

Samantha Weller

To the Department of Ecology, Clean Energy Coordination:

My name is Sam Weller and I live at 36708 SE Gravenstein CT, 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:

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

The study should assume facilities would be built to the rules Washington has actually adopted, and say what the newest standards would change, since Ecology admits the state's fire code is behind them. I ask that the PEIS evaluate the full range of stand-alone facilities actually being proposed in Washington — including large container-based lithium-ion installations sited near homes, schools, and constrained road networks — and that it analyze those facilities as built to the code Washington has actually adopted, drawing on independent safety data rather than industry assurances, and identify the most recent safety standards as required mitigation.

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

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.

The study needs to measure nighttime noise at the nearest home, not at the fence line, since Ecology's earlier studies found that noise from these facilities reaches 1,000 feet in quiet rural areas. 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 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. 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 under 1 mile from the proposed site. 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,
Sam Weller
36708 SE Gravenstein CT, Snoqualmie WA 98065