



STATE OF WASHINGTON

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

PO Box 43172 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

Addendum to Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Pursuant to Chapter 463-47 WAC, and WAC 197-11-625

Addendum to Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

For the Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility

Date of Addendum: May 16, 2002

Date of original issuance of Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement:

May 13, 2002

Description of Proposal: Construction and operation of a 660-megawatt, combined-cycle, combustion turbine electrical generating facility and associated components in Sumas, Washington. The project also includes (1) installation of a new natural gas pipeline from the Canadian border to the plant site, (2) a 230-kV electrical transmission line extending north from the plant site to the U.S./Canadian border, then to BC Hydro's Clayburn Station, (3) a process/potable water pipeline provided by the City of Sumas (water system) to the plant site, with associated upgrades to the water system, and (4) a wastewater discharge pipeline from the plant site provided by the City of Sumas (wastewater collection system) at the plant boundary, with associated upgrades to the wastewater collection system.

Proponent: Sumas Energy 2 Inc., Kirkland, Washington

Location of Proposal: The proposed Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility would be located on a 37-acre site within the industrial area of Sumas, Washington, just north of the Sumas Cogeneration Company LP No. 1 Generation Facility. The electrical transmission line for the project extends off the site to the U.S./Canada border and into Canada.

Purpose of Addendum: On May 13, 2002, the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council issued a final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility. This addendum serves to add the City of Abbotsford and

Abbotsford Chamber of Commerce comments on the draft SEIS, and the responses to those comments, to the final SEIS. Responses to similar comments were addressed in the final SEIS. This addendum does not change the analysis or conclusions in the May 13, 2002 final SEIS.

Name of Agency: Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
925 Plum Street SE, Building 4
PO Box 43172
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Responsible Official: Allen J, Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager

Signature: _____

Contact person: Irina Makarow
PO Box 43172
Olympia, WA 98504-3172
(360) 956-2047

Appendix B

Public Comments and Responses

Introduction

In September 2001, EFSEC invited public comment on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft SEIS) for the proposed Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility. In addition, comments were received at a public hearing conducted on October 16, 2001 in Everson, Washington.

Appendix B presents the following:

- Written comments on the Draft SEIS received by the October 19, 2001 deadline
- Responses to written comments
- A transcript of the public hearing conducted on October 16, 2001
- Responses to public hearing comments

A total of 35 comment letters were submitted to EFSEC. The comment letters are categorized and numbered based upon the affiliation of the individual submitting the letter. Table B-1 presents a list of those who submitted comment letters by category.

Comments specific to the Draft SEIS are marked in the right margin of each comment letter. Immediately following each letter is a written response, with responses corresponding to the specific comments marked in the letter. Two letters (CF1 and CR5) had lengthy attachments that did not directly address the SEIS. The attachments are not reproduced here, but are available for review through EFSEC.

The public hearing transcript is presented following the comment letters and responses. Note that the printed public hearing transcript is reduced such that four pages of transcript are shown on each printed page in this appendix. In the left margin of the transcript, comments specific to the Draft SEIS are marked with a vertical line. Following the public hearing transcript, a document responding to each of the public hearing comments (that are marked in the margin of the transcript) is presented.

In the letters as well as public hearing testimony, many comments were made that did not specifically address the adequacy of the Draft SEIS. Although such comments are not necessarily formally identified and provided with a written response in Appendix B, all comments were reviewed by EFSEC and its consultant (Jones & Stokes) and are acknowledged.

Table B-1. Classification of Letters Received Concerning the Draft SEIS, by Affiliation

United States	Canada
<p>USF—Federal</p> <p>None</p> <p>USS—State</p> <p>USS1 Jeannie Summerhays, Washington State Department of Ecology</p> <p>USL—Local government</p> <p>None</p> <p>USO—Nongovernmental organization</p> <p>USO1 Danielle Dixon, NW Energy Coalition USO2 Brian Carpenter, REBOUND USO3 Charles E. Martin, Sumas Energy 2, Inc. USO4 Brad Owens, Northwest Building and Construction Trades Council</p> <p>USR—Resident</p> <p>USR1 Kirk Deal USR2 Marian G. Beddill USR3 Marlene Noteboom USR4 Candice Ambrosio and Dean Rogers USR5 Lynn Peterson and Hugh Lewis USR6 Connie Hoag USR7 Joni Hensley USR8 Mike Bozzo USR9 Paige and Ladd Shumway USR10 Margaret Curtis USR11 Richard H. Severson USR12 Bo Bumford USR13 Darryl Ehlers USR14 Andy Ross USR15 Rolf B.G. Nilsen USR16 Mike Kaufman</p>	<p>CF—Federal</p> <p>CF1 Kirk Johnstone, Environment Canada</p> <p>CP—Provincial</p> <p>CP1 Margaret Eckenfelder, British Columbia Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection</p> <p>CL—Local government</p> <p>CL1 Patricia Ross, City of Abbotsford CL2 Peter Andzans, City of Abbotsford and Abbotsford Chamber of Commerce</p> <p>CO—Nongovernmental organization</p> <p>CO1 Lee Larkin, Chilliwack Field Naturalists CO2 Mary Reeves, Abbotsford Downtown Business Association CO3 Garry Dickinson, Huntingdon Duty Free Shop Inc.</p> <p>CR—Resident</p> <p>CR1 Les and Joan Hay CR2 Andrea Mikulan CR3 E. Herbert Warkentin CR4 Heather Taylor CR5 James Degen CR6 James Degen CR7 Rose Morrison CR8 Laurie Hoekstra</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of Application No. 99-1:

SUMAS ENERGY 2 GENERATION FACILITY
(SE2GF)

**CITY OF ABBOTSFORD AND
ABBOTSFORD CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE COMMENTS
REGARDING THE DRAFT
SUPPLEMENTARY ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
SUMAS ENERGY 2 GENERATION
FACILITY**

I. INTRODUCTION

In June 2001, SE2GF submitted a Second Revised Application to EFSEC. As the lead SEPA agency for this proposal, EFSEC determined that changes being proposed to the project could have an adverse environmental impact, and prepared a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) under WAC 197-11-600(3)(b). The SEIS evaluates impacts for the following areas based on the proposed changes to the project and suggested mitigation that were not evaluated in the Final EIS:

1. Greenhouse Gases– changes in proposed carbon dioxide mitigation;
2. Noise (Low-Frequency) – possible mitigation;
3. Groundwater Quality – proposed mitigation;
4. Groundwater Quantity – proposed mitigation;
5. Wetlands – proposed mitigation;
6. Flooding Potential – potential impacts and possible mitigation; and
7. Faulting and Seismicity – seismic risks based on new information.

EFSEC invited the public and other reviewers to provide comments regarding the areas of environmental impact discussed in the draft SEIS. The comment period for the draft SEIS closes

1 on October 19, 2001. Written comments must be addressed to: Allen Fiksdal, Manager, Energy
2 Facility Site Evaluation Council, P.O. Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172, and must be
3 received in the EFSEC office by 5:00 p.m. October 19, 2001.
4
5
6
7

8 **II. COMMENTS**

9 Drawing from EFSEC's covering letter and the draft Supplementary Environmental Impact
10 Statement (SEIS) for the proposed SE2GF the City of Abbotsford wishes to make the following
11 comments:
12
13
14

15 **A. Sewage Treatment:**

16 The City of Sumas has a sewage disposal agreement with the City of Abbotsford for up to
17 400,000 gallons per day of sewage to be accepted for treatment at the Abbotsford-Mission
18 Sewage Treatment Plant. Since the agreement is subject to a 20-year time limit, with only sixteen
19 years left to run, it does not ensure long-term sewage disposal. Furthermore, the City of Sumas
20 currently does not have a sewage treatment plant and it is not known whether it is feasible to
21 establish one before the end of the term of the sewage disposal agreement. Consequently, the draft
22 SEIS should consider alternative long-term sewage disposal requirements and strategies (refer to
23 page 2 of EFSEC's cover letter).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **B. Electrical Transmission:**

36 With respect to the transmission of electrical power from the proposed SE2 plant some
37 clarification is required regarding the transmission route/s that will be used and the authorities that
38 must be consulted. It is our understanding that the power from the plant would be transmitted part
39 of the way to consumers in the United States over lines located in British Columbia; however, this is
40 not clear in some of the sections in the draft SEIS (refer to: Table 2-1 (see Electrical
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Transmission/BPA), page 2-8; Section 2.2.1.8 (Intertie Capacity), page 2-10; and Section 2.2.3.4 (Transmission Lines), page 2-17).

C. Air Quality:

In respect of Green House Gas (GHG) emissions the draft SEIS outlined possible mitigation plans including the potential for a "monetary path" offset agreement with Oregon. If such an agreement were utilized how could or would considerations relevant to the Lower Fraser Valley airshed be incorporated into the administration of the program? How might this arrangement be changed in the future to address potential changes to institutional frameworks that would allow a similar program in this airshed? (refer to Table 1-2 (see Air Quality GHG mitigation), page 1-9; and Section 3.1.3.1 (Proposed SE2 GHG mitigation plan), pages 3.1-3 and 3.1-4).

How are the fees cited in Section 3.1.3.1 of the draft SEIS related to the projected impacts of the plant on the regional environment of the Fraser Valley and Whatcom County in which the plant is proposed? In other words, while the draft SEIS discusses some GHG mitigation measures it appears to ignore the potential impacts of other non-GHG emissions on this region. Even if all of the GHG emissions from the plant were offset elsewhere (e.g. Oregon) the non-GHG emissions will still remain and affect the communities of the Fraser Valley and Whatcom County. These are important considerations that should be addressed in the SEIS.

Furthermore, the basis for the emission fees cited in Section 3.1.3.1 of the draft SEIS is not satisfactorily examined. Details should be provided in the document to explain how these fees were established as well as an explanation of their relevance to local and regional circumstances in Washington and British Columbia (refer to Section 3.1.3.1 (Proposed SE2 GHG mitigation plan), pages 3.1-3 and 3.1-4).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Lastly, again with respect to Air Quality matters, what is the relevant efficiency of the SE2 emissions offsets outlined in Section 3.1.3.2 of the draft SEIS ? How effective and legitimate is the concept of paying for carbon mitigation as offsets as opposed to reducing and eliminating carbon emissions at the source? Recent research, for example, has raised questions about the effectiveness of some carbon sinks. These issues are important for EFSEC to consider especially when comparing preventative versus mitigation approaches in the draft SEIS (refer to Section 3.1.3.2 (Environmental Benefits of Proposed GHG Mitigation), pages 3.1-4 and 3.1-5; and to page 3.1-7 (Actual Cost of Greenhouse Gas Elimination).

D. Groundwater Quantity:

The draft SEIS does not address cumulative impacts arising from the demands to both supply SE2 with water for its operations as well as for further new residential, industrial and commercial development in the City of Sumas. Considerable land for residential, industrial and commercial development still remains unused in Sumas. It is important therefore to know if sufficient water resources exist locally to permit continued development in Sumas in the future. Section 3.3.1 of the draft SEIS outlines that the difference between the combined water rights of the two Sumas water well fields (3611 gpm) less the maximum peak water demand (3452 gpm) following the development of SE2 is only 159 gpm. If there is considerable growth in the future with a corresponding increase in water use, then it is important to consider the feasibility of supplying this water especially in light of limited water rights allocations. Are there any water rights left on surface watercourses such as the Nooksack River? What possible options remain and how much water allocation (volume wise) is available? All of these factors should be considered more fully in the SEIS (refer to Section 3.3.1 (Groundwater Quantity - Existing Conditions), page 3.3-1).

1 The draft SEIS states that "the large volume of groundwater that would be extracted from
2 the Sumas well fields to supply the SE2 plant would result in increased drawdown in the area
3 surrounding the well fields" (Section 3.3.3). This effect is of concern to the City of Abbotsford
4 residents whose wells may be affected by this activity. It would appear that the potential impacts on
5 well users in Abbotsford have been insufficiently addressed. The draft SEIS states that the actual
6 number of wells within the proposed 1-mile mitigation radius was not determined by the
7 researchers. More importantly, does the proposed 1-mile radius surrounding the wells supplying
8 water to SE2 accurately delineate the area that will actually be impacted or is that area in fact larger
9 or smaller? What is the certainty with respect to these delineations? If the 1-mile theoretical radius
10 of well interference does not include all properties that will be affected then this limitation may result
11 in depriving legitimately impacted areas beyond that 1-mile radius from receiving mitigation (refer to
12 Section 3.3.3 (Groundwater Quantity- Environmental Impacts), pages 3.3-2 to 3.3-4).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **E. Low Frequency Noise:**
26

27 As noted in previous testimony before EFSEC, low frequency noise and tones can be
28 disturbing and disruptive to many people and deserves careful consideration and assessment.
29 Therefore serious concerns arise with respect to the analysis of low-frequency noise and tones,
30 including the failure of the applicant to provide the necessary predictive information to undertake a
31 rigorous and comprehensive environmental impact assessment. In particular, the draft SEIS reveals
32 that no measurements were taken of existing low-frequency noise levels at the receivers near the
33 project site, and there is no predictive modelling of sound levels in this range. Consequently it is
34 understandable that the consultants have not prescribed any low-frequency noise guidelines in the
35 draft SEIS other than those applied by Oregon State.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

However, because predictive data for low-frequency noise levels will eventually need to be produced, the draft SEIS should include research on, and provide recommendations regarding, acceptable standards. Accordingly, noise limit standards that have been developed for similar projects in the United States and in other jurisdictions could be drawn upon for that review (refer to Section 3.4.1.3 (Existing Low Frequency Noise Levels), page 3.4-2; and Section 3.4-7 (Establish Quantitative Low-Frequency Noise Limits Prior to Construction), page 3.4-7).

Another major flaw in the document exists in the proposed mitigation section. If as the draft SEIS states that potential mitigation measures “would be difficult to incorporate after the facility has been constructed” then clearly post construction mitigation should be considered as an option of last resort. Furthermore, the potential effectiveness of post construction/retrofit measures is not even analysed in the draft SEIS.

The applicant did originally address broad band noise effects. This helped the environmental consultant conduct a reasonable assessment of the potential impacts with respect to broad band noise. Consequently, it is suggested that the same protocol should hold true for low-frequency noise and tones. It is unacceptable to give lesser regard to the potential impacts of low-frequency noise from the SE2GF than was given to broad band noise.

In regard to the noise mitigation measures outlined in the draft SEIS, we found this information useful but insufficient. In order to help evaluate the usefulness of the specific noise mitigation measures it would be beneficial to present a comparative analysis of their effectiveness. This material would also help identify mitigation measures that should be incorporated into the design of the facility in the event that the proposed SE2 plant is approved by EFSEC. In this way

1 EFSEC would also be able to make recommendations on the preferred mitigation measures (refer
2 to Section 3.4.3 (Potential Noise Retrofit Mitigation Measures), pages 3.4-4 to 3.4-8).
3
4
5

6
7 **F. Faulting and Seismicity:**

8
9 The draft SEIS presents some statements regarding the existence of faults and seismic
10 activity that are inconclusive. While the existence of the Sumas Fault has not been proven, it has
11 been inferred to exist by a number of geologists and seismologists who work in the Pacific
12 Northwest. Given the projected orientation of the inferred Sumas Fault near, or through, the site of
13 the proposed plant and the risks posed to Canadian and United States residents, further
14 investigations regarding the presence of this fault and associated seismic activity or, at the very least,
15 a risk assessment analysis of such a possibility would be prudent as this is clearly a site or location
16 issue as opposed to a construction or site development matter. Consequently, this information
17 should be an important part of the SEIS (refer to Sections 3.7.1.2 and 3.7.1.3 (Faulting and
18 Seismicity), pages 3.7-1 to 3.7-8).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28
29 It should also be mentioned that a great deal more work could be done to investigate the
30 presence, activity and risks posed by faults in the Fraser Valley / Whatcom County region including
31 reviews of air photographs, surveys using LIDAR (light detection and ranging) and ground
32 penetrating radar, localized trenching across suspected faults to assess horizontal as well as vertical
33 movements, and drilling. Although the draft SEIS mentions that a "detailed geo-technical
34 investigation would be conducted prior to the final design [of the plant] to establish the areas and
35 extent of liquefiable soil layers underlying the proposed plant ... and to further assess the presence
36 and seismic potential of the Vedder Mountain and inferred Sumas faults" it does not include enough
37 detail about the extent and scope of that investigative work. We feel that greater detail and
38 direction regarding these matters should be included in the draft SEIS.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Section 3.7.5 of the draft SEIS includes the following statement: "In the very unlikely event the Sumas Fault is found to underlie the plant site and to have ruptured in the last 10,000 years, it is questionable whether it would be feasible to economically construct the plant to provide adequate protection from the hazard of surface rupture" (refer to Section 3.7.5 (Adverse Impacts), page 3.7-11). The statement suggests there is sufficient reason to determine this matter now before the proposed SE2GF is designed. It also suggests that it would be uneconomic to satisfactorily mitigate the risks posed by the proposed plant to surrounding communities by a surface rupture of the Sumas Fault. While the draft SEIS states that the likelihood of such a rupture is remote the document should nonetheless consider the implications for surrounding communities if such a seismic risk is determined to exist in the future. Furthermore, if the proposed plant is built and the fault is discovered to lie beneath or near the plant site in the future would the plant be required to close in the interests of public safety? The SEIS should address these concerns.

Finally, how close might the plant be to a fault and still be safe? And, how far should the plant be away from an "active fault"? These are important questions that have not been addressed in the draft SEIS and again may prove critical in allowing EFSEC to evaluate the appropriateness of the site for the proposed plant (refer to Section 3.7.3 (Surface Fault Rupture), pages 3.7-8 to 3.7-9; and Section 3.7.4 (Mitigation Measures), page 3.7-10).

DATED: October 19, 2001.
By _____
Peter Andzans, Manager, Environment and Community Planning, City of Abbotsford
AGENT for the City of Abbotsford and the Abbotsford Chamber of Commerce

**Responses to Comments in Letter CL2 from
Peter Andzans, City of Abbotsford and Abbotsford Chamber of Commerce**

**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 not within the scope of the SEIS.
2. This comment is not within the scope of the SEIS. The power would be transmitted north to Canada on the BC Hydro system. The fate of the power depends on future power purchasers and none have been identified to date.
3. No mechanism has been proposed to change the GHG offset payments to focus on offsets specifically within the Lower Delta airshed. The GHG fees would essentially be a one-time, up-front payment made to the Oregon Climate Trust, which would then administer GHG elimination programs throughout North America. Regardless, the Climate Trust's GHG programs would benefit citizens in Abbotsford and Sumas because GHG reduction anywhere on earth would provide incremental worldwide reductions in global climate change.
4. The proposed GHG emission fees are unrelated to the applicant's proposal to offset PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions in the Lower Delta airshed. The NO_x/PM₁₀ offsets would be in addition to criteria pollutant emission controls required under the PSD permit. The impacts of emissions other than GHG's were analyzed in the February 2001 FEIS, and are not within the scope of this SEIS.
5. The basis and magnitude for the proposed GHG emission fees are described in detail in the final SEIS. The applicant has made a voluntary proposal to pay up-front emission fees calculated using the Oregon Monetary Path system. The annual tons of CO₂ for which emission fees would be required would be calculated based on the Oregon emission limits. The applicant would pay fees based on a unit cost of \$0.57/ton, which was the fee in effect when the applicant developed the Second Revised Application (Oregon has since raised the unit cost for power plants in Oregon, but the applicant has not offered to increase their proposed unit cost for the Sumas plant). This SEIS does not evaluate the basis for how the Oregon legislature established the Oregon Monetary Path mitigation system. Washington State has no similar laws or regulations for basis of comparison. As stated above, there are no local or regional circumstances that apply to GHG emissions or impacts; this is a global issue.
6. As described in the final SEIS, the applicant's voluntary GHG fee payments are estimated to provide funding to the Oregon Climate Trust to administer North American GHG elimination programs to offset between 2% to 5% of the total GHG emissions from the Sumas plant. The proposed combined-cycle power plant would be exceptionally fuel efficient, so it is not feasible to further reduce GHG emissions from the project. The Oregon law requires the Oregon Climate Trust to demonstrate that the GHG elimination

programs it funds are effective and traceable. The final SEIS describes some of the programs the Oregon Climate Trust has recently funded.

7. The SEIS and the February 2001 FEIS conclude that there is adequate water to meet normal growth demands over the next 20 years but large industrial water demand customers may be precluded from development in the city.
8. Section 3.3.4 has been revised to clarify that the theoretical 1-mile radius of drawdown interference would be “adjusted based on the results of a controlled aquifer test” (described in previous paragraph, p. 3.3-4). Figure 3.3-1 also has been revised to depict more completely the theoretical 1-mile radius of drawdown interference.
9. The final SEIS recommends SCA compliance conditions related to low-frequency noise. The applicant's expert witness indicated predictive modeling would not be valid at this time, because the actual mechanical design for the plant has not yet begun. The SEIS recommends that the SCA require the applicant to submit, for EFSEC review and approval, predictive noise modeling based on the 50% complete design package for the power plant. The SEIS also recommends that SCA conditions also require the applicant to conduct post-startup compliance noise monitoring at representative homes near the plant.
10. The noise analysis in the SEIS does discuss other standards. The proposed ASC conditions would allow the applicant to propose relevant low-frequency noise limits other than those recommended in the SEIS, subject to review and approval by EFSEC.
11. The proposed ASC conditions would require the applicant to submit predictive noise modeling during the early stages of the actual plant design (e.g., based on the plant's 50% design package), and to implement noise control based on the predictive modeling. This would ensure that the post-startup noise monitoring and retrofit mitigation would not be a "last resort".
12. Please see response to Comment 11.
13. Sufficient information on design and operation and receptors is not available at this time to assess comparative effectiveness. The recommended ASC conditions would require the applicant to provide predictive noise modeling during the early stages of the actual plant design, for review and approval by EFSEC. After the plant was constructed using appropriate mitigation based on the predictive modeling, it is recommended that the applicant be required to conduct post-startup compliance monitoring.
14. Seismic response is a design issue based on measured data. The seismic characteristics of the site are discussed in the Final SEIS. Additional studies would be done for final design as stated. The project would have no impact on local seismic conditions. Offsite impacts from the facility in the event of an earthquake are not within the scope of this SEIS.

15. Seismic risk is discussed in the SEIS. The statement to which you refer implies that, if future studies confirm the existence of the Sumas fault and evidence of surface ruptures, then seismic impacts to the plant would not be likely to occur because the plant may not be constructed. The seismic analysis concludes that no data exists to confirm this condition to date.

16. Facilities such as this are designed according to local and regional seismic standards, based on specific site conditions. Such conditions would be derived upon the basis of the additional seismic analysis to be conducted by the applicant's design consultant. The facility would be designed and constructed to comply with the seismic protection standards in effect for the chosen location.