Responses to Comments in Letter 145 from Dale Steele, Sumas 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 comments.

2. Please see Letter 5, Response to Comment 9 and Letter 107, Response to Comment 22 for a discussion of noise impacts related to the proposed facility.

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.

4. Please see Letter 3, Response to Comment 1 for a discussion of human health considerations in establishing air quality standards.

5. As discussed in General Response I, the amount of wastewater that would ultimately be discharged into the Fraser River from this plant, via the JAMES Treatment Plant, has been greatly reduced since preparation of the Draft EIS. The wastewater discharge would meet existing standards for public sewer systems, and would be treated prior to release from the JAMES facility.

   See General Response D for a discussion of impacts of this project to the availability of water resources to other groundwater users.

6. See General Response J for a discussion of the impacts of construction of the facility on flooding.

7. See General Response H and Letter 11, Response to Comment 2 for a discussion of risks and proposed mitigation measures relating to the 2.5-million-gallon diesel fuel tank that would be used for storage of backup fuel.

8. The load – resource balance varies with time. Absence of a need for generation at the time the resource was shut down does not necessarily mean that there is a lack of need at other times.