RECEIVED
NOV 04
ENERGY FACILITY SITE
EVALUATION COUNCIL

BP Cherry Point Cogen
DEIS Comment - 28

11/2/03

ALLEN FIKSDAL, MANAGER
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL
P.O. BOX 43172
OLYMPIA, WA 98504-3172

RE: PROPOSED BP CHERRY POINT COGENERATION PROJECT

DEAR MR. FIKSDAL,

AS I GLANCE THROUGH PORTIONS OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE BP CHERRY POINT COGENERATION PROJECT I AM APPALLED BY THE NUMEROUS UNSUBSTANTIATED ASSUMPTIONS MADE, AND BY THE INADEQUACY OF WHICH SOME ISSUES ARE ADDRESSED, OR GLOSSED OVER.

AS YOU CAN SEE BY THE DATE OF MY LETTER, I DO NOT HAVE TIME TO ADDRESS EVEN A SMALL PORTION OF THE UNSUBSTANTIATED ASSUMPTIONS OR THE ISSUES THAT WERE INADEQUATELY ADDRESSED. I HAVE TO WONDER IF THE HUXLEY PROFESSOR AT WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY WOULD HAVE CONCLUDED THE SAME THING ABOUT

THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AS SHE DID ABOUT THE ONE F.E.R.C. WROTE FOR THE GEORGIA STRAIT PIPELINE (GSX): "IF A STUDENT HANDED THIS IN, IN MY CLASS THEY WOULD NOT RECEIVE A PASSING GRADE."

IN VOLUME 1 OF DOE/EIS-0349, CHAPTER 3, (3.3-14) IT MENTIONS WATER DISCHARGE AND WASTEWATER. NO WHERE IN THAT PARAGRAPH DOES IT EVEN ADDRESS ANY IMPACT THAT THE WASTEWATER, ALTHOUGH TREATED, MAY HAVE ON THE SALT WATER, THE SEA CREATURES, AND PLANT LIFE AT CHERRY POINT. IT IS JUST IGNORED BECAUSE THERE IS ALREADY AN EXISTING WASTE WATER DISCHARGE POINT; OUTFALL 001, INTO GEORGIA STRAIGHT UNDER AN EXISTING PERMIT (NPDES PERMIT). 1

THERE ARE MANY FACTS THAT ARE GIVEN ELSEWHERE IN THE EIS AND THERE ARE MANY STATEMENTS OF THE STATUS QUO, BUT IT DOESN'T EVEN MENTION HOW MUCH FRESH WATER IS ALREADY FLOWING INTO GEORGIA STRAIGHT AT THAT PARTICULAR CHERRY POINT OUTFALL, OR WHETHER OR NOT THERE ARE ANY LIMITS ON THE AMOUNT OF WATER THAT CAN BE DISCHARGED UNDER THE EXISTING NPDES PERMIT.

WHAT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DOES 3 MILLION, 3 HUNDRED SIXTY SIX THOUSAND, 7 HUNDRED AND TWENTY GALLONS OF FRESH WATER HAVE, →

(2,338gpm x 60 x 24 = 3,366,720)

TO: ALLAN FIKSDAL
FROM: CATHY CLEVELAND
— 2 —

WHEN ADDED WITH THE UNDISCLOSED AMOUNT OF WATER ALREADY GUSHING OUT INTO GEORGIA STRAITS, TO MARINE ANIMAL AND PLANT LIFE? **1 cont.**

WHILE THE SECTION ON HABITAT, WILDLIFE, FISHERIES, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES DOES AN INVENTORY OF SPECIES PRESENT IN THE CHERRY POINT AREA, NO WHERE DOES IT REALLY ADDRESS ANY IMPACT TO THOSE SPECIES. FOR EXAMPLE, THE EIS MENTIONS PACIFIC HERRING (3.7-12) BUT, DOES NOT MENTION THAT THE PACIFIC HERRING STOCK THAT SPAWNS AT CHERRY POINT HAS UNDERGONE A DRAMATIC DECLINE IN THE LAST 20-30 YEARS. (A REGIONAL ASSESSMENT OF THE POTENTIAL STRESSORS CAUSING THE DECLINE OF THE CHERRY POINT PACIFIC HERRING RUN AND ALTERNATIVE MANAGEMENT ENDPOINTS FOR CHERRY POINT RESERVE (WASHINGTON, USA) Wayne Landis, P. Bruce Duncan, Emily Hart Hayes, April Markiewicz, and Jill Thomas; Institute of Environmental Toxicology, Huxley College of the Environment, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225 USA) SEE ALSO: CHERRY POINT HERRING REGIONAL RISK ASSESSMENT PHASE II Emily S. Hayes & Markiewicz 2001 **2**

I AM VERY SHORT ON TIME, BUT THERE IS A WONDERFUL LIST OF BIRDS ON PAGE 3.7-6, BUT THEY ALL APPEAR TO BE "LAND" BIRDS, NOT MARINE BIRDS, SUCH AS SEAGULLS OR THE GREAT BLUE HERON, WHICH HAS A ROOKERY, OR RESERVE, WITHIN A MILE OF THE B.P. PROPERTY. MANY MARINE BIRDS HAVE SHOWN SERIOUS POPULATION DECLINES, INCLUDING REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL NORTHWESTERN (GEORGIA STRAIT PUGET SOUND) WASHINGTON MARINE BIRD FAMILIES. (ASSESSING SOUTHERN STRAIT OF GEORGIA MARINE BIRD POPULATIONS SINCE 1980, DR. John L. Bower, Western Washington University, 2003) 3

WHY DOESN'T THE EIS SHOW ANY STUDIES OF WHAT DE-SALINIATION OF SALT WATER DOES TO THE MICROSCOPIC ORGANISMS OF THE SALT WATER FOOD CHAIN. DOES IT AFFECT WHAT THE HERRING FEED ON? OR DOES IT AFFECT THE KELP BERS THE HERRING PREFER TO INHABIT? OR DOES IT AFFECT THE MARINE ANIMAL LIFE UPON WHICH THE MARINE BIRDS FEED? I KNOW FRESH WATER KILLS MARINE LIFE. 4

AND NOW THAT THE CHERRY POINT AREA HAS BEEN DETERMINED TO BE AN AQUATIC RESERVE BY THE DEPARTMENT 5

TO: ALAN FIKSDAL
FROM: CATHY CLEVELAND
- 3 -

OF NATURAL RESOURCES, SHOULDN'T THE DNR BE ALLOWED TO SERIOUSLY LOOK INTO HOW ANY FURTHER HEAVY INDUSTRIAL GROWTH WILL IMPACT THEIR AQUATIC RESERVE? DNR SHOULD DO AN EIS TO PROTECT THE AQUATIC RESERVE. (TO ASSESS WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO PROTECT THE AQUATIC RESERVE.) 5 cont.

A REGIONAL ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT FOR THE NEAR SHORE MARINE ENVIRONMENT IN NORTHWEST WASHINGTON, WHICH ANALYZED CUMMULATIVE IMPACTS FROM MULTIPLE SOURCES OF CHEMICAL AND NON-CHEMICAL STRESSORS IN THE NEAR SHORE REGIONS AND UPLAND WATERSHEDS OF CHERRY POINT, FOUND THE CHERRY POINT REGION TO BE HIGH RISK. (REGIONAL ECOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT OF A NEAR SHORE MARINE ENVIRONMENT: CHERRY POINT, WA; Emily Hart Hayes and Wayne G. Landis (author to whom correspondence should be addressed), Institute of Environmental Toxicology, Huxley College of the Environment, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225-9180 USA) (Risk Assessment involved WA Dept. of Natural Resources, WA Dept. of Fish + Wildlife, WA Dept. of Ecology, National Ocean Service, the Lummi Nation, and Whatcom County Planning and Development Services + other county dept.) 6

AND WHAT ABOUT THE NEW PUGET SOUND

FURTHERMORE, THERE IS NO MENTION OF POTENTIAL IMPACT OF PARTICULATES ON THE SALT WATER: (MOST LIKELY IMPACT FROM WIND DIRECTION, BIRCH BAY) AND FRESH WATER (MOST LIKELY IMPACT, TERRELL CREEK, WHICH IS CURRENTLY BEING CLEANED UP FOR SALMON SPAWNING, AND VARIOUS WETLANDS). THERE IS SOMEONE, TONY BASABE, WHO IS SUPPOSED TO BE WORKING WITH THE SWINOMISH INDIANS TO STUDY THE IMPACT(S) OF PARTICULATES ON PADILLA (OR FIDALGO) BAY AND THE ANACORTES AREA. UNFORTUNATELY, I DID NOT FIND THE TIME TO CONTACT HIM. (I JUST FOUND MY E-MAIL - THIS INFORMATION SHOULD BE ON ERSEC'S WEBSITE + EPA - ATMOSPHERIC DEPOSITIONS) IF THERE IS INFORMATION ON THIS TOPIC, IT SHOULD NOT BE IGNORED. IT MUST BE ADDRESSED. IF TOXINS IN PARTICULATES ACCUMULATE IN FISH OR ANY OTHER MARINE SPECIES EATIBLE BY MAN, LIKE MERCURY DOES, IT MUST BE ADDRESSED NOW, NOT 20, 30, 40 OR 50 YEARS FROM NOW WHEN PEOPLE ARE GETTING SICK AND/OR DYING. AND, ARE ANY OF THESE POLLUTANTS OR PARTICULATES FILTERING INTO TO OUR WATERSHEDS?

BY THE WAY, FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE NOT CHEMISTS, MERCURY IN THE IONIC FORM, Hg^{+2}, IN THE FORM OF MERCURIC CHLORIDE, $HgCl_2$, AND IN THE FORM OF MERCURIC OXIDE, HgO, CAN ALL BE FOUND IN PRESENT IN OR ON PARTICULATE MATTER. PARTICULATE MATTER, (A HANDBOOK FOR WATERSHED MANAGERS, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY)

7

8

9

TO: ALAN FIKSDAL
FROM: CATHY CLEVELAND

—4—

ALSO, MAY CONTAIN LEAD (Pb), CADIUM (Cd) AND MANY OTHER COMPOUNDS YOU WOULDN'T CHOOSE TO BREATH.

I BELIEVE THE ISSUE OF PARTICULATES HAS BEEN SERIOUSLY GLOSSED OVER AND HAS BEEN PRESENTED IN A CONFUSING (NOT STRAIGHT FORWARD) MANNER IN THE 3.2, AIR QUALITY SECTION, YOU SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED A LENGTHY REPORT REGARDING PARTICULATE MATTER FROM MY FATHER, ARNE CLEVELAND. IF NOT, PLEASE ALLOW ME TO INTRODUCE IT INTO EVIDENCE AFTER THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS, AS IT IS CREDIBLE DATA AND FACTS RESEARCH ON PM 2.5 (WHICH WILL BE EMITTED FROM THE COGENERATION PLANT). IT CONCLUDES, AMONG OTHER THINGS THAT "THERE WILL BE SEVERE HEALTH IMPLICATIONS FOR THE WEST AS NATURAL GAS-FIRED POWER PLANTS COMMENCE SPEWING HUNDREDS OF TONS OF PM 2.5 AND AMMONIUM SULFATE ANNUALLY, IN 1997, THE EPA CONCLUDED THAT HIGH LEVELS OF FINE PARTICULATE MATTER (2.5) POSES UNACCEPTABLE HEALTH RISKS! HEALTH

10

11

RISKS INCLUDED, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO; ASTHMA, PNEUMONIA, CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE, AND A BROAD RANGE OF EFFECTS LEADING TO HOSPITALIZATION, INCLUDING SUDDEN DEATHS FROM CHANGING HEART RHYTHMS IN PEOPLE WITH EXISTING CARDIAC PROBLEMS. (NATIONAL CAMPAIGN AGAINST DIRTY POWER). **11 cont.**

I WAS UNABLE TO MEET WITH BP'S CHEMIST TO ASK MANY QUESTIONS ABOUT PARTICULATES, ESPECIALLY PM2.5. BUT, THE EIS DOES NOT EVEN ADDRESS THE FACT THAT THERE ARE CONTROL DEVISES TO TRAP PARTICULATES. I ALSO, DO NOT RECALL THE EIS ADDRESSING WHAT HAPPENS IF THE LEVEL OF PARTICULATE MATTER EMITTED IS HIGHER THAN PREDICTED? AND WERE ESTIMATIONS DETERMINED TO BE LOW IN ORDER TO AVOID A HIGHER DEGREE OF SCRUTINY AND REGULATION?

UNFORTUNATELY, I DID NOT FIND TIME TO DO MORE ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTRY RESEARCH, BUT WHY WEREN'T ANY OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS OR DEVISES ADDRESSED TO REDUCE PARTICULATES?: **12**

1) GRAVITATIONAL SETTLING CHAMBERS
2) CENTRIFUGAL SEPARATORS
3) WET SCRUBBERS (0.05 μm)
4) FILTERS (BAGHOUSE 0.01 μm)
5) ELECTROSTATIC PRECIPITATORS (0.005 μm)

TO: ALAN FIRSDAL
FROM: CATHY CLEVELAND
-5-

ASTONISHINGLY,
NO WHERE IN THE (3.10), THE EXISTING LAND USE SECTION DOES IT MENTION THAT THE BP REFINERY LAND IS ADJACENT TO THE BIRCH BAY GROWTH MANAGEMENT AREA, WHICH IS DESIGNATED UNDER THE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO BECOME A CITY. WHILE THE POPULATION SECTION (3.12 + 3.12-1) ACCURATELY STATES THE WA STATE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT NUMBERS: THAT WHATCOM COUNTY CONTAINS 2.8% OF WASHINGTON STATE'S POPULATION, IT DOES NOT MENTION THAT THERE IS OVER 5,000 PEOPLE CURRENTLY LIVING, FULL TIME IN THE BIRCH BAY GROWTH MANAGEMENT AREA, AND THAT DURING THE SUMMER, THAT NUMBER TRIPLES! (U.S. CENSUS FIGURES FOR 2000; SAME CENSUS SHOWING MORE THAN 1/2 OF THE HOUSES AT BIRCH BAY ARE EMPTY AT (NON-SUMMER) JANUARY CENSUS TIME.) 13

THEREFORE, THE STATEMENT, "NORTHWEST OF THE REFINERY, SEASONAL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES OCCUR IN THE BAYFRONT COMMUNITY OF BIRCH BAY", IS A GROSS MISREPRESENTATION OF THE FACTS!
I HAD TO WONDER IF BP WROTE THIS

SECTION OF THE EIS. FOR SOME REASON, I THOUGHT THAT AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY, LIKE THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, WROTE THE EIS. BUT, NO. I FLIP TO THE COVER OF THE EIS AND I SEE THAT BOTH LEAD AGENCIES ARE PRO-ENERGY AGENCIES. NOT THAT I AM AGAINST ENERGY — JUST NOT ENERGY WITHOUT REGARD TO THE COSTS AND WHEN IT IS DONE RATHER, FOR A LACK OF A BETTER WORD, DISHONESTLY, VIA THE EIS. 14

IN LAW, THEY USE THE TERMS, "CONFLICT OF INTEREST" AND "APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY." THERE IS TRULY A CONFLICT OF INTEREST WHEN THE SAME AGENCY WHO "SITES" THE POWER PLANT LOCATION, ALSO WRITES THE EIS. NO WONDER I HAVE SEEN SO MANY INADEQUATELY ADDRESSED ISSUES AND UNSUBSTANTIATED ASSUMPTIONS AND FACTS.

WANDERING OFF TRACK FOR A MINUTE...

FOR EXAMPLE, THE SECTION ON ODOR (3.2-9) MISREPRESENTS THE FACTS. MY FATHER, ALONE, HAS MADE MORE THAN "SEVERAL" COMPLAINTS TO NWAPA REGARDING SULFUR SMELL. CITIZENS AND NEIGHBORS HAVE TOLD ME THEY COMPLAINED AT THE BIRCH BAY PLANNING MEETINGS, AND I EVEN HEARD MULTIPLE COMPLAINTS WHEN I TOURED THE REFINERY WITH A GROUP OF CITIZENS. LOCAL OFFICIALS NEVER DETECT THE SULFUR BECAUSE IT IS EMITTED AT NIGHT, 15

TO: ALLAN FIKSDAL
FROM: CATHY CLEVELAND

—6—

USUALLY AROUND 11pm OR 1 OR 2 AM
OR ANYTIME WHEN OFFICIALS ARE NOT
AROUND TO CHECK, e.g. HOLIDAYS. I WORKED FOR
THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ON
THE EXXON VALDEZ CASE. SCIENTISTS
KNOW THAT CRUDE OIL FROM ALASKA
HAS A HIGHER CONTENT OF SULFUR
THAN (MIDDLE EASTERN) SAUDI OIL. ARCO AND BP
RECEIVE OIL FROM ALASKA, SO 16
LET'S STOP PLAYING THIS GAME THAT
THERE HAVE NEVER BEEN SULFUR
EMISSIONS FROM THAT REFINERY.* !!!!
ONE DOES NOT SMELL SULFUR AS
FREQUENTLY AS ONE DID IN THE
PAST, SO MAYBE BP HAS IMPLEMENTED
A PROCESS TO REDUCE THE EMISSION
OF SULFUR.
* MY ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTRY, MOORE + MOORE
TEXTBOOK SPECIFICALLY MENTIONS THAT SULFUR IS
IN FOUND IN BOTH FOSSIL FUELS,
COAL AND PETROLEUM. SO, I
FIND IT DISTURBING THAT REFINERY
OFFICIALS RESPOND TO CITIZENS
AS IF THEY HAVE AN OVERACTIVE
IMAGINATION WHEN THEY MENTION
SULFUR EMISSIONS, AND ALLUDE TO THE
BUILD-UP ON THE CARS AT BIRCH BAY AS, "POLLEN".

AIR QUALITY STANDARDS (3.2-1) SECTION.
PURSUANT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT
OF 1970, THE EPA ESTABLISHED
AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR THE
FOLLOWING AIR POLLUTANTS, INCLUDING
PARTICULATE MATTER
PM10 AND PM 2.5.
SO, THEN WHY DO VARIOUS TABLES
NOT EVEN INDICATE HOURLY EMISSIONS 17
OF $PM_{2.5}$? EG. TABLES 3.2-6,
3.2-7, 3.2-9, 3.2-20, 3.2-22,
3.2-23, 3.2-29, AND 3.2-21; ESPECIALLY
IMPORTANT 3.2-20 AND 3.2-21 WHICH
WOULD SHOW OVERALL REDUCTION OR
EMISSION, IF ANY, OF PM2.5.
ONCE AGAIN, IMPORTANT DATA IS OMITTED!

THE AIR QUALITY SECTION ALSO DOES
NOT MENTION WHAT THE SIGNIFICANT
EMISSION RATE THRESHOLDS ARE IN
WAC 173-400-030. NOR DOES THE EIS
SPECIFICALLY SAY BY WHAT AMOUNT,
QUANTITY, OR VOLUME THE PROPOSED
PROJECT WOULD BE EXCEEDING THE
100 tpy OF NO_x, CO, PM_{10} AND $PM_{2.5}$.
THE NUMBERS SHOULD BE UPFRONT. 18
ONE SHOULD NOT HAVE TO GUESS BY LOOKING
AT VARIOUS TABLES. (3.2-5)
JUST BECAUSE "PM 2.5" IS NOT A REGULATED
POLLUTANT UNDER THE PSD PROGRAM AT THIS
TIME" (3.2-5) DOES NOT IN ANY WAY EXEMPT
IT FROM FEDERAL REGULATION UNDER THE CLEAN
AIR ACT. SOMEHOW AFTER THIS STATEMENT
PM 2.5 IS IGNORED AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.

TO: ALLEN FIKSDAL
FROM: CATHY CLEVELAND
-7-

MITIGATION MEASURES ARE TOTALLY INADEQUATE. (3.2-36) THERE SHOULD BE, AT MINIMUM, FINES FOR EXCEEDING ANY AND ALL LIMITS ON POLLUTION, NOT JUST CO_2; AND ESPECIALLY PARTICULATE MATTER.

PERSONALLY, I BELIEVE THE ONLY ETHICAL AND EQUITABLE MITIGATION FOR EXCEEDING $PM_{2.5}$ EMISSIONS IS A FUND FOR FUTURE MEDICAL EXPENSES FOR $PM_{2.5}$ RELATED MEDICAL PROBLEMS. I THINK ALL BIRCH BAY CITIZENS SHOULD GET A BASE-LINE HEALTH EXAM BEFORE THE CO-GEN PLANT IS FINISHED. AND, IF NO ONE SMOKES IN THEIR FAMILY, POSSIBLY/HOPEFULLY PROXIMATE CAUSE CAN BE ESTABLISHED, AND MEDICAL EXPENSES WILL BE AWARDED. 19

ALSO, NO WHERE IN THE SECTION ON AIR QUALITY (3.2) DOES IT MENTION THE SYNERGISTIC EFFECT BETWEEN TWO POLLUTANTS. THE TOTAL INFLUENCE OR AFFECT OF BOTH POLLUTANTS COMBINED IS GREATER THAN THE SUM OF THE NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES EACH 20

WOULD PRODUCE ALONE. [THE SYNERGESTIC EFFECT MAY HAVE ALSO BEEN IGNORED AMONG MANY OTHER PHYSICAL, CHEMICAL AND THERMO DYNAMIC LAWS AND PRINCIPLES DUE TO ASSUMPTIONS AND QUESTIONABLE ACCUMULATION OF RESEARCH DATA IN THAT ONE, LONE TEST REPORT, WHICH BP WOULD LIKE TO RELY ON TO SUPPORT THEIR APPLICATION & Prepared by Stephanie Wien and Glen England at GE Energy and Environmental Research Corporation, Irvine, CA, October 23, 2002 — Another energy company biased test] 21

A SYNERGESTIC EFFECT HAS BEEN DOCUMENTED BETWEEN PARTICULATES AND SULFUR OXIDES. PARTICULATES SERVE AS NUCLEATION SITES FOR FORMULATION OF WATER AND/OR FOG DROPLETS, AND THEIR LARGE SURFACE AREA ALLOWS THE CATALYSIS OF OXIDATION OF SO_2. OXIDATION OF SULFUROUS AND SULFURIC ACID FORMED BY THE REACTION OF SO_2 WITH WATER IS QUITE RAPID. SULFURIC ACID IS OFTEN ABSORBED ON THE SURFACES OF PARTICLES WHOSE DIAMETERS FALL IN PRECISELY THE RANGE TO BE ABSORBED DEEP INTO THE LUNGS (IN THE BRONCHIOLES AND ALVEOLI). FROM THERE, BIO-CHEMICAL REACTIONS MAKE BREATHING MORE DIFFICULT AND STRAIN THE VICTIM'S HEART, LEADING TO BOTH ACUTE AND CHRONIC HEALTH DAMAGE. NONE OF THE ABOVE IMPACTS ARE DISCUSSED OR EVEN MENTIONED IN THE EIS. 22

(ENVIROMENTAL CHEMISTRY, MOORE + MOORE)

-8-

THERE ARE MANY, MANY MORE THINGS THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN THE EIS. IT IS ALMOST MIDNIGHT ON SUNDAY. I HAVE WORKED ON THIS FOR EIGHT HOURS. (UNABLE TO DO SO PREVIOUSLY BECAUSE I HAVE BEEN OUT OF TOWN FOR THE LAST MONTH AND A HALF ON WEEK-ENDS) MY ONLY REAL TIME TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES. I TAKE A BUS TO WORK, SO MY WORK DAY IS 11 HOURS FROM THE TIME A LEAVE HOME UNTIL THE TIME I ARRIVE HOME.) SO, AS YOU CAN SEE, THE AVERAGE CITIZEN DOES NOT REALLY HAVE MUCH TIME TO RESPOND TO SOMETHING THAT WILL SO DRAMATICALLY AND PERMANENTLY CHANGE THEIR LIFE.

I WOULD ASK, THAT IF YOU MUST APPROVE THIS DUE TO FEDERAL POLITICAL PRESSURE AT MOST THAT YOU ONLY ALLOW ENOUGH ENERGY FOR BP TO USE ON THEIR REFINERY. OTHER ALTERNATIVES WERE NOT SERIOUSLY ADDRESSED. LOOK AT OTHER SITES — THE INTALCO PLANT IS TRULY IN A RURAL AREA. IF THEY LEAVE, THAT SITE WOULD BE MORE APPROPRIATE. THERE ARE PLANS FOR TRANSMISSION 23

LINES
WIRES TO BE BUILT ANYWAY. FOR THE SAKE OF PEOPLE'S HEALTH, IT IS **IRRESPONSIBLE** TO PUT A POWER PLANT ALMOST IN THE MIDST OF A GROWING CITY, KNOWING THE SERIOUS, INEVITABLE HEALTH CONSEQUENCES.

SINCERELY,
Cathy Cleveland

CATHY CLEVELAND
4961 MORGAN DRIVE
BLAINE, WA 98230
(H) (360) 371-9056
(W) (360) 650-3380

P.S. IF THIS NEEDS TO BE TYPED, I CAN TYPE IT NEXT WEEKEND AND MAIL IT TO YOU ON NOVEMBER 10TH.