

RECEIVED

NOV 12 2025

TOWNSHIP OF ARMOUR

NO LITHIUM WAY
Citizens United Inc.

Date: November 4, 2025

Resolution Number: NLW-02-25

Moved by: Ashley

Seconded by: Ana

WHEREAS, Power Bank Corporation has submitted an application to the Township of Armour for approval of a Battery Energy Storage System (B.E.S.S.) to be located at Concession 6, Part Lot 3, 219 Peggs Mountain Road, Burk's Falls, Township of Armour, and

WHEREAS, Armour Township is requesting public engagement and concerns from local residents and surrounding townships, and

WHEREAS, No Lithium Way Citizens United Inc. (NLWCUI) is a Not-for-Profit Corporation representing citizens and residents of Armour Township and surrounding municipalities, and

WHEREAS, the citizens, residents and ratepayers have expressed their concerns regarding the risks associated with this B.E.S.S. site and the opposition to the proposal from Power Bank, and

WHEREAS, NLWCUI recognizes the critical importance of safeguarding the health, safety, and well being of the members of this and surrounding communities and of its fire fighters and acknowledges the potential risks associated with the proposed Battery Energy Storage System (B.E.S.S.), and

WHEREAS, the Burk's Falls and District fire department issued a report on May 26, 2025 to the Township of Armour, issued by Fire Chief Joe Readman, and

WHEREAS, the report states “EVLO the battery manufacturer state on their website” “no battery is perfect and thermal runaway can, in rare cases, result in fires or explosions”, and

WHEREAS, continued in the report “Lithium Iron Phosphate Batteries being the newer version of B.E.S.S. available, there is very limited information in the fire service today”. “There is conflicting tactic in the fire service, most agree with a defensive tactic only protecting exposures. While others side with a direct attack.”, and

WHEREAS, the report continues to state “Specific hazards arising from the hazardous products: the contact of water or water vapour and exposed lithium Hexafluorophosphate (LiPF6) may result in the generation of hydrogen and hydrogen fluoride (HF) gas. Fire will provide irritating, corrosive and/or toxic gases. Fumes may cause dizziness or suffocation.”, and

WHEREAS, the report continues to state “At anytime during the life of this B.E.S.S. we may have to commit most, if not all of our resources at this one site for a possible multiday event. This directly contradicts the proposed training and Solar Banks expert’s opinion. I don’t believe this is done intentionally, more that this is such new technology and is truly evolving by the day. But as the Fire Chief I must rely on the manufacture’s direct information. After reviewing these documents, I believe as a Fire Department we must now prepare for the worst-case scenario, a multiday large-scale event requiring the need of our Automatic Aid Partners and possibly Mutual Aid Partners.”, and

WHEREAS, the report continues to state “With this installation being in the MNRF high risk area I’d like to point out to Council that in our MNRF agreement we are responsible for any fires that start in this area. This means if a large forest fire was to occur and we needed to call in the MNRF for assistance, the additional costs would fall back on the township.”, and

WHEREAS, the location of the B.E.S.S. project is within 900 meters of the Magnetawan River and 200 meters of the two tributaries that feed the Magnetawan River as indicated in Power Bank’s application and is in close proximity to Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW) including the Magnetawan water shed, and

WHEREAS, the location of this site and the real possibility of fire and explosion and or leakage of toxic electrolytes could be in conflict of the Environmental Protection Act 14(1) which states “Despite any other Provisions of this Act or Regulations, no person shall discharge a contaminant or cause or permit the discharge of a contaminant into the natural environment that causes OR IS LIKELY TO cause an Adverse Effect.”, and

WHEREAS, the risk of a fire and or explosion and or contaminated water runoff could be an offense against the Water Resource Act, “Prohibits discharge of polluting material that may impair the quality of water, which encompasses impacts on aquatic life, including those with in wetlands.”, and

WHEREAS, the environmental assessment was not thorough enough to collect adequate information for the protection of these at-risk species. (Hoary bats and Silver-Haired bats) Hoary bats are not a cavity roosting bat species so, putting one detector at a snag tree would be very limiting in terms of surveying their maternity habitat. Hoary bats roost alone in living trees (not snags) with lots of leafy overstorey and plenty of space below for flight (they are big bats, high flyers and need adequate space for take off). Females use large diameter trees but also ones that tend to be close to the tallest trees for use as maternity habitat. So, using a single snag survey to determine whether there is Hoary bat maternity habitat in the subject area is useless. Silver-Haired bats are a cavity roosting species, but they use both deciduous and coniferous trees for roosting so, again putting one detector on a deciduous snag is pretty limiting in terms of surveying the maternity habitat, and (Reference: *Committee On The Status Of Endangered Wildlife In Canada COSEWIC*)

WHEREAS, Power Bank’s application to amend the Zoning of the remaining lot, at 219 Peggs Mountain Road, consisting of 32.37 HA, to a site-specific exception to allow an industrial B.E.S.S. installation is not a land use compatibility when considering there are three Rural Residential lots to the east and two Rural Residential lots to the west, and

WHEREAS, the installation of a B.E.S.S. site at 219 Peggs Mountain Road would likely cause neighbouring properties to devalue significantly and also increase property insurance rates.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. No Lithium Way Citizens United Inc., by way of this resolution indicate our firm opposition to the application submitted by Power Bank Corporation (Formerly Solar Bank Corporation) for a Battery Energy Storage System (B.E.S.S.), due to the risk of hazardous chemical contamination and the risk of forest fire and the harm it would cause to the Almaguin area, the community, the environment and the added risk to our fire services.
2. A copy of this resolution to be sent to Armour Township for their records in consideration in evaluating the proposal with a strong recommendation to reject the application.
3. No Lithium Way Citizens United Inc. shall notify Armour Township of our opposition to the application by sending a copy of this resolution as a written submission to Armour Township so that No Lithium Way Citizens United Inc. is entitled to appeal any decision or be party to an appeal by others.

Carried: Carried

Defeated:

Date: Nov, 4 2025

Chair Signature: *Barry Burton*

RECEIVED

NOV 12 2025

TOWNSHIP OF ARMOUR

Nov. 5/25

Re: The proposed development of a Battery Storage System in Armour Township

I'm opposed to the project. The resources needed to deal with large-scale fires,

fueled by lithium batteries' toxic materials, in the location being considered, would be logically challenging and costly.

Perhaps there is a role for the manufacturers of lithium batteries to play in the "end-of-life" reality of this product rather than "storage" at the centre of a tourist area.

- regards,

R.W. Haviland

RECEIVED

Ken Preston & Amber Woodcock

NOV 10 2025

TOWNSHIP OF ARMOUR

Burk's Falls, ON P0A 1C0

November 10, 2025

To: The Council of the Township of Armour
56 Ontario Street
Burk's Falls, ON P0A 1C0

Subject: Opposition to the proposed Official Plan Amendment No.4 Plus, A Related Zoning By-Law No 27-95. Opposition to the Proposed Battery Energy Storage Facility in the Township of Armour.

Dear Members of the Armour Township Council,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Burk's Falls to express my strong opposition to the proposed construction of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facility within the Township of Armour. While I understand the growing need for renewable energy solutions, the placement of such a facility in or near a residential and environmentally sensitive area raises serious concerns regarding safety, health, property values, and environmental impact.

1. Safety and Fire Risk

Large-scale battery storage systems are known to carry significant fire and explosion risks due to potential “thermal runaway” incidents. Fires at BESS sites have occurred across North America and can burn for days, releasing toxic gases that are extremely difficult to contain. Given the rural layout of our township and the limited proximity of emergency response resources, even one incident could be catastrophic for residents and the surrounding environment. This purposed site is within 4-6 kilometers from our public school. This impact would be catastrophic.

2. Environmental and Health Impacts

In the event of malfunction, fire, or containment failure, these systems can release hazardous chemicals and contaminants into the air, soil, and groundwater. This would threaten our local ecosystem, including waterways, forests, and wildlife—key parts of what make Burk's Falls such a valued community. The long-term health effects of exposure to these substances, particularly for children, seniors, and those with respiratory conditions, are deeply concerning.

3. Property Value and Community Character

Introducing an industrial energy storage site into or near a residential area would decrease property values and diminish the natural character that defines Armour Township. Homeowners invest here for the safety, beauty, and peace of rural living—qualities that a high-risk industrial site would compromise. It would also deter future residents and investors from choosing Armour as a place to live and build. As a resident who has built two homes close to the suggested area of the storage site, we have already had concerns from prospective buyers about the storage site. This proposal impacts on the value of our home.

4. Appropriate Siting and Alternatives

If the township supports the principle of renewable energy development, such projects should be located in appropriately zoned industrial areas, far from homes, schools, and natural habitats. Community safety and environmental integrity must remain the highest priorities.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, we strongly urge Armour Township Council to reject the proposed Battery Energy Storage Facility and to commission a thorough, independent environmental and safety review of any similar proposals in the future. The safety, health, and property security of Armour's residents must come before industrial development.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Ken Preston & Amber Woodcock

Burk's Falls, Ontario P0A 1C0

From: Kev and Jen(home)
Sent: November 7, 2025 5:02 PM
To: Charlene Watt; Dave Gray; Charlene Watt (Deputy Clerk); planning@armourtownship.ca; pwerner@armourtownship.ca; juangman@armourtownship.ca; dmacdonald@armourtownship.ca; Councillor Dorothy Haggart-Davis
Subject: BESS opposition

Dear Mayor and Members of Armour Township Council,
I am writing to formally and strongly state my opposition to the proposed Battery Energy Storage Site (B.E.S.S.) by PowerBank on Lot 3, Mountain Road in Armour Township.

As a long-time seasonal resident for 47 years, my family and I have a deep and lasting commitment to the community and a significant vested interest in preserving its natural environment and safety.

My opposition is based on serious concerns regarding the potential impact of this industrial facility on the health, safety, and economic well-being of the township.

Key Concerns that Need Full Consideration:

1. Fire and Public Safety Risks: The flyers indicate that lithium-ion battery fires are incredibly difficult to extinguish and can lead to thermal runaway. The potential release of highly toxic chemicals and gases, such as hydrogen fluoride, carbon monoxide, and others, poses an unacceptable risk to residents, especially those in nearby Burks Falls, Ryerson, and South River, and could have long-term health consequences for the general area.

2. Environmental and Water Quality: The proposal is located within the Magnetawan River Watershed. The risk of chemicals and fire suppressing agents entering local

waterways, ecosystems, and wetlands is a major threat to the health of the local environment, flora, and fauna, which are critical to the area's appeal.

3. Risk to Local Economy (Tourism): Our local economy is heavily reliant on tourism. The perception of environmental or safety risks associated with a B.E.S.S. facility could negatively impact tourism, property values, and the associated businesses, leading to significant financial consequences for residents.

4. Strain on Local Resources: Any major incident, particularly a fire, would place an enormous and possibly overwhelming strain on local volunteer fire departments and emergency services, potentially compromising public safety across the entire region.

5. Lack of Local Economic Benefit: The proposed facility appears to offer minimal economic benefit, particularly in terms of local, long-term employment opportunities.

I urge the Council to seriously consider the resolutions of opposition already passed by the Villages of Burk's Falls, Ryerson Township, and South River. I respectfully request that the Armour Township Council **refuse the current application** and vote against any necessary Official Plan Amendment and Zoning Bylaw Amendment required to change the property zoning to Industrial.

Thank you for your time and for upholding the best interests of your constituents and the Township of Armour.

Sincerely,

Kevin Anderson

Charlene Watt (Deputy Clerk)

From: jake ferrante
Sent: November 8, 2025 10:28 AM
To: Charlene Watt (Deputy Clerk)
Subject: opposition to proposed lithium battery storage facility

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Lithium Battery Storage Facility in Armour Township

Dear Armour Township,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed 4.99 MW Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) in Armour Township. While I recognize the importance of advancing renewable energy solutions, the history of lithium battery storage facilities raises significant concerns regarding public safety, environmental impact, and community well-being.

Public Safety Risks: Lithium battery storage facilities have been associated with several hazardous incidents in recent years. Notably:

- Moss Landing, California (January 2025): A massive fire at one of the world's largest battery storage facilities led to the evacuation of approximately 1,500 residents due to toxic smoke. The incident highlighted the challenges in managing lithium-ion battery fires, which can emit harmful gases and are difficult to extinguish.
- Hwaseong, South Korea (June 2024): An explosion and subsequent fire at a lithium battery factory resulted in 23 fatalities and eight injuries, underscoring the potential dangers associated with such facilities.
- Valley Center, California (September 2023): A fire erupted inside a battery storage container at the Valley Center Energy Storage Facility, leading to evacuations and shelter-in-place orders for nearby residents. This incident emphasized the risks of thermal runaway in lithium-ion batteries.
- Geelong, Australia (July 2021): During initial testing, a fire broke out in one of the Tesla Megapack modules at the Victorian Big Battery site. The fire took three days to extinguish, highlighting the challenges in controlling lithium-ion battery fires.

These incidents demonstrate the inherent risks of thermal runaway, fires, and explosions associated with lithium-ion batteries. Given Armour Township's rural setting, our emergency response capabilities may be insufficient to effectively manage such emergencies, potentially endangering residents and first responders.

Environmental Concerns: The environmental impact of lithium battery fires is profound. The Moss Landing incident, for example, resulted in the release of toxic chemicals into the air and nearby waterways, causing significant environmental damage. Armour Township's pristine natural environment could face similar threats, with potential contamination of our air, soil, and water resources.

Community Impact: The presence of a large-scale industrial battery storage facility is incongruent with the character of Armour Township. Residents value our community for its tranquility and natural beauty. The introduction of such a facility could adversely affect property values and diminish the quality of life we currently enjoy.

In light of these concerns, I urge the council to reject the proposal for the BESS in Armour Township.

I advocate for the exploration of alternative energy solutions that do not carry the same level of risk to our community's safety and environment.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Jake Ferrante