

Rachel McCall

To the Department of Ecology, Clean Energy Coordination:

My name is Rachel McCall and I live at 7517 Pinnacle Pl SE, Snoqualmie, WA. I am writing to submit a scoping comment on the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for stand-alone, utility-scale, lithium-ion battery energy storage system facilities in Washington (Publication 26-06-017).

I am commenting because a stand-alone BESS facility is proposed in the Snoqualmie Valley, and Ecology has said that project-level reviews will tier to this PEIS. Ecology has asked for input on questions for the study.

This is personal for my household. I live within 2 miles from the proposed site. In an emergency my household would evacuate via Snoqualmie Parkway, along with everyone else who depends on that road.

My comment addresses the following:

Q1 · Facility types: Which kinds of battery facilities get studied.

I would like the study to look at stand-alone sites near homes like mine, not the remote ones it studied before, which are frankly not very relevant to situations my neighborhood is facing. The study should picture rows of container-sized battery nestled in neighborhoods near homes, schools and playgrounds, because that is what is being proposed and how Ecology itself describes these sites. I ask that Ecology define the facility types studied to include large, container-based lithium-ion installations near residential areas, and that the analysis assume the fire codes currently in force in Washington, rely on independent safety data, and call for the newest safety standards as a condition of approval.

Q2 -- Where they get built.

Because Ecology itself says stand-alone facilities "could be sited in a variety of locations," including near cities, the PEIS should not assume facilities will be far from people. I ask that Ecology treat proximity to residents as a defining condition of the analysis, and that the Draft PEIS state plainly which impacts cannot be mitigated below significance, so that lead agencies and the public are not left to guess.

The Ecology study should define "suitable" areas by what is safe for the people who live there, not just by where a facility could physically be built. Closeness to existing infrastructure should not be used as a stand-in for a safe site. Being near a substation should not make a place "suitable." The study's map should clearly say where facilities should not go, not only where they could, since nearly every kind of land is in play.

Thank you for considering this comment. Please include it in the scoping record. Our community is following this PEIS closely and intends to participate in the Draft PEIS comment period.

Sincerely,
Rachel McCall

7517 Pinnacle Pl SE, Snoqualmie, WA.