

**From:** Douglas Taylor [ctn49482@centurytel.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 08, 2010 11:27 PM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Cc:** Marvin, Bruce (ATG)  
**Subject:** [Fwd: public comment to mitigated determination of nonsignificance] Satsop Combustion Turbine Project  
**Attachments:** public comment to mitigated determination of nonsignificance

Sent this day: March 8, 2010 at 11:27 PM

**From:** Douglas Taylor  
95 Keys Rd W  
Elma, WA 98541

This is comments to the MDNS in addition to the attached comments from Patti-Jo Farr. These additional comments and concerns are based on news articles published in the local newspaper as well as further comments to the MDNS. Further, these questions and concerns are what I have as well as what I have heard from neighbors within the Satsop area.

It appears Grays Harbor Energy (GHE) has withdrawn a 10 acre site area that was in the original public hearing process and now after the public hearing process has in fact obtained a lease on another piece of property owned by the Public Development Authority (PDA). That manuver of switching to a different site area in itself should require another SEPA public review and comment period to take place. The original SEPA and mitigated determination of nonsignificance (MDNS) did not designate the location of this new area until after the fact.

\*Power Need;\* I would like to make it known that during this whole SEPA process for units 3 and 4 the gas fired turbine units 1 and 2 have not been operating. It makes one wonder if that is intensional so people will not be able to see the steam plum rising hundreds of feet into the sky, hear the roar of the turbines, check the water aquifer levels, smell the air, see the off colored emissions, see the light in the night sky, see no wild life in the area and hear the squealing pitchy noise.

Further, let it be known that this winter was one of the nations worst snow fall and cold weather years in the 48 States power grid system ever. With that in mind the need for power should have been grandiose.

This plant did not run one day since the later part of October 2009 to the present day of March 8, 2010. If the power grid system did not need power from units 1 and 2 during the nations worst winter why is there a need to build units 3 and 4?

\*Analysis of Impacts;\* The MDNS has indicated units 3 and 4 is not expected to have more than minor impacts to all the environmental concerns as mentioned in items 1 through 6 below. Currently, units 1 and 2 have created many environmental problems to the surrounding neighborhood and the environment. Rather than trying to fix those problems with the current units 1 and 2, GHE wants to build two more plants (units 3 and 4) with the same problems. One would only think that the most prudent thing to do is find out what is wrong with the first two units and fix that, so when you building the next two units they will be right. The question is how many more Toyota's (Turbines) are you going to keep building before you fix what you have? The entire analysis of impacts alludes to modeling for the basis of the statements to the environment, both current and future. By using the term modeling means you are not sure, so it is an estimation or best guess. At this point, you do not have to model or guess. You have a turbine plant (units 1 and

2) which has operated and you can take actual data and measurements in that geographic location and environment. Had this MDNS analysis been done using the actual measurements of the current units 1 and 2, the outcome would be much different. Even the surrounding neighbors have been determined to be insignificant. After reading this MDNS, I would urge you to consider having an independent, non bias, SEPA expert who would apply some science to the environmental impact study complete with a new SEPA. Further, I believe a non bias expert would find this project to be a determination of significance (DS).

\*1. Air; \*Basically the MDNS indicates, not sure what the impact will be with units 3 and 4. Here again, if the current actual measurements of emissions of units 1 and 2 were used, rather than modeling, there would be actual scientific data to measure the impacts to the air. Yes, it is known that units 1 and 2 are not very emission efficient in their current status, but maybe after they are retro fitted and filtered to function properly, the numbers might be favorable. Further, the percent of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emitted and the contributing illnesses and deaths were taken from the Environmental Defense Air Quality Fact Sheet. Nitrogen oxides combined with water makes nitric acid (HNO<sub>3</sub>), which is also a major component of atmospheric acidification. Who knows what HNO<sub>3</sub> can cause to the surrounding neighborhood.

\*2. Water;\* The MDNS indicates units 3 and 4 would require 6.5 cubic feet per second (cfs) in addition to the amount of water required for units 1 and 2. Also indicated was that when the Chehalis River is at low flow levels well water will be withdrawn from the aquifer that all the residents rely on for their water supply. This concerns us residence due to the fact that the water rights for this generator plant was allowed by the transfer of rights from the nuclear power plant dated in about 1977. The residents have gone on record since the power plant public hearings that we are concerned about the aquifer. Our wells are very sensitive with very low flows for most of the residents on the hill, especially those residents closest to the edge of the hill above the Chehalis River. In the last two years I have personally had to replace three submersible water well pumps due to possibly low levels in the well. The pump man indicated that in all three wells the water levels in the well casings had dropped 35 feet. What this has cause in casing that use to be under water is now above the water level and the casing now has rusted up and keeps dropping chunks of rust into the potable water system in the house water. The only thing I can contribute the lower level in the aquifer is the turbine plant coming on line. This SEPA has not done a study of the affects to the aquifer. Therefore, here again exists another reason to have a expert non-biased SEPA check list done.

Your mitigation measures indicate this project will use water withdrawn pursuant to water rights that are not subject to base flow limitations.

What do you plan to do if the water taken for this plant leaves the residents without potable water?

\*3. Animals;\* It has been indicated that the plant does not lessen the area for habitat. Provided no more land is cleared and the plant is able to use the lay down area to the west, habitat will stay the same. The problem is the west lay down area to the west of Keys Road was suppose to be returned back to its natural state when the nuclear plant became operable or shut down. That never happened. When this turbine plant is done will that land be turned back to its natural state?

\*4. Noise;\* The major problem is that when the plant is in operation the wild life seems to migrate away from the plant. Not known if it is the loudness of the noise, the squealing pitch noise, the increased traffic, the steam plum or something else, but the deer are not seen feeding there when the plant is operating. What bother me most is the squealing pitch. After a few days of that, I have to leave the area for relief from the noise and allowance of some much needed sleep. Personally, our horse is moody and we don't even try to ride him while the plant is operating. The horse pins his ears back, looks in the direction of the noise and is very unmanageable. The bald eagles that fly over the valley are non existent during turbine plant operation and they certainly do not fly through the steam

plum. You do not hear the birds singing in the yard because they leave the area or it is too noisy. The migrating ducks and geese fly around the steam plum during their annual migrations. According to the mitigation measures nothing different will be done to make units 3 and 4 quieter. The mitigation measures in the this MDNS report has no meaning, such as obtaining a qualified acoustical engineer to monitor noise to the maximum levels. Who is that person? It sounds like a staff person you deemed qualified to monitor noise. It should be a non-biased licensed expert in the field of noise and a continuous measurement of the noise level as well as stopping the squealing pitch. Also, units 3 and 4 should not be built until you have a plan and a fix to control the noise of units 1 and 2. Do not keep building broken plants until you fix what you got. Don't wait to measure noise after units 3 and 4 are built before you put acoustical sound barriers. You already know the noise is too much. Do the right thing, extend the great iron wall and spray with acoustics, filter and muffler the turbines. The great wall should be painted to blend with the area with maybe murals of wild life feeding, flying, etc. How do you propose to improve the response of complaints? It's time to start doing business by being a good neighbor and quit doing the minimum required and operating at the maximum environmental levels allowed.

\*5. Light and Glare;\* The existing 25 foot high wall needs to be extended on the west of the project in a southerly direction to help block some of the noise as well as dampen the glare of the light levels. The good part about the light is at night I can find the direction home from as far away as Summit Lake or Aberdeen.

\*6. Transportation;\* The mitigation measures indicate encouraging traffic to use the on and off ramps in Elma rather than take the highway 12 and Keys Road intersection is absurd at best. People will take the path that is closest and easy. Besides Keys Road was originally built for construction traffic and the other road, Wakefield, was built for high volumes of employee vehicle traffic.

Thank you for this opportunity!

Douglas Taylor