

Jessica Moylan

To the Department of Ecology, Clean Energy Coordination:

My name is Jessica Moylan and I live at 7903 Cortland Ave SE Snoqualmie WA 98065. 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. My comment addresses the following:

Q2 · Geographic scope — Where the study assumes batteries will go.

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 geographic assumptions should screen out places with private wells, floodplains, earthquake faults, and neighborhoods with one road out, because site details will be left to later reviews. 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. I ask that the PEIS's geographic-scope assumptions explicitly account for proximity to homes, schools, and hospitals; wildland-urban interface and wildfire-prone areas; seismic hazard zones and floodplains; areas dependent on private wells; and communities with limited evacuation routes — and that proximity to existing infrastructure not be treated as a proxy for suitability.

Q3 · Impacts to analyze — The harms the study has to look at.

It's important that the study model what a battery fire's smoke does to the people living nearby. The scoping document acknowledges toxic gas from damaged batteries can hurt firefighters' skin and lungs. It does not mention neighbors, who have no protective gear and may not be able to leave. Evacuation, displacement, and offsite cleanup should count as impacts in their own right. Ecology's own example, the Moss Landing fire, forced 1,200 people from their homes. The study should look at what a multi-day battery fire demands from local fire, hazmat, hospital, and evacuation capacity, since Ecology could not say whether the burden on small rural fire districts can be fixed. I would like to see the study thoroughly examine the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of how smoke settles into valleys, runoff reaches wells and streams, and what happens when there are several facilities on the same stretch of grid. The study should properly model whether neighbors can evacuate without breathing dangerous levels of toxic gas in places such as a valley that traps air, which is what the fire code requires. I ask that the PEIS analyze, for stand-alone facilities: thermal-runaway fires and hazardous-gas emissions (including hydrogen fluoride) with dispersion modeling for inversion-prone valleys; contaminated fire-suppression water and its path to groundwater, private wells, and fish-bearing streams; multi-day incident demands on local fire, HazMat, hospital, and evacuation capacity; continuous nighttime noise from cooling and inverters at distances beyond 1,000 feet; and seismic performance of container-based installations in mapped fault zones.

Q4 · Mitigation — The steps Ecology should require to reduce the harm.

The study should be specific enough to give local reviewers something to hold a developer to, because my county will lean on it when it reviews a real project. The siting and design considerations Ecology plans to give developers from the study must include minimum distances from homes, schools, hospitals, and drinking-water wells that are proven to be safe for the surrounding community, not just general guidelines. The study should recommend large-scale fire testing be required for every facility, whether or not the state has adopted the newest code, since Ecology itself credits it with reducing risk. The study should recommend developer-funded monitoring, cleanup guarantees, and decommissioning bonds, as state rules already require these for other energy facilities. The study should state that local governments may require stronger protections than the state minimum. State standards should be a floor, not a ceiling. I ask that the PEIS identify concrete mitigation measures, including minimum setbacks from homes, schools, hospitals, and drinking-water wells; large-scale fire testing (UL 9540A) and compliance with the current edition of NFPA 855 regardless of state adoption status; funded emergency-response plans, training, and equipment for local fire districts before operation; containment and disposal plans for fire-suppression water; enforceable nighttime noise limits at the nearest residence; and decommissioning and financial-assurance requirements.

This is personal for my household. I live less than one mile from the proposed site. My son currently go to Pre-K nearby, at Timber Ridge Elementary. In an emergency my household would evacuate via Snoqualmie Parkway, along with everyone else who depends on that road.

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.

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,

Jessica Moylan