

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

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In the Matter of)
Application No. 99-1)
) EXHIBIT _____ (PJC-T)
SUMAS ENERGY 2, INC.)
)
SUMAS ENERGY 2 GENERATION)
FACILITY)
_____)

WHATCOM COUNTY'S PREFILED TESTIMONY
WITNESS # _____ : PAULA J. COOPER

Q. Please introduce yourself to the Council.

A. Paula Cooper

Q. What is the subject of your testimony?

A. My testimony includes a brief description of my background and addresses concerns regarding potential flood impacts associated with the proposed facility.

Background

Q. What is your occupation and title?

A. I am a water resources engineer specializing in floodplain management. I am employed as Whatcom County's Special Projects Manager, where I manage the County's River and Flood Section within the Public Works Department.

1 **Q. Please describe your background.**

2 A. For the last twelve years I have worked for both county government and private
3 consultants in the areas of floodplain management and water resources engineering.
4 Throughout my career I have had extensive experience with the application of hydrologic
5 and hydraulic models and related analyses, which has provided me with an in-depth
6 understanding of the limitations in different types of models. I began working for
7 Whatcom County in my current position in August of 1998. Since then I have been
8 involved in numerous issues involving the Nooksack River and its floodplain including
9 sitting on the Nooksack River International Task Force whose primary purpose is to
10 resolve the international flooding problem resulting from Nooksack River overflows into
11 the Sumas River floodplain.

12 I received Bachelors of Science degree in Agricultural Engineering from Rutgers
13 University in 1986 and a Masters of Science degree in Civil and Environmental
14 Engineering from the University of Wisconsin in 1988. A copy of my resume is provided
15 as Exhibit PJC-1 to this testimony.

16 **Q. What is the County's role in floodplain management issues as related to the Sumas
17 Energy 2 project?**

18 A. The River and Flood Section of Whatcom County's Public Works Department serves as
19 the staff for The Whatcom County Flood Control Zone District (WCFCZD). The
20 WCFCZD is a countywide special district formed to provide for comprehensive flood
21 hazard management and flood hazard reduction. The WCFCZD is currently in the
22 process of implementing the Lower Nooksack Comprehensive Flood Hazard
23 Management Plan (CFHMP). The CFHMP was adopted by Whatcom County in 1999
24 and includes analyses of alternatives to address the flooding problems in the Nooksack
25 River overflow corridor between Everson and Sumas. The SE2 plant site lies within the
26 overflow corridor floodplain.

Flooding

27 **Q. Please provide a brief characterization of the flooding problems in the Everson-
28 Sumas overflow corridor.**

29 A. During large flood events, Nooksack River floodwaters overtop a low divide between the
30 Nooksack and Sumas Rivers near Everson. These floodwaters flow northeast through
31 agricultural areas of unincorporated Whatcom County and the City of Sumas in
32 Washington State and then cross the international border and follow the Sumas River
33 floodplain flooding areas in the West Sumas Prairie in British Columbia, Canada. The
34 Sumas River flows to the Vedder River which enters the Fraser River shortly
35 downstream. The Barrowtown Dam and Pump Station is located on the Sumas River a

1 short distance upstream of where it enters the Vedder River. During large flood events
2 overflows at Everson often coincide with high river levels on the Vedder and Fraser
3 Rivers, and discharge from the Sumas River corridor into the Vedder River in Canada is
4 essentially shut off. Because the system has virtually no discharge during large flood
5 events, it may be more sensitive to changes in floodplain storage.

6 Flood damages to properties in the overflow corridor have been and will probably
7 continue to be extensive. During the flood event in early November of 1990, damages in
8 the City of Sumas and in Canada were estimated at exceeding \$6.5 million. In addition to
9 damage to private properties, numerous roads in the overflow corridor were closed and
10 damaged by flooding. The Trans Canada Highway was flooded for 26 hours.

11 These flooding problems are described in more detail in excerpts from the Lower
12 Nooksack River Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan prepared by the
13 Whatcom County Department of Public Works (Exhibit PJC-2) and The Sumas River
14 Flood Routing Study Interim Report prepared by Wilson Hydrotechnical, Ltd.(Exhibit
15 PJC-3), for the City of Abbotsford.

16 **Q. What materials have you reviewed regarding the impacts of the proposed facility on
17 flood levels?**

18 A. I have reviewed the following materials:

- 19 • Floodplains section (3.3.4) of the SE2 Application for Site Certification
- 20 • Floodplains section (section 3.2.2.3) of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
21 (DEIS)
- 22 • Appendix A of the DEIS which is a Technical Memorandum prepared by KCM and
23 dated June 19, 1997 regarding the hydraulic modeling performed in support of the
24 floodplain management investigation performed for the City of Sumas
- 25 • A Technical Memorandum prepared by KCM and dated July 8, 1997 regarding a
comparison of industrial area blockage versus no blockage also performed in support
of the floodplain management investigation for the City of Sumas

Q. Please summarize the salient points contained in these materials.

A. The City of Sumas retained KCM to perform hydraulic analysis in support of the
development of a Floodplain Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.
KCM's analysis included the development and calibration of a Finite Element Surface
Water Modeling System (FESWMS) hydraulic model and evaluation of the impacts of
filling the floodplain areas in the industrial areas south and west of the BN Lynden Spur
Railroad and areas north and south of Halerstick Road. These industrial areas are shown
in Figure 4 contained in "Appendix A" of the SE2 DEIS, and include the area proposed
for the Sumas Energy 2 facility. The analysis was conducted for a 100-year event, based
on the peak flow rate. The results of their analysis show increases in water surface of less

1 than one foot in the impacted areas. The color graphic depicting changes in water surface
2 elevations is difficult to accurately interpret but does indicate that in some areas increases
of 0.3 to 0.5 feet could occur.

3 **Q. In your opinion, does the analysis conducted adequately address the actual flood**
4 **impacts that could occur?**

5 A. During a flood, floodplain areas within the Everson-Sumas overflow corridor both
6 convey and temporarily store floodwaters. The filling of floodplain areas typically
7 reduces the area available for both storage and conveyance. Fill materials displace
floodwaters which can increase flood levels upstream and increase flow rates and
velocities in other parts of the floodplain.

8 The FESWMS model is a two-dimensional flow model that simulates flow in a horizontal
9 plane. The model can simulate both unsteady and steady-state flow conditions.
10 Unsteady flow models route an entire flood hydrograph through the floodplain system
and can simulate the relative differences in flood conditions resulting from filling
11 floodplain areas due to the loss of both floodplain storage and conveyance. Steady-state
models route only a peak flow rate and can only account for differences in flood levels
12 and velocities resulting from loss in floodplain conveyance. The effects of the loss in
floodplain storage are not inherently accounted for in steady-state analyses.

13 For the Nooksack River system and Everson-Sumas overflow corridor, the FESWMS
14 model was used in the steady-state mode due to problems with model instabilities in the
unsteady flow mode. The analysis comparing water surface elevations for the 100-year
15 event before and after filling of the industrial areas only reflected the impacts due to loss
of floodplain conveyance. The impacts of the fill in displacing the temporary storage of
16 floodwaters is not reflected in the model results.

17 During large flood events like the November 1990 event, the discharge of floodwaters at
18 the Barrowtown Dam and Pump Station can be virtually shut off due to high river levels
downstream of the dam. In this type of system, temporary storage of floodwaters
19 becomes even more important. The amount of floodwater which would be displaced by
the fill proposed for the Sumas Energy 2 site may not be large enough to significantly
20 affect flood levels and velocities off-site; however, in my opinion, an analysis with an
unsteady flow model would allow us to evaluate whether or not other floodplain
21 properties are adversely affected. Such an analysis would enable quantification of
changes in water surface elevations and velocities off-site and an evaluation as to whether
22 these changes would increase the frequency or magnitude of flooding.

23 If such an analysis indicates that adverse off-site impacts would be expected, measures
24 such as compensatory storage could then be considered to mitigate these negative
impacts. Conversely, if the unsteady flow analysis shows no adverse off-site impacts, we
25 would be better assured that additional mitigation measures would not be necessary.

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

END OF TESTIMONY

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above testimony is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed at Bellingham, Washington, on this 23rd day of June, 2000.

By: _____
Paula J. Cooper