

**Responses to Comments in Letter CR2 from
Andrea Mikulan, Canadian 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. Section 3.4 has been revised to describe specific mitigations that are recommended to be required as part of the certification process and/or prior to startup of the plant.
2. There currently is no evidence to indicate that an active fault underlies the plant site. Based on the lack of evidence for young geologic offset and the scarcity of seismic activity, if there is a fault in the site vicinity, it is likely to be old and inactive. There is, however, the potential that a strong earthquake could affect the site during the life of the facility. Based on this seismic potential and the possibility that there could be an active fault at or near the site, the applicant would perform geologic and geotechnical investigations to evaluate the potential for active faulting and to develop a seismic design that incorporates a probabilistic hazard assessment of all potential earthquake sources. If an active fault was found to underlie the plant site, the facility design would have to be substantially revised in order to comply with the seismic design code.
3. Section 3.1 has been revised to describe the types of greenhouse gas offset programs that could be implemented, and to clarify that greenhouse gas offset programs anywhere in the world would benefit citizens in Washington and Canada.