Gina Anderson

To the Department of Ecology, Clean Energy Coordination:

My name is Gina Anderson and I live on Snoqualmie Ridge in 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.

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 Ecology study should define "suitable" areas by what is SAFE for the people and rivers in the area, not just by where a facility could physically be built. Wildfire exposure and fire-district capacity should also be part of the map should inform what sites are suitable or unsuitable.

The study's map should clearly say where facilities should not go, not only where they could. Unsuitable sites should be clearly disqualified and designated as such on the study's map.

The study's geographic assumptions should screen out places with private wells, floodplains, earthquake faults, and neighborhoods with one road out. Proposed sites should not be close enough to homes or schools to affect them with noise and not close enough to waterways, homes, and schools that would be affected by a fire or fire response run-off.

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.

This is personal for me and my family. We live near a site where a stand-alone BESS facility is proposed, the Snoqualmie project.

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,

Gina Anderson
Snoqualmie Ridge
Snoqualmie, WA