

**Responses to Comments in Letter USR2 from
Marian G. Beddill, United States 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 revised maximum water requirement for operation of S2GF is 802 gpm, up to a total of 1,025 acre-feet per year. The water right for water to be supplied for this project is held by the city of Sumas and was granted by the Department of Ecology. Any future changes resulting in more or less water allocated to the city through legal water rights would also be under the control of the Department of Ecology.

The evaluation of cooling technology proposed by the applicant is not within the scope of this SEIS. EFSEC's decision whether or not to recommend approval of this application will be based on the current configuration of the proposal and any resulting environmental impacts.

2. A consequence of the use of water for this facility would be the limitation it would place on the city of Sumas to make water available to other water users. Please refer to Section 3.3.5 of the SEIS.
3. The flood modeling completed to date indicates that the impact on flooding as a result of filling in the entire industrial area (rather than just this facility) would result in relatively minor and local changes in the depth of flooding. The impact from filling this facility alone would be substantially less than that from filling the entire area. The modeling that has been used to date in evaluating flood impacts was considered adequate for nearby facilities and is considered to be sufficiently reliable to meet Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards for communities to qualify for flood insurance. However, in response to concerns expressed primarily by Whatcom County during the adjudicative hearings, the applicant has agreed in the Second Revised ASC to perform unsteady-state flood modeling, which is substantially more complex and time consuming. The applicant also agreed that it would evaluate potential flood impacts from the fill for the S2GF and propose reasonable mitigation for any adverse off-site impacts identified by the modeling.
4. This comment is outside the scope of this SEIS.