

## Responses to Comments in Letter 10 from John McKay, Bellingham Resident

*Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond to the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.*

1. Thank you for your comment.
2. SE2 has proposed to mitigate visual impacts associated with the plant as outlined in the EIS Section 3.6. SE2 has taken into account the time required for trees to mature and is proposing to plant fast-growing varieties (Lombardy poplars) as well as planting native trees up to 25 feet tall.
3. The 115 kV power lines that run through Whatcom County are no longer part of the project. Only the 230 kV line to Canada is included in the project. The 230 kV line follows existing utility and railroad right-of-way (ROW) 0.5 miles to the U.S./Canadian border and then another 5.3 miles to the Canadian BC Hydro Clayburn station.

The ROW would be maintained for the 230 kV line as outlined in EIS Section 2.2.2.3 Transmission Line Maintenance. Vegetation management of tall, dead, and dying trees is required to prevent damage to the transmission lines from windthrow. Within 25 feet of the power line all trees of a mature height of 25 feet or greater would be removed. Trees less than 25 feet tall may remain, and tree trimming is permitted in the wire and clearing zone if tree removal is not desired due to ownership, environmental, or cost considerations. Between 25 and 30 feet from the power lines, maintenance would include trimming structurally sound conifers that are 20 inches in diameter or greater and deciduous trees that are 25 inches in diameter or greater. Trees less than the specified diameter may be removed. Beyond 30 feet, maintenance would include the removal of dead, dying, and unstable trees.

The 230 kV line would follow existing ROW which already has been cleared and maintained, which would decrease the amount of trees and vegetation that would have to be trimmed or removed for the 230 kV transmission line installation.

4. The 115 kV lines are no longer part of the project. Please see General Response B for discussion of socioeconomic impacts in Canada and Section 3.6 of the Final EIS.
5. It is not anticipated that visibility would be significantly affected by operation of the plant since it would result in a small, incremental increase in emissions and would not exceed regulatory air quality standards. For more discussion of visibility, see Letter 49, Response to Comment 7.

6. SE2 has agreed to provide specific best management practices for in a project-specific erosion and sediment control plan and a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). Before construction could begin, the Washington Department of Ecology and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) would have the opportunity to review and comment on these plans and EFSEC would have to approve the plans. Agreements between SE2, Ecology, and WDFW stipulate the conditions of these plans (see Volume 1, Appendix G).

The drainage from the site to a tributary to Sumas Creek, then to Johnson Creek, is described in paragraph 2 of section 3.2.2.1 of the DEIS. Salmon presence in Johnson Creek is described in Table 3.5-1 and in paragraph 10 of section 3.5.2.4 of the DEIS.

7. The applicant has chosen to use pavement for the final parking areas, which will result in a more durable parking surface requiring less maintenance. Although gravel parking lots are somewhat permeable, they are not entirely permeable and can contribute similar quantity and quality of runoff, depending on local conditions and construction methods.

A long-term stormwater runoff control plan and a petroleum and toxic material handling, storage, and spill response plan would be provided as stipulated in an agreement with WDFW (see Volume 1, Appendix G, Exhibit 3, page 9). A stormwater pollution prevention plan would be submitted to EFSEC for approval and provided to Ecology for review and comment as stipulated in the agreement with Ecology (Volume 1, Appendix G, Exhibit 6, page 4).

8. Please see General Response I, which addresses the contract that is in place between the City of Sumas and the City of Abbotsford for acceptance of wastewater.
9. If the events cited did occur, the resulting power outage could have significant social and financial impacts.
10. See Letter 5, Response to Comment 9 for discussion of noise related to the project.
11. The 115 kV power lines that run through Whatcom County are no longer part of the project. Only the 230 kV line to Canada is included in the project. Therefore, potential impacts of the 115 kV lines related to electric shock would not occur.