Ingrid Yenin

To the Department of Ecology, Clean Energy Coordination:

My name is Ingrid Yenin and I live at 14607 Main St, A103. 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 Washington is siting stand-alone battery facilities near communities, including one 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:

Q3 · Impacts to analyze — The harms the study has to look at.
I'm deeply concerned about this situation and this project plan: we are creating serious safety issues and medical safety concerns related to long term health issues due to various factors including high air pollution levels, noise pollution levels and fires caused by these chemicals in the facility. Washington state is currently plaques with wildfires every year. Facility like this is an everyday concern and anxiety for residents. It must not be built in the residential area or so close to it. Residents opinions must be heard and taken into consideration. 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 elsewhere in Washington, near the kind of grid infrastructure Ecology says may make a place "suitable" for a facility like this.

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,
Ingrid Yenin
14607 Main St, A103