RECEIVED
OCT 16 2001
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

SE2 DSEIS - 21
10/16/2001 Bumford

My sincere thanks to each of you on the Essec and all the staff for your continued care in the process of reccomendations for power plants.

No longer do I feel that Sumas is the wrong location for SE2. Now I see that it is the worst location. Little of essence has changed between the first and present applications.

Regarding Greenhouse Gases - it is precisely the nature and the technology of burning natural gas in its preponderous amounts with flash ignition that leaves so many unburned hydrocarbon gases. Natural gas is approximately 20 times more potent than diesel as a greenhouse gas. At some point we, as a society, need to rein in greenhouse gas emmissions. Money given by the applicant to try to camouflage this pollution is unacceptable to sentient beings.

Groundwater quality + quantity will be addressed by many others so I will only briefly say that proposed mitigation is only for a relative few of vast potential users affected leaving the rest without mitigation. Why on earth would anyone condone the degradation of what is rapidly

1

2

No one can argue that we would be good economically. But there are important things than the economy.

becoming one of our most precious resources.

Low frequency noise is something that I have heard people complain about often. These sounds are presently coming from a plant only 1/5 the size of the proposed one. Strangely, while people living near the plant do not hear these low frequency sounds, the inhabitants in the uplands - and Sumas is surrounded on three sides by higher elevations - complain of low frequency noise disrupting sleep. I see the mitigation listed is possible. Possible - as many of these mitigations are, I feel little reassurance ~~I don't see a remedy here~~.

On the topic of flooding - if any of you have yet to see the photograph of a full size tractor ~~washed~~ off the road and into a ditch in exactly the proposed location of SE2 by a flood event in '90-91 I will be happy to supply a copy. This summer the industrial park has seen the addition of many tons of fill to the north of the plant. Now, with the proposed plant and its attendant fill the velocities and depths of floodwaters ~~will~~ would be even higher. During the flood of 90-91 one man saved his building from washing away only

by chaining the rocking building to this fully deployed backhoe in the street upstream. Why would anyone want to increase these dangers? 4

Finally, regarding the seismicity issue - This is a no brainer. If given the choice would you build an infrastructure meant to reliably serve society in an area prone to liquifaction. 5

Tonight you have heard ~~of the~~ from proponents, almost all if not all are directly vested in their interest in the building of this plant. Did you notice the bus outside with the big yes SCE sign is owned by the same family owning the proposed SCE site.

Please, ~~as~~ nearly 100,000 people from our watershed have signed the petition asking you to please send these opportunist packing to a different location, where they may bring good instead of harm.

Thankyou

We produce more than twice the power we consume in this county already - all from thermal plants. (as residences and bzs.)

If there was no danger of seismicity why did they remove the dikes ~~tanks~~ to alleviate these fears? 5

Bo Bomford
8523 Paradise Vly Rd.

The bridge change mentioned in Emerson is below the area of avulsion.