

## Todd Andersen

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and provide input as to "what to study and how to study it". However, I find that the information provided in the project description is lacking detail, contains inaccurate statements, and is based on contingencies that are not likely to occur. I'm puzzled as to how you can "scope" a project when the scope (i.e. footprint) is not defined and the information provided by the project proponent is inaccurate and/or continually changing (e.g. recent changes to discharged pollutant estimates). For example, the project description states that "On-site structures are not expected to impact views from neighboring properties, which are blocked by either higher ground or trees, and no lighting or glare issues are anticipated." My residence is at the same elevation as the proposed site with nothing but flat ground in between. Additionally, the land between my residence and the site, owned by Idaho Department of Lands, has recently been logged and is now sparsely treed. What will be the groundwater impacts be with an additional withdrawal of 10,000 gallons a day? I specifically want to know what the impacts are to my water supply. Or, is the water going to be withdrawn from the Little Spokane aquifer? Is that something your agency has precise information on? It probably should since the WRIA boundary goes right through the center of the HiTest property.

I'm skeptical that Ecology can adequately determine the full scope of the environmental review given the limited, inaccurate, and frequently changing information that HiTest has provided. Accurate information needs to be acquired regarding trucking and transportation routes, railroad and spur locations, groundwater source, and preliminary project emissions estimates before an adequate scoping process can commence. Therefore, I'm requesting that the Scoping Process for the silicon smelter be delayed until more concrete information is provided.