

Washington State

ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

Satsop Combustion Turbine Project
Prevention of Significant Deterioration/Notice of Construction
Permit No. EFSEC/2001-01 Amendment 2

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

September 7, 2004

1 Background

In January 2004, Energy Northwest and Duke Energy Grays Harbor, LLC, (jointly “Duke Energy”) submitted a joint request to the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC or Council) to amend the Prevention of Significant Deterioration/Notice of Construction (PSD/NOC) permit for the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project, sited near Elma, in Grays Harbor County, Washington. The request sought an extension of the time period allowed to suspend construction by 18 months, modify specific monitoring provisions, and other specific changes to subparagraphs of approval conditions in EFSEC Permit No. EFSEC/2001-01, Amendment 1.

A preliminary approval of PSD/NOC permit No. EFSEC/2001-01, Amendment 2, was issued for public comment on July 2, 2004. Public notice of the comment period and of a public hearing on this matter was performed by publication of a legal notice in the Aberdeen Daily World (7/2/04), The Olympian (7/2/04), and the Montesano Vidette (7/1/04), and by mailing to EFSEC’s interested persons list for this project, and EFSEC’s minutes and agendas list on By July 2, 2004. Copies of the draft permit and associated fact sheet were made available for public reference in the W. H. Abel Memorial Library in Montesano, the EFSEC offices in Olympia, and Ecology’s Offices in Lacey, Washington, on EFSEC’s web site and to any interested person upon request.

The public comment period closed on August 2, 2004. A Public Hearing was also held on August 2, 2004, at the EFSEC offices, Conference Room 308, in Olympia, Washington.

The Council received two written comments. No oral comments were received at the July 2, 2004, Public Hearing. The comments received are summarized below, and responses to comments are given. Changes to the permit as a result of the comments are also indicated. Copies of the original comment letters are available upon request from the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

2 Response to Comments

Comment 1, submitted by Duke Energy Grays Harbor.

The commenter requests that Paragraph 26.2 of the permit should be changed to January 20, 2006. This date corresponds to an 18 month extension.

Response: The date (July 20, 2005) in the preliminary approval of the extension request is based on 18 months counted from the suspension of construction rather than 18 months from the end of an 18 month period to restart construction without the need for an extension. A further review of the language in the regulation and guidance on the matter indicates that the date should be as requested, which is 18 months from the end of the 18 month period starting on the day construction was suspended.

The date in the Final Approval has been changed to January 20, 2006.

Comment 2, submitted by Grays Harbor County Department of Public Services

Grays Harbor County has reviewed the proposed additional amendment and concurs with the determination that the amendment does not represent a probable significant adverse impact to elements of the natural environment, including air quality, water quality, soil or natural vegetation.

Response: Thank you for your comment. No changes are required to the draft Approval as a result of this comment.