

1 **Re: 2009 Capital Plan, p. 17 - Soot Blowing Controls - Holyrood**

2 Q. The following quote appears at Page 17 of the 2009 Capital Plan;

3

4 “In recent years Hydro has reduced the stack emissions from the Holyrood
5 facility by moving to cleaner oil, with lower sulphur content. Experience with
6 other thermal plants has indicated that utilizing more sophisticated controls
7 for the soot blowing equipment can reduce particulate emission
8 concentrations. It is anticipated that Hydro may be required to address
9 particulate emissions whether or not the Lower Churchill project is
10 sanctioned.”

11

12 a) What is the basis for NLH’s conclusion that it may be required to address
13 particulate emissions, regardless of the status of the Lower Churchill infeed?

14

15 b) Does NLH anticipate that it will become subject to a legislative
16 requirement to address these emissions within the next five (5) years, and if
17 so, why?

18

19 c) Have any reports been produced which address the public health effects
20 of these emissions?

21

22 d) If the answer to (c) is in the affirmative, please provide a copy of same.

23

24

25 A. This project has been included in the “Five Year Plan for Holyrood” section of
26 the 2009 Capital Plan tab of the 2009 Capital Budget Application to illustrate
27 the nature of work which Hydro anticipates will be required in the near future.
28 The project will be formally submitted for approval in a future Capital Budget

1 Application and will be described in detail and fully justified at that time. The
2 present sootblowing system is of the fixed sequence type which results in
3 frequent particulate emission events of high concentration. A modern control
4 system can significantly reduce the peak concentration of particulate
5 emissions during sootblowing operations and may be able to reduce
6 operating costs.