RECEIVED

MAY 0 3 2000

ENERGY FACILITY SITE
EVALUATION COUNCIL

9843 Hammer Road
Lynden, WA 98264
May 1, 2000

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
Attn: Mr. Allen Fiksdal
P.O. Box 43172
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

R.E. Sumas Energy 2

Dear Mr. Fiksdal and EFSEC:

I do not think the Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility Draft Environmental Impact Statement is adequate. In some cases, I do not think that the methodology was appropriate. The following are my top concerns.

The air quality at the Abbotsford (B.C.) airport is qualitatively different from the air quality in Chiliwack, B.C. where pollution from Vancouver and its suburbs accumulates due to the winds and Coastal Range. Abbotsford is west of the proposed plant while Chiliwack is east of the plant. Sumas is part of the Frasier River Valley and Sumas is usually upwind from Chiliwack. Chiliwack will be the recipient of a great part of the air pollutants from the proposed plant. This is a significant piece of information that has not been addressed. Air quality records need to be compared in Chiliwack to see how much air pollution has increased since the first plant (Sumas Energy I) began operations. Health records need to be compared to see if there is an increase in asthma, cancer, or heart disease after SEI started operations. The proposed plant is 5 times larger, thus these comparisons at both locations are critical. 1

Canada is less than one mile (perhaps only ½ mile) from the proposed power plant site. The proposed site will affect our Canadian neighbors as much, or more, than the Whatcom County residents, yet what is being done to consult the EFSEC counterpart in B.C.? Just because one is not "required" to do this, doesn't mean that it is ethical or appropriate. Their input is imperative. The general public in lower B.C. is only in the last month or so even learned of the proposed site. It seems like the choice of silence and non-communication with our B.C. neighbors is ignorance at best. A more thorough study is needed that is a report that is shared by both EFSEC and the B.C. counterpart. The residents in B.C. need to be consulted as well as the residents in Whatcom County. 2

My son has asthma and I do not think that air quality has been adequately addressed in the Draft EIS. It is good to say how proposed emissions are compared according to the current EPA standards. However, it is more important, and vital for public knowledge, to compare how these various emissions are correlated to disease (such as asthma, heart disease, cancer, and others) in various studies, both in North America and in Europe (and other locations if studies are available). 3

(page 1 of 2 pages – from S. Shields-Priddy)

(page 2)

There is a rising rate of asthma in this country and an alarming mortality rate associated with it. Air pollution has a role in this. Will my 3-year-old son's life be at risk? The statement needs to further address air quality and health implications.

I also want to know the implications the proposed air pollution may have on vegetation (farms surround the area) and forests (timber industry lands and national forests). What are the studies that discuss this? 3

I don't have the scientific education or the time to research such health and environmental studies – that is why I pay taxes so that EFSEC will do this. Please address these concerns more thoroughly. I want to know if my son's life will be at risk.

I also think that this proposed plant needs to be held accountable to the new standards of EPA pollutants criteria and not be allowed to sneak in under the old standards. The proposed (or likely to be proposed) new standards need to be ~~also~~ used in this report. When it comes to public health risks, the public deserves to know the latest and most current information. It is unethical for the proposed plant to get in under the old standards, which studies show will hurt people. (How can the company not know this? This is unethical.) Therefore, please revisit the criteria on carbon monoxide and particulate matter. 4

A socio-economic issue I think needs to be addressed is the impact of high power transmission lines. Agricultural lands of many small and several large farms will be affected. Several raspberry farmers would be adversely affected. Numerous homes will be devalued significantly. Many more properties will be less valuable due to power lines that are more than twice the current height in most ~~some~~ areas. Health risks also need to be considered. Part of the affected area usually gets severe northeasterly winds that have the potential of blowing over such lines (several similar poles went down due to such winds a year or two ago). This needs to be a part of the site evaluation report since the power lines are only needed if this proposed plant is built. (Channeling the electricity through power lines in British Columbia is not a viable option due to opposition of such lines in Abbotsford and perhaps elsewhere in B.C. Prior to the recent opposition to such lines in B.C., it was cost prohibitive for the company to use the lines in B.C. even though they tried to convince the local land owners and the public that lines in Whatcom County would be unlikely.) This is a significant socio-economic issue for our family since our property (family farm) is along the proposed power line route. 5

Thank you for reading this letter and for all of your work on the EIS. I hope that you will take all of these issues into consideration as well as all of the other issues that others have taken time to write to you about. Your work is greatly appreciated and needed.

Sincerely yours,

Sara Shields-Priddy

Sara Shields-Priddy
(360) 354-8464
shieldsp@sprynet.com