

My wife and I own two properties and a home roughly 3 kms. from the proposed power generating site. These properties have already been cut through by two high power transmission lines, plus a four lane 100 series highway. As such, we are less than enthusiastic about a new project that could further degrade local amenity, plus pose an increase in local nuisance or pollution to the community. I should add, however, that natural gas power generation is a significant improvement from our current coal fired power plant.

Logic would dictate that in locating such a facility, priority should be given to existing sites that already have substantial access to the electrical grid and/or pipeline network. The Northern Pulp site has a gas lateral from the M&N pipeline, although likely not adequate to the capacity of the proposed plants at Salt Springs and/or Marshdale. Nevertheless more pipeline capacity could be laid to that site on existing pipeline rights of way and preclude having to jeopardize groundwater in rural areas. Likewise an expanded gas lateral could be extended to the current Trenton generating station which, not surprisingly, has excellent access to the grid. Both sites have proven access to cooling water. Remember, too, that both sites will need to be remediated in the future, at direct, or indirect public expense, so why create one or two more additional future remediation sites at Salt Springs and Marshdale?

Nevertheless, if such a plant has to come to Salt Springs, I think a couple of principles should be adhered to:

1. The natural gas coming in from the U.S. to fuel the plants(s) could be used as a tool of political influence, or shut off altogether, in the current economic war being waged by the U.S. against Canada. As such, the added wind turbine capacity scheduled for the eastern part of the County should be used first to produce backup hydrogen for NS gas turbine plants, before any is shipped to Europe as green hydrogen. As the green hydrogen comes online, it should displace the natural gas coming in from the U.S. Hydrogen combustion for power generation will pretty well eliminate pm 2.5 particulate concerns. Any new gas powered plant should be able to run on hydrogen alone, in addition to natural gas or some mixture of the two. A longer view would be to consider modular fuel cell electrical power generation which, while it has higher purchase costs, produces power more efficiently, and has excellent noise, particulate and NOx profiles.
2. Before and after air analyses for pm 2.5 particulate matter, well water quality and flow, and sound levels (decibels) should be conducted on all dwellings within a reasonable radius of the structure, and households whose benchmarks are impaired by the operation after start up should be made whole. This may necessitate better pollution control and sound proofing of the facility and community water systems to replace damaged or depleted well supply.
3. To reduce or eliminate groundwater issues, as in # 2, a cooling pond should be built at the site whose water is treated and reused, instead of reliance on continuing groundwater extraction. No cooling water should go into the West River or any of its tributaries, as the river water temperature is already at or above critical levels for fish in some summers. The necessity of keep the cooling water in good condition for power station use will help insure the quality of the water will not be a major issue in case of pond leakage. Groundwater should only be used to top up the pond.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Williams