Anastasia Ivasenko

To the Department of Ecology, Clean Energy Coordination:

My name is Anastasia Ivasenko and I live at 6720 Silent Creek Ave 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 near where I live, 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 map should clearly say where facilities should not go, not only where they could, since nearly every kind of land is in play. 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. Ecology promised to hear from local communities and it's important to take what our communities are saying about where we live seriously in order to ensure this study is done properly. 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 crucial that responder training, hard-to-extinguish fires, toxic air, harm to water and fish, and cleanup each get a full analysis, not a mention, as the Ecology study scoping document states it "will evaluate" each of them. 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. 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 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. 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.

This is personal for my household. I live near a site where a stand-alone BESS facility is proposed. My children attend school near a proposed stand-alone BESS site. My household depends on Snoqualmie Parkway, which is also an emergency route for everyone along it.

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,
Anastasia Ivasenko
6720 Silent Creek Ave SE Snoqualmie, WA