

Burke, Ruth A

From: Frances Pan <frananpan@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2020 10:33 AM
To: DEP, Nordic Aqua Farms
Subject: Strongly opposed to NAF's proposal as it stands

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Maine Board of Environmental Protection:

I am strongly opposed to siting NAF's proposed industrial RAS facility on 56 acres of established woodland, field, and wetland in Belfast. Building this huge facility would sacrifice the environmental services (carbon sequestration, water filtration, water storage, etc.) that we all benefit from for possible profits for out of town (indeed out of state and even country) investors and hoped for, but not guaranteed, tax benefits for the town. Nordic could site their fish farm on already cleared land zoned for industrial development, but they have refused that option as not being suitable for their purposes. What about the purposes of the people, other life forms, and the environment of coastal Maine, the Little River estuary, and Penobscot Bay?

I am also concerned about the possible disturbance of mercury in the sediment in Belfast Bay that dredging for the placement of Nordic's inflow and outflow pipes will cause. At the very least, more study must be done to determine the level of sediment in the dredging site before a dredging permit is issued.

I am "only" a retired high school and middle school science teacher, but I studied and taught marine science and participated in research projects in Fisher's Island Sound and Long Island Sound in southern New England. I have seen first hand the effects that warming waters and nutrient fertilization have on the lobster fishery as well as other organisms in that area. As waters in the Gulf of Maine warm at a faster rate than most other ocean areas, it is critical to consider how Nordic's 7.7 million gallons of nitrogen laced waste effluent may cause algae blooms and resulting hypoxia and die off of marine organisms.

Nordic makes the argument that their RAS plant takes the pressure off wild salmon populations. I would argue that they only place a different pressure on our wild populations with their fertilizing effluents and taking of forage fish, which would normally feed these wild populations, to feed their captive fish. In so doing, they insure that wild populations have a difficult time recovering and can argue that their system is necessary to supply needed protein. Far better to do the work of supporting wild salmon recovery (which does seem to be currently occurring) directly.

I am requesting that more study of the environmental effects of Nordic's proposal be required before any permits are issued. I would prefer to see the permits denied outright.

Sincerely,
Frances Pan
49 Village Rd
Belfast, ME 04915
860 984 1935