AUC
Alberta Utilities Commission

Indus Power Generation LP and Northbridge Power GPC Inc.

Beacon AI Centers – Indus Project Thermal Power Plant

November 17, 2026

Alberta Utilities Commission
Decision 30524-D01-2026
Indus Power Generation LP and Northbridge Power GPC Inc.
Beacon AI Centers – Indus Project Thermal Power Plant
Proceeding 30524
Application 30524-A001

November 17, 2026

Published by the:
Alberta Utilities Commission
Eau Claire Tower
1400, 600 Third Avenue S.W.
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0G5

Telephone: 310-4AUC (310-4282) in Alberta
1-833-511-4AUC (1-833-511-4282) outside Alberta
Email: info@auc.ab.ca
Website: www.auc.ab.ca

The Commission may, no later than 60 days from the date of this decision and without notice, correct typographical, spelling and calculation errors and other similar types of errors and post the corrected decision on its website.

Contents

1 Decision summary 1

2 Introduction 1
2.1 Summary of the application 1
2.2 Interveners 3

3 The regulatory framework and the Commission's public interest assessment of the power plant 5
3.1 Regulatory framework 5
3.2 How does the Commission consider the power plant's impacts within Alberta's broader regulatory framework? 6
3.3 What is the role of the Commission in assessing the public interest? 6

4 Discussion and findings 7
4.1 Was Indus Power's participant involvement program adequate? 7
4.2 Are the power plant's impacts to the environment acceptable? 9
4.2.1 Are the power plant's risks to water quality or quantity acceptable? 10
4.2.2 Are the power plant's impacts to air quality acceptable? 12
4.2.3 How are greenhouse gas emissions managed? 13
4.2.4 What are the power plant's impacts on wetlands, habitat and wildlife? 13
4.3 Are the power plant's effects on agricultural operations acceptable? 14
4.4 What is the expected noise from the power plant and how will it be mitigated and monitored? 15
4.5 What are the cumulative effects of the power plant? 19
4.6 Does the power plant comply with municipal land use planning documents and land use policy and have municipal issues been adequately mitigated? 21
4.6.1 How does the Commission consider municipal planning instruments? 21
4.6.2 Will the power plant comply with Rocky View County's land use planning framework? 21
4.6.3 How should the Commission consider the County's requested conditions and how should other local community effects be addressed? 23
4.7 Is the emergency response plan protective of the public? 24
4.8 Will there be a suitable reclamation security program in place? 26
4.9 What are the power plant's benefits? 28

5 Decision 28

Appendix A – Proceeding participants 30

Appendix B – Oral hearing – registered appearances 32

Appendix C – Summary of Commission conditions of approval in the decision 33

List of figures

Figure 1. Proposed power plant location 2

1 Decision summary

1. In this decision, the Alberta Utilities Commission approves, with conditions, the application from Indus Power Generation LP, by its general partner Northbridge Power GPC Inc., to construct and operate the Beacon AI Centers – Indus Project Thermal Power Plant (the power plant). The 1,494-megawatt (MW) natural gas-fired power plant will supply power to a co-located, on-site data centre.

2. The power plant will be located approximately three kilometres east of the city of Calgary and two kilometres northwest of the hamlet of Indus. It is within an area designated by Rocky View County for a data centre campus and power generation. More than 20 individuals who opposed the power plant were granted standing to participate in this proceeding and the oral hearing. They had many concerns including environmental and air effects, water use, noise, and potential impacts on agricultural and livestock operations. Rocky View County also participated in the hearing, providing helpful information about the land use and municipal planning process for this area.

3. The Commission finds that the power plant is reasonably well-sited, being on lands designated by Rocky View County for this type of development and being adjacent to another area designated for future industrial development. While the power plant is large, it uses cooling technology that reduces the demand for water in comparison to other technologies. Water volumes that are required will be provided by a local water utility company under its existing water licence. Air emissions from the power plant are predicted to comply with provincial air quality guidelines.

4. In its application and through the proceeding, Indus Power made many commitments aimed at mitigating the concerns of the interveners and Rocky View County. The Commission weighed the concerns raised by the interveners against the benefits of the project and the mitigation measures proposed by Indus Power. The Commission's reasons for finding the power plant to be in the public interest are set out in detail in this decision.

2 Introduction

2.1 Summary of the application

5. On December 29, 2025, Indus Power Generation LP, by its general partner Northbridge Power GPC Inc., applied for approval to construct and operate the power plant. It will be located in Section 11, Township 23, Range 28, west of the Fourth Meridian, in Rocky View County, as shown in Figure 1. The power plant's 45-acre footprint is located in the northwest portion of a broader 627-acre data centre campus. This broader development boundary (labelled Indus Project Area) is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Proposed power plant location



6. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. is the general partner of Indus Power Generation LP and the proposed approval holder. The approval conditions in this decision are therefore directed to Northbridge Power, which is also responsible for the commitments made by Indus Power in this proceeding.

7. The power plant will consist of two systems:

- 100 4.6-megawatt (MW) INNIO Jenbacher J624 lean-burn natural gas-fired reciprocating engines; and

- 12 61.2-MW Siemens SGT-800 natural gas-fired turbines, with heat recovery steam generators supplying four 75-MW Siemens SST-500 condensing steam turbines, operating in four combined-cycle units, each with three gas turbines and one steam turbine.

8. The power plant's total generating capability is 1,494 MW, of which approximately 1,200 MW is intended to supply the co-located, on-site data centre campus.

9. Indus Power submitted that, in determining the power plant layout, it considered and balanced various siting factors, including environmental considerations; proximity to roads, natural gas and transmission infrastructure; construction considerations; landowner interests; proximity to lands planned for industrial development; and separation between the power plant and nearby residences.

10. Indus Power further submitted that the power plant is expected to provide benefits through capital investment, construction and permanent employment, municipal tax revenue and the supply of on-site electricity to the associated data centre campus.

11. Indus Power plans to eventually connect the power plant to the Alberta Interconnected Electric System, which will require future regulatory applications.

12. Indus Power expected construction of the power plant to begin no later than the fourth quarter of 2026, with an in-service date in the fourth quarter of 2027. It requested a construction completion date of December 31, 2028, to allow for potential delays or other contingencies during construction.[1]

2.2 Interveners

13. The Commission issued a notice of application, in accordance with Rule 001: *Rules of Practice* and granted standing to eligible interveners.[2]

14. The Commission established a hearing process that included information requests, written evidence, reply evidence, a joint oral Indigenous Knowledge session, an oral hearing and written argument. Rocky View County, the Indus and Area Residents Group (IARG),

[1] Exhibit 30524-X0003, Rule007_Thermal Power Plant Application Form, PDF page 3; Exhibit 30524-X0297, Indus Response to AUC IR Round 3, response to IndusPower-AUC-2026APR29-003(a), PDF page 9.

[2] Exhibit 30524-X0231, AUC letter - Ruling on standing and process direction and Exhibit 30524-X0296, AUC letter - Second ruling on standing - Anita and Dave Sacco.

the Antliffs, the Colwell-Allen Cousins, Blood Tribe/Kainai (Kainai), and Siksika Nation participated in the proceeding.

15. Rocky View County, the municipality where the power plant is located, was granted participation rights in the proceeding.[3] The County requested that the Commission impose specific conditions on the power plant or confirm the County's authority to deal with its concerns through the County's development permit process.

16. IARG is a group composed of members that own or occupy land near the power plant, with concerns about the power plant's siting and setbacks, noise levels, biodiversity impacts and water use, air pollution, safety and emergency response planning, reclamation security plan, cumulative effects and consultation. It requested that the Commission deny the power plant application, or, if approved, include specific conditions outlined in its submissions.[4]

17. The Antliffs own and occupy land, including an organic farm, near the power plant. They requested that the Commission deny the power plant application due to inadequate consultation and failure to meaningfully address concerns related to their organic farm, water security, planned infrastructure upgrades, and the power plant's social impacts on the local community.

18. The Colwell-Allen Cousins own and farm near the power plant and raised environmental concerns about groundwater, overland flooding and potential heat-island effects associated with the power plant.

19. Kainai and Siksika initially opposed the power plant but withdrew their statements of intent to participate prior to the hearing.[5] The Commission understands the Indigenous groups' withdrawals to indicate that their concerns regarding the power plant have been addressed and that they no longer seek the Commission's consideration of those concerns. The Commission respects their decisions and finds that the duty to consult has been fulfilled. The Commission notes that Indus Power has committed to ongoing engagement with Kainai and Siksika, including a cross-cultural session, historical resources monitoring and communicating chance finds, and to discussing the decommissioning and final reclamation plan.[6]

20. The Commission also permitted persons without standing to file letters of comment.[7] The Commission reviewed the letters of comment and recognizes that the concerns are similar to those of the interveners granted standing, including concerns related to water, air emissions, noise, agricultural impacts, visual and lighting effects, and other community effects.

---

3 Exhibit 30524-X0371, AUC letter - Ruling on standing for Rocky View County and further process direction regarding written and reply evidence.

4 Exhibit 30524-X0378, Attachment to IARG-AUC-2026JUN22-001_IARG's Proposed Conditions of Approval; Exhibit 30524-X0510, 2026-09-04_IARG Final Written Argument_final, PDF page 8.

5 Exhibit 30524-X0473, 2026-08-17 - Feltmate (JFK) to Yu (AUC) - Kainai Withdrawal of Statement of Intent to Participate;
Exhibit 30524-X0474, 2026-08-17 - Feltmate (JFK) to Yu (AUC) - Siksika Withdrawal of Statement of Intent to Participate.

6 Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 2.

7 Exhibit 30524-X0358, Letters of comment from stakeholders with no standing.

3 The regulatory framework and the Commission's public interest assessment of the power plant

21. In this section, the Commission discusses the legislative and regulatory framework applicable to the power plant and the broader data centre development, including the role of other provincial regulators in overseeing project-related impacts such as wetlands, wildlife, water use, air emissions and greenhouse gas emissions. The Commission then explains its mandate and powers when considering facility applications, in this case the power plant application, and describes how it assesses whether a power plant is in the public interest.

3.1 Regulatory framework

22. In this proceeding, interveners raised environmental concerns relating to both the power plant and the broader data centre development. The proposed Beacon AI Centers development requires approvals or decisions from several different regulatory bodies.

23. At the federal level, Indus Power submitted an initial description of the Beacon AI Centers Indus Project to the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada (IAAC). The IAAC conducted an assessment and determined that no further assessment is required for the Beacon AI Centers Indus Project.[8] The IAAC was of the view that the potential adverse effects within federal jurisdiction, or the direct or incidental adverse effects, would be either limited or addressed through existing federal and provincial legislative and regulatory frameworks.

24. At the provincial level, power plant impacts such as air quality, wetlands, water use, wildlife and groundwater are subject to the regulatory oversight of Alberta Environment and Protected Areas (AEPA) pursuant to the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* (EPEA) and the *Water Act*. For example, the *Water Act* is intended to promote the conservation and management of Alberta's water resources while supporting the sustainable use of water. It establishes a framework for water management planning, protects the aquatic environment, governs the allocation and use of water, and provides mechanisms for licensing, approvals and water allocation transfers. The *Water Act* also establishes the priority system for water rights, sets water conservation objectives, and provides enforcement tools to ensure compliance. The *Water Act* is supported by regulations and codes of practice administered by AEPA. AEPA also oversees the *Technology Innovation and Emissions Reduction Regulation*, which is designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from large industrial facilities.

25. The Government of Alberta recently established a regulatory framework under the *Electric Utilities Act* and the *Data Centre Regulation* governing how large data centres access and use Alberta's electricity system. This framework is administered primarily by the Alberta Electric System Operator and is intended to manage electricity demand, maintain grid reliability, and prioritize data centre projects that provide or support additional power generation.

26. At the municipal level, the power plant is located in Rocky View County. Indus Power needs to engage with Rocky View County and obtain any required municipal development permits and approvals.

[8] Exhibit 30524-X0411, Indus Power - Corporate Reply Evidence, PDF page 37;
Exhibit 30524-X0355, 2026-06-01 - Affidavit No. 1 of Mike Oka, Exhibit C – Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, Notice of Early Decision with Reasons, PDF pages 30-32.

3.2 How does the Commission consider the power plant's impacts within Alberta's broader regulatory framework?

27. The current legislative and regulatory framework for power plant applications requires the Commission to determine whether construction and operation of a proposed power plant is in the public interest, while recognizing the jurisdiction and oversight of other regulators with respect to certain project impacts. This reflects the allocation of regulatory responsibilities under Alberta's existing regulatory framework and forms part of the Commission's public interest determination.

28. As considered in the relevant sections of this decision, the Commission recognizes that certain project impacts fall within the jurisdiction and expertise of other regulators. In those instances, the Commission relies on those regulators' oversight rather than undertaking a duplicative review.[9] This promotes an efficient and co-ordinated regulatory process while respecting the mandates of other regulatory authorities. The Commission's findings do not replace any approvals, permits, licences, authorizations or oversight required from those authorities.

3.3 What is the role of the Commission in assessing the public interest?

29. The Commission is an independent regulator responsible for considering power plant applications under the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*. Under the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* and the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*, the Commission's approval is required to construct and operate a power plant.

30. In deciding whether to approve an application to construct and operate a power plant, in addition to any other matters it may or must consider, the Commission must determine whether it is in the public interest, having regard to its social, economic, environmental and other effects.[10] Applicants bear the burden of demonstrating that an approval is in the public interest.

31. The Commission does not regulate or approve data centres. Nevertheless, the impacts of a proposed data centre may be relevant when the Commission considers cumulative effects as part of its public interest assessment of a power plant.

32. As a starting point, power plant applications filed with the Commission must comply with Rule 007: *Facility Applications* and Rule 012: *Noise Control*. These rules provide a comprehensive set of requirements for a facility application.

33. The Commission balances a variety of public interest considerations, taking into account the purposes of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* and the *Electric Utilities Act*. A power plant that is in the public interest will, at a minimum, comply with all applicable regulatory approvals, including those outside the Commission's jurisdiction. The Commission therefore considers the existence of applicable approvals, regulatory requirements or oversight by other regulators as supporting its public interest assessment.

---

[9] Decision 28132-D01-2025: Federation Group Inc. – Marguerite Lake Compressed Air Energy Storage Project, Proceeding 28132, Applications 28132-A001 and 28132-A002, June 5, 2025, paragraphs 13, 21, 22 and 23; Decision 30375-D01-2026: Strathcona Resources Ltd. – Tucker Organic Rankin Cycle Power Plant and Industrial System Designation, Proceeding 30375, Applications 30375-A001 to 30375-A003, February 25, 2026, paragraph 21.

[10] Section 17(1) of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*.

34. Conducting a public interest assessment requires the Commission to assess and balance the competing elements of the public interest in the context of each specific application before it. Part of this exercise is an analysis of the nature of the impacts associated with a particular power plant, and the degree to which the applicant has addressed these impacts. Balanced against this is an assessment of the power plant's potential public benefits. The assessment includes the positive and adverse impacts of the power plant on those nearby, and on the environment, including air, water and wildlife. The Commission has previously affirmed that the public interest will be largely met if an application complies with existing regulatory standards and the power plant's public benefits outweigh its negative impacts.

35. Additionally, when the Commission approves a power plant, it does so having considered the entirety of the proceeding record including the representations and commitments made by an applicant. The Commission's determination that a power plant is in the public interest is informed by, and in many cases contingent on, the commitments made by an applicant. In some cases, where the Commission finds it necessary to supplement or clarify the terms of a commitment, the Commission may include a commitment or a version of it as a condition of approval. However, the Commission considers commitments to be binding on an applicant regardless of whether the commitment is made a condition of approval or not.

4 Discussion and findings

36. The Commission has reviewed the application and has determined that the application, together with the information required by the conditions in this decision, satisfies the information requirements of Rule 007 and Rule 012. The Commission considers the proposed power plant to be in the public interest in accordance with Section 17 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act* and other applicable enactments, subject to the conditions described below.

37. In the following subsections, the Commission discusses its findings regarding Indus Power's participant involvement program, the adequacy of Indigenous consultation, environmental impacts, agricultural impacts, noise impacts, cumulative effects, compliance with municipal land use planning documents, emergency response planning, reclamation security, and the power plant's benefits.

4.1 Was Indus Power's participant involvement program adequate?

38. In this section, the Commission finds that Indus Power's participant involvement program met the requirements of Rule 007, although some aspects of the program could have been improved. It is important that effective communication take place between the applicant and all potentially affected persons including Indigenous groups, the public, local authorities, agencies, industry and government so that concerns may be raised, properly addressed, and if possible, resolved.

39. Indus Power submitted that it designed and implemented a comprehensive participant involvement program in compliance with Rule 007 using an 800-metre consultation radius and a 2,000-metre notification radius from the boundary of the entire 627-acre data centre campus, rather than only from the 45-acre power plant footprint.[11]

40. The Commission finds that the project boundary used by Indus Power to design its participant involvement program was appropriate and meets the requirements of Rule 007. The definition of a power plant project boundary in Rule 007 states that if any portion of a project is sited within a quarter section, that quarter section should be included in the project boundary.[12]

41. Indus Power explained that on November 20, 2025, it sent 111 participant involvement packages to stakeholders by tracked mail and email, and notified Rocky View County and Wheatland County. A public open house was held on November 24, 2025, at the Indus Recreation Centre, with representatives of 27 households in attendance. Indus Power established a toll-free phone number and dedicated email address for stakeholders to contact them. It then sent a follow up letter to stakeholders in late December 2025, in response to concerns raised and to provide further information and mitigation measures.[13]

42. IARG submitted that Indus Power's consultation process was inadequate, arguing that stakeholders were given limited time to review the information and raise concerns before the open house and application filing. IARG noted that Indus Power issued the initial participant involvement program notification on November 20, 2025, held the open house on November 24, 2025, and filed its application on December 29, 2025. It contended that the approximately 39-day period between the initial notification and the application filing, including fewer than five days before the open house, was insufficient for meaningful participation given the scale and complexity of the power plant.

43. Similarly, the Antliffs submitted that Indus Power failed to consult with them before filing the application. They argued that the addition of a natural gas-fired power plant represented a significant change from the originally proposed energy supply arrangement and this warranted a more robust consultation. The Antliffs further submitted that they did not initially receive notice of the power plant due to an incorrect mailing address and that Indus Power did not make any further attempts to follow up with them until after the application had been filed. They argued that this prevented Indus Power from understanding and meaningfully addressing their concerns.

44. IARG and the Antliffs argued that the inadequacy of Indus Power's consultation process warranted a denial of the power plant.

45. In reply, Indus Power submitted that its consultation process exceeded the requirements of Rule 007, that its participant involvement program was intended as a starting point for engagement and that Rule 007 does not require resolution of all stakeholder concerns before filing an application. Indus Power argued that it made reasonable efforts to follow up on returned mail and noted that it made numerous commitments during the proceeding, including ongoing

[11] Exhibit 30524-X0012, TP36 – PIP Summary, PDF pages 6-7;
Exhibit 30524-X0505, Indus Power Written Argument - August 28, 2026, PDF page 11.
[12] Rule 007: *Facility Applications*, PDF page 156.
[13] Exhibit 30524-X0012, TP36 – PIP Summary, PDF pages 7 and 13-15;
Exhibit 30524-X0505, Indus Power Written Argument - August 28, 2026, PDF page 11.

stakeholder engagement, a dedicated community liaison, and a formal complaint-resolution process to address intervener concerns. Indus Power acknowledged that the initial participant involvement package sent to the Antliffs was undelivered, but it subsequently engaged with them through telephone and direct discussions at the open house. Indus Power further submitted that the Antliffs fully participated in the proceeding and that their concerns were addressed through targeted commitments, including organic farm protections, emergency response planning engagement, and hazardous-goods disclosure obligations.

46. The Commission agrees with IARG and the Antliffs that the four-day period between the notification mailout and the open house likely did not provide many stakeholders with sufficient time to meaningfully review information and respond before the open house. Additional time for consultation and issue resolution before application filing may have helped with addressing stakeholder concerns. Despite these shortcomings, the Commission does not find that they are sufficient to render the participant involvement program inadequate.

47. The Commission also finds that Indus Power's engagement with the Antliffs could have been better, particularly given the undelivered notification package and unsuccessful pre-application contact attempts. However, once the Antliffs were identified, Indus Power engaged with them and made commitments aimed at addressing their concerns. Although earlier engagement may have informed Indus Power's planning of the power plant application, the Commission is not persuaded that these deficiencies render the participant involvement program inadequate.

48. As such, the Commission finds that Indus Power's participant involvement program was conducted in accordance with Rule 007. However, earlier and more proactive stakeholder engagement could have helped identify and address concerns before the application was filed. The Commission considers that Indus Power's commitment regarding a community liaison, a complaint-resolution process and continued information sharing will be beneficial to Indus Power's ongoing consultation efforts.

4.2 Are the power plant's impacts to the environment acceptable?

49. In this section, the Commission discusses the environmental evidence focusing on specific environmental impacts due to the power plant, predicted residual effects to the environment, and how the Commission formed its decision on these residual effects.

50. The Commission finds that the power plant's overall residual effects on the environment are acceptable. This finding is based on the power plant's design and mitigation measures; Indus Power's commitments; the power plant's benefits; and the additional federal, provincial and municipal requirements and approvals that apply to the power plant. The requirements for approvals under the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* and the *Water Act* are of particular importance, as they provide additional regulatory oversight of environmental effects within AEPA's jurisdiction.

51. *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* approvals consider a range of environmental impacts, including air quality, surface water and groundwater protection (including wastewater), soil management, contamination, and conservation and reclamation

planning.[14] *Water Act* approvals consider both the use of water and impacts to wetlands. Together, these approval processes add another layer of independent regulatory review. AEPA can require further conditions and mitigations, or deny approvals, if it considers environmental impacts to be unacceptable. The Commission considers environmental impacts in its public interest test; the Commission's review complements, but does not replace, the review and approvals from other regulators.

4.2.1 Are the power plant's risks to water quality or quantity acceptable?

52. The power plant requires water for its operations, and the associated data centre will also use water. Alberta's water regulations have protections in place to safeguard both water quality and quantity.

53. The Commission notes that the considerations in this section for water use are in the context of assessing whether the power plant is in the public interest. The Commission does not approve or authorize the power plant's water use. The power plant will receive its water from Langdon Waterworks Ltd. under a water service agreement. Langdon Waterworks' water diversion is licensed by AEPA under the *Water Act*.[15]

54. The power plant and data centre will be located in the South Saskatchewan River Basin. In 2006, it was determined that the limits for water allocations had been reached in the Bow, Oldman and South Saskatchewan River sub-basins, which include the area where the power plant will be located.[16] Indus Power's agreement with Langdon Waterworks is for 1,500 cubic metres (m^3) of water per day, of which the power plant is anticipated to use 360 m^3 of water per day.[17] This water use falls within Langdon Waterworks' existing water licence allocation.[18]

55. The power plant incorporates technologies that are considerate of water use. The combined-cycle units use a closed-loop glycol cooling system, while the reciprocating engines use dry air-cooled radiators. These systems avoid the continuous evaporative water demand associated with wet cooling towers.

56. IARG and the Colwell-Allen Cousins raised concerns regarding the power plant and data centre's potential impacts to water, including the potential for surface water contamination and runoff to adjacent lands, impacts to groundwater quality and quantity, and their demand on the local water supply. IARG was especially concerned about the power plant and data centre's potential to reduce available water for residents in and surrounding the hamlet of Langdon, stating that contracted water supply represents approximately 41 per cent of Langdon Waterworks' total licensed diversion.[19]

---

[14] *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act – Approvals and Registrations Procedure Regulation*, 1993 – current as of June 17, 2013.

[15] Exhibit 30524-X0234, Indus Power Information Response to Round 2-IndusPower-AUC-2026MAR19-001 to 010, PDF pages 3-4.

[16] Government of Alberta, Water Allocation Policy for Closed River Basins in the South Saskatchewan River Basin Directive, current as of September 22, 2016.

[17] Exhibit 30524-X0234, Indus Power Information Response to Round 2-IndusPower-AUC-2026MAR19-001 to 010, PDF page 4.

[18] Exhibit 30524-X0391, Indus Power Response to AUC IR No. 4, PDF page 29.

[19] Exhibit 30524-X0510, 2026-09-04_IARG Final Written Argument_final, PDF pages 17-20.

57. Regarding surface water concerns, Indus Power detailed that surface drainage from the power plant is managed through an industrial stormwater pond. A stormwater management plan will be prepared which includes mitigations, monitoring and reporting as required by *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* approval conditions. The Commission notes that the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* approval process will assess the appropriateness of the proposed water management plans and that AEPA can refuse approval or identify further conditions if it considers a project to pose risks to water quality or quantity. Additionally, Indus Power committed to ensuring that the stormwater pond would not alter drainage patterns in a manner that adversely impacts adjacent lands, to maintaining a complaint system for adjacent landowners, and to promptly addressing these complaints as they arise.[20]

58. Regarding groundwater impacts, Indus Power described spill prevention and response plans in its environmental protection plan and detailed that groundwater monitoring would be overseen by AEPA as part of the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* approval processes. To address concerns raised by IARG and the Colwell-Allen Cousins, Indus Power also stated that it is willing to conduct baseline water well testing, if requested, for IARG members granted standing who own a water well within the 2,000-metre notification area.[21]

59. Regarding overall cumulative considerations for water quality and quantity in the province, Alberta's regulatory framework also includes comprehensive groundwater and watershed monitoring, with monthly water quality monitoring at more than 30 stations on Alberta's major rivers, groundwater quality monitoring in approximately 70 wells per year, and continuous water level monitoring at more than 300 wells and over 400 hydrometric stations to monitor cumulative impacts on water in the province.[22] The Commission accepts that AEPA's process for considering surface water and groundwater impacts and management is robust.

60. In terms of Langdon Waterworks' capability to provide water service to the power plant and data centre, the Commission understands that Langdon Waterworks has the authority and discretion to enter into water service agreements for the power plant.[23] The Commission notes that Langdon Waterworks is responsible for securing and managing water in a manner consistent with Alberta's water regulations and frameworks. Rocky View County requested that Indus Power be required to supply a comprehensive water assessment report to the Commission, or that the Commission state that the County retains jurisdiction to assess water supply issues as part of its development approvals process.[24]

61. Water allocation and use are regulated through the provincial legislative framework. However, Rocky View County retains an interest in understanding the project's water servicing arrangements and infrastructure requirements for municipal planning and development purposes. Accordingly, while the Commission does not consider further water assessment necessary, it expects Indus Power to provide the County with information reasonably required to assess water servicing needs and related municipal concerns.

---

20 Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF pages 4-6.

21 Exhibit 30524-X0391, Indus Power Response to AUC IR No. 4, PDF pages 5, 9 and 31; Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 5.

22 Exhibit 30524-X0391, Indus Power Response to AUC IR No. 4, PDF pages 20-23.

23 Exhibit 30524-X0234, Indus Power Information Response to Round 2-IndusPower-AUC-2026MAR19-001 to 010, PDF pages 2-5.

24 Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County, PDF pages 11-12 and 21.

62. Based on the above considerations, including the power plant's predicted water use, the provincial regulatory framework and Indus Power's commitments, the Commission finds that the potential effects of the power plant on water quality and quantity have been reasonably addressed for the purposes of this proceeding.

4.2.2 Are the power plant's impacts to air quality acceptable?

63. Stantec Consulting Ltd. was retained by Indus Power to complete an air quality assessment. Stantec's modelling determined that the power plant would meet the *Alberta Ambient Air Quality Objectives* (AAAQOs) for concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less ($PM_{2.5}$).[25]

64. IARG retained Brian Wiens to assess Stantec's air quality assessment. B. Wiens raised concerns with the power plant's contributions to air pollution and cumulative air emissions, and the methods of Stantec's air emissions models. The project is located east of the city of Calgary. B. Wiens submitted that Stantec's air emissions modelling methods excluded relevant background data from the city of Calgary, did not consider all relevant air emissions standards, and that the modelling lacked consideration for secondary atmospheric pollutants.

65. In response, Stantec provided revised modelling demonstrating that the AAAQO thresholds would be met, even when city of Calgary background emissions were included.[26] While the revised modelling did not materially change the conclusions, the Commission finds B. Wiens' critiques valid given the area's prevailing wind patterns coming from the west.

66. B. Wiens emphasized the importance of Indus Power participating in regional airshed monitoring, specifically through the Calgary Regional Airshed Zone, as a means of accessing expertise and confirming actual emissions rates in the environment.[27] Indus Power committed to providing funding to the Calgary Regional Airshed Zone to establish and operate an air quality station for the monitoring of regional impacts.[28]

67. IARG also raised concerns about potential fogging and icing based on experiences associated with the Shepard Energy Centre, a gas-fired power plant located on the east of city of Calgary, approximately five kilometres from the project. The Commission accepts the evidence that the proposed power plant's cooling design differs from that of the Shepard Energy Centre and that the power plant's technology significantly reduces the likelihood of fogging and icing.[29] The Commission is therefore not persuaded that the experience at the Shepard Energy Centre demonstrates that comparable effects are likely to occur at the proposed power plant.

68. The Commission accepts that Stantec's assessment was conducted in accordance with the AEPA's *Air Quality Model Guideline.* Considering Stantec's conclusions that air emissions will meet the AAAQO, the commitments made by Indus Power and AEPA's oversight of emissions, the Commission finds that the power plant is unlikely to cause significant impacts to air quality. The Commission notes that the *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* approval process will assess the appropriateness of air emissions modelling, mitigations and monitoring,

[25] Exhibit 30524-X0007, TP25 – Air Quality Assessment, PDF page 3.
[26] Exhibit 30524-X0280, Indus Response to Indus and Area Residents Group IR No. 1, PDF pages 70-72.
[27] Exhibit 30524-X0340, Appendix J_Expert Evidence of Brian Wiens (Air Quality Assessment Analysis).
[28] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 8.
[29] Exhibit 30524-X0280, Indus Response to Indus and Area Residents Group IR No. 1, PDF pages 66-67.

and AEPA can refuse approval or identify further conditions if it considers the power plant to pose risks to air quality.

4.2.3 How are greenhouse gas emissions managed?

69. The power plant will use both natural gas lean-burn reciprocating engines and gas turbines in a combined-cycle configuration. Indus Power has quantified the power plant's operational greenhouse gas emissions at approximately 4.78 million tonnes per year of carbon dioxide equivalent.[30]

70. The power plant must comply with all applicable federal and provincial decarbonization requirements, which include Alberta's *Technology Innovation and Emissions Reduction Regulation* (TIER). TIER is an industrial carbon pricing and emissions system designed to reduce industrial greenhouse gas emissions over time by increasing benchmarks and carbon prices to drive continuous greenhouse gas decreases over time. The ultimate goal of TIER is to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.[31]

71. The Commission accepts that TIER considers and encourages greenhouse gas reductions over time. Considering these regulations and the power plant's design, the Commission finds that the power plant's proposed contributions of greenhouse gases will be managed within the existing regulatory framework.

4.2.4 What are the power plant's impacts on wetlands, habitat and wildlife?

72. In addition to supporting wildlife and habitat, wetlands have a role in protecting water quality and quantity. IARG retained Cliff Wallis of Cottonwood Consultants Ltd. to assess Indus Power's environmental submissions for the project. C. Wallis raised concerns about the power plant and data centre's impacts to numerous wetlands and ephemeral waterbodies, with important waterfowl considerations.

73. C. Wallis stated that no mitigation measures could eliminate the impact of the power plant and data centre to wildlife habitat. The Commission acknowledges that converting cultivated land to industrial use will have adverse effects on habitat and wildlife. The Commission weighs the impact against siting benefits of the project, for example, siting the power plant in an area designated by Rocky View County for industrial development.

74. C. Wallis recommended that, if the Commission approves the power plant, the stormwater management system avoid as many wetlands and ephemeral waterbodies as possible and that permanent vegetative cover in the southern portion of the project area use native plants to increase habitat quality as a slight offset for wildlife impacts.[32] Indus Power committed to implementing C. Wallis' recommended mitigation measures,[33] which the Commission considers beneficial and a modest offset for habitat impacts.

75. Indus Power indicated that a *Water Act* approval would be required for wetland impacts, and AEPA will review impacts and mitigations. Indus Power added that AEPA can impose

[30] Exhibit 30524-X0391, Indus Power Response to AUC IR No. 4, PDF pages 11-15.
[31] Exhibit 30524-X0391, Indus Power Response to AUC IR No. 4, PDF page 14.
[32] Exhibit 30524-X0335, Appendix E_Expert Evidence of Cliff Wallis final May 28 2026, PDF pages 2-3 and 12-68.
[33] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 8.

further mitigations or compensatory payment offsets for wetland replacement initiatives to address cumulative wetland impacts. C. Wallis raised concerns that the *Alberta Wetland Policy* does not guarantee that comparable habitat is replaced, nor does it guarantee replacement of wetlands in similar habitats. The Commission acknowledges C. Wallis' concerns but accepts that AEPA's process for addressing wetland impacts is robust.

76. Given the project's siting, the mitigation measures listed in the environmental protection plan, the *Water Act* approval, and the commitments detailed above, the Commission is satisfied that the impacts to wetlands, habitat and wildlife are acceptable.

4.3 Are the power plant's effects on agricultural operations acceptable?

77. General concerns were raised by some interveners over the conversion of agricultural land to industrial use. In this regard, the Commission places significant weight on the fact that Rocky View County has designated this land for industrial development.

78. More specific concerns were raised about the compatibility of the power plant with existing agricultural operations. These concerns included potential effects from air emissions, runoff, spills, weeds, dust, traffic, noise and vibration. Some interveners submitted that these impacts could affect crops, soil, livestock, equine activities, and the ongoing operation of nearby farms. These concerns are addressed below and elsewhere in this decision.

79. Creig and Jeannie Antliff operate an organic farm. They were particularly concerned that there could be contamination from the power plant that would adversely affect their organic farming operation and certification.[34]

80. To address the Antliffs' concern, Indus Power committed to retaining an independent, mutually agreed-upon agrologist or organic-certification specialist to assess whether additional targeted mitigation is required to prevent harmful effects that could potentially lead to revocation of the Antliffs' certification. Indus Power further committed that, if documented contamination attributable to the power plant and identified by the mutually agreed-upon specialist results in the suspension or revocation of the Antliffs' certification, it will remediate the affected land at its own expense, fund any necessary transition protocols to restore certification and financially compensate the Antliffs for proven economic losses directly resulting from the contamination.[35]

81. The Commission recognizes the importance of maintaining an organic certification for the Antliffs' farming operation and livelihood. The Commission considers that the independent expert-led evaluation and Indus Power's related commitments provide an appropriate process to identify, assess and address potential effects of the power plant on the organic farming operation. As a result, the Commission finds that Indus Power's commitments reasonably address the Antliffs' concerns about their organic farming operation. The Commission expects Indus Power to work constructively with the Antliffs in selecting a mutually agreed-upon specialist, completing the evaluation and implementing any additional targeted mitigation that the specialist determines is required.

---

[34] Exhibit 30524-X0324, 30524 - Written Evidence of Jeannie Antliff - June 1 2026 (executed);
Exhibit 30524-X0325, 30524 - Written Evidence of Creig Antliff - June 1 2026 (executed), PDF pages 1-3;
Exhibit 30524-X0330, 2_2026-06-01_IARG Group Submissions_final, PDF pages 34-36.

[35] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 2.

82. Specific to the power plant's potential effects on livestock and equine activities, including activities at the Indus Riding Arena, Indus Power committed to assessing how construction and operational noise may affect nearby livestock, addressing noise-related concerns raised by equine event organizers and implementing a communication protocol to provide event organizers with advance notice of particularly loud construction activities, such as impact pile driving and commissioning steam blows.[36] The Commission is satisfied that Indus Power's commitments sufficiently mitigate the potential for effects on livestock and equine activities. Potential construction and operational noise effects and the related mitigation and notice requirements are further addressed in Section 4.4 of this decision.

83. One of Rocky View County's concerns was weed control, and it submitted that a formal weed management plan would be appropriate because of the risks weeds pose to surrounding communities and agricultural operations.[37] Indus Power committed to preparing a formal weed management plan with guidance from Rocky View County, and to submitting this formal weed management plan for approval as part of the County's development permit process.[38]

84. Finally, Indus Power committed to providing a dedicated community liaison as a single point of contact for adjacent landowners and to maintaining a formal complaint-resolution process that includes direct communication, investigation and mitigation, transparent reporting and escalation to the Commission's dispute-resolution processes where required.[39] The Commission considers the liaison role to be a positive arrangement for facilitating communication between Indus Power and area residents. The Commission expects concerns affecting the Antliffs or other adjacent landowners during construction and operation to be addressed promptly through this process, without limiting their ability to raise concerns directly with the Commission or other relevant authorities.

85. Given the independent evaluation and related commitments concerning the Antliffs' organic certification, the livestock and equine-related commitments and the complaint-resolution process, the Commission is satisfied that the potential effects of the power plant on nearby agricultural operations can be adequately managed.

4.4 What is the expected noise from the power plant and how will it be mitigated and monitored?

86. The Commission finds that the power plant is expected to comply with Rule 012: *Noise Control* and that the related noise can be adequately mitigated and monitored, provided that the final design incorporates the acoustic assumptions and mitigation measures relied upon in the noise impact assessment (NIA).

87. Indus Power retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. to prepare an NIA in accordance with Rule 012. The NIA assessed cumulative sound levels from the proposed power plant, the associated data centre development and relevant existing energy-related facilities. While the associated data centre is not regulated under Rule 012, the Commission considers its sound contribution relevant because the data centre is co-located with the power plant and expected to

[36] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF pages 3 and 6; Exhibit 30524-X0280, Indus Response to Indus and Area Residents Group IR No. 1, PDF pages 95-98.
[37] Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County, PDF pages 15-16.
[38] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 7.
[39] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 5.

operate concurrently. Assessing both facilities is therefore necessary to provide a representative prediction of the cumulative sound levels that will occur.

88. The project is predicted to comply with Rule 012 at all assessed receptors. At the most affected receptor, R2, the predicted nighttime cumulative sound level was 40.3 A-weighted decibels (dBA), which rounds to the applicable nighttime permissible sound level of 40 dBA and results in no predicted compliance margin.[40]

89. IARG and the Antliffs raised concerns about the reliability of the predicted noise results, the limited compliance margins at certain receptors, the power plant's reliance on mitigation that remains subject to detailed design, and potential effects on nearby residents, livestock and equine activities. IARG retained Henk de Haan of dBA Noise Consultants Ltd., who recommended that the NIA be updated based on detailed power plant design and questioned whether the proposed mitigation would achieve the predicted sound levels.[41]

90. Indus Power disputed H. de Haan's submissions. Stantec maintained that the NIA provides a reasonable basis to conclude that the power plant will comply with Rule 012 and that the required noise mitigation is technically achievable. Indus Power also relied on confirmation from Energy Link International, its engineering, procurement and construction contractor, and discussions with equipment suppliers concerning the feasibility of the proposed mitigation.[42] The NIA relies on extensive mitigation and acoustic-performance requirements for the power plant and associated data centre, including silencers, low-noise equipment, acoustic louvres, barriers and specified equipment sound power limits.

91. The Commission acknowledges the concerns raised by IARG and H. de Haan regarding the limited compliance margins and the power plant's reliance on mitigation measures that remain subject to detailed design. However, the Commission accepts the evidence of Indus Power's noise experts that the required mitigation measures are technically achievable. Because final equipment selection, acoustic specifications and detailed design information remain subject to procurement and engineering, the Commission requires a final NIA based on the final power plant design and imposes the following conditions of approval:

a. Once Northbridge Power GPC Inc. has finalized the equipment selection and detailed design for the power plant, it shall file a final project update with the Commission confirming that the power plant remains within the final project update allowances for thermal power plants specified in Rule 007: *Facility Applications*. The final project update must be filed at least 90 days before the start of construction.

---

40 Exhibit 30524-X0010, TP31 – Noise Impact Assessment, PDF page 33;
Exhibit 30524-X0280, Indus Response to Indus and Area Residents Group IR No. 1, PDF page 4.

41 Exhibit 30524-X0330, 2_2026-06-01_IARG Group Submissions_final;
Exhibit 30524-X0342, Appendix L_Expert Evidence of Henk de Haan;
Exhibit 30524-X0324, 30524 - Written Evidence of Jeannie Antliff - June 1 2026 (executed);
Exhibit 30524-X0325, 30524 - Written Evidence of Creig Antliff - June 1 2026 (executed).

42 Exhibit 30524-X0412, Attachment 1 - Stantec Consulting Ltd., Reply Evidence – Noise (July 24, 2026);
Exhibit 30524-X0418, Attachment 7 - Energy Link International, Indus Power Generation LP – Noise Mitigation Confirmation (July 14, 2026).

b. As part of the final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall submit a noise impact assessment based on the final design and acoustic-performance information for the power plant and associated data centre. The final noise impact assessment must assess cumulative sound levels from the power plant and associated data centre operating concurrently, identify the mitigation measures and acoustic-performance requirements relied upon to achieve compliance, and demonstrate that the power plant is predicted to comply with Rule 012: *Noise Control*.

92. IARG and Rocky View County also raised concerns about the proximity of nearby residences and requested greater setbacks or physical barriers.[43] In particular, IARG requested a minimum 1.5-kilometre setback from the project to nearby residences, in part to address noise concerns. Indus Power responded that thermal power plants have no prescribed minimum residential setback and are governed by Rule 012's performance-based requirements.[44]

93. Although Rule 012 refers to a 1.5-kilometre distance, that distance is used to identify noise receptors for assessment and does not establish a minimum setback for a power plant. Compliance is determined by comparing cumulative sound levels at the applicable receptors with the permissible sound levels established under Rule 012. In this case, the NIA identified receptors within or near 1.5 kilometres of the project development area boundary, which encompasses the power plant and associated data centre. The NIA predicts compliance at all assessed receptors, and the conditions imposed in this section require final-design verification, implementation of the relied-upon mitigation measures and post-construction verification. The Commission is therefore satisfied that power plant-related noise can be adequately addressed without imposing an additional setback condition.

94. IARG also raised concerns about noise from commissioning steam blows and operational venting, including operational blowdown and continuous steam venting.[45] The Commission recognizes that these activities raise different noise considerations. Commissioning steam blows are temporary and intermittent and are not representative of normal facility operations, while operational venting forms part of normal power plant operations. The filed NIA did not assess continuous steam venting or clearly account for all operational venting scenarios. Indus Power committed to including continuous steam vent sources in the final NIA and stated that continuous steam venting would be designed to comply with Rule 012.[46] The Commission therefore requires the final NIA to identify feasible mitigation measures for commissioning steam blows and to include operational venting in the cumulative sound level assessment. Accordingly, the Commission imposes the following conditions of approval:

c. As part of the final noise impact assessment for the final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall identify feasible mitigation measures for commissioning steam blows and describe how those measures will minimize noise effects on nearby residents and livestock.

---

43 Exhibit 30524-X0510, 2026-09-04_IARG Final Written Argument_final, PDF pages 9-13; Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County, PDF page 11.

44 Exhibit 30524-X0512, Indus Power Reply Argument, PDF page 7.

45 Exhibit 30524-X0510, 2026-09-04_IARG Final Written Argument_final, PDF page 16; Exhibit 30524-X0330, 2_2026-06-01_IARG Group Submissions_final, PDF page 24.

46 Exhibit 30524-X0493, Undertaking Response - Noise from blowdown; Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 8.

d. As part of the final noise impact assessment for the final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall assess operational venting, identify any mitigation measures necessary to reduce noise from those activities, and demonstrate that cumulative sound levels, including operational venting, are predicted to comply with Rule 012: *Noise Control*.

95. IARG and the Antliffs raised concerns that construction activities, including impact pile driving and steam blows, could create elevated short-term noise levels and affect nearby residents and livestock.[47] Indus Power committed to assessing potential construction and operational noise effects on nearby livestock, providing advance notice of particularly loud construction activities to Indus Riding Arena event organizers, addressing noise-related concerns from equine event organizers, and limiting the loudest construction activities to weekdays and daytime hours where practicable.[48]

96. The Commission acknowledges that construction noise will be temporary but that certain activities, including earthworks, heavy equipment operation, impact pile driving and commissioning steam blows, may result in elevated short-term noise levels and affect nearby residents and livestock. Although construction noise is not assessed against the operational permissible sound levels in the same way as operational noise, Section 2.10 of Rule 012 requires approval holders to manage construction-noise impacts on nearby dwellings. The Commission expects Indus Power to implement its commitments, take reasonable measures to minimize construction-related noise effects and respond promptly to concerns. Accordingly, the Commission imposes the following condition of approval:

e. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall, where practicable, provide nearby residents with advance notice of planned high-noise construction activities and commissioning steam blows and maintain a process for receiving and responding to noise complaints throughout construction and commissioning.

97. Further, the as-built power plant must reflect the mitigation measures and acoustic-performance requirements relied upon in the final NIA, or measures providing equal or better acoustic performance. Accordingly, the Commission imposes the following condition of approval:

f. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall implement the mitigation measures relied upon in the final noise impact assessment, or measures providing equal or better acoustic performance. Within 30 days after the power plant and associated data centre commence concurrent operation, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file a report identifying the implemented mitigation measures, confirming whether they are consistent with those relied upon in the final noise impact assessment, and describing any deviations and, where alternative measures were implemented, demonstrating that they provide equal or better acoustic performance.

[47] Exhibit 30524-X0330, 2_2026-06-01_IARG Group Submissions_final, PDF pages 23-24; Exhibit 30524-X0342, Appendix L_Expert Evidence of Henk de Haan, PDF page 5; Transcript, Volume 4, page 541, lines 11-15.

[48] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF pages 3, 6 and 8; Exhibit 30524-X0280, Indus Response to Indus and Area Residents Group IR No. 1, PDF page 98.

98. The Commission finds that post-construction verification is warranted because the power plant relies on extensive design-based mitigation and has no predicted nighttime compliance margin at Receptor R2. Accordingly, the Commission imposes the following condition of approval:

g. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall complete a post-construction comprehensive sound level survey at Receptor R2, including an evaluation of low-frequency noise. The survey must be conducted under representative operating conditions and in accordance with Rule 012: *Noise Control*. Within one year after the power plant and associated data centre commence concurrent operation, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file the survey report with the Commission, including the measurements, results and an assessment of compliance with Rule 012. If non-compliance is identified, the report must include a mitigation plan identifying the corrective measures and associated implementation timelines.

99. In response to concerns raised by IARG about constant hum and low-frequency vibration from the power plant's operation, Indus Power also committed to conducting a vibration impact assessment during the detailed engineering phase of the power plant.[49] The Commission expects Indus Power to implement any mitigation measures the assessment identifies as necessary to address potential vibration effects on nearby residents and livestock.

100. Power plant-related noise concerns raised during construction or operation remain subject to the Commission's complaint and compliance processes. If non-compliance is identified during operation, Northbridge Power is expected to implement appropriate mitigation measures as soon as practicable. Where permanent mitigation cannot be implemented immediately, Northbridge Power should consider reasonable interim operational measures to reduce noise impacts and maintain or restore compliance until permanent mitigation measures are implemented.

101. In summary, the Commission concludes that the power plant is expected to comply with Rule 012. The conditions imposed in this section address the remaining uncertainty by requiring verification of the acoustic assumptions and mitigation measures relied upon in the NIA, implementation of the required mitigation, and post-construction verification of compliance.

4.5 What are the cumulative effects of the power plant?

102. The Commission finds that the power plant's contribution to cumulative effects has been adequately assessed and can be appropriately managed through mitigation and monitoring measures, Indus Power's commitments, the conditions imposed in this decision and applicable regulatory frameworks.

103. The Commission considered cumulative effects in the sections addressing water, air quality, wetlands and noise. The findings in those sections inform the Commission's conclusions in this section.

104. IARG expressed concern that the power plant should be assessed in the context of the associated data centre campus rather than in isolation. In particular, IARG raised concerns about cumulative effects on water availability, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, wetlands,

[49] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 4.

wildlife and habitat, agricultural land, surrounding land uses and nearby communities.[50] IARG's expert, Dr. Brad Stelfox, also advocated for a broader, sector-wide cumulative-effects assessment of future artificial intelligence and data centre development.[51] Similarly, Rocky View County requested that the Commission consider the potential cumulative effects of the power plant alongside future industrial development within the adjacent Prairie Economic Gateway Area Structure Plan.[52]

105. Indus Power responded that the cumulative-effects assessment for this application should focus on power plant-specific effects and reasonably foreseeable developments supported by the record. It submitted that broader future development scenarios are speculative and beyond the scope of the application.[53]

106. The Commission recognizes that the power plant and associated data centre are functionally connected. Approximately 1,200 MW of the power plant's generating capability is intended to supply the co-located data centre, and the facilities are expected to operate concurrently.

107. While the Commission does not approve or regulate data centres, the associated data centre may be subject to separate regulatory approvals and oversight. This reflects the existing legislative and regulatory framework, where different aspects of the power plant and the data centre development may fall under the jurisdiction or oversight of other regulators.
A sector-wide cumulative-effects assessment of future artificial intelligence or data centre development is beyond the scope of this proceeding. Such an assessment would depend on the location, scale, technology and operation of developments that are not before the Commission. The Commission's assessment of cumulative effects is based on the evidence before it. With respect to Rocky View County's request, the Commission recognizes that the power plant's location next to lands planned for industrial development is relevant and has considered it as a siting factor in Section 4.6. The Commission also expects that Rocky View County considered the area context in its land use planning, and in development of the Beacon AI Hub Area Structure Plan (Beacon ASP).

108. The Commission considered cumulative impacts from this broader development context as part of its public interest assessment of the power plant. In particular, the Commission considered the power plant's water requirements in the context of the combined water demand under the proposed water-supply arrangement, the contribution of emissions from the broader development in the air quality assessment, including the effects of the data centre buildings on air dispersion, and cumulative sound levels from both the power plant and associated data centre.

109. Based on the record and the findings in this decision, the Commission is satisfied that the power plant's contribution to cumulative effects can be appropriately managed. The Commission has considered these effects in its overall public interest assessment and finds that they do not weigh against approval of the power plant application.

---

50 Exhibit 30524-X0510, 2026-09-04_IARG Final Written Argument_final, PDF pages 11-13 and 17-21.
51 Exhibit 30524-X0359, Dr Brad Stelfox Assessment of Beacon CER June 14, 2025, PDF page 22; Transcript, Volume 3, page 330, lines 5-10; page 395, lines 3-5.
52 Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County, PDF page 3.
53 Exhibit 30524-X0512, Indus Power Reply Argument, PDF pages 11-12.

4.6 Does the power plant comply with municipal land use planning documents and land use policy and have municipal issues been adequately mitigated?

110. The power plant is proposed within Rocky View County. The County participated in the proceeding to provide information on the local land use framework and requested that, if the application is approved, the Commission either impose certain conditions or confirm the County's jurisdiction to impose such conditions as part of its development permit approval process.[54]

111. This section first discusses how the Commission considers municipal planning instruments. It then discusses Rocky View County's land use planning framework as it applies to the power plant and whether the power plant complies with that framework. Finally, it focuses on specific local community impacts raised by the County and other interveners, and whether the Commission should impose conditions requested by the County to address these impacts.

4.6.1 How does the Commission consider municipal planning instruments?

112. Municipalities play a unique role in land use planning and have a strong interest in upholding local objectives. The Commission considers municipal land use when determining if a project is in the public interest and values the insights that municipalities can provide on the potential effects of projects including the regional context of their planning documents and land use policies. While the Commission considers municipal planning documents and land use policies in making its public interest determination, these documents and policies are also assessed against existing provincial legislation and policy such as the Alberta government's "Bring Your Own Generation" policy, project impacts (social, economic and environmental effects), and compliance with Rule 007 and Rule 012.

113. Although the Commission endeavours to achieve consistency with municipal planning instruments, under sections 619 and 620 of the *Municipal Government Act*,[55] the Commission's decision on applications takes precedence over municipal planning documents where there is a conflict.[56] This approach aims to reduce regulatory burden and to ensure that issues heard and determined at the provincial level are not reheard at the municipal level.[57] However, these legislative provisions do not remove a municipality's authority over matters within its jurisdiction that are not determined by the Commission's decision.

4.6.2 Will the power plant comply with Rocky View County's land use planning framework?

114. The County provided detailed evidence regarding its land use framework, including the development of the Beacon ASP and the Special, Data Centre District (S-DAT district) in its land use bylaw.

---

54 Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County.

55 *Municipal Government Act*, sections 619 and 620.

56 *Borgel v Paintearth (Subdivision and Development Appeal Board)*, 2020 ABCA 192, paragraph 22. This was affirmed most recently by the Court of Appeal of Alberta in *Canmore (Town of) v Three Sisters Mountain Village Properties Ltd.*, 2023 ABCA 278, paragraphs 74 and 75.

57 Decision 29226-D01-2025: Fox Meadows Wind Inc. – Fox Meadows Wind Project, Proceeding 29226, Applications 29226-A001 to 29226-A003, June 20, 2025, paragraphs 30 and 31.

115. The power plant and data centre will be located on lands sited within the Beacon ASP.[58] The Beacon ASP was approved by Rocky View County Council and lays out the plan for development of a data centre campus. The lands comprising the Beacon ASP were also redesignated to the S-DAT district,[59] which sets out the land use regulations for these lands.

116. The County explained that natural gas power plants were included as a discretionary use in the S-DAT district on the expectation that they would be ancillary to a data centre use. However, it emphasized that a natural gas power plant was not contemplated when the Beacon ASP was developed. The County stated that the Beacon ASP was based on the expectation that energy would be supplied by a combination of solar facilities and power from the Alberta electricity grid. Neither the Beacon ASP process and associated public consultation nor project open house materials indicated that a natural gas power plant was contemplated on the Beacon ASP lands.[60]

117. There was much discussion in the hearing over when the decision to shift to a natural gas power plant was made by Indus Power, and when Rocky View County became aware of the change. Regardless of timing, the County submitted that an on-site natural gas power plant is a deviation from the Beacon ASP since it presents additional community and environmental impacts that were not considered.[61] The County confirmed that an amendment to the Beacon ASP will be required if the power plant is approved.[62]

118. Indus Power explained that it revised the project to include a natural gas power plant following changes affecting the ability of large data centres to connect to the Alberta electricity grid. These changes are the outcome of the Alberta Electric System Operator's large-load integration process and the Alberta government's "Bring Your Own Generation" policy for large data centres.[63]

119. While the proposed power plant differs from the development contemplated in the Beacon ASP, the County neither expressly supported nor opposed the application. Instead, its participation and evidence focused on ensuring that local land use context and community concerns are fully understood and considered, and on supporting appropriate mitigation should approval be granted.[64]

120. Based on the evidence presented in this proceeding, the Commission is not persuaded that the change in the source of power generation, by itself, weighs against approval of the power plant. Although a natural gas power plant was not initially contemplated under the Beacon ASP as the primary source of electricity, the Commission is satisfied that the power plant can proceed in a manner consistent with the County's land use planning framework. In reaching this determination, the Commission considered that the Beacon ASP is designated for industrial and

---

58 Exhibit 30524-X0403, 2026-07-15 Attachment 6 – June 17, 2025 Approved Beacon AI Hub Area Structure Plan.

59 Exhibit 30524-X0401, 2026-07-15 Attachment 4 – June 17, 2025 Approved S-DAT District Bylaw and Overlay.

60 Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County.

61 Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County, PDF pages 2 and 9.

62 Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County, PDF pages 10-11.

63 Exhibit 30524-X0202, Indus Power Response to AUC Round 1 IRs 001-022, PDF page 9; Exhibit 30524-X0411, Indus Power - Corporate Reply Evidence, PDF pages 41-42.

64 Exhibit 30524-X0362, SIP Letter to Alberta Utilities Commission - Rocky View County, PDF page 1; Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County.

technology-related development.[65] It is located adjacent to the Prairie Economic Gateway Area Structure Plan, which is also planned for industrial development and sits between the Beacon ASP and the east boundary of the city of Calgary. The Commission also took into account the change in legislation regarding how large data centres are supplied with power. Finally, the Commission notes Indus Power's commitment to ongoing engagement with the County and the local community throughout the life of the power plant and data centre, and to complying with all municipal regulatory requirements under the Beacon ASP and municipal development plan.[66]

4.6.3 How should the Commission consider the County's requested conditions and how should other local community effects be addressed?

121. The County provided submissions on a number of community concerns, including residential setbacks, water use concerns, cumulative effects and emergency response.

122. The County requested that the Commission impose certain conditions or confirm that the County may impose such conditions as part of its development permit approval processes.[67] These conditions relate to the development permit process, construction development timelines, local community engagement, landscaping, weed control, project screening and fencing, reclamation security, emergency response, lighting, road access and parking, construction management plan (dust, litter and keeping the site clean), traffic management plan, stormwater, surface water management and wastewater discharge, visual mitigation, noise, water source and supply, and power. Indus Power submitted that the Commission should defer to municipal controls when a municipality can sufficiently address identified risks and concerns, and Indus Power committed to unequivocally fulfilling all reasonable conditions imposed by Rocky View County through its municipal development approval process.[68]

123. As mentioned above, although the Commission endeavours to achieve consistency with municipal planning instruments, Sections 619 and 620 of the *Municipal Government Act* confirm that the Commission's approval prevails over conflicting municipal planning instruments and development decisions. However, Sections 619 and 620 are only engaged where it is necessary to resolve conflicts between the Commission's decisions and a municipality's planning instruments. Where there is no conflict between the two, both may apply. Accordingly, matters within the County's planning authority may continue to be addressed through the County's regulatory processes, provided they do not conflict with the Commission's approval.

124. With this context, the Commission is satisfied that conditions requested relating to the County's development permit process, local community engagement, landscaping, weed control, project screening and fencing, municipal reclamation security under the S-DAT district, lighting, road access and parking, construction and traffic management plan, stormwater, surface water management and wastewater discharge, visual mitigation and an updated agrivoltaics plan can be

[65] Exhibit 30524-X0403, 2026-07-15 Attachment 6 – June 17, 2025 Approved Beacon AI Hub Area Structure Plan, PDF pages 18, 23 and 26-27.

[66] Exhibit 30524-X0411, Indus Power - Corporate Reply Evidence, PDF page 42;
Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF pages 3 and 7;
Transcript, Volume 2, PDF page 228, lines 3-6.

[67] Exhibit 30524-X0397, 2026-07-15 Evidence of Rocky View County, PDF pages 12-21.

[68] Exhibit 30524-X0512, Indus Power Reply Argument, PDF pages 7-8.

addressed by the County within its planning authority. Indus Power has already made commitments relating to these issues,[69] which the County has welcomed.

125. Furthermore, concerns related to water use, noise, reclamation security, emergency response and cumulative effects have been addressed by the Commission in this decision. Regarding the power plant construction timeline, the Commission finds that this issue falls within its jurisdiction and is appropriately addressed through the power plant approval and in accordance with Rule 007.

126. Regarding project siting and residential setback concerns, the County and IARG raised concerns regarding separation distances between the power plant and nearby residences. IARG argued that the setbacks between residences and power plants similar in size to the applied for power plant are often much greater than 1,500 metres and that the project is not in the public interest due to insufficient setbacks.

127. The distances to residences vary depending on whether measurements are taken from the power plant itself or from the overall project boundary which includes the data centre. Measured from the power plant, the nearest intervener residences are located approximately 1.6 kilometres away.[70] Measured from the project boundary, the Antliffs' residence is approximately 210 metres away.[71] There are some residences closer than this distance, but they did not intervene in this proceeding.

128. The Commission has considered the location of residences in its assessment of the power plant's effects rather than a specific setback distance to residences. This is illustrated in other sections of this decision, including Section 4.4, where the Commission considers the specific noise impacts at receptors. Given this, the Commission finds that no setback-related conditions are required for the power plant.

129. Overall, the Commission is satisfied that the County's concerns have been appropriately addressed and that any remaining local community effects can be managed through Indus Power's commitments and applicable municipal approval processes, provided they are not inconsistent with this decision.

4.7 Is the emergency response plan protective of the public?

130. The Commission finds that, subject to the conditions below, the proposed approach to emergency response is protective of the public.

131. Indus Power filed an emergency response plan (ERP)[72] with a corporate-level framework and placeholders for site-specific details to be developed during detailed engineering and design. It identified potential power plant hazards including spills, medical emergencies, fires, transportation incidents, weather and natural disasters, security incidents and animal encounters. A project-specific ERP had not yet been completed.

[69] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026).
[70] Exhibit 30524-X0503, X0503 - ATC 14- Project Setback Distances to Residences Figures, PDF page 3.
[71] Exhibit 30524-X0280, Indus Response to Indus and Area Residents Group IR No. 1, PDF pages 133-134.
[72] Exhibit 30524-X0285, IndusPower-IARG-2026APR27-012(a)-Emergency Response Plan.

132. IARG retained Peter May and Bruno Cornejo of Trace Associates Inc. to conduct a review of the hazards and emergency management aspects of the power plant.[73] Trace Associates stated that the ERP did not sufficiently characterize site-specific hazards and lacked detail. IARG contended that Indus Power failed to comply with the requirement to consult local responders and emergency response authorities, and it raised a safety concern regarding the power plant's waste heat and aircraft using the Indus airport. IARG argued that Indus Power failed to satisfy consultation requirements for the ERP and that the power plant should be denied. If the power plant is approved, IARG requested that Indus Power complete consultation with local emergency services, identify site-specific hazard and risk analysis, and design a site-specific ERP and emergency procedures.

133. Indus Power submitted that local public services, including Rocky View County responders, were notified through the consultation process but the County directed Indus Power to delay detailed consultation with local first responders until final design details were available. Indus Power stressed that the power plant is a conventional natural gas-fired power generation facility with well-understood hazard types, and the power plant's residual risks are consistent with those of similar power plants operating safely across Alberta. With respect to IARG's aircraft-safety concern, Indus Power noted that waste heat is inherent in thermal generation, but thermal plumes are generally a concern near flight paths, and the power plant is not sited close to flight paths.

134. Indus Power committed to developing a comprehensive site-specific ERP with input from Rocky View County Fire Services and filing it before construction begins, and to engaging with local emergency services and the community in its emergency response planning. It also committed to engaging the Antliffs and IARG members granted standing in developing the site-specific ERP, providing IARG members granted standing with draft and final copies of the ERP for review and comment, and inviting them to participate in emergency response exercises at the facility where practicable and safe.[74]

135. The Commission stresses that emergency response planning is an integral part of mitigating fire and other risks. ERPs are living documents requiring periodic review and updating throughout the planning, construction and operation of the power plant. As P. May testified, finalization of emergency response plans typically happens after the power plant design is completed.[75] The Commission agrees that this is an appropriate approach for a project of this nature and that site-specific emergency response planning can appropriately be finalized as the project proceeds through detailed design and implementation. The Commission nevertheless considers it necessary that the project-specific ERP be completed before construction begins. The ERP must be reviewed with the appropriate emergency response authorities and maintained by periodic review throughout the construction and operation of the power plant.

[73] Exhibit 30524-X0339, Appendix I_Expert Report of Trace Associates Inc. (Hazard and Emergency Management Review Report).
[74] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF pages 2, 4, 5 and 7.
[75] Transcript, Volume 3, page 355, lines 13-16.

136. Accordingly, the Commission imposes the following condition of approval:

h. At least 90 days before the start of construction, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file a project-specific emergency response plan for construction and operation of the power plant. The filing must confirm that the plan has been provided to and reviewed with Rocky View County Fire Services and any other emergency-response authorities identified through that review. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall review and update the emergency response plan throughout construction and operation to address material project-design changes, operational experience and reasonable recommendations from applicable emergency-response authorities.

137. The Commission finds that the identified hazards and mitigation measures, the availability of emergency-response services, Indus Power's commitments, and the requirements to complete, co-ordinate and maintain the ERP provide assurance that emergency response planning for the power plant will be appropriate.

4.8 Will there be a suitable reclamation security program in place?

138. Indus Power filed a third-party decommissioning and reclamation cost estimate and proposed to provide progressively funded reclamation security. Under its proposal, five per cent of the estimated reclamation cost would be secured by the end of the first year of operation, with the security increasing annually until the full estimated amount is secured by the end of year 20. The cost estimate would be updated every five years without deducting anticipated salvage or scrap value, and the security and subsequent annual increases would be adjusted accordingly. Indus Power proposed that the security take the form of a letter of credit.[76]

139. The County's land use bylaw requires a minimum reclamation security of $500,000 through the municipal development permit process, and Indus Power has committed to complying with this requirement.[77] This municipal requirement is separate from and does not replace or reduce the reclamation security required by the Commission, which is based on the estimated cost of decommissioning and reclaiming the power plant.

140. IARG raised concerns about the timing of the security and the proposed beneficiary. Rocky View County also addressed the beneficiary issue and accepted that it be named as the beneficiary of the reclamation security rather than Cal 02 Holdings GPC Inc., the registered landowner and an affiliate of Indus Power. The County indicated its willingness to hold the reclamation security subject to guidance from the Commission or another provincial agency, such as AEPA, as to what would constitute satisfactory reclamation under the relevant legislation.[78] While Indus Power initially proposed that Cal 02 Holdings GPC Inc. be the

[76] Exhibit 30524-X0202, Indus Power Response to AUC Round 1 IRs 001-022, PDF page 39;
Exhibit 30524-X0206, IndusPower-AUC-2026JAN28-019(a) Third-Party Estimate of Decommissioning & Reclamation Funds, PDF pages 10 and 12-13;
Exhibit 30524-X0297, Indus Response to AUC IR Round 3, PDF pages 4-5.

[77] Exhibit 30524-X0237, IndusPower-AUC-2026MAR19-004(a)-Bylaw C-8648-2025, PDF page 7;
Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 7.

[78] Transcript, Volume 3, page 310, lines 18-25 and page 311, lines 1-11.

beneficiary, it subsequently confirmed that it was amenable to naming the County as beneficiary and committed to continued engagement with the County regarding reclamation security.[79]

141. The Commission accepts Indus Power's proposed 20-year funding schedule. However, Indus Power should continue discussions with the County about the County acting as beneficiary, including the County's concern about responsibility for determining compliance with provincial reclamation obligations. In the event the County will not act as beneficiary, Indus Power should consider whether there is a non-affiliated third party that could hold the reclamation security or another suitably protective arrangement that would ensure the security remains available to satisfy the power plant's decommissioning and reclamation obligations.

142. Given the importance of having sufficient reclamation security in place and a suitably protective security arrangement, the Commission imposes the following conditions of approval:

i. As part of its final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file, for Commission approval, its proposed reclamation security arrangement, including the proposed beneficiary, the proposed form of security and an explanation of how the arrangement will ensure sufficient funds are available for the power plant's decommissioning and reclamation obligations. If the reclamation security arrangement includes one or more letters of credit, each letter of credit must be irrevocable, provide for automatic renewal and be issued by a qualified financial institution acceptable to the Commission.

j. By the end of the first year of operation, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall provide reclamation security in an amount equal to five per cent of the most recent third-party decommissioning and reclamation cost estimate. The security must increase annually and equal the full amount of the most recent third-party decommissioning and reclamation cost estimate by the end of year 20 of operation.

k. On the fifth anniversary of the date the power plant commences operation and every five years thereafter for the duration of the power plant's operational life, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall obtain an updated third-party decommissioning and reclamation cost estimate that does not deduct anticipated salvage or scrap value. It shall adjust the security and subsequent annual increases based on the updated estimate and file the cost estimate and confirmation of the security amount with the Commission.

l. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall maintain the reclamation security until a reclamation certificate has been issued.

143. Subject to these conditions, the Commission finds that Indus Power's approach to reclamation security is sufficient and supports the Commission's finding that approval of the power plant is in the public interest.

[79] Exhibit 30524-X0234, Indus Power Information Response to Round 2-IndusPower-AUC-2026MAR19-001 to 010, PDF page 6;
Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF page 7;
Exhibit 30524-X0511, Rocky View County Argument, PDF pages 11-12.

4.9 What are the power plant's benefits?

144. The Commission finds that the power plant will provide benefits through employment and associated economic activity, municipal tax revenues and the supply of on-site electricity to the associated data centre. While there may be additional benefits associated with the broader Beacon AI Centers development, the Commission's assessment focuses on benefits attributable to the power plant.

145. Indus Power submitted that the power plant would provide employment, investment, municipal tax contributions, natural gas royalties, procurement opportunities, infrastructure improvements and other economic benefits. It estimated that construction of the power plant would create approximately 150 to 350 jobs and that operation of the power plant will create approximately 55 permanent positions. Indus Power also filed an economic impact assessment addressing the economic benefits of the combined power plant and data centre development.[80]

146. Indus Power also committed to developing a community investment program in conjunction with local stakeholders, including support for local organizations and events, educational opportunities and scholarships, environmental stewardship and community infrastructure. Indus Power further committed to funding a study of school-busing safety impacts and potential mitigation, such as busing turnouts, in co-ordination with Rocky View Schools.[81]

147. The Commission accepts that construction and operation of the power plant will provide employment and associated economic activity and will contribute municipal tax revenues. However, many of the broader economic benefits identified by Indus Power relate to the combined power plant and data centre development rather than the power plant alone.

148. The power plant will add 1,494 MW of generating capability, with approximately 1,200 MW intended to supply the co-located data centre under normal operating conditions. Indus Power's proposed on-site generation is consistent with the Alberta government's "Bring Your Own Generation" policy, which encourages large electricity needs to be met through self-supply generation. This policy is a consideration for the Commission's public interest assessment.

149. On balance, the Commission finds that the employment, associated economic activity, municipal tax revenues and on-site electricity supply attributable to the power plant contribute positively to its public interest assessment.

5 Decision

150. The Commission considers the application to be in the public interest in accordance with Section 17 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*.

151. Under sections 11 and 19 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, the Commission approves Application 30524-A001 and grants Northbridge Power GPC Inc. the approval set out

[80] Exhibit 30524-X0411, Indus Power - Corporate Reply Evidence, PDF page 8;
Exhibit 30524-X0416, Attachment 5 - Nichols Applied Management Inc. - Indus Project Economic Impact Assessment (July 23, 2026), PDF page 7.

[81] Exhibit 30524-X0506, Indus Power Updated List of Commitments (28 August 2026), PDF pages 6 and 8.

in Appendix 1 – Power Plant Approval 30524-D02-2026 to construct and operate the Beacon AI Centers – Indus Project Thermal Power Plant.

152. Appendix 1 will be distributed separately.

Dated on November 17, 2026.

Alberta Utilities Commission

Renée Marx
Panel Chair

Michael Arthur
Commission Member

Appendix A – Proceeding participants

Name of organization (abbreviation) Company name of counsel or representative
Indus Power Generation LP and its general partner Northbridge Power GPC Inc. Bennett Jones LLP Martin Ignasiak Larissa Lees Nathan Murray Logan Lazurko Siobain Quinton Corporate representative Joseph Shovlin
Rocky View County Reynolds, Mirth, Richards & Farmer LLP Breanne Schwanak Moira Lavoie County representatives Andrew Chell Dominic Kazmierczak Justin Rebello
Indus and Area Residents Group (IARG) Ackroyd LLP Richard Secord Chinedu Kema Non-legal representative Elizabeth Barrett Participants with standing Antonio Ferreira Arnold Heuver Candace Vanin Chris Nikkel Connie Challice Edwin Patton Flavio Gomes Gary Sutherland Janet Kyle Janice Hilton Jeff Kerridge Jessica Ferreira John Gowdy Kenneth Schemenauer and Patricia Schemenauer Lindsay Nikkel Michelle Dominique-Aris Nancy Gowdy Vanessa Steele Amanda Gratton Ryan Gratton Sebastiaan Borsboom Anita Sacco and Dave Sacco

Name of organization (abbreviation) Company name of counsel or representative
Creig and Jeannie Antliff Carscallen LLP Michael Niven Sarah Howard
Colwell-Allen Cousins Non-legal representative Michael Taylor
Nicole Major Self-represented
Shiela Buckley Self-represented
Colleen Quinn Self-represented
Freddy Flores Self-represented
Blood Tribe/Kainai JFK Law LLP Blair Feltmate Shayla Praud Consultation leader Mike Oka
Siksika Nation JFK Law LLP Blair Feltmate Shayla Praud Consultation leaders Cedric Solway Dale Springchief
Alberta Utilities Commission **Commission panel** Renée Marx, Panel Chair Michael Arthur, Commission Member **Commission staff** Peju Anozie (Commission counsel) Jaimie Graham (Commission counsel) Glenn Harasym Kloria Wen Allan Anderson Joan Yu

Appendix B – Oral hearing – registered appearances

Name of organization (abbreviation) Name of counsel or representative	Witnesses
Indus Power Generation LP and its general partner Northbridge Power GPC Inc. Martin Ignasiak, Bennett Jones LLP, counsel Larissa Lees, Bennett Jones LLP, counsel Nathan Murray, Bennett Jones LLP, counsel	Joseph Shovlin, Indus Power Generation LP Kris De Palezieux, Indus Power Generation LP Ed De Palezieux, Indus Power Generation LP Shilo Brauer, Onterris Canada Inc. Tim Van Dijk, Onterris Canada Inc. Allisha Sordi, Onterris Canada Inc. Delanie Player, Onterris Canada Inc. Wayne Christianson, Power Team Consulting Ltd. Clarke Ellis, Proactive Power and Automation Tim Oldham, Proactive Power and Automation Paul McLauchlin, Environmental Leadership Matters Erin Flory, Stantec Reid Person, Stantec Jonathan Chui, Stantec Pearce Shewchuk, Nichols Applied Management Inc.
Rocky View County Breanne Schwanak, Reynolds, Mirth, Richards & Farmer LLP, counsel Moira Lavoie, Reynolds, Mirth, Richards & Farmer LLP, counsel	Andrew Chell, Rocky View County Dominic Kazmierczak, Rocky View County Justin Rebello, Rocky View County
Indus and Area Residents Group (IARG) Richard Secord, Ackroyd LLP, counsel Chinedu Kema, Ackroyd LLP, counsel Elizabeth Barrett, non-legal representative	Cliff Wallis, Cottonwood Consultants Ltd. Henk de Haan, dBA Noise Consultants Peter May, Trace Associates Inc. Brian Wiens, Atmospheric Services Consultant Brad Stelfox, ALCES Landscape and Land-Use Ltd. Elizabeth Barrett, Barrett Veterinary Practice Candace Vanin Connie Challice Jessica Ferreira Michelle Dominique-Aris Arnold Heuver Chris Nikkel Vanessa Steele
Creig and Jeannie Antliff Michael Niven, Carscallen LLP, counsel Sarah Howard, Carscallen LLP, counsel	Creig Antliff Jeannie Antliff

Appendix C – Summary of Commission conditions of approval in the decision

This section is intended to provide a summary of all conditions of approval specified in the decision for the convenience of readers. Conditions that require subsequent filings with the Commission will be tracked as directions in the AUC's eFiling System. In the event of any difference between the conditions in this section and those in the main body of the decision, the wording in the main body of the decision shall prevail.

The following are conditions of Decision 30524-D01-2026 that require subsequent filings with the Commission and will be included as conditions of Approval 30524-D02-2026:

a. Once Northbridge Power GPC Inc. has finalized the equipment selection and detailed design for the power plant, it shall file a final project update with the Commission confirming that the power plant remains within the final project update allowances for thermal power plants specified in Rule 007: *Facility Applications*. The final project update must be filed at least 90 days before the start of construction.

b. As part of the final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall submit a noise impact assessment based on the final design and acoustic-performance information for the power plant and associated data centre. The final noise impact assessment must assess cumulative sound levels from the power plant and associated data centre operating concurrently, identify the mitigation measures and acoustic-performance requirements relied upon to achieve compliance, and demonstrate that the power plant is predicted to comply with Rule 012: *Noise Control*.

c. As part of the final noise impact assessment for the final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall identify feasible mitigation measures for commissioning steam blows and describe how those measures will minimize noise effects on nearby residents and livestock.

d. As part of the final noise impact assessment for the final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall assess operational venting, identify any mitigation measures necessary to reduce noise from those activities, and demonstrate that cumulative sound levels, including operational venting, are predicted to comply with Rule 012: *Noise Control*.

f. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall implement the mitigation measures relied upon in the final noise impact assessment, or measures providing equal or better acoustic performance. Within 30 days after the power plant and associated data centre commence concurrent operation, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file a report identifying the implemented mitigation measures, confirming whether they are consistent with those relied upon in the final noise impact assessment, and describing any deviations and, where alternative measures were implemented, demonstrating that they provide equal or better acoustic performance.

g. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall complete a post-construction comprehensive sound level survey at Receptor R2, including an evaluation of low-frequency noise. The survey must be conducted under representative operating conditions and in accordance with Rule 012: *Noise Control*. Within one year after the power plant and associated data centre

commence concurrent operation, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file the survey report with the Commission, including the measurements, results and an assessment of compliance with Rule 012. If non-compliance is identified, the report must include a mitigation plan identifying the corrective measures and associated implementation timelines.

h. At least 90 days before the start of construction, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file a project-specific emergency response plan for construction and operation of the power plant. The filing must confirm that the plan has been provided to and reviewed with Rocky View County Fire Services and any other emergency-response authorities identified through that review. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall review and update the emergency response plan throughout construction and operation to address material project-design changes, operational experience and reasonable recommendations from applicable emergency-response authorities.

i. As part of its final project update, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall file, for Commission approval, its proposed reclamation security arrangement, including the proposed beneficiary, the proposed form of security and an explanation of how the arrangement will ensure sufficient funds are available for the power plant's decommissioning and reclamation obligations. If the reclamation security arrangement includes one or more letters of credit, each letter of credit must be irrevocable, provide for automatic renewal and be issued by a qualified financial institution acceptable to the Commission.

k. On the fifth anniversary of the date the power plant commences operation and every five years thereafter for the duration of the power plant's operational life, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall obtain an updated third-party decommissioning and reclamation cost estimate that does not deduct anticipated salvage or scrap value. It shall adjust the security and subsequent annual increases based on the updated estimate and file the cost estimate and confirmation of the security amount with the Commission.

The following are conditions of Decision 30524-D01-2026 that do not require subsequent filings with the Commission:

e. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall, where practicable, provide nearby residents with advance notice of planned high-noise construction activities and commissioning steam blows and maintain a process for receiving and responding to noise complaints throughout construction and commissioning.

j. By the end of the first year of operation, Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall provide reclamation security in an amount equal to five per cent of the most recent third-party decommissioning and reclamation cost estimate. The security must increase annually and equal the full amount of the most recent third-party decommissioning and reclamation cost estimate by the end of year 20 of operation.

l. Northbridge Power GPC Inc. shall maintain the reclamation security until a reclamation certificate has been issued.