

REES' Pieces

Is perception more important?

A basic simple question — is perception more important? For my thoughts, see farther down this column.

Before we deal with perception, let's have a look at the anger from taxpayers and how fashionable is it becoming in Canada, especially Nova Scotia.

Taxpayers, started to revolt with the election of Justin Trudeau, then BREXIT; in November Donald Trump was elected. Canada is fascinated with Trudeau, UK can't believe it, and USA still hasn't figured out what hit them. Trump will do exactly what he said he would do.

Many taxpayers, particularly those near the bottom, feel so alienated, if a politician captures their imagination, that politician will likely win. Canada is not as militant as other countries, but the litmus test is yet to come. Were the three instances referenced above a "one hit wonder", or is this becoming a regular occurrence in democracies.

Federally, Kevin O'Leary is the 14th candidate in the Conservative Party leadership race. He's cut from cloth similar to Donald Trump. Will the leadership race become more "Trumpish"? Are there enough Conservative Party members who feel alienated that he has a chance?

In Nova Scotia we have our own unique situation. Premier McNeil has maintained he will not sign something Nova Scotia can afford. So far he has driven a hard bargain and had success with Doctors Nova Scotia. By no means is he out of the woods, he still has nurses, the NSGEU and teachers.

Recently, the 3rd agreement was reached with the NSTU negotiating team. The two previous ones were rejected by members. Initially there was hope disruption might be coming to an end. "Work to Rule" was called off and now it back on as of January 30th.

Media reports are abundant membership is not happy and will reject the deal. If that happens, the union leadership and its bargaining team are in trouble. Already there's a petition calling for resignations. Public opinion has certainly pushed the pendulum in support of the government. McNeil can do what he wants, if that happens.

Results of the February 8th teachers vote could create some interesting political and not-so political sidebars.

Now back to my opening question. Is perception more important? Sometimes, I wonder if there is a sincere interest to re-develop the rural economy including the remote areas of Colchester. As reported here last month, Colchester has a Regional Economic Network in its formative stages. Here's why I wonder if there's a serious effort or it's just wordsmithing.

Just before Christmas, as three monthly newspapers which service certain portions of the rural areas had gone to press the newly announced Colchester REN issued an call for nominations which closed early in January prior to those publications being able to report nominations were expected.

With each of those publications having good market penetration, and are looked upon as "the local media", it should be prudent to ensure every part of the county had equal opportunity to be represented and taxpayers had the opportunity to read the good news in their local paper.

Definitely, the populated areas have more people, generate more taxes, have more votes, etc, but without the rural communities, who go to town to shop and other services, where would the downtown businesses be without them?

Since the REN is to be business driven, let's hope there's an equal balance with representatives who might not live on a paved road, or have water and sewer connections. There are many successful and astute thinkers in the rural areas. They probably don't belong to a business organization, like a merchants association or a chamber, not only, because one doesn't exist there, but maybe they are too busy being successful.

Not that I am complaining, but just issuing an advisory to those in charge. The constituency is volatile. Not only do you need to do what is right, but you have to transmit the perception to them it's correct, fair and they have to believe it. I'll leave it up to others to decide if the REN's current motivators are serious about the whole county and if they have established the perception "they are".

My worry is they are more concerned about areas with water and sewer lines.

Maurice

Some More Facts About Tidal Power

By Dr Graham R. Daborn

The campaign of misinformation about the tidal power testing in Minas Passage continues, it seems. In science, it is perfectly acceptable that scientists may hold different views, especially where knowledge is incomplete. However, there is no excuse for ignoring established facts. In Dr. Michael Dadswell's opinion piece in the December issue of the South Cumberland News, there are at least five completely misleading statements that need to be recognised as false or baseless.

Dr. Dadswell implies that there was a connection between the failure of the turbine installed at FORCE in 2009 and observations of "two humpback whales suddenly showed up on Minas Basin beaches with large gashes in their bodies". The facts are: the turbine was installed in Minas Passage on 12 November 2009; the blades failed and it stopped operating at approximately 5:30 pm on 4 December 2009 — i.e. less than four weeks later. A single male fin whale (not two humpbacks) was observed floating ventral side up in Minas Basin on 4 June 2010 — six months after the turbine stopped operating. When first seen, the animal had no cuts on its body, nor on 8 June when it was beached and photographed near Tennycape. Subsequently, a Marine Animal Response Society (MARS) team examined it, found two cuts on the body, and concluded that they had to have been caused post mortem. (Details can be found at: [Facebook.com/marineanimalresponsesociety/posts](https://www.facebook.com/marineanimalresponsesociety/posts)). The connection between this

animal and the failed turbine is clearly not based on any facts.

Dr. Dadswell states that a Clean Current tidal turbine tested at the Race Rocks in British Columbia "...was suddenly removed. Rumour among turbine engineers is that it murdered a killer whale". This is a complete fabrication. When the turbine was removed after its test period it was completely intact, although covered by seaweeds and other fouling organisms (see accompanying photo). Clearly, this device did not kill an orca (killer whale).

Dr. Dadswell also claims that: "Recently the deployment of OPEN (sic) turbines in Puget Sound was stopped because of concerns for killer whales". It is true that the resident orca population in Puget Sound had been a major concern for federal and Washington State regulators. Considerable research was carried out by scientists at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and Washington State University to assess the risk to whales. It was concluded that, even if an orca made contact with moving blades, there was little likelihood of lethal harm to the animal. (See Annex IV: State of the Science Report 2016 - available at: [tethys.pnnl.gov/publications/state-of-the-science-2016](https://www.tethys.pnnl.gov/publications/state-of-the-science-2016)), and the project was approved by the US Federal Government. The project was actually terminated, however, because the public utility sponsoring it, Snohomish PUD, was unable to acquire sufficient funding, not because of the perceived threats to orcas, in spite of the Orca Conservancy's claim.

Dr. Dadswell claims that the

Cape Sharp turbine will be "doubly dangerous" by comparison with the Annapolis turbine, which we know causes significant fish mortality. The Cape Sharp (OpenHydro) and Annapolis "Straflo" turbines do have some similarities, but the context in which they operate is entirely different. At Annapolis the turbine is installed in a dam which forces most of the water — and its contained fish — to pass through the turbine. (There are two fishways, but these are placed in positions that the majority of fish do not appear to find and use). In going through the turbine fish must negotiate a rapidly spinning device (50 rpm), a pressure drop of almost 2 atmospheres, and strong shear and turbulence forces in water flowing at more than 10 metres per second. At the Cape Sharp site 99.9% of the water flowing in the Passage will not be going through the turbine. Those fish that end up in the 0.1% of water that will drive the turbine must deal with water flows of 3 to 4 metres per second, a turbine rotating at 6 to 8 rpm, and a pressure drop of about 3%. The risk to fish is not zero, but obviously very much less than at Annapolis, even if the fish are unable to avoid going through the turbine.

According to Dr. Dadswell's article, "Cape Sharp can keep putting in 2-megawatt turbines for years without triggering an assessment". This too is false. The permission to deploy is limited in time and contingent upon acceptable environmental effects monitoring programme (EEMP). Amendments to the originally-proposed EEMP have been required by

the Nova Scotia Department of Environment as one of the conditions, and it is understood that Cape Sharp can be required to remove the turbines at any time that an unacceptable result occurs. That represents a continuous assessment.

There are enough concerns to be dealt with regarding tidal power development in the Bay of Fundy. Misleading statements do not serve the public interest well.

Dr. Graham R. Daborn is Emeritus Professor, Acadia Centre for Estuarine Research/Acadia Tidal Energy Institute, Acadia University, Wolfville

The
Shoreline
Journal

Here's where
to find us:

BASS RIVER:

Bayside Pharmacy
Dominion Chair Factory Store

BIBLE HILL:

C.W. Fraser Pharmacy
MacQuarries Pharmacy

DEBERT:

Barnhill's Superette
Debert Mini-Mart

FIVE ISLANDS:

Masstown Market Five Islands

GLENHOLME:

Double "C" Truckstop
Glenholme General Store

GREAT VILLAGE:

Wilson's Gas

MAITLAND:

Frieze & Roy General Store

MASSTOWN:

Masstown Market
MTM Retail Gas (Petro-Can)

NORTH RIVER:

Grant's Grocery

ONSLow:

Onslow Market

PARRSBORO:

CrossRoads Co-op
Ken's Grocery
Wright's Pharmasave

TRURO:

Atlantic Superstore
MacQuarrie's Pharmasave
(Esplanade)

We are interested in placing the Shoreline Journal in additional locations.

If you have a suggestion, or wish to have the Shoreline Journal available from your store, please contact:

*Maurice Rees, Publisher
902-647-2968,
or E-MAIL:*

maurice@theshorelinejournal.com

Colchester, Truro to Hold Joint Meeting

By Maurice Rees

Colchester and Truro councils will hold a joint meeting at 7 pm on February 15th with two items on the agenda: discussion on progress being made by the joint events attractions committee and the joint flood study.

At Colchester council's meeting on January 26th councillor Stewart, who heads the Palliser property re-development committee said the final report from the consultants had been received. When the plan will be further unveiled to the public and what the committee is planning to implement the plan was not disclosed.

Councillor Lloyd Gibbs advised council about a "Thank you Retailer" contest which could provide \$15,000 in prize money to repair the 4-H barn at NSPE. Story printed elsewhere in this issue.

Council's delegation to the FCM conference in Ottawa will include councillors MacInnes, Boutilier and Cooper in addition to Mayor Blair; Deputy

Mayor Masters and CAO, Rob Simonds. Councillor Taggart will also attend as he is on the FCM Board of Directors.

Councillor MacKenzie asked council to consider revisiting paving of Hillridge, Hillvale and MacCallum Drive and to add Runway Court to the overall project. Runway is already paved, but residents have to drive over the others to get home. In an earlier presentation council agreed to pay its share for the properties it owns, but was turned down by residents. Council asked staff to see if there could be a way for residents on Runway Court to receive some credit because their street is already paved, but still contribute to the project costs for Hillridge, Hillvale and MacCallum.

If the project was to move forward, another survey or series of meetings would be required to proceed. Any plan would have to be approved by at least 60% of homeowners within the defined area.

A rezoning application from

Helen and Bill Craig was referred to the Planning Advisory Committee. A letter from Chief Robert Gloade, Millbrook First Nation dealing with possible changes to the electoral boundaries was referred to staff.

Hatti Dyck sent letter to council asking for council to take over maintenance of the Memorial Garden off Highway 102, which was an initiative started years ago by Herb Peppard. After considerable discussion the matter was referred to staff for study, then report back to council. As the result of a letter from Housing Nova Scotia office in New Glasgow council decided to invite the group to make a presentation to council at a later date.

The Epilepsy Association of Nova Scotia, in an email, asked councillors to wear a purple ribbon on March 26th and to arrange a photo which the association could share on social media venues. Council agreed it was a good grassroots initiative to support.

The Shoreline Journal (circ. 1650) is a monthly community newspaper serving communities along the Glooscap Trail from Truro to Parrsboro, Nova Scotia serving the communities of Belmont/Debert, Wentworth/Londonderry, Onslow/Masstown along the shore to Great Village, Bass River, Economy, Five Islands and Lower Five Islands. It is published on the last Wednesday of each month (earlier in December) with a deadline of the 20th of the month.

MAILING ADDRESS: The Shoreline Journal, P.O. Box 41, Bass River, Nova Scotia, B0M 1B0.

PHONE: 902-647-2968; **Fax:** 902-647-2194 **Toll Free:** 1-800-406-1426; **Cell:** 902-890-9850 • **E-MAIL:** maurice@theshorelinejournal.com

EDITOR PUBLISHER: Maurice Rees • **ADVERTISING:** Maurice Rees • **CIRCULATION:** Dorothy Rees

Canadian Publications Mail Products Agreement #40048924, ISSN #1209-9198

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

LOCAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: B0M / B2N / B6L - \$23.00, PLUS HST = \$26.45 • **OTHER PARTS OF NS:** \$28.00 plus HST = \$32.20
ALL OTHER AREAS OF CANADA: \$30.00, plus HST = \$34.50 • **USA SUBSCRIPTIONS:** \$45.00
HST: #890564404RT001. Printed by Advocate Printing & Publishing Ltd, Pictou, Nova Scotia

All rights reserved. Material published in The Shoreline Journal may not be reproduced in an form without prior approval of the publisher. Material to be returned to sender must be accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope.

1996 Heritage Award recipient. Listed with Canadian Advertising Rates & Data (CARD) and Bowden's Media Monitoring Service.

We acknowledge the financial support of the Government of Canada. | **Canada**

The publisher is not responsible for minor errors in ads, which do not lessen the value of the item(s). The publisher is not responsible for space beyond that portion of the advertisement containing the item(s) in error. Letters to the editor are subject to editing or rejection, must be signed by the author and contain a phone number.



NEWSPAPERS ATLANTIC
TRUSTED | CONNECTED | TARGETED