

Hydro One Networks Inc.

7th Floor, South Tower
483 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M5G 2P5
www.HydroOne.com

Tel: (416) 345-5393
Fax: (416) 345-6833
Joanne.Richardson@HydroOne.com

Joanne Richardson

Director – Major Projects and Partnerships
Regulatory Affairs



BY COURIER

November 25, 2015

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
Suite 2700, 2300 Yonge Street
P.O. Box 2319
Toronto, ON.
M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

EB-2007-0050 – Hydro One Networks' Section 92 Bruce to Milton Project – Hydro One's Post-Construction and Financial Monitoring Report

In accordance with the conditions of approval for the Hydro One Networks Inc. Bruce to Milton Leave to Construct application, please find Hydro One's Post Construction and Financial Monitoring Report.

An electronic copy of the complete report has been filed using the Board's Regulatory Electronic Submission System (RESS).

Yours truly,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY JOANNE RICHARDSON

Joanne Richardson

Attach.

POST CONSTRUCTION FINANCIAL REPORT
Bruce to Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project
EB-2007-0050

1.0 Introduction

Hydro One Networks Inc. ("Hydro One") was granted leave to construct facilities associated with the Bruce to Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project for the following purposes: (i) to meet the increased need for transmission capacity associated with the development of wind power in the Bruce area and; (ii) to meet the increased need for transmission capacity associated with the return to service of the refurbished nuclear units at the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station.

2.0 Background

- Hydro One filed an Application, dated March 29, 2007, and an Amended Application on November 30, 2007, with the Ontario Energy Board under section 92 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* (the 'Act'), seeking an Order of the Board granting leave to construct electricity transmission reinforcement facilities between the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station and Milton Switching Station. The Application was assigned Board File No. EB-2007-0050.
- On September 15, 2008, Hydro One was granted leave to construct electricity transmission reinforcement facilities in the municipalities of Kincardine, Brockton, Hanover, West Grey, Southgate, Wellington North, Erin, East Luther Grand Valley, East Garafraxa, Halton Hills and Milton, subject to the Conditions of Approval attached to the Order.
- On December 16, 2009, Hydro One was granted Notice of Approval to proceed with the undertaking as required by the Environmental Assessment Act.
- In April 2010, Hydro One commenced construction activities on this project.
- On January 7, 2011, Hydro One advised the Board of a change in the estimated cost of the Project to \$755M, reflecting changes in the costing methodology of AFUDC, and confirmed the expected in-service date of December 2012.
- On May 1, 2012, the new transmission line between Bruce NGS and Milton SS was substantially complete and declared ready for service. The first circuit of the new line was energized on May 7, 2012, and the second new circuit was energized on May 14, 2012.
- Removal of the temporary construction facilities, access roads and site restoration was completed in August 2013.

3.0 Constructed Facilities

The subject project scope included:

Line Work:

1. Build 3 km of new 500 kV single circuit steel transmission line from Bruce A TS to Bruce Junction adjacent to the existing transmission corridor within the Bruce Power Complex.
2. Build 3 km of new 500 kV single circuit steel transmission line from Bruce B SS to Bruce Junction adjacent to the existing transmission corridor within the Bruce Power Complex.
3. Build 174 km of new 500 kV double circuit steel transmission line adjacent to the existing transmission corridor (500 kV and/or 230 kV) between Bruce Junction in Kincardine Township to Milton SS in the town of Milton.

Station Work:

1. Milton SS Line termination and switching facilities:
 - Modified existing structures and installed new structures and station equipment to accommodate the termination of the new 500 kV circuits
 - Modifications and additions to protection and control facilities, SCADA, AC/DC station service facilities
 - Modifications to telecommunications facilities to provide status information and control capability for the new 500 kV circuits
2. Bruce A TS and Bruce B SS Line Terminations and switching facilities:
 - Modified existing structures and installed new structures and station equipment to accommodate the termination of the new 500 kV circuits
 - Modifications and additions to protection and control facilities, SCADA, AC/DC station service facilities
 - Modifications to telecommunications facilities to provide status information and control capability for the new 500 kV circuits
3. Bruce Junction:
 - Modified existing structures and installed new structures to accommodate the routing of the new 500 kV circuits

4.0 Landowner Communications and Complaints

A log of all landowner complaints was recorded during the course of construction. The log records the person making the complaint, date of complaint, the nature of the complaint and the action taken in response. The complaints log has been included as part of this report in Appendix A.

5.0 Schedule Report

	Planned In-Service		Actual Ready for Service Date /Completion
		Updated In-Service¹	
Bruce NGS x Milton SS (Line work)	December 2011		May 2012
Bruce A TS and Bruce B SS (Station work)	July 2011		May 2012
Milton SS (Station work)	June 2011		February 2012
Bruce Junction (Station work)			May 2012
TOTAL PROJECT IN-SERVICE	December 2011	December 2012	May 2012

6.0 Schedule Variance

The Transmission Reinforcement project was completed approximately 4 months later than originally planned but 7 months ahead of the revised scheduled that was confirmed with the OEB on January 27, 2010. The principal cause for the delay was that the Environment Assessment approval for the project was not obtained until December 2009, which was approximately 15 months later than anticipated. This resulted in delaying mobilization of Construction to site in April 2010, rather than the projected date of October 2008.

Hydro One was able to offset this delay by:

- Completing line work at the northwest section of the transmission line route ahead of schedule (substantially completed by late 2011). Consequently, there were temporary construction roads that could be removed through some agricultural locations in late 2011, thus minimizing impact on these agricultural operations in 2012.
- Taking advantage of the unusually favourable weather conditions that were experienced during the winter months of 2012. The entire Line Work was completed and placed in-service in May 2012. The removal of the remainder of the temporary access roads commenced in April 2012 and was completed by August 2013.

¹ Confirmed in-service date in Hydro One letter to the Board dated January 27, 2010

7.0 Cost Report

Table 1 – Total Project Costs (Lines and Stations)
(\$000s)

	Estimated Cost	Revised Cost Estimate²	Actual Costs³	Variance
Engineering and Project Management	\$ 20,900	\$ 54,305	\$ 48,768	(\$ 5,537)
Real Estate	125,000	109,563	95,827	(13,736)
Procurement	251,300	141,723	190,672	48,951
Construction	87,200	262,799	243,388	(19,411)
Commissioning	1,800	1,775	5,891	4,116
Contingencies	33,000	31,381	-	(31,381)
Sub-Total	519,200	601,546	584,546	(17,000)
Overhead	60,800	69,224	78,009	8,785
Interest (AFUDC)	55,000	84,761	47,618	(37,143)
Total	\$635,000	\$755,531	\$710,173	\$(45,358)
Percentage Variance				6.0%

Table 2 – Cost of Line Work
(\$000s)

	Estimated Costs	Revised Cost Estimate²	Actual Costs³	Variance
Engineering and Project Management	\$ 16,000	\$ 49,630	\$ 43,735	(\$ 5,895)
Real Estate	125,000	109,563	95,827	(13,736)
Procurement	218,000	117,093	165,785	48,692
Construction	76,00	252,687	222,849	(29,838)
Contingencies	28,000	29,390	-	(29,390)
Sub-Total	463,000	558,363	528,196	(30,167)
Overhead	54,000	64,104	70,696	6,591
Interest (AFUDC)	50,000	77,759	42,794	(34,965)
Total	\$567,000	\$700,225	\$641,686	\$(58,540)
Percentage Variance				8.4%

² Revised project cost estimate in Hydro One letter to the Board dated January 7, 2011.

³ Actual costs for Real Estate includes projected costs to completion for expropriated property settlements that are still outstanding

**Table 3 – Cost of Stations Work
(\$000s)**

	Estimated Costs	Revised Cost Estimate⁴	Actual Costs	Variance
Engineering and Project Management	\$ 4,900	\$ 4,675	\$ 5,033	\$ 358
Procurement	33,300	24,630	24,887	257
Construction	11,200	10,113	20,539	10,426
Commissioning	1,800	1,775	5,891	4,116
Contingencies	5,000	1,991	-	(1,991)
Sub-Total	56,200.00	43,184	56,350	13,166
Overhead	6,800	5,120	7,313	2,193
Interest (AFUDC)	5,000	7,002	4,824	(2,178)
Total	\$68,000	\$55,305	\$68,486	\$13,181
Percentage Variance				23.8%

⁴ Revised project cost estimate in Hydro One letter to the Board dated January 7, 2011

8.0 Cost Variance

The Bruce to Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project was granted leave to construct based on a project estimated cost of \$635 M, with a revised projected cost estimate of \$755 M. Actual costs were \$710.2 M (variance of -6%).

Cost variance on Line work (decrease of \$58.5M or 8.4%) is attributable to:

- The cost for the Real Estate associated with the Lines work (easements and compensation) includes the projected costs to completion for expropriated property settlements that are still outstanding – 7 remaining properties require finalizing settlements. The real estate total costs are projected to be significantly less than originally anticipated (approx. \$13.7M less).
- Engineering and Project Management costs were lower than forecast (approx. \$5.9M). The extended stakeholder consultations during construction were not required and the provision for a project management services contractor to complete the Environmental Assessment approval process which was also not required.
- The Construction portion of the costs estimate included the permanent tower foundation materials and other civil materials associated with site preparation and temporary access road construction (aggregate, geotextile fabric, culverts). These materials were available for less than estimated (total of approximately \$53M) and were reported under the procurement portion of the actual costs rather than the construction portion. This resulted in a reduction to construction costs (approx. \$53M) and an increase to procurement costs (approx. \$53M). This increase in procurement costs were offset by the sale of the conductor stringing equipment for more than originally planned resulting in a net increase in procurement costs of approximately \$48.7M.
- Increase to construction costs (approx. \$11M) due to standby charges and other charges for the line contractor. These charges were associated with receiving the Environment Assessment approval for the project approximately 15 months later than anticipated.
- Line clearing and civil construction costs were higher than estimated (approx. \$12M) due to factors such as the extended land acquisition process, landowner consultations and right-of-way restoration costs above what was anticipated.
- Contingency budget of (\$29.4M) would be reflected, as required, in the items addressed previously.
- AFUDC reflect the interest savings resulting from lower projects costs and the earlier in-service date.

Cost variance on Station work (increase of \$13.2M or 23.8%) is attributable to:

- Work items at Bruce A TS that were not identified in the forecast but identified when construction crews mobilized to the site, such as protection and control upgrades, installation of cyber security in relay buildings, replacement of circuit disconnect switches, HydroVac equipment costs (required to work safely within the energized station) (\$6.9M)
- Work items at Bruce B SS that were not identified in the forecast but identified when construction crews mobilized to the site, such as protection and control upgrades, installation of cyber security in relay buildings, HydroVac equipment costs (required to work safely within

the energized station), relocation of the permanent access road to the Bruce Heavy Water plant and also the relocation of the main drainage ditch (\$6.5M)

- Required work for expansion of Bruce Junction to incorporate the new transmission circuits and protection and control modifications at Claireville TS that was not provided for in the estimate. Bruce Junction was expanded to receive the new circuit coming from Bruce B (B561M), this included area expansion, new foundations, support steel, insulators, re-alignment of existing circuit B569B, bus work, grounding and removals (\$5.3M)
- The contingencies for work at Milton SS (\$1.6M) were not required as there was no unanticipated costs for this portion of the stations work

9.0 Environmental monitoring

Prior to construction of the project during the Environmental Assessment Approval process, an Environmental Study Report (ESR) was prepared and was approved by the Ministry of the Environment. Section 5 of the ESR documented predicted effects of construction and the mitigation measures taken to prevent or reduce negative long term effects.

The effects and mitigation information as well as all other approval commitments were consolidated into a site-specific environmental specification to ensure that all conditions and commitments were met during the construction and post-construction phases of the Project. An environmental monitoring program was in place to ensure all commitments and mitigation measures were followed and that any effects and the effectiveness of mitigation were documented.

Observed effects were as predicted and mitigation measures were effective in preventing or reducing long term effects. Restoration of the right of way was completed in consultation with landowners and stakeholders and it addressed any outstanding concerns.

The Complaints Log which documented all complaints related to construction is found in Appendix A.

	Signature	Name	Title	Date
Prepared by:				
Submitted by:	ORIGINAL SIGNED BY ANTHONY PELLECCCHIA	Anthony Pellecchia	Manager, Project Management	November 25, 2015
Approved by:	ORIGINAL SIGNED BY CHRIS COOPER	Chris Cooper	Director, Project Delivery	November 25, 2015

Bruce TS x Milton SS (IP# 13090)
Install New 500K.V. Double Circuit Transmission Line
COMPLAINTS LOG

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
1	12-Nov-09	EG19	Yes	Employees of Hydro One mistakenly trespassed on a landowners property.	Letter of apology sent to the property owner dated Nov 16/09 from Hydro One Sr. Vice President	16-Nov-09
2	10-Feb-10	SG35	Yes	In December 2008, the property owner was notified about the activity regarding the re-tensioning of the existing lines, but discovered later that Hydro One crews entered onto his land with vehicles and the owner was never informed of this. The vehicles used have created ruts along the existing corridor. The Owner has stated that someone at Hydro One told him they would be back in the spring to repair the damage, however the owner has not heard from Hydro One and nothing has been done. Moving forward with the new project, the owner is concerned that Hydro One will do what they please and will not communicate or compensate the property owner as indicated from the beginning.	A Hydro One Agent talked to the owner and there is no other action that needs to be undertaken. The owner simply asks that they be notified of the date Hydro One will enter the owners lands for any purpose with respect to the Bruce to Milton project in the future. Hydro One will ensure that the owner is notified before entry to the property.	22-Feb-10
3	18-Mar-10	SG11-12	Yes	Owner indicated that access points were staked in locations inconsistent with those previously agreed upon on April 21, 2009. He wanted to re-confirm the access points.	Hydro One Senior Foreman removed the stakes and placed them in the locations that had been previously agreed upon.	18-Mar-10
4	19-Apr-10	WG 62	Yes	The property owner said a Hydro One crew was on his and neighbours property Monday April 19 without his knowledge/permission	Hydro One agent explained that the land was used historically and that it was used this time due to a misunderstanding relating to the new notification agreements in place. Agent assured caller it would not be used again.	10-May-10
5	07-Jun-10	B-06	Yes	A gate that had been cut into an electric fence was not installed properly allowing cattle to escape.	Hydro One Agent notified the responsible Hydro One Sr Foreman and he had an employee check the situation. The fence was insulated properly by Tuesday morning.	8-Jun-10
6	21-Jun-10	WG-59	Yes	An owner complained that trees he thought were going to be relocated were cut.	Hydro One agent explained to the property owner that the maintenance work was necessary and did not have to do with the Bruce x Milton project	21-Jun-10
7	22-Jun-10	WG-34	Yes	A Hydro One lock and tag was installed on the owners private gate without permission from the owner. Driveway was also used without owners permission	Hydro One removed the lock and followed up with the Hydro One crew responsible to review the access protocol. Owner was advised of the findings.	23-Jun-10

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
8	23-Jun-10	WG-16	Yes	The property owner said that his laneway was rutted by Hydro One crews. Also, he mentioned that there was some rutting in the field and tiles were damaged.	Hydro One supervisor confirmed that the rutting was done by the forestry brushing crew. Supervisor advised the property owner we would have road crews working in the area shortly and we would repair the damage. Also, supervisor is going to meet him on Friday June 25th, 2010 to review the layout and access. (Update Sept 30, 2010) Hydro One supervisor expressed his opinion that he did not think Hydro One created the driveway damage. Supervisor also indicated his opinion that the water back-up along the laneway was due to the wet season but the owner did not accept this. Supervisor said we would blade the laneway if it dried enough to do so.	6/23/2010 Update - Sept 30, 2010
9	21-Jul-10	B-13	Yes	The owner said his friend had a deer stand on the affected property and it is now missing	After investigation, Hydro One supervisor determined Hydro One was not responsible for removing the deer stand. Owner was informed that Hydro One is not taking responsibility for the deer stand.	22-Jul-10
10	23-Jul-10	WG-49	Yes	Owners gate was left open.	Hydro One supervisor informed him that the gate will be kept closed at all times	23-Jul-10
11	27-Jul-10	N/A	No	Owner is concerned that the new tower line will spoil the view from his retirement home. The owner is also concerned about the use of helicopters due to noise. He is worried that construction activities would be taking place during a wedding he is planning on having on his property. He has indicated he would like Hydro One to respond to what might be available to him in regard to screening of the line.	July 27th, 2010 - Hydro One agent told him at the present time we could not do anything in his area since we are waiting for the NEC hearings to end. He said he would like to hear from someone soon or he would be taking his concerns to a higher level. Aug 5th, 2010 - Hydro One landscape specialist and property agent met with the owner to discuss his issues. While he complained about the helicopter noise during line maintenance program, it is recognized that it will take place from time to time but that it is a non-issue and no more was said. He is quite concerned that he is located at the crossover and that he will have to look at the heavier angle towers from his active backyard area. While he is an unaffected owner, he only wants the towers to be hidden. Hydro One will investigate request further and develop a solution Update: In early 2012, a Hydro One landscape specialist met with this owner and developed a landscape plan to mitigate the visual issues. The owner elected to take an equivalent cash settlement that was drawn up by a Hydro One land agent, and undertook mitigation measures on his own.	July 27, 2010 & Aug 5, 2010 & early 2012
12	3-Aug-10	EG-08	Yes	A Hydro One agent left voice mail with landowner that bore holing operations will be taking place this day on the lands near tower 530. Crew entered the lands in the PM same day. Landowner approached the Hydro One agent and the crew and ordered them off the land. Landowner believed that he were to receive 2 weeks notice prior to entry for any operations.	On site investigation revealed that some mustard crops were damaged accidentally during access. Hydro One Property Agent will work out a damage claim for this.	Sept 15th, 200.

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
13	16-Aug-10	B-44	Yes	Hydro One Supervisor received a call from the owner telling him that his discbine had been damaged by a culvert on a Hydro One access road.	Hydro One supervisor instructed the owner to get an estimate to repair the damage and Hydro One would continue necessary investigations and offer damage claims as deemed appropriate.	16-Aug-10
14	19-Aug-10	WG	Yes	Owner had a spare parts tractor parked for several years on Hydro One existing ROW (with verbal permission from Hydro One) which expired on Friday Aug 13th. The owner believes it was a Hydro One crew that removed the tractor. The owner has made a voluntary land settlement for the new corridor land with a closing date of Nov. 1, 2010 and has granted access to the land.	Hydro One supervisor contacted the owner by email and arranged a follow up meeting. The owner was offered a settlement price.	August 20th, 2010
15	25-Aug-10	SG-16	Yes	Owner called regarding commitments to have trees removed from his property by the clearing contractor. The timeline originally provided by the clearing contractor on Aug 3rd had not been met. The owner required it cleared so he can gain access to his hardwood bush.	Clearing contractor foreman met Hydro One agent on the property the morning of Thursday Aug 26, 2010. An area along the edge of the corn was cleaned out to provide the owner access to his hardwood bush. The owner was satisfied with the mitigation.	August 26th, 2010,
16	7-Sep-10	B-59	Yes	The owner approached the brush contractor and inquired about what was being done with the wood that was being cut. The property owner did not want any wood to leave the property.	Hydro One supervisor contacted the individual and told him it was the contractor's wood to dispose of as they wished since the owner had been compensated already for the wood. Supervisor told the contractor to continue cutting the wood and we would resolve the issues with the owners counsel as required. Supervisor told counsel that we would be carrying on with the cutting of the brush and that nothing would be removed until this issue was resolved. As the wood belonged to the clearing contractor, the issue was resolved between the clearing contractor and the property owner (details are between the contractor and property owner)	Original - Sept. 7th, 2010 - Update - Oct 1, 2010
17	06-Oct-10	NA	No	Resident has been upset with truck traffic near her property.	Hydro One supervisor contacted resident and answered her questions and will attempt to mitigate some of the issues where possible.	6-Oct-10
18	13-Oct-10	NA	No	Residents are complaining about noise and dust from truck traffic on Southgate Road 39. Asked how long the trucks will need to use Southgate Road 39.	Hydro One supervisor contacted Southgate officials on separate occasions to discuss the project and issues. It was mutually agreed upon that most of the dust was a result of Highway 6 construction activities	13-Oct-10
19	20-Oct-10	SG-32	Yes	Owner informed Hydro One property agent that someone has zigzagged through his field and damaged his crop. He was very upset because he did not receive prior notice and wants to talk to someone regarding the damage. Also the owner mentioned that while trying to combine the downed corn he thinks his combine picked up a stone that went through his cutter head damaging 6+/- teeth that had to be replaced. Although he did not say he was positive that the stone was picked up here he does not know of where else it might have happened.	Hydro One supervisor talked to owner who was not upset because he had already been contacted by a Hydro One property agent and was satisfied that he would be paid for the crop damages. It still is unknown who damaged the crops. Hydro One will review and compensate for his time to repair and costs of replacement parts for his cutter head.	22-Oct-10

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
20	08-Nov-2010	WG- 44-45	Yes	Owner was upset because Hydro One crews left gates to his property open and ATVs and other vehicles were using the roads.	Hydro One Foreman was told to ensure all gates were closed at the end of the day	8-Nov-10
21	08 Nov 2010	WG-49	Yes	Gate was left open and owners cattle escaped. An hour was spent rounding them up. Owner is a practicing vet who lost an hour of appointment time	Hydro One crews helped round up the cattle and ensured gate was closed. Consideration of compensating the owner for lost appointment time is being given.	8-Nov-10
22	10-Nov-2010	WG58-59	Yes	Owner was upset that soil rig testers were on his property without prior notice as outlined in the real estate agreement. Also the owner believed other parts of the agreement were not being reached and would like to discuss.	Hydro One agent and foreman apologized and are to meet with the owner to discuss his issues	10-Nov-10
23	18-Nov-10	SG-44	Yes	Owner was not happy about the appraisal process and does not feel like the Hydro One real estate agents assigned to her are qualified to answer her inquiries. Also, she is upset because a letter she sent to Hydro One has gone unanswered.	The real estate agents directed unanswered inquiries regarding the construction process to Hydro One's construction contact. The letter sent by the owner may not have been received by Hydro One at the time of the complaint.	18-Nov-10
24	23-Nov-2010	WG44-45	Yes	Owner was upset that a Tower had 2 legs placed on his land. He has stated that he was promised the tower would be entirely on his neighbours lands. He would like to be compensated for this.	A Hydro One agent had met with the owner to discuss the location of the towers prior to installation. At no time did he commit the tower legs would not fall on his land and the owner was told that it is standard practice for tower legs to straddle fence lines to prevent agricultural land from being taken out of production	23-Nov-10
25	25 Nov- 2010	WN-03	Yes	The owner approached a Hydro One road crew and informed them they were trespassing as they were building road on the owners property. The crew left immediately.	A Hydro One agent contacted the owner to discuss the issue. He was told all discussions on the matter were to be done through his counsel. The Hydro One crews trespassed based on a misinterpretation of the ROW plan for the property, believing the entire tower fell on a property with rights acquired adjacent to the complainant.	25-Nov-10
26	11-Dec-2010	WG 20	Yes	Owner was concerned about her gates not being closed and the potential snowmobiling traffic.	Hydro One agent reminded crews to keep gates closed. Also that NO TRESPASSING signs would be installed at all gate entrances.	11-Dec-10
27	9 Dec- 2010	SG 22	Yes	Owner was upset that Hydro One augering machine was walked across his wheat fields.	Hydro One agent sent a letter to the owner apologizing and stating that any damage claims would be settled that were caused by the incident. Hydro One crews were reminded to keep travel on the gravel access roads.	9-Dec-10
28	11 Feb - 2011	B 38	Yes	Owners son called a Hydro One property agent to say his mothers basement was backing up with water, which was likely due to a damaged drain from Hydro One construction activities.	A Hydro One senior foreman called and arranged a site meeting on February 15, 2011 to discuss solutions.	15-Feb-11

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
29	10-Mar-2011	SG 65	Yes	Owner showed up at a Hydro One yard with questions. The site foreman directed him to a property agent on site. The owner was concerned with the span of the towers and was under the impression a tower would be located on his property. The owner has not signed a buyout and figured he would be holding up construction. He also thought tower 403 was too close to the drainage ditch. Owner eventually threatened Hydro One and said he will try to hold up construction.	The agent told the owner that Hydro One engineering has approved the design and is within span limitations. Also Hydro One environmental has approved the drainage and concerns would have to be taken up with the municipality. The agent took the owners threat as secondary and will be contacting the owner the following week. Resolution is ongoing.	10-Mar-11
30	12-Apr-2011		Yes	Owner called a Hydro One agent upset because their neighbour was taking wood off of the ROW on the neighbour's property. The owner was upset they did not receive the wood from the ROW on their property.	The Hydro One agent contacted the neighbour who was reportedly removing wood from the ROW. This neighbour told the Hydro One agent that the wood had been purchased from the clearing contractor. The Hydro One agent informed this individual that only qualified contractors may remove the wood from the ROW. The clearing contractor was also told they were not to allow unqualified contractors to enter the ROW to haul wood. The Hydro One agent informed the owner making the complaint that they had been compensated for the wood and it belonged to the clearing contractor. The agent apologized for the manner in which the wood was removed.	13-Apr-11
31	29-Apr-2011	B10	Yes	Owner complained to a Hydro One agent about the flooding occurring around the tower on his property, worried that it would kill his alfalfa and wood lot.	Hydro One scheduled to clean the culverts and if necessary have more installed.	29-Apr-11
32	29-Apr-2011	B38	Yes	Owner called and complained to a Hydro One agent that the snow clearing operations had spread stones over his crops, also indicated that the drain at the front of the farm was still not working.	The Hydro One agent ensured the owner the stones would be removed ASAP. The agent told the owner Hydro One would put on record that he still believes the drain is damaged.	29-Apr-11
33	3-May-2011	B09	Yes	Owner wanted the damage to his electric fence during snow removal repaired. Owner said he was willing to do the work himself but would likely charge +/- 200\$ for his time.	Hydro One agent responded and told him he would give the owner an answer today on whether to proceed.	3-May-11
34	5-May-2011	SG04	Yes	Owner called to say the repair to the damage on his rail fence from the clearing contractor was not satisfactory. The owner was concerned his cattle would escape	Hydro One agent informed the Hydro One senior foreman in charge who addressed the necessary fence repairs.	3-May-11
35	9-May-11	SG 11&12	Yes	Owner was upset that Hydro One personnel entered his property without the agreed upon day notice in advance. Was also concerned about the garbage being left behind on his property by crews. Two holes were also left open which were a major safety concern. The owner also wanted branches that need to be trimmed to be cut flush with the tree.	The Hydro One agent informed the senior foreman responsible who ensured these issues were all resolved.	9-May-11
36	17-May-11	SG22	Yes	The tree planting contractor did not notify the property owner that they would be onsite and planted the trees in the wrong location and wrong spacing.	The tree planting contractor returned and fixed the spacing and location of the trees as per the property owners request. Hydro One environmental specialist to call the tree planting contractor and find out why the owner was not notified.	May 2011
37	17-May-11	WG61	Yes	Tree planting contractor did not notify property owner when they would be on site and planted the trees in the wrong location	The property owner accepted the location of the trees as it was close to the preferred location. Hydro One environmental specialist to call the tree planting contractor and find out why the owner was not notified.	17-May-11

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
38	17-May-11	WG58 & WG59	Yes	Tree contractor did not notify the property owner of when they would be on site. The contractor planted trees in wrong location and left debris behind. Property owner indicated that the contractor was not following OSHA safety rules.	Hydro One environmental specialist to call the tree planting contractor and find out why the owner was not notified. property owner did NOT sign off on the work	
39	18-May-11	E09	Yes	A breach of a sediment fence caused sediment to deposit into a creek and trout pond.	Hydro One site visit determined the cause and took action to repair sediment control. An environmental specialist was on-site to monitor the work to ensure no sediment entered creek.	19-May-11
40	1-Jun-11	SG05	Yes	Owner complained that water was backing up on his property and was concerned it would kill his woodlot. The clearing contractor caused rutting which may have caused natural drainage of the property to fail.	Hydro One senior foreman had the drainage issue fixed.	7-Jun-11
41	20-Jun-11	N/A	No	A member of the Inverhuron Ratepayers Association was unhappy with the communication efforts to notify residents of implosive connector use.	Hydro One notified the member that Emergency services had been notified of the implosive connector use, as well flyers were delivered to residents within close proximity to the line. An additional 100 flyers were given to the member to distribute where necessary, as well as another 100 flyers to be distributed to campers at Inverhuron Park.	21-Jun-11
42	5-Jul-11	N/A	No	Owner complained about weeds growing on the existing corridor adjacent to his wheat field. Owner was told not to crop this portion during the project. Owner would like to have area sprayed and be compensated for it.	Owner was told to proceed with spraying and would be compensated at a fair rate.	15-Jul-11
43	13-Jul-11	HH-19	Yes	Owners cattle escaped to his neighbours field after his gate was left open presumably by project personnel.	A new padlock was installed on the gate and the owner would be compensated for any lingering crop damage. Crews were also reminded to lock gates at all times.	13-Jul-11
44	26-Jul-11	N/A	Yes	Owners gate was found bent badly toward the road.	Hydro One construction contact told the owner that crews would attempt to fix or replace the gate.	26-Jul-11
45	12-Aug-11	WG22	Yes	Vehicle traffic causing excessive dust while travelling across her property.	While investigating it was found that the tenant on the property to the east (twr 235) was combining grain and using the road for access. Spoke to the tenant and told him not to use our construction road since he had his own access.	16-Aug-11
46	17-Aug-11	Twr 164	Yes	Stones pushed onto field by Valard during snow plowing at tower 164.	The landowner/tenant farmer of this property was forced to clean up the stones that had been pushed onto the cultivated land so that he may plant alfalfa yesterday. A request was made to Valard twice to clean up these stones well in advance. Valard was reminded by Hydro One to be diligent in addressing these concerns in a timely manner.	24-Aug-11
47	4-Sep-11	B61	Yes	Valard forces were delivering travelers to the towers and had a tractor and trailer off the gravel road and got the trailer jackknifed and a lot of rutting occurred while trying to remove it.	All rutted areas were repaired	6-Sep-11

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
48	11-Sep-11	SG21	No	<p>Hydro One received a call from property owner with a complaint about Valard's operation around tower 302 & 303.</p> <p>When the owner returned home from taking animals to market, found Valard's assembly crew working in their area.</p> <p>They found a crane walking up their concession road unescorted and with no flagman. Due to the blind hills in the area he thought this was very unsafe. When they had an opportunity to get by and pull into their driveway they noticed the operator was talking on a cell phone. An unpleasant interaction then ensued between the employee and the owners.</p> <p>Owners made claims of severe safety infractions, called Valard, Hydro One and MOL.</p>	<p>A thorough investigation would take place and Hydro One would make sure the owner received a copy of the report. Valard is responsible for their own safety plan but that Hydro One would request a full report.</p> <p>Report Received. Valard employee was let go.</p>	9/29/2011
49	18-Nov-11	N/A	No	The owner has a centre for horse riding lessons. She needs to know the minute a blast for the explosions will take place as it is spooking the horses and a rider could get hurt	Valard will contact owner about timing of implosions. Stringing will be complete out to twr 292 by mid-December	18-Nov-11
50	20-Nov-11	N/A	No	The owner called the Hydro One construction contact, and was quite concerned about damage to her home since the implosives shook the windows. The owner lives a minimum of 5 kilometers from where the implosives were used yesterday.	The Hydro One construction contact reassured her that there would be no damage to her home but if she noticed anything to take pictures and let Hydro One know. The owner requested to be notified before each implosive blast, and this request was given to Valard in order to have their foreman call the owner before each blast takes place.	21-Nov-11
51	23-Nov-11	N/A	No	Owners wrote a letter to Hydro One stating that they feel they were not properly informed about the project and would like some more information. They indicated they bought their property 13 years ago to escape hectic city life and recently they are unhappy with the loud noises (presumably from implosions) and other interruptions. They are also unhappy with the towers in their horizon view. They would like to have a discussion with someone from Hydro One on their issues.	Hydro One called the owners to follow up on their letter and they were provided information regarding the schedule of construction activities in their area.	23-Nov-11
52	24-Nov-11	N/A	No	Owner is hearing explosions and would like to know if they are coming closer to her house so she can prepare her dogs.	Valard project manager contacted owner, it was discovered that she did not receive a notice as she lives on Normandy Rd, which is quite a distance from the line. The Valard project manager explained the implosions would be periodic for a while and she was satisfied with that (she was just wondering what the noise was from). Hydro One will expand the notification radius for future stringing sections.	24-Nov-11

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
53	25-Nov-11	N/A	No	Customer is concerned that the implosions occurring near her house are causing a lot of rattling and shakes her windows. She has gas insulated e-windows and doesn't want these implosions to brake a seal.	Hydro One construction contact visited the Owner and discussed that the concern had been recorded, and that if damage was found the home owner should take pictures and information in order to make a claim.	25-Nov-11
54	25-Nov-11	SG11-SG12	Yes	Owner phoned to raise a concern about Valard's safety policies. Owner stated that a Valard truck stopped on the road in front of his house to deliver rider poles. They put their outriggers out and unloaded poles while occupying the whole road. He indicated that there were no signs in place and no flagmen. Owner said he is quite concerned about the blind hill in this area.	Hydro One discussed concerns with Owner. Situation was reviewed with Valard and they indicated that their procedure is to follow MTO Book 7. In this situation it is mobile operation, very short duration work TL-7, where you need a 360 beacon and four way flashers. They stated they also had cones out around the outriggers and the whole road was not blocked allowing vehicles to pass and that one of the crew members did direct a vehicle around the truck.	27-Nov-11
55	29-Nov-11	SG31	Yes	Valard is off loading insulators and pulleys on Owner's freshly seeded hay field and the equipment is causing minor rutting and damage to his field.	A Hydro One land agent called Owner and asked him to advise the on site workers to consider not rutting the field so much. The Hydro One land agent later visited the Owner again and it was discussed that compensation would be evaluated for Hay losses in the spring.	29-Nov-11
56	6-Dec-11	N/A	Yes	Bruce Power passed along a public complaint about the implosions. They are worried about their good relationship with the community and have asked us to issue a notice.	Hydro One stations construction crew embarked on their implosion program (approx 100 in total) inside the Bruce B Switchyard over 2 weeks ago. Hydro One understands that they will be continuing daily up until Christmas. Notice letters were delivered to surrounding community.	14-Dec-11
57	17-Jan-12	B39	Yes	Owner called Hydro One land agent believing an old 4 inch clay tile may have been crushed. A large pool of water has formed in this area. He stated there was once an old pond there that had been drained with a tile. Tile heading in a northerly direction from the current wet/pooled water area.	It is possible the tile could have been crushed by Valard's anchor locations. At this time there is a lot of ice and snow in the area but the anchor locations will be located in the future to determine if there was tile damage. If tiles were damaged they will be repaired/replaced during restoration when the temporary access roads are removed.	17-Jan-12
58	18-Jan-12	ELGV05	Yes	Owner noticed that they have experienced a decrease in milk production from their goat herd since Valard's crews have been assembling and erecting the towers in the vicinity of the barn.	The owner's assertions about decreased milk production and its attribution to the project would have to be proven as a business loss in the expropriation process. Milk production loss will be forthcoming as this will be part of the expropriation issues requiring evidence of loss from the landowner. Consequent decision to be determined via the expropriation hearing board.	18-Jan-12
59	23-Jan-12	Individual who resides not far from puller site at Twr 391/392	No	Individual called Hydro One construction contact in the evening to explain that she was awakened by a loud bang at 1:00am yesterday morning and thought it may have been implosions.	The individual did receive the construction notice that was distributed in her area. The Hydro One construction contact assured her that the contractor would not be working at such a late hour and after further investigation it appears the loud bang may have been a thunderclap. The Hydro One construction contact met with the individual to explain the findings and she thanked him for taking the time to respond to her concerns.	24-Jan-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
60	27-Jan-12	SG05	Yes	The owner phoned Hydro One construction contact and complained that he was not happy with the cleanup of the cutting that was done on his property. The area is now very wet and he is concerned that some areas of his bush are being flooded and killing trees. The Hydro One construction contact told him that the civil crews would make sure it was draining when the temporary access road is removed. The owner indicated that he thinks he wants the road left in.	The Hydro One construction contact followed up with the owner to determine the action to be taken at the time of fencing installation in the area.	31-Jan-12
61	9-Feb-12	N/A	No	Individual residing in Grand Valley called the community line to ask how long the "loud blasting" is going to last as it is upsetting the animals.	Hydro One construction contact called the individual in the afternoon to listen to his concerns and notified him that the implosions would be intermittent over the next several weeks. He was not upset but his main issue was his dogs were getting stressed. Hydro One construction contact left him a contact number so that he could call for an update in a few weeks and the individual was satisfied with that.	9-Feb-12
62	17-Feb-12	ELGV14	Yes	On Feb. 7, Hydro One construction contact received a message from the owner complaining about the implosion activity near the owner's farm. The construction contact tried several times to reach the owners but no one would answer. A message was left telling them the use of implosions would be continuing for another week or so and to please call back. On Feb. 17 the owners were covered in a Toronto Sun article regarding their issues with Hydro One and their property negotiations.	Hydro One land agent to contact the owners prior to next round of implosions during outage work at Colbeck Jct from March 6-15, 2012. Hydro One land agent will inquire if there is anywhere they can move their cattle to lessen the impact of the implosions and also if they are interested in staying in a motel while they are occurring. Valard will blow the loops for the towers at distant location and then transport to the site in order to reduce the noise impact. Also, Valard will call the owners prior to setting off the implosives.	22-Feb-12
63	16-Feb-12	SG41	Yes	On Feb. 16th while a Hydro One environmental employee was investigating some additional cutting required in the area of tower 353 -354, he was approached by a resident near the line. The individual was complaining about a lot of things but primarily the use of implosions and his lack of notification. He indicated he has horses pasturing near the line.	No evidence of horses pasturing near the line has ever been found near the line. Implosions were used in this area in early Jan. and the horses were corralled close to the barn. All fences have been secured at all times. The individual was notified by flyer on Dec. 21st, in advance of the imply use.	16-Feb-12
64	18-Feb-12	EG07	Yes	The Hydro One construction contact for the area received a call from a property owner located on Belwood Road near the tensioner site at 523 – 524. He is upset that the Valard crew is still letting off implosions at approximately 10 minutes to six that evening. The notices that were delivered indicated they would occur between 8 am and 5 pm.	Valard is using all daylight hours to meet the schedule and thus may need to use implosions after 5pm as the days get longer. Future notices delivered will indicate stringing activities will take place during daylight hours.	20-Feb-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
65	23-Feb-12	N/A	No	<p>Hydro One received a call from a very upset individual. She lives in Erin, very close to the area that we are doing implosive work. She has a large light bulb outside on her shed, and came home to find it shattered.</p> <p>She has come to the conclusion that the bulb is broken because of the implosive work. She needs to have this bulb because it's very dark where she lives, but doesn't want to pay for a new bulb every day of implosions as they are going to continue breaking. She also mentioned that she feels like an earthquake is happening every time an implosive goes off, and her whole house shakes.</p> <p>She has the receipt for the bulb (\$20) and wants to know what we are going to do for her.</p> <p>It was suggested that that the bulb could have broke for any number of reasons, but she was not interested in hearing this, insisting the implosions cause the bulb to break.</p>	<p>A Hydro One construction contact met with the individual and showed the ortho photo showing the location of their property in relation to the implosion sites. It was agreed that the association between the implosion occurrences and the light fixture damage was impossible especially since the first incident happened almost 3 weeks ago, well before Valard moved into the area. Individual indicated that they have been having some electrical supply problems of late and wondered if it had anything to do with Hydro One work on the new R.O.W. The Hydro One construction contact assured the individual that it did not.</p>	28-Feb-12
66	24-Feb-12	N/A	Yes	<p>An NEC compliance officer was recently assigned a complaint file specific to tree clearing, the location being directly N/W of 22nd Sideroad in Halton Hills (tower #666). A neighbouring property owner had complained to the NEC that Hydro One has not complied with the conditions of the development permit with the NEC. The NEC compliance officer emailed Hydro One environmental specialist to request a site meeting for the area of towers 666-659 to review the matter.</p>	<p>The Hydro One environmental specialist notes that there was limited cutting in the area referenced. The Hydro One environmental specialist met with the NEC compliance officer on-site to discuss. There was no further escalation.</p>	8-Mar-12
67	14-Mar-12	B10	Yes	<p>A Hydro One construction contact received a call from an upset owner complaining about water back up in his woodlot area due to a blocked culvert. This is crossing SR22 on the ROW development plans.</p> <p>Owner would like a culvert left in when we remove the road in this location. For some of this area to the west of tower 129 grubbing has been requested.</p> <p>Owner is also concerned that when we clear the blockage in the culvert there might be a large flow downstream into his bush.</p>	<p>It appears the culvert was installed originally and was fine but when the foundation crew was installing footings for Twrs. 126 through 128 the road pushed out with the load of the concrete trucks and river rock was added to stabilize the road. It appears the rock has eventually pushed out and blocked the ends of the culvert again. The Hydro One construction contact told the owner that when the crew clears the blockage in the culver they would be releasing the back water as slow as permissible.</p> <p>A civil crew cleaned out the culvert the morning of March 15 and the water was running smoothly. It will be checked again on Monday Mar. 19th to ensure the area is drying up.</p>	15-Mar-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
68	11-Mar-12	SG11,SG12	Yes	The Hydro One construction contact received a call from the property owner complaining that the rider pole holes that were backfilled in the winter had opened up and a large hole had been created due to the settlement and/or settlement of the backfill material. He indicated he thought this created a safety hazard to the public. He indicated he had also phoned the Twp. of Southgate to lodge a complaint.	The Hydro One construction contact phoned the Valard project manager immediately and let him know about the call. Valard was aware that some settlement was being detected in the rider pole holes and that Valard would be starting an inspection as early as Mar. 13 to address the holes that appeared to have excessive caving and fixing them immediately. The Hydro One construction contact phoned the property owner back and gave him this information. The Valard project manager confirmed that the holes at this location have been cleaned up (10:45 A.M. March 13, 2012)	13-Mar-12
69	19-Mar-12	HH 19	Yes	Owner emailed Hydro One to request again that Valard crews keep the gates shut. She just witnessed 3 dirt bikers who ripped through their fields and came almost up to her house before they saw her and turned around. She indicated that Valard crews were on her property picking up timbers and did not shut the gate. She will not be filing damage claims but would just like the gates left closed.	Valard was reminded to ensure all gates are closed after accessing a property. The Hydro One construction contact for the area visited the property owner to apologize for the gates being left open.	19-Mar-12
70	22-Mar-12	N/A	No	Hydro One received a call from the owner today about the helicopters. He mentioned that his horses were spooked by the flying, and he is hoping to receive advanced notice of the helicopter and implosive work in the vicinity of his area, so he can bring his horses in. He also mentioned that his neighbour has an Angus beef farm and his cows are in the process of giving birth. He is thinking it's a good idea to give him a heads up. He also suggested that the helicopters make turns east instead of west, if possible.	Turning east will not be possible due to the proximity of the existing transmission line. The Hydro One construction contact met with the individual who called and explained the necessity of the flight path. He also explained that it would be several days before helicopter operation resumed and that only two towers remained where a similar flight path would need to be used. Hydro One will notify the individual the day before it happens so they can confine the horse to the paddock near the barn. The Hydro One construction contact also mentioned that the implosive use would commence as early as tomorrow. They were not overly concerned about this and thanked the Hydro One contact for spending time to explain everything. The Hydro One construction contact also met with the neighbouring beef farmer who is an affected landowner (10293 4th Line, Halton Hills). The beef farmer indicated he has no concerns at all because the calves have been born healthy already, and that the helicopter operation did not affect them. Also, he did not deem it necessary to be notified about the implosion activity.	23-Mar-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
71	5-Apr-12	SG41	Yes (tenant)	<p>Hydro One Forestry manager spoke to this complainant (tenant on the property) at around 11.30 am in the morning. The tenant says he has a long term lease for horse pasture rental on the property. The tenant said around 2 weeks ago, a tree clearing crew entered the property without notifying him (so he can make arrangements for his horses) and took down a fence to access the trees. He said he spoke to them at the time and told them to put the fence back up when they were done.</p> <p>When he went back recently he found one of his horses (legs) wrapped up in the wire pile. He mentioned that the horse is worth more than a house.</p> <p>The tenant's complaints mainly focused on the following: Lots of tripping hazards, wire, sharp stumps, etc. , dangerous for his horses, fence not put back up correctly.</p>	<p>The Hydro One construction contact and land agent met with the tenant to review his claim.</p> <p>The tenant was not happy with the repairs to the fence. It is not known which tree clearing contractor did the repairs to the fence. The tenant did some repairs to the fence on the weekend that the Hydro One land agent is compensating the tenant for.</p> <p>The tenant was also upset about the height of the stumps that were left. It was explained that this was the normal height that the stumps are left. Over the weekend the tenant used his backhoe to remove a lot of the stumps that he said were dangerous because his horses might lay on them.</p> <p>The Hydro One construction contact will determine if there was a request for grubbing at this property.</p> <p>The Hydro One construction contact told the tenant to contact his landlord if he had a complaint since all communications in regard to this property would be through the landlord. The tenant was also given the Hydro One construction contact's phone number in case he had future concerns that he felt needed to be addressed.</p> <p>The Hydro One land agent paid the tenant for his work on fencing and stump removal and when they left the tenant had accepted their proposal for future communications.</p>	10-Apr-12
72	17-Apr-12	N/A	No	<p>The Hydro One construction contact received a call from an individual and she explained when the ice melted on their small pond this year they noticed a die off of their Koi fish. They were dying in batches and now all the frogs are also dead. She suggested the implosions might have caused a concussion type effect on the iced over pond. She said they have had these fish for years and that there were several different year groups of young. The Hydro One construction contact asked her if they kept any for testing. She said her husband froze the last 2 frogs they found.</p>	<p>A representative from the Hydro One environmental group called and explained to the individual that unless there is some validated evidence that the implosives caused the death of her fish, we can't proceed with a damage claim. She seemed ok with this.</p>	24-Apr-12
73	2-May-12	SG12	Yes	<p>A Hydro One construction contact received a call from an owner and his lawyer complaining about the noise from the new line. Owner said he could not sleep last night. B561M was energized on the new towers for the first time yesterday. The owner indicated that they were woken up at approx. 7:00 am by a rumbling sound with hissing in the background. It stopped abruptly at 8:15. He said that it seemed unusual since the conditions were clear at the time. He said that they have learned to live with the noise on the existing line during wet atmospheric conditions but found this to be highly unusual.</p>	<p>A Hydro One construction contact called the owner and assured him that arrangements are being made to investigate. The damp weather and thunderstorms that occurred in the area during this time period tend to increase the noise emanating from transmission lines. Investigation and subsequent monitoring revealed nothing out of the ordinary.</p>	

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
74	4-May-12	SG04	Yes	<p>The Hydro One construction contact spoke to the owner who explained that there was a heavy humming noise that appeared to be emanating from Twr 291. He says it started Wednesday night and lasted all day yesterday until approximately 7:00 pm. Right now it is quiet again. The owner says it's driving his cattle in the barn crazy and has had to turn up the volume on the radio to settle them down. He also indicated that at 11:00 pm last night he noticed a distinct "burning smell" in the air similar to an electrical fire. The owner mentioned that he will call the Hydro One construction again immediately when the noise reoccurs.</p> <p>UPDATE: May 7, 2012 - The owner phoned at night around 8:10 pm and said the line was making a lot of noise again. The Hydro One construction contact explained that it was probably the extra moisture in the air (rain) and that the noise should gradually decrease as the contaminants were gradually burned off the new conductor. The owner was not upset or concerned but was just reporting the fact that it was noisy again.</p>	<p>Hydro One engineers calculated the audible noise effects of the right-of-way with the new transmission line in-service, and the calculated noise levels were deemed to be within acceptable levels. The most likely explanation for the noise is the result of some minor contaminants being burned off of the newly energized conductor.</p> <p>No further noise complaints were received from this owner after the last one listed.</p>	June 2012
75	4-Jun-12	SG04	Yes	<p>UPDATE: June 4, 2012 - The owner phoned at 7:45 A.M. complaining that excessive noise was coming from the new line at around 7 am on June 3, 2012. It was causing his cattle to act strangely. He said it was a strange humming noise not the normal sizzling that occurs during damp weather. He said when he was in the barn working in the loft it even caused him to develop a head ache. He mentioned he is used to the existing lines and this is a completely different noise.</p>		

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
76	13-Jan-12	SG04	Yes	The Hydro One construction contact received a call from the property owner. The owner was concerned when he saw some mortar chunks from his chimney lying on his garage roof. He is concerned that they were loosened with the blasting of the implosions. The Hydro One construction contact told him that it would be recorded and investigated further at a later date. It was also explained that it might be as a result of the freezing and thawing taking place during this crazy winter. The owner agreed and said he would keep an eye on it.	The Hydro One construction contact told him that there may be the need to get an inspector in the spring to do an inspection. No further actions required at this time but follow up would be required in the spring. UPDATE: May 8, 2012 The owner phoned and informed Hydro One construction contact that he had a contractor in to give him a quote on a new roof and the contractor also inspected the chimney. The contractor told him it was definitely something that should be fixed and the contractor quoted him a cost of \$600.00 to fix it while he was doing the roof. The owner was told to get a written quote from the contractor with a description of the damages and asked him to have the contractor to take some picture of the damage while he was up there. It is believed the mortar has been loosened. UPDATE: May 11, 2012 It was determined that the implosive use may have hastened the dislodgement of chunks that were already loose, but these pieces likely would have fallen out anyway during the next winter with the freeze/thaw cycles. Hydro One land agent to contact owner and offer to cover a portion of the repair cost quoted by the contractor.	11-May-12
77	8-May-12	B03	Yes	The Hydro One construction contact received a call from the property owner raising a concern that a neighbour to the south of the corridor had noticed a water backup in a previously tiled area. He thinks a tile has been damaged. He wanted to send a contractor in to dig it up. At the time, Hydro One had crews in the area starting to remove roads and pads and the owner was asked to hold off until road removal had been completed. The Hydro One construction contact told him that if Hydro One had done damage during construction we would inspect it and repair it. The Hydro One construction contact met the owner to get a better understanding of the problem. It is understood that a 6" tile drain had been installed across the ROW in the area of tower 108 draining water from Lot 9, Con.15. The owner was also told that the Hydro One land agent would be in touch with him in regard to renewing a lease for the ORC lands on Lots 9 & 10 Con.16 since he is the tenant on the property abutting the ORC lands. The owner said he had never had a lease in place in previous years and was just keeping the weeds down.	Hydro One civil construction will do an inspection at a later date when they are removing roads and pads in the area to see if there has been a tile damaged as per their normal restoration procedure. The Hydro One land agent will follow up regarding a lease for the ORC lands.	8-May-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
78	18-Apr-12	E1	Yes	High winds on Monday, April 16, 2012 blew over a number of trees in the property owner's woodlot. The owners are concerned that they have now lost any remaining screening of the R.O.W. from their backyard. They are of the opinion that this damage was exacerbated by the removal of the woodlot on the R.O.W. They have requested that some replacement trees be planted along the rear edge of their lawn to restore the screening that they have lost.	A Hydro One environmental specialist met with the owners on May 11, 2012 to look at the windthrow damage on their property. It is estimated that 100 cedar trees on their property off the ROW have fallen. The area is wet and trees are shallow rooted so it is likely more trees will fall in the future. UPDATE: May 25, 2012: Hydro One environmental specialist spoke to the owner and explained that the possibility of planting a screen for them with a tree spade on tracks may be a solution to the soft ground conditions on the east side of their pond. The owner thought that the area is too wet to plant, but did not dismiss the idea. The Hydro One environmental specialist told her that other than compensation for the wood value of the trees (a few hundred dollars) and planting another screen there is no way of mitigating the loss of the tree buffer. Hydro One land use agent would contact her regarding compensation.	25-May-12
79	24-May-12	E43	Yes	The property owner called Hydro One construction contact and also Hydro One environmental specialist to complain. Trees Ontario planted 7 maple saplings in April and the owner is complaining that 5 of the 7 died and it is believed that these are on their front lawn. The owner was complaining about the quality of the trees etc. etc. The Hydro One environmental specialist told her that Hydro One would replace the trees next year, but the owner was not pleased. The Hydro One environmental contact then told her that he would contact Trees Ontario and get back to the owner next week.	The Hydro One environmental specialist believes it may be better to pay the owner a damage claim to replace the trees themselves than to have Trees Ontario go out to assess and replant with the possibility of another failure. The owner mentioned that they had better trees in their back property than the ones Trees Ontario provided. They could do the planting themselves or get nursery stock and plant. Hydro One environmental specialist suggests compensation of \$200/tree, Hydro One land agent to contact the owner and make a deal for them to select trees and have replaced.	31-May-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
80	23-May-12	B61	Yes	<p>On May 23rd around 9:00 AM the supplier of the portable toilets went to the access point at tower 193 to service and move a toilet that was placed there 1 week prior. This was the regular driver who had been replaced the previous week by an alternate because he was on vacation. The alternate did not reinstall the double lock correctly and the property owner could not access his property when he returned later that day after dark.</p> <p>The driver contacted a Hydro One sub-foreman for assistance because Hydro One had been locked out by the owner who had installed a thick logging chain and lock. When the sub-foreman arrived he phoned the Hydro One construction contact and told him about the situation. The sub-foreman mentioned that he could see the owner on an adjacent hill installing fences. The Hydro One construction contact asked the sub-foreman to go and see if the owner would remove the lock.</p> <p>When asked the owner cursed a bit and told the sub-foreman he was locked out for 2 weeks and he was going to lock Hydro One out for 2 weeks. The Hydro One construction contact then told the sub-foreman he would come back and deal with the situation and the sub-foreman told the driver to leave and pick up the portable toilet the next week.</p>	<p>The Hydro One construction contact arrived around 10:00 AM and again approached the owner and asked him to remove the lock. He received the same response as before and the owner said he was annoyed and did not like being locked out of his own property and that he would take it off in 2 weeks.</p> <p>The construction contact tried to reason with the owner and the owner admitted it had only been for a couple days. The owner was told that the driver would be returning this Wednesday in the morning to service the toilet and the owner said that he would remove the lock by then.</p> <p>On the morning of May 29, the Hydro One construction contact saw the owner at the end of his driveway and since it was noticed that the lock and chain were still in the same place, the owner was asked if he would remove it by Wednesday morning. The owner became belligerent again and said he would take it off in the afternoon.</p> <p>The owner was told that this is not satisfactory since our service truck would be there in the early morning.</p> <p>The owner was told again that the portable toilet supplier would be entering early the next morning to service and remove the toilet, and then the Hydro One construction contact ended the conversation and left.</p>	30-May-12
81	25-Jun-12	HH-20 & tenant on HH-21	Yes	<p>On Monday June 25, the farmer was cutting hay on property HH-21 when at approximately 5 pm around a ½" x 6' sling became entangled in his New Holland model 1465 mower conditioner as he was making his first pass around the edge of the field near Twr 695 and adjacent to No. 10 Sideroad. He was unable to continue and took the equipment to his home farm for repair.</p>	<p>The Hydro One construction contact met with the farmer at approximately 7:30 am on Tuesday June 26 and inspected the damage as well as the location of the occurrence. It was determined that the sling had been left there from the rider pole installation on the north side of No. 10 Sideroad by Valard's crew. The damage consists of 3 broken guards and 4 broken knives in the sickle bar cutter portion as well as some damage to the rubber crimping roller caused by one of the knives being embedded into it. The farmer indicated that he spent approximately 2 hours on repairs. He had the parts in stock. The damage to the roller does not appear to be very significant and will not affect the operation of the equipment.</p> <p>The Hydro One construction contact advised the farmer that he would forward a report to the Hydro One land agent and that the Hydro One land agent would be contacting him to settle the damage claim.</p>	26-Jun-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
82	22-Aug-12	WG20	Yes	The property owner has complained that he can not cut the grass in the area where a small grove of pines were cut down between his pond and his house. The property owner indicated he would like to see the stumps cut lower so he can use his lawn mower in the area to get the area back to lawn and keep the weeds cut down.	Hydro One civil construction crews still need to return to the Lipskie property to lower 2 gates. Reseeding might also be required. A stump grinder will be needed to remove the stumps.	22-Aug-12
83	22-Aug-12	SG09	Yes	The property owner phoned complaining that he could not cut the grass in the area behind his new house due to the weeds and suckers growing in the areas where the trees had been cut down.	This will be another location where a stump grinder would be the best way to remove the stumps. This is not going to be cultivated I do not think grubbing would be required.	22-Aug-12
84	11-Sep-12	WG58 & WG59	Yes	The property owner noticed signs indicating that his property was sprayed with herbicides.	The Hydro One construction contact went and talked to the property owner and the owner pointed out where he found the signs. The location was confirmed to be on the road allowance. The owner was assured that the spraying was accidental and that no more spray would be used in the area of his farm. The owner seemed to accept that it was accidental and it is not expected that the issue will go any further. The owner was told that in a few days he would be able to see where the spray had been applied.	11-Sep-12
85	13-Sep-12	SG17 - Tower 331	yes	<p>(April 3, 2012) The owner showed Hydro One an area of water lying beside the pad and he said a tile must have been damaged. It appears to be right on the line of the anchor slug marks. He was not requesting immediate repair since the damage (drowning) of the wheat had already happened.</p> <p>(April 11, 2012) Hydro One told him that we do not as a rule find tiles crushed under the access road but that if he felt there was a concern after the road was removed Hydro One would investigate.</p> <p>(Sept 13, 2012) The owner still has no relief from the water. Hydro One informed the owner that the tile will be investigated once the road is removed. However the owner fears it will not be removed in 2012. The owner wants to fix the problem before the water freezes in the winter. As a result he might call in a contractor.</p>	The investigation showed that it appears there was no tile hit with hold downs. Hydro One believes the water was being held back by the pad. Once the pad has been removed, Hydro One expects the owner will have his tile plans available and confirmation can be provided via cross reference with Hydro One GPS co-ordinates.	13-Sep-12

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
86	21-Nov-12	WG44 & WG45	Yes	<p>The owner stated that he and his son had been on site on Nov. 9th and dug test holes on either side of the removed access road area and on the access road and measured the depth of the top soil at these locations. They also took some pictures of their investigation. It is their belief that top soil was removed when the access road was removed.</p> <p>When Hydro One met the owner in the field to discuss his top soil issue he also expressed his concern in regards to the mounding of the spoil under the towers. He also did not believe there was enough top soil on the spoil and it was just going to create a weed problem.</p>	<p>It's been explained to the owner that what the owner is seeing was the result of compaction and that his pictures were taken before our crews had an opportunity to use the trim dozer to dress the area where the road was. The area on either side of the road had no compaction and appears to be higher. Hydro One along with the owner will monitor the situation and if there is a visible depression it can be addressed in a damage claim.</p> <p>In regard to the mounding, Hydro One explained originally to Mr. Weller that we would be using some of the spoil to create mounds under the towers and he did not bring this to our attention until after all the road had been removed and dozers had back bladed the area.</p> <p>There are 3 towers the owner is concerned about. He says he cannot access under them to keep the grass and weeds cut. These towers are 253, 255 & 256. Hydro One informed him he might have to move it himself but that he may be compensated by a damage claim if it was approved.</p>	21-Nov-12
87	27-Nov-12	SG18	Yes	The property owner was requesting that a strip of roadway that runs through her property be removed. The road was put in as a temporary access road for tower installation.	Hydro One addressed the situation and has given the property owner a tour of the clean up work that was completed the week of Nov 19, 2012.	3-Dec-12
88	12-Mar-13	SG05	Yes	<p>The owner complained he is not happy with the clean up of the area on his property. The bush that was removed from inside the new ROW was not cleaned up properly and it is a mess. The area is not draining properly and the tile installed is not draining the water.</p> <p>He also has a concern regarding the windfall trees and bush falling down because of the removal of the bush inside the new ROW area</p>	Issues has been addressed and resolved with the landowner	19-Mar-13
89	18-Jun-13	WG44 & WG45	Yes	The owner cleaned up a full pail of fence clippings this spring in the pasture area where the fence was installed last winter. The owner was quite upset and said this could have caused damage to his equipment or caused problems for his tenant's cattle if they had ingested any of it. Hydro One senior foreman mentioned to the owner that it should have been cleaned up and that he would bring it to the crew's attention.	Hydro One senior foreman reminded sub-foreman that crews need to take the time to ensure there is no wire clippings or garbage left behind when they leave any of the work sites. The sub-foreman discussed with the crew members.	19-Jun-13
90	25-Jul-13	E43	Yes	The property owners are not satisfied with the Hydro One construction contact and the Hydro One policy regarding the grubbing process.	Hydro One land agent and construction contact discussed the events to date and prepared a stump pile compensation document that was sent to the land owner for review and acceptance.	25-Jul-13

Complaint Details					Action Taken	
No.	Date	Property #	Affected Owner (Yes/No)	Nature of Complaint	Resolution	Date:
91	16-Oct-13	N/A	No	While the charges were going off, heard a "terrible blast" and the entire house shook - called immediately. Says name was "not on list" for blasting, but was notified from then on in. Says she KNOWS it has damaged her chimneys. Bricks have now fallen down, this last spring/summer bricks to furnace fell down. States cannot turn furnace on at this point due to this damage.	The Hydro One land agent met with the owner and explained that Hydro One has looked into this matter and after review it has been determined that the implosions could not have any effect on the chimneys. The owner was not impressed with the Hydro One determination. At the conclusion of the conversation, she accepted the answer and stated that she will be putting in propane heat in her home.	17-Oct-13
92	28-Oct-13	K08	Yes	The property owner complained that a drainage problem as a result of a damaged culvert has caused his lands to be unworkable.	The Hydro One land agent spoke with landowner by phone – acquired info – created action plan, will acquire a contractor with backhoe to dig out damaged part of culvert in creek bed and replace section of crushed culvert. This claim is a result of the BXM line – dozer or loaded highway trailer slipped off the roadway and crushed the culvert. Repairs have been completed to the crushed culvert. The water is flowing freely now and the landowner is satisfied.	21-Nov-13
93	6-May-14	B39	Yes	Owner forwarded a picture of a large pond on his sister's field. Owner mentioned that the pond is now about 1/2 acre in size and is located next to where the construction access road was located and near where the helicopter landing area was that was used by Valard construction. She claimed that the weight of all the gravel and vehicles is the cause of the ponding, and that before the access road was installed that there was never any water there.	Hydro One has asked the owner to contact a tile drainage company to explore possible broken or damaged tile and to replace it if there is any damaged tile. Hydro One will have a monitor on site during the work. Hydro One will reimburse the owner for the cost of the work if there is damaged tile present that requires replacement and the damaged tile is attributed to construction activities. Hydro One staff provided the owner with GPS coordinates of anchor locations for stringing pad in the area to assist the tile drainage contractor. The owner has not contacted Hydro One with estimates or arrangements for the tile contractor to investigate the issue as described above.	26-May-14