

Responses to Comments in Letter 254 from Marlene Noteboom, Lynden 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. The 115 kV transmission lines have been eliminated as an alternative. S2GF would be operated as a “merchant” plant.
2. The 115 kV transmission lines have been eliminated as an alternative.
3. The 115 kV transmission lines have been eliminated as an alternative.
4. EFSEC sent out general public information notices to state and local agencies as well as the general public on their mailing list as outlined under WAC 197-11-150 Public Notice. Notices for the April 3 and 4, 2000 public comment meetings were published in:

Bellingham Herald: March 23, 2000

Lynden Tribune: March 29, 2000

Abbotsford News: March 23, 2000

In addition to the mailings, EFSEC posted the Draft EIS and extensions of the comment period on their Web site.

5. The 115 kV transmission lines have been eliminated as an alternative.
6. See Letter 3, Response to Comment 4, for discussion of EMF health effects.
7. The volume of water that would be required from the City wells has been reduced somewhat, and is now less than was allocated by the City of Sumas in the Water Supply Comprehensive Plan. That document identifies the amount of water that is projected to be needed by the City and its customers for the next 20 years. This Plan indicates that the projection includes new industries. Based on these calculations, the City planned to allocate the remainder of the water available to them to this proposed plant.
8. See Response to Comment 7 (above). The volume of wastewater that would be generated by S2GF has been greatly reduced by a design modification. As a result, the amount of wastewater generated would be within the volume currently contracted between the City of Abbotsford and the City of Sumas. See General Response I for further discussion.

Wastewater discharge leaving the S2GF would be required to meet all existing standards for public sewer systems. Prior to discharge from the JAMES Treatment Plant, the wastewater would have to comply with Canadian environmental laws.

9. See Letter 5, Response to Comment 7 for discussion of basin/berm liner.
10. Thank you for your comments.

11. See Letter 142, Response to Comment 13 regarding MSDS sheets.
12. The exact length of time required for construction cannot be accurately predicted. The figure of 18 months given in the EIS was an estimate. The figure of 400 workers is an estimate based on peak construction activity. Fewer workers may be required at other times.
13. See Letter 3, Response to Comment 1 for discussion of air quality data and cumulative air quality impacts.
14. See Letter 3, Response to Comment 2 for discussion of air quality impacts in Canada.
15. Ozone would not be emitted directly by the project, but Canadian concerns were raised about the potential effects on ozone episodes attributable to emissions of NO_x and volatile organic compounds from the proposed project. As part of Canadian efforts to understand troposphere ozone, the MELP has conducted detailed photochemical model evaluations of ozone precursors for specific adverse episodes. The MELP evaluated ozone impacts attributable to the proposed project by adding project-related emissions to its existing emission inventory and evaluating the project's impact on ozone concentrations in the Lower Fraser Valley. Based on that modeling effort, MELP determined that emissions from the proposed project would have a slight effect on ozone episode intensity and no effect on ozone episode duration. (Exhibit 25, page 13). Also, please see Letter 3, Response to Comment 2.
16. The proposed Significant Impact Levels (SILs) have been added to Table 3.1-12 in the Final EIS. Please see Letter 155, Response to Comment 7 for a discussion of regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed facility. See Letter 3, Response to Comment 1 for discussion of air quality data and cumulative air quality impacts.
17. Please see Response to Comment 5 by Darryl Ehlers (Speaker 187 during the April 3 public hearing) for discussion of extending the Draft EIS comment period.
18. Please see Response to Comment 5 by Darryl Ehlers (Speaker 187 during the April 3 public hearing) for discussion of extending the Draft EIS comment period.