

Responses to questions raised by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) concerning the Jamaica Energy Partners (JEP) West Kingston Power Plant Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

1. **“The EIA refers to the project as being a World Bank venture and thus subject to the World Bank Environmental Guidelines. The facility is not a World Bank venture and not subject to the World Bank Environmental Guidelines. Rather, it will be subject to the International Finance Corporation's Thermal power guidelines (which are correctly attached to the EIA) and more generally, to the IFC performance standards. We do not want to imply that we are requiring OP 4.01 be applied to the project. The reference to the World Bank or the World Bank Guidelines is throughout the document (i.e. p. 10, 28, 190). We would like that corrected.”**

Response 1:

Wherever "World Bank" / "World Bank guidelines" was mentioned in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) it was in reference to the International Finance Corporation (IFC) Thermal power guidelines (2008) since it was the understanding that the IFC Thermal power guidelines (2008) is the only guideline from the World Bank / IFC in force for new thermal power plants and replaced the World Bank 1998 guidelines. We would not be in a position to change the words in the document at this time since the EIA has already been submitted to the local regulatory agency (National Environment & Planning Agency [NEPA]) and gone through an extensive review and approval process which involved NEPA and a number of other local government organizations, community and other stake holder consultations. IFC has also reviewed the document and recommended changes which were implemented and a permit has already been issued to JEP by NEPA. The EIA has also been posted on the websites for NEPA and other government agencies and stakeholders. However, JEP acknowledges this request and will honor it in future documents prepared for OPIC if this is OPIC's preference. The issues raised by OPIC were mentioned in a letter sent to the National Environment & Planning Agency (NEPA) in relation to the environmental permit received by JEP.

2. **“Section 4.4.3 Subsidence indicates that the pumping of groundwater from nearby wells, together with the presence of peaty layers and organic muck in the superficial deposits could induce subsidence locally. Whether or not subsidence has actually occurred at the site would need to be determined through examination of present and previous survey records. This is a rather significant statement and there is no mention of evaluating the impacts of subsidence in either the impacts section or in the action plan. We would like to see it included in one or the other.”**

Response 2:

Geo Technical investigations were conducted by Jentech Consultant Ltd. (please see references on pages 41, 68 & 335 in the EIA) and a report prepared and submitted to Wartsila for the inclusion of the information from this survey into their design. The mitigation measure that will be used to prevent subsistence is the extensive use of piled foundations.

3. **“Page 143 of the EIA indicates that water from the Reverse Osmosis plant will exceed standards and the Company should apply for relaxation of these standards. It is not entirely clear from the document where this RO water will be discharged. Discharge of fresh water directly into the sea would not be allowed by OPIC. The document should clarify where this water is to be discharged and if into the sea is the current plan, that other alternatives will be addressed.”**

Response 3:

The reject water from the Reverse Osmosis (RO) Unit will be discharged to the National Water Commission (NWC) sewer line and pumped to their central wastewater treatment facility for treatment and final disposal.