

Talburt, Tammy (COM)

---

**From:** A West [awestaa@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2009 12:33 PM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Subject:** Comment on Grays Harbor Energy Project

**Categories:** Blue Category

Please be in receipt of a public comment on the request to amend the Grays Harbor Site Certification.

Please confirm receipt.

Thank you.

Arthur West

December 15, 2009

To: **Manager Allen J. Fiksdal,**

**Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC)**

RE: 1) A Comment on EFSEC's proposed action and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) determination required for the approval, construction and operation of the proposed "Amendment" of the Site Certification Agreement (SCA) for the Grays Harbor Energy's Satsop Combustion Turbine Project's "Phase II", in order for this "Amendment" to allow a proposed second natural gas fired electrical power plant of the same size, 650 Megawatts, to be constructed and operated at this site on the Grays Harbor Public Development Authority's (PDA) property at Satsop, Washington, thereby Doubling the size of Grays Harbor's power plant to 1300 Megawatts and Doubling the various impacts leading from this power plant.

Dear Mr. Fiksdal;

Pursuant to the EFSEC's undated Notice of the Dec. 15, 2009 Meeting and Opportunity For Public Comment sent to Jerry Dierker, Jerry Dierker and Arthur West are making the above noted comment on the above noted matter as follows, pursuant to RCW 43.21C and WAC 197-11 et seq., and the Administrative Procedures Act RCW 34.05.

We are also incorporating by reference Mr. Dierker's prior pleadings on this project which exist in the agency records of EFSEC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), Thurston County, the Federal District Court, and/or other governmental agencies with jurisdiction over this matter related to this power plant project and its "connected actions" of the natural gas pipeline made to supply natural gas to fire the boilers for both the Phase I and Phase II sets of turbines, et seq., of the "whole" Satsop Power Plant proposal, and/or other related matters, which contain evidence of official and judicial notice which have been submitted to EFSEC, which exist within the jurisdictional boundaries of EFSEC that are the geographical boundaries of the State of Washington, and/or which is readily available to EFSEC as an agency of the State of Washington..

## Procedural

It appears to be improper for EFSEC to allow the proponent to use of a mere "Amendment" of the SCA issued for "Phase II" Grays Harbor Energy's Satsop Combustion Turbine Project, to allow EFSEC to allow this proposed Second natural gas fired electrical power plant of the same size, 650 Megawatts, to be constructed and operated at this site under construction at the Grays Harbor Public Development Authority's (PDA) property at Satsop, Washington, thereby Doubling the size of Grays Harbor's power plant to 1300 Megawatts and Doubling the various impacts leading from this power plant, without proper consideration.

Therefore, EFSEC should deny this request for a mere "Amendment" of the "Phase II" SCA, and EFSEC should at the very least require that a more detailed "Phase III" type application and and a more in-depth review of such a "Phase" of such a project, instead of the mere "Amendment" style of application and review attempted in this case, which would be merely another unlawfully "piecemealing" of EFSEC's review and consideration of this project and its impacts.

## Environmental Review

EFSEC's October 13, 2009 Monthly Meeting Minutes "Project Update" on this project, even the proponent Invenergy's Brent Oakleaf noted that there will be impacts to air, water, and noise from this Doubling the size of Grays Harbor's power plant to 1300 Megawatts.

Clearly, that admission requires at least that EFSEC issue a Determination of Significance (DS) with a request for comments on "scoping" of the detailed in-depth environmental review necessary for a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on just this project proposal alone.

We further request that, to prevent another unlawfully "piecemealing" of EFSEC's review and consideration of this project and its impacts, EFSEC do a single integrated, joint, combined, interconnected, and proper review under a single "joint" Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and SEPA, on this entire "Phased" power plant project and all of foreseeably likely directly, indirect, cumulative, and regional impacts reasonably leading from the joint action of all of the individual, integral, interconnected, interdependent and interconnected parts and all of its connected actions foreseeably leading from Grays Harbor Energy's whole "Phased" Satsop Power Plant Project proposal, including not

only just this new "Amendment" of the SCA which DOUBLES the size of both the project and its impacts, but this environmental determination must also include a review of all of those related and connected actions and impacts leading from both of its Phase I and Phase II sets of turbines, et seq., its Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) Electrical Interconnection for taking the electrical power made by both the Phase I and Phase II sets of turbines, et seq., of the "whole" Satsop Power Plant proposal, and its natural gas pipeline made to supply natural gas to fire the boilers for both the Phase I and Phase II sets of turbines, et seq., of the "whole" Satsop Power Plant proposal.

#### Air Impacts

As noted by EFSEC's October 13, 2009 Monthly Meeting Minutes "Project Update" on this project, even the proponent Invenergy's Brent Oakleaf noted that there will be impacts to air in this area from this proposed Doubling of the size of Grays Harbor's power plant to 1300 Megawatts.

Due to the prevailing "on-shore flow" of air from the Pacific Ocean in this area, any discharge of air pollutants from the Satsop, Washington site of this gas-fired electrical power plant has been and will be moving into the Puget Sound region which exceeded the EPA's allowable air quality standards for carbon dioxide in August, 2008, shortly after this power plant project first started operating at this site, and just last week this same Puget Sound area was subjected to air that the EPA considered "unhealthy" for people with breathing problems like Mr. Dierker.

This week our Governor is in Denmark with the President and other world leaders to consider and act to reduce such air pollution to reduce global warming leading from carbon dioxide and air pollution like that emitted by this power plant and other sources.

Therefore, we request that EFSEC deny this application at this time, since any further exceedances of the EPA's air quality standards is grounds for excessive fines to be levied by the EPA against the State of Washington and any or all of the various individual air-polluting industrial projects in this State like this gas-fired electrical power plant.

#### Water

EFSEC's October 13, 2009 Monthly Meeting Minutes "Project Update" on this project, even the proponent Invenergy's Brent Oakleaf also noted that

there will be impacts to water from this proposed Doubling of the size of Grays Harbor's power plant to 1300 Megawatts.

Like Mr. Dierker stated in his Feb. 4, 2002 Comment and Appeal on Phase II of this project, this project will further drain water for steam from the groundwater aquifers in the area which are in "hydraulic continuity" with the area's surface water streams and the Chehalis River, thereby decreasing the amount of water in the area's surface water streams and the Chehalis River, which will impact this area's endangered salmon and trout in the streams, etc.

Therefore, we request that EFSEC deny this application at this time, since any further reduction of water from the groundwater aquifers in the area which are in "hydraulic continuity" with the area's surface water streams and the Chehalis River, will decrease the amount of water in the area's surface water streams and the Chehalis River, which will impact this area's endangered salmon and trout in the streams, etc.

s/ JERRY DIERKER  
Jerry Lee Dierker  
1720 Bigelow St. NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

s/ARTHUR WEST  
Arthur West  
120 State Ave. NE  
Olympia, WA 98501

Talbert, Tammy (COM)

**From:** michaelspierce [michaelspierce@techline.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2009 3:38 PM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Subject:** Proposed Doubling of Satsop Combustion Project

**Categories:** Blue Category

Michael S. Pierce  
470 Wenzel Slough Road  
Elma, WA. 98541  
December 17, 2009

EFSEC [efsec@commerce.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@commerce.wa.gov)

Re: Proposed doubling of size of Satsop Combustion Turbine Project, Satsop, WA.

People:

There were issues raised and questions asked during the hearing process for Phase I of this project, the existing site, which can and should be addressed now, prior to EFSEC issuing an Amendment to the Site Certification for a phase II doubling of plant size. Environmental issues and questions which at the exploration of the Phase I permitting process were answered with speculation, can now be studied from hard data. The superficial "Sound Study" submitted by the owner, Grays Harbor Energy, is an example. Now that there is an actual history of operation of the Phase I plant, the actual environmental effects that plant causes can be measured and interpolated to ascertain what additional effect doubling the capacity of the plant will entail. As a case in point; the "Sound Study" by the Michael Theriault Acoustics Inc. showed Phase I sound levels to be sufficiently close to legal thresholds that we can easily surmise that doubling the plant capacity would surely exceed State mandated sound levels at all hours. Significant additional sound mitigation methods, techniques, and plant hardware will probably be required to keep the project within State guidelines.

I, as a close neighbor to the Phase I plant, have experienced troubling modification to environmental conditions at my farm directly related to the operation of that plant such as noise, light pollution at night, and various odd smells in the air. I would have it that the developer of the proposed plant addition submit a careful environment assessment of the existing Phase I operation with a view to how Phase II doubling of plant size will affect those environmental considerations and concerns mentioned above, as well as water temperature in the Chehalis River, effects on fish, wildlife, and migratory waterfowl, and all other pertinent environmental factors and concerns. Atmospheric conditions such as wind direction, cloud cover, temperature inversions, etc., which tend to focus or reflect plant stack effluent, sounds and lights onto the ground should be studied with a view toward identifying those combinations of atmospheric conditions when plant operation is unsafe, uncomfortable or illegal within the environs of the Phase I plant and surrounding community, and interpolate that data to the doubling of the plant output with Phase II. I suspect from observation that certain atmospheric conditions can exacerbate marginal environmental quality beyond comfort levels, and possibly legal limits. I want to know that you at EFSEC are made aware of those conditions due to Phase I operation, before you issue a Site Amendment to the Agreement allowing twice the potential for pollutants and environmental degradation to my neighborhood.

Finally, though Phase I and Phase II might adhere to Best Available Technology for pollution control, all that steam and light of "Siegfried's Forge" represent inefficiencies of wasted heat and lost wasted water resources. Further, wheeling the power thousands of miles to where it might eventually reach end users creates additional

inefficiencies. I would hope the timing of this Phase II project will not precede new federal power plant regulations promised by the EPA, and that those regulations will address the inefficiencies of producing power thousands of miles remote from where that power is consumed. The world can do without the CO<sub>2</sub> and the NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC's produced by our dwindling hydrocarbon fuels in grossly inefficient plants. We can do better than this! We must!

Michael S. Pierce

Douglas E. Taylor  
Patricia A. Taylor  
95 Keys Rd W  
Elma, WA 98541  
(360) 482-2669  
d.taylor@centurytel.net

December 17, 2009

To: Allen J. Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager

From: Douglas E. Taylor and Family

Re: Written Comments  
Grays Harbor Energy Center  
Satsop Combustion Turbine (CT) Project

Please include these questions and comments with earlier comments dated December 14, 2009. These comments are based on questions that have come to mind during and after the public hearing in Montesano on the night of December 15, 2009. Please provide written answers to all questions.

The following questions are based on the presentation from Mr Oakleaf. He presented a map of the United States showing the locations of generator plants.

1. How many were gas fired steam turbine plants and how many are currently operating?
2. Of those plants, how many turbine units are located at each site?
3. Of those plants, how many produce 650 megawatts or more?
4. Of those plants, how many are located within a mile of residential homes?
5. How does each of those plants control the noise, steam and light?
6. Has any of those plants tried to spray a sound deadening product on steel and equipment to control the noise?
7. What are your plans to control the noise at the Satsop site?

The next comment is going to relate to the jobs that Grays Harbor Energy is expressing as being a positive to the Grays Harbor area. Even the Grays Harbor Economic Council and the Chamber of Commerce expressed their support to the eight (8) permanent jobs and 500 short term construction jobs this project will bring to the Grays Harbor area to help off-set the high unemployment rate of 13% percent. This sounds well and good, but here is the "rest of the story" along with the facts and questions about the eight jobs:

1. Eight jobs hardly hits the jack pot and does nothing to off-set the unemployment rate.
2. Of those eight jobs, how many are permanent full time?
3. Of those eight jobs, what are their job titles and their hourly wage?
4. Of those eight jobs, how many will be filled by current residents of Grays Harbor County?

Douglas E. Taylor  
Patricia A. Taylor  
95 Keys Rd W  
Elma, WA 98541  
(360) 482-2669  
d.taylor@centurytel.net

Currently, it has been said units 1 and 2 employ 23 people. Now, after the public hearing, I'm hearing there are only 18 jobs for units 1 and 2.

1. How many full time permanent jobs are there at the Satsop site for units 1 and 2?
2. What are the titles of all those jobs at unit 1 and 2 and the hourly rate for each?

The next wet of questions are about the 500 construction jobs which might be way over estimated and here are the facts and questions:

1. There are not enough parking spaces for that many workers, where are they going to park?
2. These 500 workers come out of union halls from outside the Grays Harbor area. How will this help the unemployment for Grays Harbor? In reality this will make the unemployment worse in the long term. The fact, based on every short term construction project done on Fuller Hill Industrial Park, is some of these construction workers will move from outside the area to Grays Harbor for the years worth on work. Then when the construction work is over they stay here and go on unemployment in Grays Harbor and that will increase the unemployment rate. History has shown very few jobs go to the local community.
3. Can you estimate how many of the construction jobs will go to the local residents in the Grays Harbor area?

The following are general questions that I would request written answers please:

1. Are you planning on extending the current Iron wall?
2. Do you plan on building some other type of noise barrier such as earthen berm, trees, spray on acoustical sound walls, acoustical spray on noise making machinery, etc.?
3. Current noise sounds like a bearing squeal. How will you stop the pitchy spuealing noise?
4. How many megawatts of power produced at this plant stays in this area?
5. Has Grays Harbor PUD bought or used power from this plant? If so, how many megawatts per year?
6. Do you agree that the neighboring residents are impacted by this power plant?
7. The impacted residents of other power producing plants, such as the residents of the City of Wenatchee, are compensated with free power. Why are the impacted neighbors of this plant not compensated with free power?

Douglas E. Taylor  
Patricia A. Taylor  
95 Keys Rd W  
Elma, WA 98541  
(360) 482-2669  
d.taylor@centurytel.net

As I had indicated in the public hearing, our family homesteaded here back in 1962. My father-in-law lives here and sub-divided the property to allow each of his children to live on acres of land on this hill. Currently, both daughters and their families live here. His son has held off on building here because of all the unfavorable industrial activity through the years. It was not the family's choice to have the land re-zoned from agriculture to industrial and have property condemned and taken for industrial zoning purposes. We believe the responsible thing to do as well as the right thing to do would be to buy out everyone. This should have happened long ago and it should happen now. Please, do not allow this permit process to proceed without a full consideration of those neighbors and people most directly impacted by your decisions.

Thank you!

## Talburt, Tammy (COM)

---

**From:** Douglas Taylor [ctn49482@centurytel.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 17, 2009 11:54 PM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Subject:** Comments - Grays Harbor Energy Units 3 and 4  
**Attachments:** Gas Fired Generator Plant 12-17-09.wpd

**Categories:** Blue Category

Mr fiksdal,  
Please add the attached comments to the earlier comments sent on Dec 14, 2009 in reference to the Satsop gas fire turbine, Units 3 and 4.

Thank you!



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

PO Box 47775 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7775 • (360) 407-6300  
711 for Washington Relay Service • Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341

December 18, 2009

Allen Fiksdale, EFSEC Manager  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
PO Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172



Your address  
is in the  
**Lower  
Chehalis**  
watershed

Dear Mr. Fiksdale:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the prethreshold consultation for the Grays Harbor Energy Project-Amend the Site Certification Agreement located in Elma as proposed by Grays Harbor Energy LLC. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environmental checklist and has the following comment(s):

**WATER RESOURCES: Vicki Cline (360) 407-0278**

Any modification to existing water rights must be approved by Ecology's Water Resources Program.

Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions or would like to respond to these comments, please contact the appropriate reviewing staff listed above.

Department of Ecology  
Southwest Regional Office

(SM: 09-6863)

cc: Vicki Cline, WR  
Grays Harbor Energy LLC (Proponent)

**Talburt, Tammy (COM)**

---

**From:** Mendoza, Sonia (ECY)  
**Sent:** Friday, December 18, 2009 9:00 AM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Subject:** SEPA No. 09-6863 " Grays Harbor Energy Project-Amend the Site Certification Agreement"  
Comment Letter  
**Attachments:** 09-6863.pdf  
**Importance:** High  
**Categories:** Blue Category

Mr. Allen Fiksdale,

Per your request is our comments for the Grays Harbor Energy Project-Amend the Site Certification Agreement (Ecology SEPA File No. 09-6863). Comments are due today 12/18/09.

**Please reply to this message for confirmation. Thank you.**

*Sonia Mendoza*

Department of Ecology-SWRO  
SEPA Coordinator  
360-407-6313 (P)  
360-407-6305(F)

**Talbur, Tammy (COM)**

---

**From:** Terry Willis [twillis@co.grays-harbor.wa.us]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 31, 2009 1:37 PM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Cc:** anthaholt@me.com  
**Subject:** Grays Harbor Energy Project

**Categories:** Blue Category

Dear Allen Fiksdale;

I am the Grays Harbor County Commissioner for District 1 representing those persons living in the vicinity of Grays Harbor Energy LLC as well as the Grays Harbor Energy company itself. While we welcome this business and look forward to their expansion it is apparent from the comments being made by neighbors living adjacent to Grays Harbor Energy's property and also those property owners below the site, down in valleys, that the noise of the plant is an issue. I attended the public hearing held in Montesano on December 15 and listened to the families living in the vicinity of the plant comment that the noise is affecting their daily lives and possibly their health. They also have fears that the plant is devaluing their properties and should they decide to move, that may not be possible and that expansion of this plant would only make things worse. I listened to reports that noise studies were done by a company hired by Grays Harbor Energy LLC and that they found all the noise levels to be within acceptable ranges. On the other hand the land owners claimed that weather conditions, plant operations, time of day, and other changing parameters allow the noise to be worse and beyond accepted levels.

As EFSEC processes this permit I am requesting that a more intensive evaluation of the noise of the existing plant take place under a larger variety of conditions including those I mentioned above, that the noise abatement features be evaluated for effectiveness and improved upon if necessary, and that the company be requested to facilitate an e-mail tree, web-site announcements, phone recordings or some such mechanism announcing a change in activity by the plant that would have impacts on the neighbors. These announcements should include what the change will be, how long it will last, if it will involve odors as well as noise, and where people can call should they have more questions.

The expansion of this company will be a great asset to our county but we can't ignore the high value we place on quality of life and the value of our private homes. I have no doubt that solutions to these issues are attainable. If there is anything our office can help with do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Willis  
Grays Harbor County Commissioner, District 1  
360-249-3731 Office  
360-249-5386 Res.  
360-581-4608 Cell  
[twillis@co.grays-harbor.wa.us](mailto:twillis@co.grays-harbor.wa.us)

All e-mail sent to this address will be received by the Grays Harbor County e-mail system and may be subject to Public Disclosure under Chapter 42.56 RCW and is subject to archiving and review by someone other than the recipient.

RECEIVED

JAN 04 2010

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

To Allen Fipsdal EFEC Manager :

A note to let you know that we are against the expansion of plant 3 and 4. We have heard all of the stories of how great these power plants are going to be for our area before.

It won't work anymore. You people are in this for yourself not us.

So far all we have noticed is a lack of quality of life and a decrease of property value. Thanks!

After my retirement we had plans of possibly building on our 7 acres along Keys Rd. W. where my father and two sisters and their families reside.

That is probably not going to happen thanks to you people.

If you really would like the support of the community I would suggest doing what you say and saying what you mean!

Dian + Cindy Lowe

P.O. Box 104

Satsop, Wa. 98583

**From:** Richard Carver [bdonthego@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 06, 2010 10:55 AM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Subject:** New Turbine at Satsop

**Categories:** Blue Category

My name is Richard Carver I live at 90 Keys Rd. West Elma Wa. 98541 and I would like make several comments on the new proposed turbine east of the existing one. The turbine that's operating now makes a constant drowning sound on other wise quiet summer days . If this sound doubles it will change our quiet country life. Also when they decide to clean the pipes it will knock you out of bed Its so loud. I would hope that any new plant or development would keep the noise down to acceptable levels. After all both of these turbines could have and should have been constructed on top of the site near the Boise Cascade plant site and away from homes and farms.

Richard C. Carver  
P.O. Box 147  
Satsop Wa. 98583  
(360) 470-8100



State of Washington  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mailing Address: 600 Capitol Way N • Olympia, WA 98501-1091 • (360) 902-2200, TDD (360) 902-2207  
Main Office Location: Natural Resources Building • 1111 Washington Street SE • Olympia, WA

January 7, 2010

Allen Fiksdal  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council Manager  
Post Office Box 43172  
905 Plum Street South East  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

RE: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Comments on Amendment #5  
for the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project Site Certification.

Dear Mr. Fiksdal,

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the on the proposed amendment to the Satsop Gas Combustion Facility.

This amendment essentially proposes to double the size of the facility and represents a significant change to the Site Certification. The expansion will be built on the construction and maintenance yard for the existing facility. The amendment requests that an additional 10 acres of land be would be acquired and used as the new construction and maintenance yard.

WDFW has reviewed the proposed amendment. We have three issues that need further development in this amendment application:

- 1) The applicant proposes to withdraw an additional 7 cfs from the Chehalis River to operate this expanded facility. The proposal states that they will purchase or lease water rights from either the City of Aberdeen or from the Grays Harbor Public Development Authority. WDFW notes that the Chehalis River is frequently falling below minimum flows required for fish, especially during the summer. This has been confirmed by the Department of Ecology's SW regional office.

WDFW recommends that the amendment be expanded to explain how this water right acquisition will affect minimum flow requirements in the river. Will the applicant cease operations during these low flow periods, or does the acquired water rights that predate the establishment of fish flows? Are these water rights still active, or have they expired?

- 2) The proposal states that an additional 10 acres of land will be acquired immediately to the east of the current and proposed powerplant sites. This 10 acre parcel would be used as a laydown area during construction of Phase 2, and as a maintenance yard after construction. These ten acres are described in the draft amendment as roughly 50% mature conifer that has recently been thinned, and 50% grass and shrub.

These 10 acres were designated as wildlife mitigation lands in a July 27, 1994 agreement between WDFW and the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS). The mature timber portion is designated as polygon C4T-080 in figure 2 of this agreement. This stand was designated as mature timber to be thinned to achieve old-growth like conditions. This thinning has apparently occurred, and from aerial maps it appears to be more like 80% of the proposed laydown area rather than 50%. The proposed laydown area also contains a part of polygon C1-091, which is managed for conifer regeneration, and possibly a part of polygon G-083 ('Meteorological Tower Field'), which is managed for deer and elk forage.

WDFW would prefer to maintain the proposed laydown area as wildlife habitat. The mature timber habitat (C4T-080) will be difficult to replace anywhere in the vicinity. This mature timber is also a buffer between the noise and activity from the gas-firing power plants, and the deer and elk forage area in polygon G-083. If the applicant wants to amend the 1994 agreement, we will be seeking in-kind replacement of this mature timber stand, and for foraging habitat and immature conifer stands that are also lost. To maintain consistency with current agency standard, as described in the April 2009 WDFW Wind Power Guidelines, WDFW recommends a 2 for 1 replacement of lost acreage for each habitat type, and this replacement should be located in an area that is suitable for long-term wildlife management.

WDFW recommends that the applicant revise the proposed amendment to more precisely identify the habitat types and the acreage of each habitat type in the proposed laydown area. WDFW also recommends that the application be revised to explain how the applicant intends to maintain the intent of the July 27, 1994 wildlife habitat management agreement between WDFW and WPPSS.

- 3) If the applicant wants to proceed with the acquisition and modification of the 10 acre laydown site next to the power plants, WDFW recommends that the applicant conduct a survey of the area for both state-listed and federal-listed endangered and sensitive species.

WDFW will be looking forward to discussing these issues with the Council and the applicant as necessary to achieve resolution of these issues.

If you have any questions, contact me at [Mark.Hunter@wdfw.wa.gov](mailto:Mark.Hunter@wdfw.wa.gov) or 360-902-2542.

Sincerely,



Mark A. Hunter  
Environmental Planner 5

CC: Jeff Tayer, WDFW Council Designee  
Michele Culver, Region 6 Habitat Program Manager  
James LaSpina, EFSEC staff

**Talburt, Tammy (COM)**

---

**From:** Hunter, Mark A (DFW)  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 07, 2010 2:10 PM  
**To:** COM EFSEC  
**Cc:** LaSpina, Jim (COM); Culver, Michele K (DFW); Leigh, Curt S (DFW); Tayer, Jeff J (DFW)  
**Subject:** WDFW issues and recommendations concerning the Satsop CT certification amendment #5  
**Attachments:** SatsopComms010710.doc

Dear Mr. Allen Fiksdahl;

Please see the attachment for WDFW recommendations concerning the Satsop Combustion Turbine Amendment #5.

Mark A. Hunter

Habitat Program  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
600 N. Capitol Way  
Olympia, WA 98501-1091

Phone 360-902-2542  
FAX 360-902-2546  
[huntemah@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:huntemah@dfw.wa.gov)



January 7, 2010

RECEIVED

JAN 08 2010

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Mr. Brett Oakleaf  
Director, Business Development  
Invenergy LLC  
2580 W. Main Street, #200  
Littleton, Colorado 80120

Via Electronic Submission: boakleaf@invenergyllc.com

In Re: Grays Harbor Energy Expansion Project

Dear Mr. Oakleaf,

Thank you for this second opportunity to comment on the above referenced expansion project.

FOGH is a broad-based 100% volunteer tax-exempt 501(c)(3) citizens group made up of crabbers, fishers, oyster growers and caring citizens. The mission of FOGH is to foster and promote the economic, biological, and social uniqueness of Washington's estuaries and ocean coastal environments. The goal of FOGH is to protect the natural environment, human health and safety in Grays Harbor and vicinity through science, advocacy, law, activism and empowerment.

While FOGH generally supports the concept of alternative energies and welcomes responsible projects to promote that end, we have some questions and concerns about the proposed expansion of Grays Harbor Energy Turbine Complex.

There appears to be an inconsistency in the expressions of values throughout the tables and within the narrative of the impacts of the project. The mixing of Celsius with Fahrenheit, use of pounds per hour, tons per year for example, do not readily translate to permit requirements. It is cumbersome for the general public who is not schooled in conversion of these factors to see how these pollutants might affect the environment. We hope that the regulatory agencies will provide clear and precise parameters on all permits, so that the public can be assured that their interest is being served. How will the various permits, including but not limited to, air, water, NPDES and wastewater be reconciled by the reported values and the permitted values?

We note that the project life is projected to be over thirty years, but there is no discussion of the impacts of climate change. This is particularly important in the planning stages since the water withdrawal Site Certification Agreement sets base flow restrictions. The base flow figures of this Agreement seem to be based on a December 17, 1973 study with a reference to a 1975 Water Resources Management Program in the Chehalis River Basin. What changes to instream base flow and drought conditions have been studied or reported in the 35 intervening years? What impact would withdrawal have if instream base flows are not met to Tribal treaty rights and expectations?

The narrative explains in 3.3.23 Impacts of Process Water Withdrawal, that the lines have been scaled to carry 80 cfs. Is this making the statement that the underlying aquifer is capable of supplying that volume? What is the seasonal peak flow capabilities if the maximum of 80 cfs is withdrawn? What is the resultant predicted instream flow?

A discussion under 4.3.31 Construction of Units 3 and 4, indicates that the PDA has a former construction laydown for WMP-3 and WNP-5 is available. Why is this area not used instead of converting the 10 acres of undeveloped meadow and mature forest land? What would be the carbon sequester loss of permanently removing 5 acres of meadow and 5 acres of mature forest? How has this 10 acres of impact been mitigated? What are the ages of the 5 acres of mature forest trees?

Temperature of process water has been addressed by the requirement from Fish and Wildlife, however there doesn't appear to be a discussion about heavy metals that would/could be part of the discharge water. Studies have shown that added heavy metals tend to bind to the heavy metals of the water column and act as a sink for the storage of the contaminants. Lorz and McPherso, 1976 report that complete or partial inactivation for the gill-ATPase system occurs if fish are exposed to 20-30 micograms per liter (ug/l) of copper during the parr/smolt transformation. Excess flow, dredging and point/non-point effluent sources can exacerbate the re-suspension of these toxicants. How would this interfere with hydro-osmoregulatory ability of smolt? What protections of the outfall are in place and planned for future to prevent a level of discharge that could result in smolt mortality? What dredging is planned or has been done in the area of the project outfall or outfall plume?

Sanitary Water Discharge is discussed under 3.3.2.6. In that discussion it is mentioned that the on-site septic system can accommodate up to 3,500 gpd sanitary waste. The discussion continues that it would use less than 3,500 gpd. How much less? If the plant were to be shut down for maintenance how would this affect usage? During construction of units #3 and #4 what would be the use and how close would this be to capacity?

The discussion of light and glare states that the "light spillover *could* impact Keys Road or be obtrusive to nearby residences." The discussion further states that angles could be adjusted and light shields and vegetation screening *could* be used. This discussion should be changed to *shall*. In addition to the impacts to the human environment, there is also an impact to night-flying birds and bats in the area. Why was there not a light study on the effect of night migration patterns for birds and bats? We strongly suggest that all lighting be downcast, that lighting at night utilizes fixtures that minimize fog reflection and spacial disorientation for night flyers. We are also concerned that while the neighbors might be "used to" the light, glare and noise of the existing project, an increase in these impacts will cause harm.

FOGH has already received complaints and concerns from the area about light, air, noise, water quality and quantity and we would suggest Grays Harbor Energy do its utmost to minimize their impact.

We were not able to discover a draft modification of the NPDES permit which would discuss and set limits for the increased operation. Is this something that will be presented for public and agency review before the comment deadline? Will this extend the comment period?

In summary FOGH is concerned that the expansion Document may not properly protect water quality, wetlands, avian and aquatic resources, critical areas and the comfort and economic values of neighboring human residents

This can be and should be corrected by writing a permitting process that meets the highest expectations and standards.

Sincerely,



Arthur (R.D.) Grunbaum  
Vice President

cc: Debbie Nelson, Department of Ecology [dene461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:dene461@ecy.wa.gov)  
Jim La Spina, EFSEC [jim.laspina@commerce.wa.gov](mailto:jim.laspina@commerce.wa.gov)

