

Responses to Comments in Letter 155 from Diane Petty, 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. Please see Letter 148, Response to Comment 1, for discussion of the EIS process.
2. Thank you for your comments.
3. Thank you for your comments.
4. Different individuals observed the wetland to record wetland hydrology characteristics on numerous occasions over the past five years. Hydrologic observations were made in January through April 1995, October 1995, January 1996, and May 2000. Other observations relative to determining wetland acreages, functions, and mitigation strategies as reported in Exhibit JW-4 of the Supplemental Agreement Between Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and Sumas Energy 2 (see Appendix G) were also made on those and other site visits.

One of the purposes of SEPA is to provide sufficient information to describe principal features of the environment that would be affected by the alternatives, including the proposal (WAC 197-11-440). The amount of time spent determining characteristics of the wetland is consistent with this SEPA directive.

5. SEPA is intended to identify significant impacts, such as the unmitigated destruction of a threatened species' habitat. Wildlife studies were sufficient to identify significant issues and impacts on wildlife. A complete list of birds (or mammals for that matter) with data collected over one year may be interesting but is not particularly relevant to the significant issues related to decisions on the applicant's proposal.
6. The fill material for construction of this plant would be obtained from existing, permitted gravel pits. The environmental impacts of that mining would be addressed as part of the permitting process for the gravel extraction, and not under EFSEC jurisdiction.
7. The proposed facility would be subject to emission limits established by regulation and incorporated into the facility's operating permit. New regulatory requirements would be incorporated into operating permit renewals.
8. Please see Letter 3, Response to Comment 2 for a discussion of air quality emissions from the proposed facility and their impacts in the Lower Fraser Valley.
9. Please see Letter 3, Response to Comment 1 for a discussion of air quality standards and their relation to potential human health effects
10. The S2GF would include low-level lighting around the exit areas and general outside area, including stairs and platforms, ground-level operating areas, and parking areas. No high-mast, wide area lighting is planned. The stacks will also have platform lighting at

emission monitoring locations, which will be used only during equipment inspection and maintenance.

Light and glare impacts on neighboring properties and the night sky are expected to be minimal. During the day, potential glare impacts will be minimal because of the planned use of nonreflective, earth-tone/light paint colors on exterior surfaces. Adjusting light direction and screening lighted areas with vegetation will minimize light spillover at night. As an industrial land use, the S2FG is expected to make a slight contribution to overall ambient light levels in the immediate vicinity. Because of the flat topography, some S2GF lights may be seen by distant or elevated viewers, but impacts caused by lighting are expected to be minimal.

11. See Letter 142, Responses to Comments 3 and 4, for discussion of location of S2GF vs. load.
12. Thank you for your comments.