

Part A. RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

1. City of Kanata

- i) At the route stage hearing in January 1985, Ontario Hydro presented evidence on the selection of its recommended transmission line route. Alternatives to Hydro's recommendation were presented to the Joint Board by the City of Kanata and Township of Goulbourn and various groups and individuals residing in these municipalities. Reply evidence on these alternatives was also presented by Ontario Hydro. All of the alternatives traverse both the Township of Goulbourn and the City of Kanata.

- ii) After considering the evidence presented, the Joint Board in its Reasons for Decision, dated September 30, 1985, selected the route presented by the Township of Goulbourn. Ontario Hydro had indicated at the hearing that the choice between its recommended route and the

one recommended by Goulbourn was very difficult. The primary advantages of the Goulbourn route, as outlined in the Joint Board's Reasons for Decision, at page 43, were that:

- a) it has the least impact on prime agricultural lands,
- b) it parallels a portion of a CPR rail line and utilizes an existing Ontario Hydro right-of-way in Kanata which pre-dated the existing Bridlewood community. No additional land is required in the Bridlewood community as the existing right-of-way has sufficient width to accommodate the new facilities.
- c) heavy angle towers are avoided because the route is straight,
- d) vacant lands are left untouched for future development,
- e) no existing residences need be removed,
- f) no new severance is required across National Capital Commission lands.

iii) The route proposed by the City of Kanata would not be adjacent to "a planned major regional road". After numerous public meetings and reports from the Regional Planning Committee and the Transportation and Works Policy Committee, the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton approved a location for the road approximately 400 metres north of the transmission line route proposed by the City of Kanata (motion No. 265 on November 27, 1985).

iv) The transmission line route supported by Kanata would result in the further fragmentation of the community of Bridlewood in that a new severance would be required for the transmission line right-of-way.

The route approved by the Joint Board utilizes an existing Ontario Hydro right-of-way, requires no additional land and would not create a new severance. Existing secondary uses, such as the playground found on the right-of-way, can remain.

v) The transmission line route approved by the Joint Board does not require the removal of any residences whereas the Kanata alternative would require the removal of two residences on Richmond Road.

- vi) The National Capital Commission did not give its support to Kanata's alternative. In a letter to the Joint Board dated February 11, 1985, the Chairman of the National Capital Commission ("NCC") stated that the NCC has "no objection to it." The NCC has, in fact, stated a preference for using the existing severance on the route approved by the Joint Board.
- vii) Ontario Hydro gave evidence before the Joint Board that the alternative suggested by Kanata would have the greatest visual effect of the alternatives considered because:
- (a) it would visually dominate and encircle the southern end of the proposed Bridlewood expansion;
 - (b) it would require eight additional heavy angle towers which are much bulkier and more visible than the suspension towers to be used on the route approved by the Joint Board;
 - (c) visibility would be increased along existing and proposed roads leading into the nation's capital;
 - (d) a new, highly visible, severance would be created in the "Stony Swamp" conservation area.

viii) In Kanata's petition, the argument is made that use of a 230 kV easement in Goulbourn was avoided, yet the 230 kV easement in Kanata is utilized in the Joint Board's approved route.

The existing 230 kV easement was not used in Goulbourn Township because it is only 150 feet wide (as opposed to 275 feet in Bridlewood) and would have to be expanded, affecting existing or approved plans of subdivision. Because of the narrower width of the existing easement in Goulbourn, Ontario Hydro would have had to remove many existing homes in areas such as the Amberwood subdivision. This is not the case in Bridlewood.

ix) Ontario Hydro has on many occasions stated that the use of the existing 230 kV right-of-way through Bridlewood is technically acceptable. As addressed in the Environmental Assessment, one of the alternative routes (the Blue Route) incorporated this 230 kV right-of-way, but was not recommended by Ontario Hydro because of numerous problems along its length, and not because of any technical difficulties related to the portion of this route which passes through Bridlewood.

- x) Evidence was given at the hearing that 500 kV lines do not pose a health risk. (See Ontario Hydro's response to the petition of the City of Kanata Citizen's Task Force, paragraph 4).

- xi) The facilities approved by the Joint Board are two 500 kilovolt (kV) circuits. The fact that there are two circuits does not raise the voltage to 1,000,000 volts as suggested. It remains at 500 kV, which is the standard voltage for extra high voltage (EHV) transmission lines in Ontario.

- xii) Ontario Hydro submits that the Joint Board had adequate studies and information available to it, and made an appropriate decision. The Joint Board was reasonable in ruling that mutually acceptable mitigation measures be agreed to by the City of Kanata and Ontario Hydro.

Ontario Hydro recommends that the Honourable Lieutenant Governor In Council accept the Joint Board decision to use the existing 230 kV right-of-way in Bridlewood, and dismiss the Petition brought by the City of Kanata.