	04-Jul-22	Dan Di Rocco	General Public	<p>Based on the drawing our home appears to be a safe distance from the line. What are the recommended distances for power line of this voltage and where can I find the regulations? I would also like to know exactly where the line will cross Old Goulais Bay Rd. I assume this is the center of the gas pipeline right of way. I strongly believe locating the the substation on Algoma</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP’s proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the city of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>Your residence is approximately 400 meters south of the proposed powerline. The minimum horizontal clearance requirement is 10 meters. Applicable clearance standards are prescribed under the</p>	<p>20-Jul-2022 – PUC responded as noted.</p>



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				Steel property may have repercussions in the future, say a new owner or creditor takes possession of the property. Please put this on publicly owned land so control is guaranteed.	<p>Ontario Building Code, the Ontario Electrical Safety Code and by the Canadian Standards Association. The proposed line will comply with all of these requirements.</p> <p>The proposed line is planned to cross Old Goulais Bay Road between civics 184 and 160. A map of the proposed layout can be viewed at this link: https://puctransmissionlp.com/documents/assets/uploads/files/en/property_maps_3.pdf.</p> <p>Thank you for your recommendation regarding the location of the substation. This will be taken into consideration as part of the decision-making process when assessing the options for the station location.</p>	
W21	05-Jul-22	Sherri Crosato	General Public	What are the health risks of living within close distance to 230 kV transmission lines?	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the City of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html.</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada that includes the following statement at the center-bottom of page 2: “Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELFs. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors.”</p>	21-Jul-2022 – PUC responded as noted



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
					For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com	
W22	05-Jul-22	Jacob McEachern	General Public	I was out of town during the appropriate window for open houses and emailing questions - my apologies! After reviewing the information, I am cautiously optimistic about the PUC Transmission project and what the electric arc furnaces may mean for local air quality. That said, I would like to express my preference for "any option other than route option 5". I assume, since I've provided my address, that my reasoning is clear enough. While I do appreciate the efficiency of route 3, I'd love to see a combination of route options 1 and 2, which would keep the lines further from St. Francis school. (My kid does NOT attend this school, but I still believe we should shield children from health risks, even if they are moderate risks.) Thank you for your time.	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Minor Transmission Class Environmental Assessment for PUC Transmission LP's proposed new 230 kV Transmission line and station in the city of Sault Ste. Marie.</p> <p>We have noted your preference for any route other than Route 5, and your comments have been noted and will be taken into consideration in completing this study.</p> <p>With regards to health concerns, Health Canada provides information and guidance on electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) at extremely low frequencies (ELFs) – i.e. 60 Hz. powerline frequencies – at this link; https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/everyday-things-emit-radiation/power-lines-electrical-appliances.html.</p> <p>Please see the attached information pamphlet from Health Canada which states at the bottom-center of page 2 ... "Health Canada does not consider that any precautionary measures are needed regarding daily exposures to EMFs at ELFs. There is no conclusive evidence of any harm caused by exposures at levels found in Canadian homes and schools, including those located just outside the boundaries of power line corridors".</p> <p>For up-to-date information on open houses or the status of the project, please sign up for our mailing list at www.PUCTransmissionLP.com</p>	19-Jul-22 – PUC responded as noted.
W23	13-Jul-22	John Halucha	General Public	Your latest response follows the familiar pattern of evasive and partial answers, along with avoiding questions altogether.	No response required.	N/A



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				<p>This huge transmission line will continuously feed more than twice as much electricity to Algoma Steel as is consumed from time to time by all the rest of Sault Ste Marie – homes, businesses and other industry combined. It is a long-term project that will deliver that enormous energy for many years after all of us are gone.</p> <p>If PUC planners had proper environmental awareness and concern they would have set out to find the most direct route possible as the first objective, since the longer the line is the more environmental damage it will do in multiple ways. Instead, they pounced on using a round-about route just because it had been envisaged half a century ago. They put on blinders and focused on details along that circuitous path rather than looking at the big picture. It is a classic case of failing to see the forest for the trees.</p> <p>I was assured in May that the old path was not a fait accompli and was subject to change as a result of environmental assessment but as I was told later in the same session, PUC had neither examined any other route nor would it do so.</p> <p>All attempts to convince the engineers that they must look at the biggest environmental flaw of their route – its unnecessary length – have been in vain. Their minds are closed.</p> <p>It is a shame that a few powerful people backed by an immense budget, large staff and vast resources can force such a short-sighted choice whose environmental cost will be paid by our descendants, including their own, for many generations.</p>		



ID#	DATE	NAME	STAKEHOLDER GROUP	COMMENTS FROM CALLER	COMMENTS TO CALLER	DATE RESPONDED AND BY WHO?
				Trying to participate in this flawed environmental assessment in good faith has been an exercise in futility. Any further attempt to make PUC see reason would serve only to lend legitimacy to an “environmental assessment” process that has none.		