

## Responses to Comments in Letter 32 from Chris Smith, Abbotsford 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. Please see Letter 9, Responses to Comment 1 and 5 for a discussion of the BACT process and PM2.5 impacts associated with the proposed facility.
2. Please see Letter 9, Response to Comment 2 for a discussion of emissions associated with the proposed project.
3. As discussed in Letter 3, Response to Comment 2, the incremental impact of air emissions from the proposed facility on overall air quality would not exceed applicable regulatory requirements and would have a relatively small incremental impact on total emissions in the airshed. The percent contribution of regulated pollutants to the entire airshed total would range from 0.03 percent to approximately 1.48 percent.
4. The wildlife evaluation was based on habitat evaluations, records for sensitive species, and reconnaissance surveys. Complete surveys were not necessary to understand the impacts of the project. Conversion of habitat is an unavoidable impact of any construction project in a rural area. Listing of all species is not necessary to determine significant impacts on wildlife. Over 100 species of birds could be present, as well as numerous species of mammals and amphibians and a few reptile species. However, EIS evaluations are intended to focus on rare, threatened, or endangered species, per WAC 197-11-440(6), which defines what level of detail is appropriate for the affected environment of an EIS:

*“Succinctly describe the principal features of the environment that would be affected, or created, by the alternatives including the proposal under consideration. Inventories of species should be avoided, although rare, threatened, or endangered species should be indicated.”*

The EIS does this and notes the key species that are present and would be affected.

5. Please see Letter 9, Response to Comment 5 for a discussion of the BACT determination process.
6. Please see Letter 9, Response to Comment 6.
7. Please see Letter 9, Response to Comment 7 for a discussion of emission limits associated with the proposed facility.
8. Please see Letter 3, Response to Comment 2 for a discussion of air quality impacts associated with the proposed facility.
9. Please see Letter 9, Response to Comment 9.

10. Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response B.
11. It is not anticipated that visibility and tourism will be significantly affected by operation of the plant since it will only provide a minimum incremental increase in emissions and not exceed regulatory standards. For more discussion of visibility, see Letter 49, Response to Comment 7.
12. The Final EIS includes comments from many residents who are concerned about Canadian issues. Please see General Response B for discussion of power line impacts in Abbotsford.