Responses to Comments in Letter CR7 from Rose Morrison, 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. This comment is outside the scope of this SEIS.

2. Comment acknowledged.

3. 3a and 3d. Note that after the Draft SEIS was published, SE2 updated the specific provisions of its proposed greenhouse gas mitigation program. The updated program would provide less funding than was indicated in the Draft SEIS. Section 3.1 has been revised to address the updated proposal.

   3b. Section 3.1 has been revised to describe the types of greenhouse gas offset programs that could be implemented.

   3c. Section 3.1 has been revised to clarify that greenhouse gas offset programs anywhere in the world would benefit citizens in Washington and Canada, and vice versa.

   3e. Comment acknowledged.

4. The applicant submitted additional revisions to the wetlands mitigation plan in September 2001 within the framework of the adjudicative proceedings. These revisions were used to update Section 3.5.4. This revised mitigation plan does meet requirements described in this Final SEIS.

5. Based on hydrogeologic data obtained from aquifer tests of the city's well fields, the area that would be affected by the increase in pumping would be limited to the zone of interference centered around the pumping wells. The theoretical zone of interference is portrayed in Figure 3.3-1. Theoretically, the water table area within the circle shown on this map would be lowered potentially (drawn down) 1 foot or more as a result of the increased pumping that would be required to supply water for the S2GF; outside of the circle, the drawdown would be less than 1 foot. The actual amount of drawdown would decrease outwardly from the pumping well so that the water table underlying areas near the center of the zone of interference would decrease the most, whereas the drawdown beyond the 1-mile circle would be progressively less than 1 foot. While this analysis is not sufficiently reliable to predict the absolute amount of drawdown in any given location, it does give a good approximation of the general extent of the area that could potentially be affected by a lower water table. The actual impact on wells would be determined by pre-and post-startup groundwater testing and monitoring that would be performed by the applicant. Based on this testing and monitoring, the zone of potential interference would be revised to better reflect where drawdown might be expected to

occur. For those wells that were found to be adversely affected by the increased pumping for the S2GF, the applicant has agreed to provide mitigation.

6. The applicant has agreed to perform additional modeling that was called for by Whatcom County. This modeling, when complete, would provide a basis for evaluating the off-site flood impacts and designing appropriate mitigation measures, if warranted. Whereas this approach does not provide for an absolute accounting of the flood impacts for the SEIS, the existing flood modeling is sufficiently reliable to indicate that off-site flood impacts would be relatively minor and capable of being mitigated. Should the proposal be approved by the governor, EFSEC would retain the authority to review and approve any mitigation being proposed by the applicant.