NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1	Reau	est IR-7:
2	21040	
3	Prean	nble:
4	1 Tour	
5	With	regards to Grand Riverkeeper Labrador information request # 3 (a) (b) (c) and
6	(d) we asked: With regards to Emera's statement that it will be able to retire one or two	
7	coal fired generating plants, please advise: (a) exactly which plants will be retired? (b) what	
8	criteria would determine whether it is one or two plants that might be retired? (c) what is	
9	the output of each of the two plants proposed to be retired? (d) what is the current GHG	
10	releases of each of these plants?	
11		
12	The r	esponse in M-19 is as follows:
13		
14	(a)	Currently it is expected that Lingan units 1 and 2 would be the units that would
15	, ,	retire.
16		
17	(b)	The main criteria to be used would be to deliver the best value to the Nova Scotia
18	` ,	customer. Underlying this would be the condition of the asset, need for investment,
19		value as backup capacity, and planning reserve.
20		
21	(c)	The two Lingan units are 150MW units.
22	,	
23	(d)	The amount of GHG/s released by each unit is dependent on the utilization. In a
24	` ,	base load year, the units can emit approximately 1 mega tonne of CO2 each.
25		
26	We a	re confused by the Proponents answers! It appears that the Proponent and the
27		rnment Officials who are conducting the "Energy Show" touting the merits of the
28		ime Link throughout Nova Scotia are not on the same page with regards to shutting
29		these plants. i.e. in a visit to Nova Scotia earlier this month I attended one of these
30	Energ	gy Shows in Amherst, NS and asked the Government Officials exactly this same

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

question to which they replied.... (paraphrased) That no coal fired units would actually be

1

2 shut down, that they would simply not be used as much, therefore saving on Greenhouse 3 Gas emissions, i.e. they would be kept running in case of need but at a lesser output. 4 5 I'm sorry I do not remember the names of the officials who presented at that meeting off hand however that should be fairly easy to determine by contacting the NS Government, 6 7 Nevertheless, we have these questions again for the Proponents: 8 9 1. Do you actually plan to shut down coal fired plants for certain? 10 11 Response IR-7: 12 13 Yes. The use of coal-fired generation units will reduce over time due to the hard CO2 caps in 14 place in Nova Scotia. The Maritime Link project provides both firm capacity as well as 15 renewable energy. The capacity that comes as part of the project will allow for one Lingan unit 16 to retire. The exact dates on which coal units will retire is a decision that will be made in the 17 future in the best interest of NS Power customers.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1	Requ	est IR-8:
2		
3	Prean	nble:
4		
5	With	regards to Grand Riverkeeper Labrador information request # 3 (a) (b) (c) and
6	(d) w	re asked: With regards to Emera's statement that it will be able to retire one or two
7	coal fired generating plants, please advise: (a) exactly which plants will be retired? (b) what	
8	criteria would determine whether it is one or two plants that might be retired? (c) what is	
9	the or	atput of each of the two plants proposed to be retired? (d) what is the current GHG
10	releas	ses of each of these plants?
11		
12	The r	esponse in M-19 is as follows:
13		
14	(a)	Currently it is expected that Lingan units 1 and 2 would be the units that would
15		retire.
16		
17	(b)	The main criteria to be used would be to deliver the best value to the Nova Scotia
18		customer. Underlying this would be the condition of the asset, need for investment,
19		value as backup capacity, and planning reserve.
20		
21	(c)	The two Lingan units are 150MW units.
22		
23	(d)	The amount of GHG/s released by each unit is dependent on the utilization. In a
24		base load year, the units can emit approximately 1 mega tonne of CO2 each.
25		
26	We a	re confused by the Proponents answers! It appears that the Proponent and the
27	Gove	rnment Officials who are conducting the "Energy Show" touting the merits of the
28	Marit	ime Link throughout Nova Scotia are not on the same page with regards to shutting
29	down	these plants. i.e. in a visit to Nova Scotia earlier this month I attended one of these
30	Energ	gy Shows in Amherst, NS and asked the Government Officials exactly this same

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 question to which they replied.... (paraphrased) That no coal fired units would actually be 2 shut down, that they would simply not be used as much, therefore saving on Greenhouse 3 Gas emissions, i.e. they would be kept running in case of need but at a lesser output. 4 5 I'm sorry I do not remember the names of the officials who presented at that meeting off hand however that should be fairly easy to determine by contacting the NS Government, 6 7 Nevertheless, we have these questions again for the Proponents: 8 9 1. Will the two Lingan units mentioned in your response to IR-3 likely be the ones to 10 shut down as you say? 11 12 Response IR-8: 13 14 Please refer to GRK IR-007.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1	Requ	est IR-9:
2		
3	Prean	nble:
4		
5	With	regards to Grand Riverkeeper Labrador information request # 3 (a) (b) (c) and
6	(d) w	re asked: With regards to Emera's statement that it will be able to retire one or two
7	coal fired generating plants, please advise: (a) exactly which plants will be retired? (b) what	
8	criteria would determine whether it is one or two plants that might be retired? (c) what is	
9	the or	atput of each of the two plants proposed to be retired? (d) what is the current GHG
10	releas	ses of each of these plants?
11		
12	The r	esponse in M-19 is as follows:
13		
14	(a)	Currently it is expected that Lingan units 1 and 2 would be the units that would
15		retire.
16		
17	(b)	The main criteria to be used would be to deliver the best value to the Nova Scotia
18		customer. Underlying this would be the condition of the asset, need for investment,
19		value as backup capacity, and planning reserve.
20		
21	(c)	The two Lingan units are 150MW units.
22		
23	(d)	The amount of GHG/s released by each unit is dependent on the utilization. In a
24		base load year, the units can emit approximately 1 mega tonne of CO2 each.
25		
26	We a	re confused by the Proponents answers! It appears that the Proponent and the
27	Gove	rnment Officials who are conducting the "Energy Show" touting the merits of the
28	Marit	time Link throughout Nova Scotia are not on the same page with regards to shutting
29	down	these plants. i.e. in a visit to Nova Scotia earlier this month I attended one of these
30	Energ	gy Shows in Amherst, NS and asked the Government Officials exactly this same

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1	question to which they replied (paraphrased) That no coal fired units would actually be	
2	shut down, that they would simply not be used as much, therefore saving on Greenhouse	
3	Gas emissions, i.e. they would be kept running in case of need but at a lesser output.	
4		
5	I'm sorry I do not remember the names of the officials who presented at that meeting off	
6	hand however that should be fairly easy to determine by contacting the NS Government,	
7	Nevertheless, we have these questions again for the Proponents:	
8		
9	1. Can you explain why 3 government officials on the Energy Circuit for the Maritime	
10	Link in Nova Scotia are making different statements with regards to shutting down	
11	coal fired plants?	
12		
13	Response IR-9:	
14		
15	NS Power is responsible for the decisions regarding which units would retire and when, in order	
16	to meet legislation and regulations. The statements as described above are not inconsistent, as	
17	NS Power has also indicated that these coal plants would be used as back-up until they are no	
18	longer needed. It is the objective of NS Power and Emera to use the Maritime Link to enable the	
19	retirement of coal plants.	

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1	Request IR-10:	
2		
3	Pream	able:
4		
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	With regards to Grand Riverkeeper Labrador information request # 3 (a) (b) (c) and (d) we asked: With regards to Emera's statement that it will be able to retire one or two coal fired generating plants, please advise: (a) exactly which plants will be retired? (b) what criteria would determine whether it is one or two plants that might be retired? (c) what is the output of each of the two plants proposed to be retired? (d) what is the current GHG releases of each of these plants?	
12	The response in M-19 is as follows:	
13		
14	(a)	Currently it is expected that Lingan units 1 and 2 would be the units that would
15		retire.
16		
17	(b)	The main criteria to be used would be to deliver the best value to the Nova Scotia
18		customer. Underlying this would be the condition of the asset, need for investment,
19		value as backup capacity, and planning reserve.
20		
21	(c)	The two Lingan units are 150MW units.
22		
23	(d)	The amount of GHG/s released by each unit is dependent on the utilization. In a
24		base load year, the units can emit approximately 1 mega tonne of CO2 each.
25		
26	We an	re confused by the Proponents answers! It appears that the Proponent and the
27	Government Officials who are conducting the "Energy Show" touting the merits of the	
28	Maritime Link throughout Nova Scotia are not on the same page with regards to shutting	
29	down	these plants. i.e. in a visit to Nova Scotia earlier this month I attended one of these
30	Energ	y Shows in Amherst, NS and asked the Government Officials exactly this same
31	questi	on to which they replied (paraphrased) That no coal fired units would actually be

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1	shut down, that they would simply not be used as much, therefore saving on Greenhouse	
2	Gas emissions, i.e. they would be kept running in case of need but at a lesser output.	
3		
4	I'm sorry I do not remember the names of the officials who presented at that meeting off	
5	hand however that should be fairly easy to determine by contacting the NS Government,	
6	Nevertheless, we have these questions again for the Proponents:	
7		
8	1. What would be the difference in GHG emissions IF, as the Government officials say,	
9	those plants are not shut down, but remain on standby, i.e. minimal operation?	
10		
11	Response IR-10:	
12		
13	Please refer to NSUARB IR-66. The Province of Nova Scotia has established hard caps on GHG	
14	emissions. NS Power will comply with the regulations in force which will include reductions in	
15	emissions from all base load or stand-by units.	