EFSEC

Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

STARBUCK POWER PROJECT
SCOPING REPORT

Proposed Project

On August 27, 2001, Starbuck Power Company, LLC, submitted an application to the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to construct and operate the Starbuck Power Project, a 1,200-megawatt natural gas-fired combustion turbine (CT) electrical generation facility. Associated with the proposed generation facility will be an approximately 17-mile electrical transmission line and a 1,200-foot natural gas pipeline. The proposed Starbuck Power Project will be located within Columbia County, approximately six miles northwest of the Town of Starbuck. The proposed transmission line will be located in both Columbia County and Walla Walla County.

Environmental Analysis

EFSEC has taken lead agency status under WAC 173-11-938 [State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules] for the environmental review of Starbuck Power Company's proposed generation facility. The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the lead agency for the transmission line, substations, and access roads under federal jurisdiction. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is responsible for siting of the natural gas pipeline, also under federal jurisdiction. EFSEC and BPA will be preparing a joint environmental impact statement (EIS) for this project.

Public Comments/Scoping

When siting a new energy facility, EFSEC is required to hold a public information meeting in the county in which a project is located. To meet this requirement, EFSEC and BPA co-hosted both an agency and a public EIS scoping meeting on October 3, 2001. The agency meeting was held at 10:00 am at the Youth Building on the Columbia County Fairgrounds in Dayton, WA. The public scoping meeting was held at 6:30 pm at the Starbuck Public School in Starbuck, WA. At both meetings, Starbuck Power Company presented a description of the project, reasons why the proposed site or location was selected, and a short summary of anticipated environmental, social, and economic impacts. EFSEC staff then described the state's siting process, followed by a short presentation by the Counsel for the Environment, a Washington State Assistant Attorney

General who represents the citizens of Washington State before EFSEC. In addition, BPA staff explained the federal review process for the gas pipeline and the transmission line.

Agency and public comments were recorded during the meetings and are compiled in this summary report along with comments submitted by comment form, e-mail, fax, and letter. Comments are grouped by general topic (and repeated, in some cases, if they relate to more than one issue). Approximately 40 people attended the agency meeting and about 60 people attended the evening public scoping meeting.

General

- Discuss the need for the power plant. Provide justification in light of the projected supply demand for the western U.S. Or, as an alternative, have up-to-date information on the supply-demand power situation for the West Coast.
- Evaluate cumulative effects including two other EFSEC projects in the region.
- Need for and access to cheap power – power should be available to local PUD's and Washington businesses at below market cost.
- Address the limited liability status of Starbuck.
- Address the Starbuck Power Company's rehabilitation of the site and ability to do so.
- Distinguish between the construction and operational phases of the project.
- When will the project start?
- Describe the experience and track record of PPL Global in developing and operating power plants.
- The LLC is owned by an LLC: assets for site termination and restoration.
- Coordinate with agencies of the jurisdiction to update the permits and approvals that will likely be needed for the project.
- Identify the additional permits and approvals that would be needed to construct the water line, if indeed the water line from the town of Starbuck is needed.
- Show a project timeline that would include when permits and approvals need to be in place for construction of the project to commence.
- Agreements with municipal, state, county governments – when in place? Provide a timeline.
- Provide a permitting/construction schedule.

Facilities, Transmission Lines, Natural Gas Pipeline

- What mitigation measures have been proposed for footprint of plant and transmission line corridor?
- Address cumulative impacts.
- What is the rationale for the 1,200-foot spacing between the existing and the proposed transmission lines? It appears that the spacing proposed will cause considerably more impact to the shrub-steppe ecosystem than the 300 to 400 foot spacing.
- What type of combustion/steam turbines are proposed?

Air Quality

- Discuss the amount of CO2 emissions and dispersion/mitigation.
- Discuss the CO2 mitigation related to local projects and benefits (economic benefits?).
- Discuss local agricultural sinks as credits (can farmers be compensated for the credits that Starbuck Power Company could potentially receive?).
- Discuss air emissions as they relate to:
  - Use of gasoline/diesel
  - Back-up fire pump
  - Onsite gas use for transportation needs
- Compare the projected emissions from this facility with at least a few other recently constructed power plants in the U.S. (Want some idea whether Washington is getting a "state of the art" facility in terms of the potential to pollute.)
- Quantify the proposed PM_{10} & $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from this facility.
- Identify and describe the control options and control measures to achieve PM_{10} & $PM_{2.5}$ emission reduction.
- Describe and explain mitigation for PM_{10} & $PM_{2.5}$ particulate.
- Describe how BACT will be applied for the other criteria pollutants.
- Describe and quantify the effectiveness of the proposed emission controls.
- Identify the potential Toxic Air Pollutants (TAPs) of concern. Describe the processes and any control strategy for TAPs.
- Describe the potential to emit VOCs from this facility's operation.
- Discuss the probable impacts on the dispersion of emissions that siting the facility in a valley presents. Describe how siting the plant in a valley was accounted during air modeling.
- Describe the potential cumulative impacts to air quality from the many proposed gas-fired turbine facilities in the Columbia County, Franklin County, Walla Walla County, and Hermiston, Oregon, area.
- How much thermal output will come from the plant?
- Specifically discuss the uses for the additional 200 gpm needed for water supply versus the 100 gpm mentioned in the Potential Site Study. Address whether there would be any adverse impacts to air emissions or wastewater discharge from use of the larger amount of water.

Water Resources

- Has a water right been granted to avoid construction of the water pipeline?
- Will the water pipeline fall within 100-year floodplain?
- What effects would occur if there were a total water outage (operational)?
- Thoroughly analyze water use – groundwater depletion; impacts of construction of the waterline pipeline; and potential future use of water by the city. Create a mitigation package early in the process for agency and public review.

- What potential water mitigation has been proposed for the groundwater well?
- Look at the regional/cumulative impacts of the water system vs. this plant and other plants (individual comparison).
- Ecology encourages the use of all cost effective measures to conserve and reuse water.
- Address whether anything else can be done beyond what is proposed in the ASC to conserve and reuse water.
- Specifically discuss the uses for the additional 200 gpm needed for water supply versus the 100 gpm mentioned in the Potential Site Study. Address whether there would be any adverse impacts to air emissions or wastewater discharge from use of the larger amount of water.
- Describe the aquifers, their depths, and their characteristics.
- Are there potential groundwater impacts from pollutants in discharges of wastewater and stormwater?
- Evaluate the water-related impacts of taking the agricultural land out of use.
- Describe the approximate flows for each wastewater category.
- Describe the design of the infiltration ponds.
- Chemically characterize the wastewater effluent coming from the plant (compounds and concentration levels).
- Describe the projected impacts of total dissolved solids (TDS) to groundwater.
- Describe the secondary containment that is proposed for fuel tanks.
- Describe how sanitary wastewater will be handled during the construction phase.
- There is concern about the incongruity of the amounts of water, 432,000 gallons per day proposed for Starbuck with respect to the 11 million gallons per day proposed for the Wallula plant. Given the close proximity in megawatts generated and similar design of these two plants, one would assume they would utilize similar amounts of water. Why this vast discrepancy in water usage?
- Using on-site wells is problematic given efforts to maintain water flows in the Snake and Columbia Rivers for endangered fish populations. Investigate solutions that would net a zero loss of groundwater recharge to the nearby Snake River.
- Wastewater discharge to unlined ponds on the site is unacceptable. Consider using clay and HDPE liners in the ponds with leakage detection devices and monitoring (similar to the Wallula Power Project).
- Blue Mountain Audubon Society would like to be a part of the decision as to where emission fees on CO2 emissions would be allocated.

Wetlands and Vegetation

- Describe the location and classification of wetlands that would be impacted if the water supply line from Starbuck were needed.
- Consider and evaluate transmission line route alternatives that would minimize impacts to the shrub-steppe ecosystem.
- It is understood that along the proposed route there are no wetland or shoreline jurisdictional issues associated with this project. This is except for the small

wetland that is described that lies along the path of the power line, but which would not be directly impacted by its construction.

Wildlife

- Wildlife impacts and mitigation – evaluate early in the process to allow for adequate agency/public review.
- What habitat mitigation would be implemented for the power plant footprint?
- Concern was expressed about the potential impacts to migratory waterfowl and raptors in the vicinity of the power line.
- Where impacts to this ecosystem are necessary, the commenter would like to see mitigation measures proposed and implemented to minimize impacts.

Fisheries

- De-rating of the transmission system due to fish issues: What impact will adding a 1,200 MW (+) plant to BPA system have on fisheries and system reliability? Will the addition of 1,200+ MW allow BPA greater flexibility in meeting F&WL protection requirements along Columbia River
- The few streams that need to be crossed are small intermittent streams without any fish in them.
- What cumulative impact will all proposed energy projects have on the hydro system, in terms of meeting F&WL needs in "stressful" periods?

Natural Resources and Energy

- Evaluate the efficiency of the use of natural gas consumption at plant vs. direct home consumption.
- Discuss the use of gasoline/diesel.
- Discuss the onsite gas use for transportation needs.
- Discuss the thermal efficiency of the facilities.

Visual Resources

- Analyze the visual, aesthetic, and functional impacts of the project on the Lyons Ferry State Park. The analysis should include a consideration of mitigation measures for any unavoidable impacts.

Population, Housing, and Economics

- Provide payment schedule of property taxes during construction.
- Evaluate the socioeconomic impacts of both construction and operation.
- Encourage employment from <u>all</u> of the surrounding counties.
- How will the project impact Columbia County economically - local jobs?

- Encourage employment of union craftspeople and long-term training opportunities for local people.
- Strong support was expressed for employment opportunities for local citizens.
- The project could benefit ancillary businesses, spin-off of other businesses, and the agricultural community.
- The project would reduce local taxes and is a win-win situation.
- Revenue generated by the project should be spent in the local area in the form of maintenance contracts, public support, ammonia supply contracts, police and fire support, etc.
- Address the positive benefits of project to local community
- Include the socioeconomic impacts of displacing local construction trades-people when out of area contractors bring in construction workers from outside the local area.
- Support was expressed for Starbuck Power Company's local hiring policy.
- Base socioeconomic analysis of labor displacement on the Central Washington/Columbia Basin region

Public Services

- Evaluate the impacts to the town of Starbuck services – emergency response and others.
- Evaluate the impacts of construction workers on the city of Starbuck sewage disposal system.
- How would an influx of workers during construction impact public services and utilities?
- Have impacts to policemen, etc. been considered?
- Evaluate the impacts to recreational boaters on the Snake River. The analysis should include a consideration of the mitigation measures for any unavoidable impacts.

Cultural Resources

- It is understood that the primary issues of concern expressed thus far are potential impacts to Native American cultural sites.

Transportation

- Address the transportation impacts of construction workers.
- Discuss transportation safety.

Health and Safety

- Assess the risk of range fire to the plant.
- Discuss the use and storage of hazardous materials
    - Proper storage

- Contingency plans for spills

How We Use the Comments

All the comments received will help shape the analysis in the EIS. The comments help identify the key issues to be addressed in the EIS, as well as the impacts of most concern. Everyone who attended the meetings was given the chance to be added to the project mailing list.

Project Schedule and Next Steps

We are progressing according to schedule and plan to have a Draft EIS ready for public review in January 2002.

If you have any questions about the proposed project, please call Irina Makarow, EFSEC, at (360) 956-2047, or email at irinam@ep.cted.wa.gov. If you have any questions about the proposed transmission cooridor, please call Phil Smith, BPA, at (503) 230-3294, or email at pwsmith@bpa.gov. Thank you for your interest in our work.

Sincerely,

/s/ Irina Makarow

Irina Makarow
EFSEC Siting Manager

/s/ Phil Smith

Phil Smith
BPA Environmental Lead

Enclosures: Written Scoping Comments
Agency Meeting Attendants