Michael Moll

I was a weather forecaster in the U.S.Air Force for 20 years. My backround in weather tells me that the state of Washington could find a more suitable location for this smelter. Central Washington has stronger prevailing winds and flat terrain which would allow for better dispersal of the pollution. The Newport Washington area has mountains, river valleys, weaker winds, and more pollution trapping temperature inversions. These facts are just plain common sense, but it seems the decision makers in the state of Washington lack any common sense. After spending many years staring at weather charts produced by forecast models similar to the WRF model that this EIS will use, my confidence in how it will handle local weather effects is low. This part of Washington and Idaho is a data sparse region, the closest official weather observing station is Deer Park. Newport is in a completely different weather regime than Deer park, cloud cover, rainfall, snow cover, temperature, winds, and inversions all differ considerably. There needs to be National Weather Service certified weather observing sites set up near the smelter site and downwind from the smelter site in operation for at least one year to collect data. This data collection is necessary to determine the local effects of mountains, river valleys, inversions and how these local effects will trap and funnel the pollution to local population centers like Sandpoint. Without this additional weather data input the EIS data output will be unreliable. Weather people and computer people both have a saying about computer forecasting models, garbage in=garbage out. We want the EIS data output to be reliable, not garbage!