

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Goldeneye BESS Environmental Comments
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 5:40:55 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[Goldeneye Energy Storage Project Comments.pdf](#)

From: Jack Moore <jrmoore@co.skagit.wa.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 5:40:09 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Goldeneye BESS Environmental Comments

External Email

Please see attached and let me know if there is anything else I can provide.

Thanks,

Jack



JACK MOORE
DIRECTOR
Planning & Development Services
M: (360)416-1320 | D: (360)416-1333



Skagit County
Planning & Development Services
Jack Moore, Director

Goldeneye Energy Storage Project – Comments

Attachment J Critical Areas Report

- 1) Page 10, 3.4.2 Incorrectly states that *The project site does not contain any critical aquifer recharge areas and groundwater levels reflect the water surface elevation of Hansen Creek, with infiltration within project site contributing to some extent though not significantly. Therefore, the proposed project is not subject to the restrictions further outlined in the SCC nor is the project required to provide an aquifer recharge areas site assessment in accordance with SCC 14.24.330.*

Skagit County generally requires a hydrogeological report and well search for large grading projects on industrial and commercial sites. In this case it is important to understand how the directional drilling for the gen-tie line could affect groundwater flow, and risks to groundwater from potential spills, fires, or other accidents.

The report incorrectly states that the area is not a critical aquifer recharge area – All areas outside Category I aquifer recharge areas are designated as Category II aquifer recharge areas by SCC 14.24.310

- 2) Page 10 – The report references the SCC 14,24.350(1)(a)(i) (flow sensitive basins), which has been supplanted by the Skagit Instream Flow Rule Area.
- 3) Page 11 - *Seismic Hazard Area: ...However, the site is identified as moderately to highly susceptible to liquefaction due to seismic activity based on Skagit County's Liquefaction Susceptibility Map. To address this, seismic design will adhere to procedures outlined in the 2018 International Building Code (IBC). According to the IBC, structures on Site Class E sites, as per ASCE 7-16, must be designed to withstand earthquake motions. Anticipated liquefaction settlements within the project site are expected to be within acceptable limits (up to 4 inches). As a result, ground improvement techniques for liquefaction mitigation are not anticipated to be necessary for site development.*
- 4) Page 12, 3.4.4 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas – The report does not clearly identify Hanson Creek as a Type S stream with a 200-foot protect buffer.
- 5) Page 12 - The report states that 1.18 acres of wetlands will be filled and mitigated offsite. How will offsite mitigation compensate for flood storage within the subject floodplain?

- 6) Page 12 – The report states that directional drilling avoids impacts to Hanson Creek and surrounding wetlands and buffers. However, very little detail is provided as to how temporary impacts will be avoided or mitigated, nor is there any analysis as to how directional drilling could affect the connection between groundwater and surface water and potentially affect the hydrology of the stream, wetlands, or aquifer.
- 7) Page 12-13 – The report states that the access road would impact the buffer of an offsite wetland but does not provide compensatory mitigation. Skagit County would typically require mitigation for this impact whether or not the applicants claim that *the placement of the road within the off-site wetland buffer will not adversely affect the functions and values of the wetland and creek beyond current development pressures.*
- 8) Page 13 - 4.2 Frequently Flooded Areas – The report does not clearly identify the requirement for a Habitat Impact Assessment.
- 9) Page 13-14 – The report states that the access road will impact 0.17 acres of stream buffer, referencing SCC 14.24.540(5)(a), which allows roads in HCA buffers with certain conditions. However, this road is not shown on the civil plans, nor is it demonstrated that the road needs to be placed in the stream buffer, which is also in SMP jurisdiction.
- 10) Page 14 – Wetland impact mitigation will be through wetland banking. Wetland buffer impacts would be through buffer averaging, but no mitigation is proposed – it is not clear whether the proposed buffer averaging is consistent with the Skagit County CAO.
- 11) Page 15 – 1.31 acres of HCA buffer enhancement is proposed in location where existing buildings will be removed. The buffer enhancement is shown on a planting plan but no analysis of how the plan provides ecological functions is provided.

Attachment B: Civil Engineering Drawings

- 1) The civil plans do not show Wetlands H & I, located in the path of the gen-tie line.
- 2) The civil plans do not show an access road within the stream buffer or within the buffer of an offsite wetland as described Attachment J Critical Areas Report.

Attachment L: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

- 1) Page 1 – The report incorrectly states that *the subject property has never been developed for residential or commercial purposes. However, residential features associated with the western-adjointing property, including a septic leach field and fencing, are located on the subject property.*

The existing residential development is on the subject parcel P40030.

- 2) Page 2 – Figure 1 – The subject property on the map is only part of the proposed project area as shown on the civil plans.
- 3) Page 3 – The report states that petroleum contaminated soils have been found on the PSE site on the other side of Hanson Creek and could be found on the subject site. Could directional drilling potential impact the migration potential of soil contaminants?
- 4) Page 7 – Some information on wells within 1 mile is provided. It is not clear whether this is intended to meet the well report requirements typically required.

Shallow groundwater is expected to be 7-13 feet below ground surface with a likely gradient toward Hansen Creek. How will groundwater be protected in the event of a spill or other incident?

- 5) Page 14 – The report states that the subject parcel is 8.5 acres, but Skagit County records show the parcel as 14.14 acres. Also, the tie-gen path does not appear to be included in this report. Again, it appears that this analysis does not cover the entire project site.
- 6) Pages 14 & 15 – The report identifies low points with standing water in the field but does not identify those areas as regulated wetlands in accordance with the critical areas report.
- 7) Page 21 – The report states that contaminated groundwater from the Harris property to the northwest will likely reach the subject parcel but does not describe the risk to the project associated with this project.
- 8) Page 23 - *Based on the findings of this Phase I ESA, Dudek recommends investigation of the subsurface conditions on the subject property to evaluate potential impacts due to the identified REC and VEC.*

Will investigation of subsurface conditions be forthcoming?

Attachment H Land Use Consistency Review

- 1) Page 6, 3.4 Incorrectly states that no development is proposed within Shoreline jurisdiction. Any actions within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark of Hanson Creek are within shoreline jurisdiction. Based on the proposal, a portion of the access road and the gen-tie would occur in shoreline jurisdiction.
- 2) Page 26, 4.7 Stormwater Management – No mention of Source Control measures for the developed state are described, as required by stormwater minimum requirement #3.

Attachment N: Fire Protection Plan

- 1) Page 5 (Pdf page) – The report lists fire department stations in proximity to the project but does not describe their capacity to respond to an incident at the proposed project.

Attachment G Geotechnical Studies

- 1) Page 28-29 – The report recommends pervious pavement but not describe risks to groundwater created by pervious pavement in the event of an incident.

Attachment Q Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application

- 1) 7i -The report states that 68,000 cubic yards of fill will be imported but does not mention how this could affect flood storage.
- 2) 8c – States that no direct impacts to Hansen Creek or it's buffer will occur, which conflicts with statements in the CA report that the access road will partially impact the stream buffer.

Attachment K Flood Study

- 1) PDF Page 20 – The plan incorrectly shows a 150-foot buffer for Hanson Creek – It should be 200 feet.

General

There does not appear to be a spill response or spill prevention plan included in the documents.

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS
Date: Tuesday, August 6, 2024 9:44:36 AM

From: Adam Osbekoff <adam@snoqualmietribe.us>
Sent: Monday, August 5, 2024 11:59 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS

External Email

Hello

The Snoqualmie Tribe [Tribe] is a federally recognized sovereign Indian Tribe. We were signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliott of 1855; we reserved certain rights and privileges and ceded certain lands to the United States. As a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliot, the Tribe specifically reserved among other things, the right to fish at usual and accustomed areas and the “privilege of hunting and gathering roots and berries on open and unclaimed lands” off-reservation throughout the modern-day state of Washington.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. Based on the information provided and our understanding of the project and its APE we have no substantive comments to offer at this time. However, please be aware that if the scope of the project or the parameters for defining the APE change we reserve the right to modify our current position.

Thank you

Adam Osbekoff
Snoqualmie Indian Tribe
Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

From: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 5, 2024 1:34 PM
Subject: RE: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS
Importance: High

Dear interested persons,

Please find attached a **corrected** notice regarding the upcoming Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for the proposed Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project. **This corrected notice addresses an error in the date listed for the Land Use Hearing, which will occur the same date as the Public Information Meeting.** Our apologies for the error.

If you wish to receive further updates on this project, please sign up for the project mailing list: <https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/goldeneye-bess>

Regards,

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

EFSEC Email: efsec@efsec.wa.gov

EFSEC phone number: (360) 664-1345

Address: 621 Woodland Square Loop SE, Lacey WA 98503-3172

Mailstop/P.O. Box: 43172

www.efsec.wa.gov

From: EFSEC (EFSEC)

Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 12:53 PM

Subject: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS

Dear interested persons,

Please find attached a notice regarding the upcoming Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for the proposed Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project.

If you wish to receive further updates on this project, please sign up for the project mailing list: <https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/goldeneye-bess>

Regards,

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

EFSEC Email: efsec@efsec.wa.gov

EFSEC phone number: (360) 664-1345

Address: 621 Woodland Square Loop SE, Lacey WA 98503-3172

Mailstop/P.O. Box: 43172

www.efsec.wa.gov

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS
Date: Tuesday, August 6, 2024 1:24:09 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Rhonda Foster <rfoster@squaxin.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 6, 2024 1:22 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Cc: Rhonda Foster <rfoster@squaxin.us>; Shaun Dinubilo <sdinubilo@squaxin.us>
Subject: RE: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS

External Email

Thank you for contacting the Squaxin Island Tribe Cultural Resources Department regarding the above listed project for our review and comment. This project is outside the Squaxin Island Tribe's traditional area and we do not need any further consultation for this project.

Thank you



Rhonda Foster
CR Director, THPO
CR Department
Squaxin Island Tribe
200 S.E. Billy Frank Jr. Way
Shelton, WA 98584
D 360-432-3850
rfoster@squaxin.us

Email is my preferred method of communication

As per 43 CFR 7.18([a][1]) of the Archaeological Resource Protection Act, Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and RCW 42.56.300 of the Washington State Public Records Act-
Archaeological Sites: all information concerning the location, character, and ownership of any cultural resource must be withheld from public disclosure.

From: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 5, 2024 1:34 PM
Subject: RE: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS

Importance: High

Some people who received this message don't often get email from efsec@efsec.wa.gov. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear interested persons,

Please find attached a **corrected** notice regarding the upcoming Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for the proposed Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project. **This corrected notice addresses an error in the date listed for the Land Use Hearing, which will occur the same date as the Public Information Meeting.** Our apologies for the error.

If you wish to receive further updates on this project, please sign up for the project mailing list: <https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/goldeneye-bess>

Regards,

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

EFSEC Email: efsec@efsec.wa.gov

EFSEC phone number: (360) 664-1345

Address: 621 Woodland Square Loop SE, Lacey WA 98503-3172

Mailstop/P.O. Box: 43172

www.efsec.wa.gov

From: EFSEC (EFSEC)

Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 12:53 PM

Subject: Notice of Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for proposed Goldeneye BESS

Dear interested persons,

Please find attached a notice regarding the upcoming Public Information Meeting and Land Use Hearing for the proposed Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project.

If you wish to receive further updates on this project, please sign up for the project mailing list: <https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/goldeneye-bess>

Regards,

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

EFSEC Email: efsec@efsec.wa.gov

EFSEC phone number: (360) 664-1345

Address: 621 Woodland Square Loop SE, Lacey WA 98503-3172

Mailstop/P.O. Box: 43172

www.efsec.wa.gov



Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Informational Meeting
August 13, 2024

The Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project from Goldfinch Energy Storage, LLC proposes the construction of a 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS), located in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.

Commenter Information (Please print)

Name: Gloria Abrahamson Organization: (optional) _____

Street Address: (optional) _____ Add to Project email list? (If yes please provide email address)

Apt # _____ City: _____ Yes No

State: _____ Zip Code: _____

Email: glocat0914@yahoo.com

Comment subject/Issue: _____

Comment: This sounds too dangerous for it being worth it. This is not a solution for providing a adequate energy. The possible melt-down danger is too risky.
The jobs created would be so very short term - not worth the risks.

Sign

Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project

Aug. 13, 2024

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council:

Randy Good 35482 State Route 20 Sedro Woolley, WA
I was a member of the Hansen Creek Flood Control Zone Advisory Committee and well aware of the flooding events on Hansen Creek. The Zone was designed to protect life and property of landowners from damages resulting from floods and drainage waters in the watershed.

Hansen Creek has a history of major rain flooding affecting most properties adjacent to ~~or~~ near Hansen Creek. In 1990 Minkler Rd. was washed out because of the volume and force of the water one mile east of the creek. This creek can become a raging river.

Several years ago a cement bridge on Hansen Cr near the Northern State Buildings was removed by County Parks which provided flood control. This helped hold back major flooding down stream. Without the bridge holding back waters there is no way to prevent the property proposed for this project from facing flood damages until possibly ~~a~~ bridges installed at both Hansen Creek/Minkler Rd and Hansen Creek/Hoehn Rd crossing. A large sum of money.

Portions of this property for this project have been under flood waters during flooding events. I have two photos to put into record showing flooding events. Both photos show flood waters flowing across Minkler Rd. into the proposed site.

Now that the Northern State Alluvial Fan remains filled up ^{with} water year around eliminating any intended flood water storage space, along with the removing of the cement bridge, future flood waters damages will be enormous for this watershed. This proposed property will face full force from future flooding events.

The proposed project is an agriculture zone property. This proposed project would be in non-compliance with all local and state GMA requirements. No changing of county zoning

Please consider these historical rain water flooding events of this watershed. Above all abide by Skagit County Codes, Comp. Plan Polices and GMA requirements.

Thank You Randy Good
Randy Good

35482 State Route 20

Sedro Woolley WA 98284 - 360-856-1199



Proposed project property

Proposed Project Property





Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System
Informational Meeting
August 13, 2024

The Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project from Goldfinch Energy Storage, LLC proposes the construction of a 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS), located in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.

Commenter Information (Please print)

Name: Emma Top Organization: (optional) _____

Street Address: (optional) 24561 River Road Add to Project email list? (If yes please provide email address) Yes No

Apt # _____ City: Sedro Woolley Yes No

State: _____ Zip Code: 98284

Email: sidney.top@hotmail.com

Comment subject/Issue: _____

Comment:

I am concerned about noise levels for those living close to this proposed storage system + also the use of the lithium batteries. If a fire should occur, how much water would be required to battle it? This project does nothing to produce power. This is what is needed. Would this project need to have more fire fighters spec. trained for this type possible hazard? My farm land is located on both sides of Hansen Creek. Power, water, + gas lines are on my property.

Sign Emma Top



**Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System
Informational Meeting
August 13, 2024**

The Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project from Goldfinch Energy Storage, LLC proposes the construction of a 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS), located in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.

Commenter Information (Please print)

Name: MORRIS ROBINSON Organization: (optional) _____

Street Address: (optional) _____ Add to Project email list? (If yes please provide email address)

Apt # _____ City: _____ Yes No

State: _____ Zip Code: _____

Email: antiquetractor@yahoo.com

Comment subject/Issue: EFSEC

Comment:

WHERE WILL EXCESS POWER COME FROM ?
IT CAN'T BE CREATED

WHO PAYS FOR THIS PROJECT ?
PSE USERS ?

Sign

(Please use reverse side if you need more room)
Thank you for your participation!



Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System
Land Use Hearing
August 13, 2024

The Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project from Goldfinch Energy Storage, LLC proposes the construction of a 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS), located in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.

Commenter Information (Please print)

Name: Terric Wilder Organization: (optional)

Street Address: (optional) Add to Project email list? (If yes please provide email address)

Apt # City: Yes No

State: Zip Code:

Email: tw.inspiring@gmail.com

Comment subject/Issue: Energy Storage on Minkler
Comment:

I am STRONGLY opposed to this project.

My concerns:

- Pollution of the land thus impacting the area around it - the wildlife eating vegetation in the area - livestock eating vegetation in the area.
- The noise pollution & the impact of local residents & animals/wildlife.
- The safety of the project itself & resources available for local fire departments to be able to respond to an emergency situation at the site.
- Foreign owned companies being involved in this project.

Sign Terric Wilder



Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Informational Meeting
August 13, 2024

The Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project from Goldfinch Energy Storage, LLC proposes the construction of a 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS), located in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.

Commenter Information (Please print)

Name: Debbie Moxley Organization: (optional) Van Fleet's mobile Park

Street Address: (optional) 24892 Minkler Rd #14 Add to Project email list? (If yes please provide email address) Yes No

Apt # _____ City: Sedro Woolley

State: WA Zip Code: 98284

Email: [Signature]

Comment subject/Issue: I dont want it here

Comment:
Its to close to a habitat where salmon run. Hanson crcek. And my place
I

I VOTE NO!
=====

Sign



Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Informational Meeting August 13, 2024

The Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project from Goldfinch Energy Storage, LLC proposes the construction of a 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS), located in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.

Commenter Information (Please print)

Name: Jeff Thomas Sampson Organization: (optional)

Street Address: (optional)

Add to Project email list? (If yes please provide email address)

Apt # City: Sedro-Woolley Yes No

State: Washington Zip Code: 98284

Email: astralmoss25@gmail.com

Comment subject/Issue: General Questions Regarding Facility

Comment:

Question 1 - Who are the members of this project and why have they chosen Skagit County as a base of operations?

Question 2 - With our lack of water supply in the event of fire and necessity to fight said fire, what source of water will be used and how will it be impacting the general public?

Lastly, for the individual that will be answering this question, I would like your name and true words on if you truly hear public concern and if you are still for using agricultural land that has potential to be used instead for community benefit.

Sign [Signature]

10/10/14

Dear Sir,
I am writing to you regarding the contract for the supply of goods. I have reviewed the contract and I am sorry to hear that you are not happy with it. I will be happy to discuss the contract with you and try to resolve any issues you may have.

I am sorry to hear that you are not happy with the contract. I will be happy to discuss the contract with you and try to resolve any issues you may have. I will be happy to discuss the contract with you and try to resolve any issues you may have.

I am sorry to hear that you are not happy with the contract. I will be happy to discuss the contract with you and try to resolve any issues you may have. I will be happy to discuss the contract with you and try to resolve any issues you may have.

Yours faithfully,
John Smith

John Smith
123 Street
London

123 Street
London

123 Street
London



Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Informational Meeting
August 13, 2024

The Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project from Goldfinch Energy Storage, LLC proposes the construction of a 200-megawatt (MW)/800-megawatt hour (MWh) battery energy storage system (BESS), located in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington.

Commenter Information (Please print)

Name: Virginia Good Nakosich Organization: (optional) _____

Street Address: (optional) 10158 Knitdale Rd Add to Project email list? (If yes please provide email address) Yes No

Apt # _____ City: Sedro-Woolley Yes No

State: Wa Zip Code: 98284

Email: happycowt@gmail.com

Comment subject/Issue: Sedro-Woolley Energy Storage -

Comment:
Living 5 minutes from this future site and owning 60 acres that we run cattle on. Put up our own hay - but to take away 14 acres that do feed animals - We don't want spoiled - farm land
Active volcano in our back yard Mt. Baker

We don't have Rolling blackouts. Why do we have to support them -

Noise pollution - we do already hear the snap crackle + pop of powerlines more is worse.

High fence for the Elk -

Infrastructure of the roads -

4 hrs of storage for 200,000 homes - city not town

Sign

you stated that it would be needing
20 acres to build but you have 14 acres

Will the batteries be made in the
USA

Where will all these minerals
come from -

What precautions are built into the
Buffer around the facility -

Firefighter will get training by Goldeneye - will
they also help with equipment? Breathing -
Foam - water - Who will clean up
if a fire breaks out -

Will our water quality be hurt?
Will fish be hurt?

Will out lying lands be cleaned up
also in the aftermath -

like all of us - The future is Not
written in stone - is there a cleaner
safer - less noise way to make power
to store?



August 13, 2024

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
State of Washington
621 Woodland Square Loop SE
Lacey, WA 98503

RE: Goldeneye BESS Project

To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland, we are writing to express our opposition to the proposed Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project.

Skagitonians to Preserve Farmland opposes the use of agricultural land for purposes that negatively impact the ability to farm on Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands designated by Skagit County. Ag-NRL lands were designated by the County as a means of protecting a critical mass of productive agricultural land. "Designating also ensures a cohesive and distinct agricultural area within Skagit County, and limits the extent to which non-agricultural uses can conflict and interfere with farming." (Skagit County Comprehensive Plan)

Skagitonians is committed to strengthening the agricultural infrastructure and economy required to support active farming. **The Goldeneye BESS Project seeks to take advantage of the economic investment made by Skagit County in its farmland preservation program, while degrading the County's base of arable land.**

The proposal does not to fully assess the value of arable land.

Skagit County has protected farmland through strict zoning and purchasing development rights. As a result, the assessed value of Ag-NRL land is relatively low. This favors long-term agricultural uses—and assumes agricultural use of these lands. Non-agricultural uses, particularly those incentivized by outside sources of funding, alter the economics of this designation. Any attempt to weigh Ag-NRL value against the value of non-Ag-NRL land will, by definition, create a distorted assessment of the land's value and what may or may not be considered "viable."

The project proposal, as currently written, places no value on the Ag-NRL designation and as such, Skagitonians disagrees with EFSEC's assessment that no other viable alternatives exist for the location of this battery storage facility. The Alternative Analysis provided in Attachment H, Appendix B, identifies six sites outside of the Ag-NRL as potential candidates for facility location. Four of these locations were dismissed as being "cost-prohibitive." The analysis does not address the economic differentiation between land that is zoned for the Ag-NRL, land whose value is underwritten, in large part, by Skagit County, and land that is zoned for other uses where the free market plays a stronger hand in land prices.

The proposal erroneously dismisses the agricultural value of Project parcel.

The main Project parcel (P40030, owned by John F Grinder and shown on Figure 2 in Attachment H) is approximately 14 acres and zoned Ag-NRL. Approximately half of this parcel is currently developed with four existing structures and three overhead transmission lines, which leaves approximately 7 acres, a relatively small area, available for agricultural activities. This remaining area is also disconnected from larger agricultural production areas, as Minkler Road borders the northwestern portion of the parcel and the underlying landowner does not own any of the abutting parcels. As discussed in Section 1.1 of the Land Use Consistency Review (Attachment H of this ASC), the purpose of the Project is to provide a service to the regional electric grid by receiving energy (charging) from the PSE electric transmission system, storing energy on site, and then later delivering energy (discharging) back to the point of interconnection, the Sedro-Woolley Substation. Due to the nature of the Project, it must be sited near an existing substation. Furthermore, this parcel is the only viable location for the Project within 1 mile of this point of interconnect. This is demonstrated in the alternatives analysis, included as Appendix B to the Land Use Consistency Review, which itself is included as Attachment H to this ASC. For the reasons detailed above, the Project site is not ideal for agricultural activities.

Skagitonians to Preserve farmlands disagrees with this assessment. The land in question is suitable for agricultural activities, and that is why it was included in the Ag-NRL. Project parcel P40030 is contiguous with other lands in the Ag-NRL in its current form, and these lands when taken together provide an important valuable swath of contiguous arable land capable of supporting a local, agricultural economy. To discount the acreage currently available for agricultural activities ignores Skagit County's 5-acre threshold for designating agricultural land. In doing so, the proposal makes inaccurate assumptions about what qualifies as viable agriculture and what agricultural uses might be appropriate for the property were it to be managed by a different landowner. EFSEC steps outside of its authority and its area of expertise when it makes determinations about what is valuable, arable land and what is not.

The Proposal does not align with Skagit County's Comprehensive Plan.

Under Section 3.2 of Appendix H, the Goldeneye facility not only fails to advance any of the Comp Plan goals and policies cited, the proposed BESS facility would negatively impact each of the goals and policies, despite its assurances to the contrary:

This sub-section demonstrates the Project's consistency with applicable goals and policies of the SCCP's Natural Resource Lands Element.

Goal 4A-3 Promote preservation of agricultural land for agricultural uses, minimize nonfarming uses on agricultural lands; and develop incentive programs to promote

farming.

policy 4A-3.1 Long-Term Designation of Agricultural Lands: Designation of Agricultural Lands is intended to be long-term. De-designation is discouraged, but may be considered only when compelled by changes in public policy, errors in designation, new information on resource lands or critical areas, circumstances beyond the control of the landowner, or an overriding benefit to the agricultural industry. Evaluate dedesignation requests with the same criteria under policy 4A-1.1 used for designation of Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands.

policy 4A-3.2 Development Rights Program: Maintain and continue to fund the voluntary purchase of development rights through the Farmland Legacy Program to limit potential conversions or development in agricultural lands.

The proposal goes on to suggest that the impacts of this facility would be to fragment and divorce Ag-NRL from the greater fabric of Ag-NRL in the area, thus rendering its suitability as agricultural land a moot issue. It also argues that the proposed parcels under consideration were simply not worthy of being included in the Ag-NRL to begin. Neither of these arguments provides EFSEC with grounds for declaring itself to be in compliance with or consistent with the County Comp Plan goals and policies identified above.

EFSEC should appoint a local representative to the Site Evaluation Council.

Thank you for your last minute appointment of a local Representative

The Goldeneye project demonstrates a disappointing lack of understanding of the Skagit agricultural economy. We strongly recommend that Skagit County appoint a voting council member to the EFSEC Site Evaluation Council in order to ensure an accurate representation of the local community and a better understanding of Skagit County for this and any future proposals.

The Goldeneye BESS proposal relies on extensive study of impacts to water quality, wildlife and other impacts to the landscape its surroundings, and it documents measures to address these impacts. Sadly, the project proposal is utterly silent on the question of managing for impacts to Land Use, and treats the Ag-NRL as a fungible zoning appellation—not as resource of arable to be protected and maintained for future generations.

Sincerely,



Kim Rubenstein
President, Board of Directors



Respondent No: 1

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 13, 2024 18:19:56 pm

Last Seen: Aug 13, 2024 18:19:56 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **First & Last Name** James DeLay

Q2. **Email address** jamesdelay@hotmail.com

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

Good afternoon, There are a bunch of issues with this location. Risk of contamination from burning lithium batteries spreading to the surrounding areas and forcing evacuations due to toxic levels of smoke, gas, and ash in the air- potentially forcing the evacuation of everything around the BESS for miles for the duration of the fire- which could be for two weeks. Since water is the main defensive tactic used in attempting to minimize fire expansion in a lithium BESS fire, as shown in the most recent BESS fire in Otay Mesa, CA that burned for 14 days, almost 20 million gallons can easily be used- and all that water then becomes contaminated and spreads to the surrounding area and into the Hansen Creek which is immediately next door and connects to the Skagit river... Here's more information that I have sent to you and local and county officials: info about BESS and a couple things the developers of BESS will try to sell you on: Utility- They are claiming they are a "utility" and should be able to bypass environmental, noise, risk/danger, and all other impact studies. If they can't get a utility exemption- then they will go for a "The critical areas designation and alteration exception processes." Alternatively, Developers are saying BESS can be permitted as an essential public facility- meaning they can skip all those pesky impact studies... Are BESS essential? Do rural cities and towns have an essential need for a BESS? Is your area suffering from rolling black and brown-outs weekly or even daily? Or when your power goes out, is it predominantly because a power line is down? FYI, A BESS can't transfer power to you if the powerline to you is down... You know what powerlines never go down? The big huge massive inter-state power lines that can send power to San Diego and almost all the Western half of the US (and Mexico and Canada) in fractions of a second... They will tell you that the Growth Management Act expressly prohibits placing moratoriums on central public services... How is Skagit County surviving without a BESS currently? How will a BESS Benefit Skagit County? Why are they bypassing Skagit County's permit approval process and seeking approval through the EFSEC? They will tell you that 100s of jobs will be created- ask them how many permanent on-site and full time jobs will be on duty during hours of operation (24/7)? They will tell you that the BESS will help prevent power outages- but almost 99% of PSE's power outages are due to downed lines- where BESS will be useless to help and provide zero benefit to us... They will tell you the BESS will increase the property value for the site- but they won't tell you about the 5-10year lifecycle of lithium battery BESS and how they will file property tax depreciation schedules and bring in their lawyers to knock the value from the initial \$200M-\$300M (or more) down 10% or 20% per year. Then there are all the tax credits they plan to re-sell... And, if they get too much pushback locally at the city or county level, they will bypass the local and county permitting processes and apply through the State of Washington, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC), where they don't even have to notify anyone of their project- and only people signed up for notices from the EFSEC will be notified... And, where the Governor has exclusive approval power. Ask them, for when there is a fire, what is the ideal level of fire-personnel staffing, firetrucks, equipment, and HazMat gear? The Recent Otay Mesa BESS fire had over 30 fire trucks, 2 HAZMAT crews, several toxicity testing drones, one toxicity testing robot (all of which enabled them to quickly set up the evacuation and shelter-in-place zones) and many other emergency response teams- including sheriff/police officers to shut down the roads and help with going door to door for mandatory evacuations. How does the existing staffing and equipment and device levels compare to existing levels? Do you have toxicity testing drones and robots that can be rapidly deployed to establish the evacuation and shelter in place zones? They are claiming a BESS has the same impacts as other utilities (electricity, natural gas, water, sewer, telephone, internet). Yet none of those spontaneously combust, None of the other utilities cause unstoppable fires (that last for 5 days on average and require evacuations of everyone within 1/2 a mile, nor require shelter in place orders for everyone up to 7 miles away. They don't require shutting down highways for days. They don't release a ton of deadly toxins that even firemen in Hazmat suits are afraid to walk through. Those other utilities don't generate 96db-106db of noise all day every day.

Those other utilities don't require 1ft thick reinforced concrete shrapnel/sound barriers to stop ballistically propelled burning lithium battery cells that are burning at 2,000 degrees Celsius/3632 degrees Fahrenheit. They will claim that a lithium BESS fire is no different than a house fire and the same toxins are released from your blender burning or your tv burning or and battery-operated device burning... But, we chose to have those small devices in our homes and we can immediately react to something sparking or overheating- whereas this BESS is being forced into our lives where we will have to listen to the noise daily and live in fear about when- not if- a fire and forced evacuations will happen. Will it be in the middle of the night? Will it be when our kids are sick in bed with the flu? We will be the ones impacted by an up to 2-week evacuation order... A house fire doesn't take weeks to burn out when almost 20 million gallons of water is sprayed on it- a house fire typically is extinguished with about 1,000 gallons of water. A house fire doesn't enter thermal runaway and have millions of lithium batteries that can spontaneously combust and explode and rocket 100s of feet away. They will claim any moratorium (to learn more about BESS) frustrates the State and County policies that mandate a transition to renewable energy such as the Clean Energy Transformation Act that has goals for 5.3 Gigawatt hours of energy storage by 2030. FYI, the State-level energy siting commission (EFSEC) lists over 4.8GWh of energy storage BESS already in review- leaving only 500MegaWatt-hours to meet our 2030 goals. Tenaska, the Developer behind the Covington BESS and Tukwila BESS, and your Skagit County BESS has 4GWH of proposed BESSs in process- meaning between one developer and the existing BESS proposals going through the EFSEC's approval process, we already have more than 8.8GWH of battery storage facilities in process. Overall, there are about 12GWH of proposed BESS that will be completed and online in about 12-18 months... That's 12 GigaWATT-Hours of stored energy facilities already pending/looming to hit our state's 2030 goal of 5.3 Giga-watt-hours... That is over-kill! Our Clean Energy Transformation Act's (CETA) 2045 goal is to have 13.5 Giga-watt-hours of battery storage... That's by 2045... We already have 12 gigawatt hours of BESS pending and in the approval process right now! This Skagit BESS, is 800 Mega-watt-hours- that would mean this one BESS on fertile farm land and next to Hansen Creek would provide 15% of the entire Washington State 5.3 giga-watt-hours goal for 2030... Tenaska will tell you they are helping us hit our mandated energy storage goals for 2030 and 2045- they aren't... They already know that there are more BESS being built than all of Washington State needs to hit the 2045 goals. That far exceed our goals... Even our 2045 goals... Furthermore, they aren't really intending to help with WA's CETA and our State and Utility storage goals, instead, they plan to export the power outside of WA state to the highest bidder... Tenaska, went so far as to tell the Covington City Council that if Covington's power was out and the BESS was fully charged and had the power to deploy to Covington residents to turn their lights back on- that they would sell the power to where ever the demand was highest (most profitable). Here's a link to that Covington City Council meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kYZ8AKrT4E&t=3020s> FYI, in a recent power supply shortage incident, the Texas power market (ERCOT) priced and sold electricity at \$5,000 per kilowatt hour- this BESS will house 800,000 kilowatt hours and could make \$4 BILLION with a single charge/discharge cycle- and they can do 3 full cycles per day- as seen here : "Power prices surged to \$5,000 per kilowatt-hour, the maximum amount allowed by ERCOT. That's when the batteries stepped in. They discharged 1.8 GW of power onto the grid and sent power prices falling to around \$2,700 per megawatt-hour." <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/as-heat-waves-roast-texas-batteries-keep-power-grid-humming/> Tenaska's proposed BESS in Skagit County could buy 800mWh of energy from PSE (let's assume residential rates of .15 cents per kWh, just to keep it simple) for \$120,000 and sell it for a max of \$5,000 per kWh (in Texas) and make \$4,000,000,000 off a single 800mWh charge- and, again, they can do up to 3 full charge/discharge cycles a day. Ask them how often will they charge and discharge the batteries? If the stored power is to help Sedro Wooley and Skagit County (and WA), the batteries should be charged up and sitting idle all but the 3 hours and 1 minute of average power outages (per PSE's 2022 Service Quality Report Card) per year. What are the batteries going to be doing the rest of the time? Sitting idle? Trickle charging? Ask them if they plan to export any of the stored energy outside of Washington? But, if they are building this for WA State's CETA Energy Storage goals, our grid, our resiliency, and for our needs- Please explain how, if they plan to sell WA created energy that is stored in Skagit County and export the energy out of state- how does exporting power outside WA state help us? How does it help us hit our Energy Storage goals if they are really buying up our excess energy (reducing WA energy supply), storing it, and selling to other states? Won't buying up all that power put extra demands on the supply of electricity in WA? How will this affect our electric bills? When demand goes up and supply goes down, prices rise... Ask them if we get a cut of exported power since they cited our CETA energy storage goals as a purpose of their BESS- that's for WA state's goal... If they sold the power out of state and the batteries are charged when we need it, how does that help us and our goals? Ask them if they would be okay with an 90% gross receipts tax on all exported energy stored in Sedro Woolley? If this is being built for us, then we should get the vast majority of benefits and profits if it is exporting power and isn't being used for to help us. We are putting our city at risk of fire and toxic gases that require evacuations, shelter in place orders,

snd will cause unknown amounts of damage/destruction with contaminated land and water supply from the toxins released. Our legislature/Governor never intended for there to be so many BESS nor for BESS to be this large... They believed the 2045 goal was a stretch goal... Yet, we are going to surpass the goal exponentially before 2030 with the way things are looking... They did not realize that BESS developers would come to WA state and build these massive BESS almost exclusively to sell the stored power out of state to CA and other states that have weekly rolling black-outs and brown-outs... Speaking of BESS, here's a list of BESS I am aware of: Ravensdale, Green Water(800MWH) which is SE of Enumclaw, Covington (800MWH), Tukwila(800MWH), Emerald Downs BESS in Auburn, Christopher BESS in Auburn (400MWH), 2 more in Skagit County- in addition to this one, plus the 8 that are listed on the EFSEC's website as their permits are being processed: Badger Mountain has 800MWh BESS in plans Carriger Solar has 252MWh BESS in plans Goose Prairie Solar size to be determined Ostrea Solar Project 160MWh in plans Hop Hill Solar 2,000MWH BESS in plans Hight Top Solar 160MWh in plans Horse Heaven Wind Project 1,200MWh BESS in plans Wallula Gap 240MWH BESS in plans Just looking at the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) list above, there are over 4,812MWh (4.8GWh) of BESS storage facilities under review with the EFSEC alone... Our 2030 State Goal is 5.3GWhs... 4.8GWh of BESS proposals are under review at the EFSEC and add in the other known BESS, and you have 9.6GWhs proposed... And it take about 12 months to get a BESS deployed and up and running... Remember, it's basically shipping containers with pre-built racks inside pre-filled with lithium Batteries inside... A crane drops the container and they connect it... On top of that, King County wastewater treatment plant is getting 44 tons of lithium batteries for their private BESS- but, while it is exclusively for their benefit- it will take a massive strain off of PSE/utilities during peak demand times... Why the rush with such a dangerous battery technology? It isn't a new technology... Lithium batteries have been overheating and having fires since the 1990s... And, there still isn't a way to extinguish their fires... The whole BESS industry around the US is like the wild west and gold rush- no rules, no regulations, no one really understands lithium BESS. There is no oversight... There is no known tracking of all the BESS and energy storage proposals... Developers are rushing to push their BESS permits through before more people become more educated and don't buy their clean energy sales pitch... And, most important to these developers, it is extremely profitable... They can steal our State's clean and green hydro, wind, and solar generated electricity (and coal/gas generated energy) by buying up the supply (thus, increasing demand) and selling it to CA for 4x profits or to Texas for over 30,000x profits... Wa state has one of the lowest consumer electricity rates in the country- that will change if these BESS are able to export the power stored in their batteries... Electricity used to be WA state's largest export thanks to all our hydro/dams... These BESS operators will be taking our state's "cheap" and green excess power and charging their batteries with it- only to turn around and export it to another state for potentially over 30,000x profits three times a day when the demand is that high... All WA state BESS should be fined and taxed 90%-100% for exporting power outside WA if they mention WA state's Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) as a reason for building the BESS in WA... Ask the developer if the BESS will sit idle and in a completely charged state ready to dispatch 100% of it's capacity to Sedro Woolley/Skagit/WA state? Also, remember, by this BESS purchasing our clean green energy/power- potentially equivalent to 200k homes and then exporting it out of state for a massive profits, they will be reducing our local surplus of electricity and increasing our electric prices due to supply/demand principles... They will pitch you on the following Benefits: 1. Help the community 2. Help WA state meet their 2030 and 2045 Energy Goals 3. Help grid stability 4. Help reduce need for grid infrastructure upgrades There will also be several union representatives and companies coming out to support the project that want to win the contracts for their union/companies there as well... Motivated exclusively by \$\$\$... They may bring a fire expert will play the "good cop"/"neutral party" and keep saying things like, Tenaska won't like me saying this..." but not answer any negative questions... They may even offer to build you a \$30M community center! Make other purchases of land to turn into green space. Buy a new fire station! They will make BILLIONS off this BESS by selling the power to CA and other states- and for selling back to PSE and local utilities for a handsome profit- if they have any power left in the batteries when PSE needs it... In short, this location is the wrong location- there are too many risks... Too many unknowns... I think a moratorium should be placed on all Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) near people's homes until there is a way to quickly and efficiently extinguish LFP and other Lithium based fires in minutes- NOT days to weeks- and until there are fire/thermal-runaway prevention technologies that can stop fires and thermal runaway before deadly gasses are released to the environment. Here's a quick reference a list of points as opposed to my long-winded email: Battery containers spontaneously combust- there is no way to prevent battery fires Batteries fires can't be extinguished- it takes many days if not weeks to die-down on their own Battery fires release (off-gas) airborne chemicals cyanide, hydrogen fluoride gas/hydrofluoric acid, ammonia, chlorine, and hydrogen sulfide into the surrounding air, ground, and water- they will say they need to get back to us on any dangers- and even lie and say the one chemical (hydrogen fluoride gas/hydrofluoric acid) will get burned up in the fire The chemicals/toxins released are heavier than air and will hover

in a massive and quickly spreading cloud of a cocktail of deadly chemicals about 2ft-4ft off the ground and spread all around the surrounding areas (as seen in the only well documented BESS fire- in Surprise, AZ), and seeking low ground and engulfing everything around it and spreading into our yards and into homes and all around the natural environment Because there is no known way to extinguish Lithium battery fires and firefighters know they don't have a way to extinguish these battery facilities fires- firefighter's current action plan is to play defense and spray water on the surrounding battery containers to keep them cool with the hope to prevent them from spontaneously combusting while they wait for the battery container that is on fire to die down on its own- usually taking weeks of flames and smoke filled with cyanide, hydrogen fluoride gas/hydrofluoric acid, ammonia, chlorine, and hydrogen sulfide, and Cobalt spreading around to all the surrounding areas The average of 6 million gallons (but as seen in the Otay Mesa, CA BESS fire this Summer, close to 20 million gallons of water may be required) of run-off from fire defense/control or dilution-water will be corrosive and/or toxic, and it will cause pollution and contamination of well water sources/aquifer/water table and all surrounding areas. How much does it cost to decontaminate an aquifer? Shelter in place and/or evacuation orders are usually issued for everyone within a mile (in the recent Moss Landing fire in CA, a shelter in place advisory was issued for all residents/businesses within 3 miles of the battery facility; and in the 2021 Morris industrial fire (used Li battery storage facility) required a 10 mile radius evacuation for 5 days (between June 29th and July 3rd); and in the Chandler, AZ fire, they evacuated people almost a mile away. The recent Melba, ID BESS fire burned for 5-days and they evacuated everyone within a mile and paid for hotel rooms for everyone displaced and had a shelter in place order for 7 miles out. In the Otay Mesa BESS fire they evacuated everyone within 2 miles and had shelter in place orders out to 5 miles downwind. Does the developer have an evacuation plan? What resources will be required to be dedicated evacuations, road closures, and going door to door? Who is financially responsible for the evacuations and room and board? Who pays for people's homes and yards to be sanitized? As seen with ash falling across Wa state a few summers ago from the fires in Canada- ash from fires can travel hundreds of miles- and lithium ash will be full of cyanide, hydrogen fluoride gas/hydrofluoric acid, ammonia, chlorine, and hydrogen sulfide, Cobalt and many other deadly toxins What is your ash cleanup plan- how are those costs budgeted for- insurance? What are their defensive water spray containment plan and clean up plans What are the fire plans- fire containment systems- as we all know lithium batteries are self feeding once they enter thermal runaway and un-extinguishable, do you let it burn? Do you let it burn and spray defensive water spray on nearby containers? Proper biologic level hazmat gear is required for fire fighters and having multiple toxicity testing drones and robots should be required. Most WA state residences and business don't have HVAC system that can filter out cyanide or any of these other deadly gasses that are released when there is a fire at this industrial facility, the seals on the doors and windows are not good enough to keep the toxic clouds of deadly gasses out and sheltering in place would essentially be trapping workers, family, and kids within a death cloud that will only kill them slowly, or ruin theirs and their family's lives with health problems for the rest of their lives if anyone survived The industrial battery facility will be in a rural area without the infrastructure nor resources to handle a massive multi-day lithium fire The facility will be "industrial" and not "fit" into the beauty and peacefulness of the rural and low density farming area and is not compatible with the physical characteristics of the subject property; it will go from being a quiet and safe site to acres of gravel covered land with concrete slabs and hundreds of various industrial and ugly looking large electrical grid/utility machines that are constantly making industrial noises 24/7 They will claim they are a utility or necessary central public facility- but they aren't regulated by anyone, they aren't registered as a utility, they won't actually be benefitting anyone in Skagit until there is a power outage (PSE says each customer experiences about 3 hours without electricity spread out across the year per year) , they won't be billing every household, households won't use them every day- they aren't a necessity This massive deadly and loud industrial facility being placed next to farmland and rural homes, and businesses, with ugly industrial look and feel, with massive industrial shrapnel/noise barrier walls and prison yard like chain-link fences topped with barbed-wire, and every inch inside and all around covered by security cameras and security lights- looking like a prison, the noise alone will hinder the enjoyment of the businesses and the rural area and neighborhoods and it will discourage enjoyment and use of neighboring properties; This development will conflict with the health and safety of the community through the excessively loud (100db+) systems running 24/7 and the potentially deadly gasses/toxins released when there is a fire Locating this in Skagit will demand excessive support from fire and emergency services (In last year's Tesla Mega pack fire in Australia, it took over 150 firefighters and 30 firetrucks and 4 days to try to prevent the spread- which they failed to do as the fire overheated a nearby BESS container and cause it to also enter thermal runaway- and watch and wait until the battery extinguish itself) and will adversely affect public services to the surrounding area Property values will be destroyed and plummet 50% or more for every home that can see and hear this facility- overhead power lines are proven to reduce property values by close to 50% and this facility is extremely LOUD and extremely deadly and uglier than overhead power lines... Battery storage facilities are loud- producing an average of 93db-106db of sound 24/7/365 days a year. The

substation alone will produce 100db 24/7/365 The inverter will produce 92db 24/7/365 There will be 100s of battery containers making 93db-106db of noise 24/7 each (93db is louder than a train's whistle 500ft away-which is only 90db- we can hear the train going through Covington at night, the train is 10,000+ft away and we can still hear it) and we estimate this facility will have 100s of containers. This noise would be "next-door" to business, rural homes, and large farms and could potentially be generating the 93db-106db noises 24/7 Battery storage facilities require a transformer which is even louder than the quieter batteries containers at 100db- equivalent to a jackhammer 25ft away. 102db, (which is less than 106db this facility could produce 24/7) is equivalent to you using a jackhammer... This facility could potentially be generating these loud of noises 24/7 365 days a year as well The sounds won't just be a deep humm like a powerline- the sounds produced 24/7 have been measured at extreme levels at 31.5db (deep hum), 63db, 125db, 250db, 500db, 1k db, 2k db, 4k db, and up to 8k db (super high pitched whine)- all of which can make you lose you hearing Interestingly, the paid for by Tenaska sound/noise study shows sound levels way below the average BESS sound study, and that is because they told the sound engineering firm doing their study to adjust the sound levels based on 40% fan speed, whereas almost every other BESS study shows 90%-100% fan speeds. Also, interesting to note, is they don't show the overall noise created by the combined components- which gives a more realistic idea of how loud the BESS as a whole will sound The constant noise will drive people to lose their hearing- not to mention driving them mad and destroy the peace and quiet and everyone's ability to enjoy being outside and will drive all birds and wildlife far away How often are they going to be charging/discharging the batteries- the more often they sell power, the more money they make- so as often as they can 24/7- meaning the whole facility will be running at close to 100% max speed all the time and needing exponentially higher fan speeds to try to keep the lithium batteries from overheating and entering thermal runaway- all it takes is one battery out of the millions in each BESS container to overheat, malfunction, or have any issue that causes it to overheat and enter thermal runaway and cause a cascading fire that burns until all the batteries in the container have burned themselves out. During the permitting process, they will tell us they will throttle down the cooling systems - their noise study shows the cooling systems operating at 40% to meet noise/sound requirements- but the batteries must be kept at 70 degrees (or cooler) to reduce the chance of entering thermal runaway and spontaneously combusting. Tenaska is misrepresenting fan speed/noise levels. Those cooling systems will be running at full tilt all the time- except on the coldest days/nights of winter- because the constant charging and discharging is a high heat producing process... Does your cell phone ever get warm? Multiply that by having millions of lithium batteries stack on top of and next to each other... In their sound study, they also say that the charge discharge cycle only lasts an hour- every other BESS I've studied is 4 hours to charge and 4 hours to discharge- so 8 hours for the whole cycle and a max of 3 full cycles per day.. Most BESS noise studies are provided showing at least 80% operating capacity- ideally worst case sound levels should be provided, but Tenaska submitted their self sourced sound study to show system operating at 40%. Here's another BESS noise study submitted to the WA state EFSEC: Comparing only the broadband sound levels, Tenaska's BESS operating at 40% puts out 84.9dBA vs 106 at the Watoma project This may be explained by Tenaska withholding data- see this sound study where it lists the BESS rooftop HVAC noise levels for a single BESS HVAC unit and also provides cumulative sound levels for all the HVAC units combined: The more noise generating units/items, the louder the BESS- so by reducing the fan speed to 40% for the sound study and only reporting the sound level created by a single HVAC unit, it gives the appearance of a quieter overall BESS- but, only because the testing and data parameters were adjusted to fit the target noise levels.. What happens if the county sound ordinance levels are exceeded? Covington City Council asked Tom from Tenaska that exact questions during the city council meeting linked above- and Tenaska Tom's response was, they will pay the fine as it is a cost of doing business... If they are making billions, as planned, they won't care about any small noise violation or any other fines once the cash is rolling in- are there laws that have to power to shut them down for violating noise levels? They say they will build an 8ft-10ft reinforced concrete shrapnel barrier that are 12 inches thick to block the noise and shrapnel- That won't prevent all the loud noises and shrapnel (rocketing burning lithium batteries) from flying over the wall and going straight into anything nearby The proposed location isn't designed for a dangerous industrial complex and when there is a fire and lithium batteries are exploding and flaming lithium batteries are rocketing in all directions, firemen will have to block off the roads and still won't be able to get into position properly to spray other containers to keep them cool and the fire may spread to other BESS containers The closest home shares the property line with the potential BESS The closest neighbor's home is potentially only 50 feet away The developer will say that their facility won't impact the flow of water, yet increased flash floods and brown water runoff from denuded land, plus herbicides (Roundup?) used on site to control vegetation growth, will pollute neighbors' properties, pollute streams and other bodies of water Plus replacing natural habitat with acres of gravel and concrete will create more run-off to the adjacent properties and will create a heat island that will raise temperatures all around the facility. The amount of defensive water used to attempt to keep surrounding battery packs from overheating at a battery energy storage system fire 24/7 for the course of many days to

weeks could approach 20 million gallons- if not more- and all of those gallons of contaminated run-off will all flow away from the facility It took 14 days and almost 20 million gallons of water to try to contain the Otay Mesa BESS fire A BESS fire and the defense/control water would poison the aquifer/water table with millions of gallons of contaminated runoff water- again, who pays for that? In most BESS designs, the developer tries to pack the massive BESS containers as close as possible per the manufacturer's specifications- the developer will tell you that no BESS fire has leapt from one container to another- but the Tesla Megapack fire in Australia did exactly that... So extra spacing must be required This facility will be in the Skagit River tributary basin and could kill and contaminate everything downstream for miles There are 9 wetlands on the proposed site plus additional wetlands all around- fire defense/control water run-off could poison/contaminate all of them There are already retention ponds on the property which will get contaminated The water table is very high, which will allow the contamination to seep into water supply and water sources for wildlife- fire defense water run-off would poison all the surrounding land, storm drains, streams, rivers, and beyond Are there homes within a 1-mile radius on wells? The fire defense water run-off could poison the water table Salmon Streams could be impacted as well Where will up to 20 Million gallons of contaminated water go? How fast can you evacuate the surround homes/businesses within a mile or two miles? Is there any wildlife that would be impacted by the noise? You have to consider what impacts both the noise and water contamination the BESS will cause to wildlife The noise will drive wildlife away and make a major impact on the serenity, peacefulness, and calming sounds of nature neighbors are used to hearing/sensing They will say they will use nighttime compliant lights- but their motion sensing security lights will impact nighttime sky and stargazing- Night glare from bright security lights interfering with valuable dark night skies. They will have a ton of security measures, including cameras aimed outwards directly at and into people's homes There are no known fire prevention technologies that work 100% in preventing battery facility fires- the codes- no matter how up to date can't prevent the lithium battery fires and the codes and rules can't stop them- so adhering to all the latest NFPA 855 and other codes only provide a feeling of safety... No one knows how to prevent nor stop Lithium battery fires- and all the fire safety codes, regulations, rules are just best guesses and do nothing other than to set a minimum standard. All the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) fires, and e-bike, e-scooter, cell phone, laptop, and all other Lithium battery fires were all in devices that were "up to code"- being up to code, when codes can't prevent fires nor stop lithium fires once they have started isn't enough. They will tell us everything is up to code- but that won't prevent or stop Lithium battery fires nor can the codes extinguish a fire- there is no known technology that can quickly and efficiently extinguish lithium battery fires They will tell us they are using the safest Lithium battery chemistry- LFP, which has exploded in several recent fires (Germany, Neuhausen July 2021; Australia, Brisbane March 2020; US, IL, LaSalle July 2021; US, PA, Millvale January 2023; Warwick NY had two separate BESS fires in June 2023; East Hampton, NY in May 2023; Chaumont NY in July 23; Melba ID in October 2023) and killed people (China, Beijing April 2021) Even though they haven't decided on which battery brand to go with yet- and all brands have had fires as no Lithium battery is safe- they are dangerous and release deadly toxins/chemicals when they spontaneously combust They will tell us that Lithium Iron Phosphate (LFP) batteries are safe- yet studies have shown that while LFP does have a 100 degree higher ignition point, it is more dangerous due to the toxins/chemicals it releases when burning: "This report on different chemistry of battery fires, has data that LFP has the most dangerous gas emissions vs other chemistry. So while manufacturers rely on LFP for their higher temperature tolerance and say they are safer, once they hit thermal runaway, they are actually more d a n g e r o u s . " https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352152X24008739?fbclid=IwY2xjawEgtA1leHRuA2FibQIxMAABHZCELgftzerehwcmPfWs3CGut1IXzFsgqsQZCxfnqTnhNHR48U9_ubUbA_aem_k_EV42orJyc-GucX0WyocQ#sec4 Review of gas emissions from lithium-ion battery thermal runaway failure — Considering toxic and flammable compounds Lithium-ion batteries (LIBs) present fire, explosion and toxicity hazards through the release of flammable and noxious gases during rare thermal runaw... www.sciencedirect.com They will tell us someone (maybe the battery manufacturer) will train our Local Fire Department and there will be a QR code on the gate so firemen can read up on how to watch the fire and how to try to contain the fire so it doesn't spread. In a recent Australian BESS fire, it took over 150 firefighters and 30 firetrucks and 4 days of spraying water on nearby Tesla Megapacks to try to prevent the fire from spreading to additional Tesla Megapacks while they waited for the lithium battery fire to extinguish itself- so they would have to train all the surrounding fire departments as well to bring an adequate response to fight a up to 2 week long fire.. In the recent Otay Mesa BESS fire it took 55 firefighters 24/7 for two weeks to battle the blaze- plus two HAZMAT teams, the bomb squad, and many other resources... "Lithium- ion fires release an array of deadly toxins including Carbon Monoxide, Hydrogen Cyanide, Hydrogen Fluoride and Cobalt. These toxins are especially dangerous to firefighters because they are dermally absorbed through the skin and no personal protective clothing can protect you against it." Greg McConville, UFUA National Secretary Hydrogen Cyanide (HCN) is a colorless, flammable, and poisonous chemical compound that is released by Battery Storage facilities during a fire. HCN interferes with the body's use of oxygen and may

cause harm to the brain, heart, blood vessels, and lungs; exposure can be fatal within 3 minutes of exposure Ammonia (NH₃), NH₃ is hydroscopic, or water-seeking. When combined with moisture it forms a corrosive substance. Ammonia gas is very irritating to the eyes, nose and respiratory system, and in high concentrations is also corrosive to the skin and eyes. Breathing ammonia gas can be fatal. Chlorine (Cl₂), Chlorine (Cl₂) gas is a very toxic chemical element that can cause eye irritation, coughing, vomiting and other symptoms. It is easily distinguishable by its greenish-yellow color and a bleach-like odor. Chlorine was even weaponized during World War I and is estimated to have caused at least 1100 deaths in its first usage Hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), Hydrogen Sulfide (H₂S) is a flammable and highly toxic substance that can be dangerous in both acute and chronic forms. One exposure to high levels of H₂S can cause immediate death, while health problems might not show up until three days after the exposure. It is a chalcogen-hydride gas, and is poisonous, corrosive, and flammable, with trace amounts in ambient atmosphere having a characteristic foul odor of rotten eggs When there is a fire, the gasses and smoke released could be carried miles away and poison several lakes and rivers- The Valley Center BESS fire had people outside the 5-mile shelter-in-place orders suffering from exposure (including burning, eyes, nose, and throat-including swelling throat making it hard to breathe, headaches, nausea, and people as far as 7 miles downwind from the BESS fire coughing up dark phlegm for days afterwards Stranded energy- after the fire, batteries still retain energy and there is a likely-hood the batteries will reignite on their own multiple times up to 2 weeks after the fire. The Otay Mesa fire re-ignited multiple times- before the first re-ignition, they down-graded the evacuation order for about 6 hours before the "extinguished" lithium batteries re-ignited and spewed toxic gases/smoke all over again, requiring re-instating the evacuation order. The Otay Mesa BESS fire ended up burning for 14 days- and the evacuation and shelter in place orders remained in effect until it was done re-igniting. Many Battery storage facilities aren't engineered to withstand the potential level of the Puget Sounds' earthquakes. The earthquake's vibration, shock, shaking, and impact could induce faults such as disturbances to the internal construction of the cells, breakage of cell tab or intercell connections, contacts between the cathode and anode due to a distortion or tear of the separator, and the creation of other defects that can lead to an internal short circuit or high temperatures, both of which can lead to a catastrophic thermal runaway. Of course, any of these internal issues could also occur during the device's transportation and installation in its final location. There are a million things that can go wrong and result in batteries spontaneously combusting- defective batteries, poor system/container design, defective ancillary systems, too much wear and tear, failed components- one Tesla Megapack fire at Moss Landing was because a fan bearing failed and the fan couldn't spin fast enough to keep the temps down and in another Tesla Megapack fire a coolant line was leaking and the batteries overheated. In the most documented fire, the facility operator said it was a defective battery (Surprise, AZ fire, APS blamed LG battery defect and LG said it was an external cause). And in South Korea, "After a five-month investigation into fires at 23 energy storage installations in South Korea, an expert panel has blamed poor-quality installations, faulty operating procedures, missing protections against electrical shocks and lack of overall control systems for the fires". Two separate BESS fires in Warwick NY last Summer were blamed on rain from a big storm getting into the BESS container and triggering a reaction that led to thermal runaway. What happens if Hansen Creek and Skagit river flood- the lithium batteries will react to any exposure to water by entering thermal runaway... The question is not "if" a runaway event will occur but "when". Daniel J. Gorham, Fire Protection Research Foundation Quincy, Massachusetts, USA These fires can be explosive and their proposed 10ft wall will not prevent rocketing shrapnel from flying over the 1ft thick reinforced concrete shrapnel/noise barrier and hitting things a couple hundred feet away. This industrial facility will be ugly with chain link fences and barbed wire - looking like prison Murals on the shrapnel walls will only invite graffiti It will be not be manned and any attack or vandalism will have to go through the remote monitored process- delays. The Suprise AZ fire burned for hours and was only reported by locals who lived 1000s of feet away when they smelled the toxins inside their closed up home with the AC on and looked out the window and saw smoke. They reported it as a fire across the freeway- firefighters arrived thinking it was a brush fire- and immediately saw the deadly cloud of toxins hovering about 3ft above the ground and called in HAZMAT squad- read about it! It is very well documented! Electrical grids are being targeted more and more frequently by thieves, vandals, and terrorists who have shot at electrical facilities- this would be a target and could have catastrophic consequences. The Department of Defense said BESS could be hacked and weaponized and removed and or stopped installation of BESS on military bases/sites... They say it will create local jobs, but that is only during the construction- as this facility will be unmanned- and even with that, they will bring in their own crews and only hire a about 100 local union members from different trades for very short periods of time- all of whom will most likely have ZERO experience in building a dangerous facility like this where even the smallest thing can lead to catastrophic issues in the future... Another study concluded that homes within .67 a mile of an industrial facility decrease in value up to 62% due to proximity to that industrial facility- the decrease in home value exponentially gets larger the closer the home is to the site... A recent news story about a Mason County, Texas home owner who had a BESS installed next door says "it is a nightmare"

and hasn't been able to sell his house for 2 years.. If homes are close enough, they may become unsellable.... They will say the substation, transformers and the massive levels of electrical current from charging and discharging the batteries won't be seen, heard, or felt and that all studies show EMF is not an issue- even though both the 1979 study and 2002 California Health Department report on EMFs proved otherwise. The CA report, a 7-year, \$9 million study, concluded that EMFs can cause some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage. The evaluation further concludes that magnetic fields may cause suicide and adult leukemia. They will say they are necessary- but we are existing fine without them and there are already enough BESS in various permit review stages to almost double the 2030 energy storage goals. Any question that may have an answer that is negative, they will defer and say they will need to get back to us on that. But they have been asked the same tough questions at many presentations and they avoid answering them. Contact the Covington City Council to learn their experience with the exact same Developer! Also watch their council meeting where Tenaska tried to sell them on the BESS. FYI, Tenaska hasn't gotten back to them on any of dozens of questions asked... They will bring in all their experts and will refuse to answer any questions that reflect negatively on them and their project and instead tell us they will have to get back to us- please watch the linked City of Covington Council Meeting to see Tenaska Tom avoid answering questions he's been asked many times at many of his presentations. They will have an Electric union representative show up and speak in favor of the BESS/job and she will try to bring a couple other electricians to say they need the work and how great this BESS will be Our grid is stable and we rarely experience extended outages- and when we do, it is because a powerline is down- this facility won't help with that. They will tell us it is to benefit our community- but they are a private for profit company that is building BESS solely to make profit. They will sell the power to the highest bidder (usually CA, AZ, NM, and TX) as often as they can- up to three times a day. They won't let this battery facility sit idle waiting for us to have peak demand scenarios or power outages- they will be constantly selling the power they bought from PSE for pennies to the highest bidder that is most desperate for energy and willing to pay the most By buying power cheaply from PSE (charging their batteries with cheap electricity) and selling the stored power to the highest bidder (discharging the batteries and sending the electricity to the highest bidder) as fast as they can- they will make the most money possible- and by quickly charging and discharging the system- they will be putting the maximum stress on all components and making the facility's cooling and other systems extremely loud and increasing the likelihood of a catastrophic event... We don't need the power- PSE's studies have shown that by 2030 we will need 1,000 megawatts of stored power- this facility (which can be operational in 8-12 months from getting approval) will supply 80% of the TOTAL projected need by PSE in 2030... There is no need to place this facility at this rural location where there are so many risks and so many other issues. We don't want to be the case study used for future citing regulations because we allowed this deadly industrial facility to be placed in a small rural town near homes and creeks/rivers/wetlands and it ended with a mass casualty event killing many people and animals due to lack of proper infrastructure, resources, and staffing Until they can quickly and safely extinguish lithium battery fires just like putting out a regular fire, there should be a moratorium on lithium battery storage facilities- there are hundreds of other energy storage options. Better yet, until they have a fast and safe extinguishing method and can prevent batteries from overheating/thermal runaway, there should be a Ban and or moratorium. It is too risky to allow BESS Developers to build industrial BESS facilities near people's homes, close to schools and hospitals, and anywhere else were it could catastrophically impact people and the environment. They belong in heavy industrial zoned areas or out in the middle of no where connected to wind or solar plants. BESS will only be increasing electricity demand (every charge cycle of this proposed BESS will use the equivalent of 200k homes at peak time- and it can do three full charge and discharge cycles per day - adding the equivalent of 600k homes worth of peak electricity usage everyday- and increasing people's electricity prices due to increased demand and reduced supply. Even if BESS were not allowed to export their power out of state, they are building BESS for profit- so they buy the electricity from PSE and they won't sell it back unless it is profitable for them. Things to consider: fire risks and no known effective prevention, mitigation, or extinguishing methods after more than 30 years of research unincorporated/city/county zoning regulations- does it fit in with surrounding environment? Noise levels- how loud will this be with systems running at Max speed financial risks to the city/county Environmental risks- fire residue and ash could be distributed up to 7 miles away as seen in the 2nd fire at the Valley Center, CA BESS fire- with the potential for air, ground, and groundwater pollution, the authority of the state Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to preempt any city action the role of the state Department of Ecology- which allows BESS developers to pay a fee to the wetland mitigation fund to allow BESS developers to destroy wetlands wherever they want whether or not there is the potential for an environmental superfund contamination site to be created in the event of a catastrophic fire or other BESS failure, and the potential for individual cities/counties (as well as a combined effort of cities/counties) to utilize the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to protect the city and its residents both from BESS facilities within the city/county limits, as well as from BESS facilities located outside the city/county that may have the

potential to negatively affect the City/County and its residents in the event of a fire. And, finally, regardless of whether BESS development projects are bundled/packaged and sold, who will undertake and pay for the costs of cleanup, oversight, damages, etc. in the event of a catastrophic event in a city/county? The federal and state governments don't own the project. Neither does Puget Sound Energy. A Black Diamond City Council member stopped by to look at the BESS in Surprise, AZ when he was in town, and that fire is one of the most well documented BESS fires as a bunch of first responders were severely injured from the exploding BESS, and the BD Council member said that site has been abandoned. Tenaska and all these other developers create LLC's to build their BESS, so when something goes wrong and insurance limits are exceeded, they can declare bankruptcy for the LLC and walk away abandoning the site and community... Who will be left holding the financial bag in the event of a catastrophic event? What happens to surrounding farms that are destroyed? Who is responsible if people aren't evacuated fast enough and injuries and/or deaths happen? Industrial BESS should only be sited in heavy industrial zoned areas or far far away from people, homes, and vulnerable populations and vulnerable habitat/environments and connected to wind/solar plants where evacuation orders and shelter in place orders won't impact anyone. Any type of lithium BESS is a ticking time bomb... Remember there are hundreds of alternatives without any risk of fire explosion nor risk of deadly toxins and contamination available now... We should not rush into siting lithium BESS in risky and not ideal locations just because that is what BESS developers are selling. Please watch the Covington City Council meeting from June 13th 2023 linked above! Please spread the word and get Skagit County residents to oppose this poorly sited proposed BESS! Thank you, James PS. For more info, please feel free to read the email I sent to Covington City Council before Tenaska did their presentation over a year ago going over issues I was aware of at that time

Q5. Upload your document or picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Upload your document or picture (optional)	not answered
Q7. Upload your document or picture (optional)	not answered
Q8. Upload your document or picture (optional)	not answered



Respondent No: 2

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 13, 2024 18:20:11 pm

Last Seen: Aug 13, 2024 18:20:11 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **First & Last Name** Dean Brackett

Q2. **Email address** dcb4757@gmail.com

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

Was Goldeneye required to use the EFSEC process for approval or did they opt-in? The wattage size of the BESS appears to be below the threshold required by state law. Did Tenaska choose to use the EFSEC process in order to enable the Governor's office to override potential local government denial of the project permits?

Q5. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q7. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q8. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered



Respondent No: 3

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 13, 2024 18:32:53 pm

Last Seen: Aug 13, 2024 18:32:53 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **First & Last Name** Julie McKee

Q2. **Email address** jamckee1109@hotmail.com

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

How are you going to keep site safe? Unmanned, our power sub stations here in Washington have been vandalized numerous times. What is hoing to keep vandals away

Q5. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q7. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q8. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered



Respondent No: 4

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 13, 2024 19:16:20 pm

Last Seen: Aug 13, 2024 19:16:20 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **First & Last Name** Robert Parent

Q2. **Email address** parent.rj@gmail.com

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

Objections to the BESS projects @ Minkler Rd and Fruitdale Rd. in Skagit County, Washington: 1. Potential for land degradation and water ecosystem system degradation due to close proximity to Hansen Creek (a salmon spawning waterway), and also there are private shallow water wells directly adjacent to both projects, which could be irreparably contaminated from a chemical release of hazardous toxic materials infiltrating the groundwater, then entering the water wells. 2. "Unexpected events" will always occur, even with proper maintenance. There are several documented BESS system failures in the U.S., which included "thermal runaways", that have caused ecosystem contamination due to the chemical release from the lithium batteries as well as the liquid pollution of the land and groundwater that is caused by mixing with fire-fighting water. Off-gassing of the batteries are toxic and creates air pollution and is also highly flammable with the potential for an explosive fire. 3. Increased bothersome noise levels coming from the several A/C units, necessary to keep the batteries cool. 4. Possible negative impact on adjacent property market values, with possible increased insurance risk premiums, as well as degrading of "neighborhood appeal" of properties next to the BESS facility

Q5. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q7. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q8. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered



Respondent No: 5

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Aug 13, 2024 21:16:20 pm

Last Seen: Aug 13, 2024 21:16:20 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **First & Last Name** James DeLay

Q2. **Email address** jamesdelay@hotmail.com

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

Tenaska submitted a noise study showing their BESS noise study with the HVAC system operating at 40% fan speed. Fortunately, I found another BESS sound study showing both the 40% fan speed and showing the massive increase in noise created when the fans are operating at 100%. Remember, the HVAC/fans are the only thing preventing the lithium batteries from overheating and entering thermal runaway- so we want maximum cooling as much/often as possible... PLEASE NOTE, Tenaska's Sedro Woolley sound study and the one below is the sound levels produced for a single BESS container- and there will be hundreds of BESS containers in Sedro Woolley. In addition, in other BESS sound studies where they provide the overall sound levels created from all the BESS units combined, it shows an ADDITIONAL 16db increase going from 85db to 101db.... The Sound study paid for by Tenaska is withholding- if not hiding a lot of data about how loud BESS are... The EFSEC has several sound studies from other BESS that are part of solar/wind farms- one showing 106 noise level for the BESS. Look at your research and see that Tenaska is fudging the numbers... In the Covington Tenaska was asked by city council what happens if their promises of meeting the sound levels weren't met and the BESS were louder than estimated- and Tenaska Tom responded saying they will pay the fees. And those fees are just a cost of doing business... Tenaska has been known to lie and has been caught in lies many times- watch the Covington City Council meeting from June 13th 2023 and listen to the lies- Tom gets flustered when pressured and just like tonight, when asked about how many operations BESS they have- he didn't know... They are spending at least \$250M per BESS, and he didn't know how many BESS they have operating???? Something doesn't make sense... Just like he told Covington City Council that the had a BESS next to a highschool in San Diego and everyone was excited about it- when in fact, they snuck the permit through with zero opposition because they didn't notify the public. And those they do talk to, they give the rainbows and unicorns sales pitch and leave out all the fire risks, contamination, risks, the evacuations, shelter in place order, the clean up details. They are trying to con everyone into approving their BESS before people get educated. There are so many alternatives: Thermal energy storage (TES) systems can store heat or cold to be used later, under varying conditions in temperature, place or power. TES systems are divided into three types: Sensible heat Latent heat Thermochemical Thermal energy storage can help to balance energy demand and supply on a daily, weekly and even seasonal basis, presented in thermal systems. It can also reduce peak demand, energy consumption, CO2 emissions and costs while also increasing the overall efficiency of energy systems. The application of thermal energy storage with renewable energy sources, waste heat, or surplus energy production can replace heat or cold generation from fossil-fuels, reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and lowering the need for thermal power capacity of the generators. In Europe, the IEA has estimated that around 1.4 million GWh per year could be saved— and 400 million tons of CO2 emissions avoided—in the building and industrial sectors by more extensive use of heat and cold storage. Thermal energy storage converts electric energy from the grid into thermal energy that is stored in inexpensive materials. TES systems can store energy from hours to weeks before converting it back to electrical energy or discharging the thermal energy directly. TES systems can provide 10s or even 100s of hours of electricity or heat at rated capacity. The energy capacity of the TES system can also be extended by increasing the amount of storage material, which is independent of the power capacity of the system. TES has improved safety relative to traditional electrochemical and mechanical storage technologies, and—for certain storage materials—can have extremely high energy density. In addition, inexpensive raw materials make TES among the lowest-cost solutions for energy storage. Electrochemical Long duration energy storage includes electrochemical energy storage such as static batteries, flow batteries, metal (iron) air batteries, and other battery chemistries. These types of batteries have a number of advantages, such as longer duration (over 4 hours), increased safety, less concern with ambient temperatures, easy scalability, no detrimental effects of a deep discharge, very low self-discharge, lower levelized cost of storage, and long cycle life.

Mechanical Mechanical energy storage works in complex systems that use heat, water or air with compressors, turbines, and other machinery. Currently, the most widely deployed large-scale mechanical energy storage technology is pumped hydro-storage (PHS). Other well-known mechanical energy storage technologies include flywheels, gravity-based, compressed air energy storage (CAES), and liquid air energy storage (LAES). PHS has been deployed since 1907, and CAES since 1978. We are seeing the next wave of innovation with these technologies that are increasing security, reliability, flexibility, and the duration of today's energy storage solutions. Chemical Hydrogen and other energy-carrying chemicals can be produced from a variety of energy sources, such as renewable energy, nuclear power, and fossil fuels. Converting energy from these sources into chemical forms creates high energy density fuels. Hydrogen can be stored as a compressed gas, in liquid form, or bonded in substances. After conversion, chemical storage can feed power into the grid or store excess power from it for later use. The flexibility of being able to feed stored energy back into the grid or sell the produced chemical into industrial or transportation applications provides additional opportunities for revenue and decarbonization. So we don't need to rush into approving lithium BESS- just because that is what we are being sold by for profit developers.

-
- Q5. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/54ac9314ca0be37e7f024b59ec1e7a1b36407b0b/original/1723607820/fc7abf7f01b4d4979105da695470a060_BEES_cumulative_sound_study.jpg?1723607820
-
- Q6. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/d12fb62b95d0466a1cd25bb3b88fb6d1af283901/original/1723607832/61d42001f208fc31195d93260b24b679_Tesla_megapack_40_and_100_sound_study.jpg?1723607832
-
- Q7. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/254f8caeed3823e385a827b1d856ba2ce9111bf8/original/1723608504/645e35b4a588fbf82cc4978b129fab02_106db_for_BEES.jpg?1723608504
-
- Q8. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/3fa9c9ef72bb3532782ce6afca9c973d3393e12d/original/1723608520/17b4398dd422b371eac06a3c32d6ebb9_102_db_broadband_sound_level_with_50_BEES.jpg?1723608520
-



Respondent No: 6
Login: Luckythecat
Email: ronj98273@yahoo.com

Responded At: Aug 13, 2024 21:22:31 pm
Last Seen: Aug 14, 2024 04:01:09 am
IP Address: 73.109.17.69

Q1. **First & Last Name** Ron Johnson

Q2. **Email address** ronj98273@yahoo.com

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

Wondering what back up system(s) are in place during operation of the BESS? Who has the keys to the building if something goes wrong? Who owns the battery storage facility once it is up and running? Will the extra power be sold on the grid to other states? Who or Whom monitors the ongoing compliance issues? Where do the old batteries go? How long do the LFP batteries last? Will the batteries always be a full capacity? How is the site monitored outside the facility? Who is this information set to and who does the review? From the map at the meeting, it looks to be the BESS will be built on wetlands. Is that correct? Training for our fire fighters, who does that and who bears the cost? On going training for fire fighters who bears the cost for training? How many "fire drills" are required in a calendar year? Who is making the batteries for BESS? How does the plan for the building protect the 3 major pipelines, Nat Gas service line, Water main, and Powerlines? The area around the BESS and Hansen Creek does flood, What precautions are being taken to protect the batteries? No bathrooms will be in the facility. What will the workers who come in and work have to use as facilities? Parking lot seems very big, looks like 22 spots. Seems the parking lot should have a smaller foot print with only 2 workers in the plant. If they want to be close to the energy source, they should build next to the dams, wind farms, coal plants, etc. Who releases the energy from the batteries? What is the evacuation plan for the 2 mile circle around the BESS? What is the current dbs level of the current substation? I asked and did not get an answer. What is the dbs level of the BESS? What are the milestones for the ELSEC committee as they go through the process? When would they have a recommendation to send to the governor?

Q5. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q7. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q8. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered



Respondent No: 7
Login: Luckythecat
Email: ronj98273@yahoo.com

Responded At: Aug 13, 2024 23:13:09 pm
Last Seen: Aug 14, 2024 04:01:09 am
IP Address: 73.109.17.69

Q1. **First & Last Name** Ron Johnson

Q2. **Email address** ronj98273@yahoo.com

Q3. **Are you part of an Agency or Organization?** No

Q4. **Share any comment**

I was trying to figure out why someone would build a 250 million dollar BESS facility. You would want a return on investment for investing that much money. The extra electricity from the Sedro Woolley sub station will be sold to the highest bidder. Think of California, they charge kilowatt hours based on time of day used, peak hours cost more. Electricity is sold as a commodity to other energy companies in other states. In Washington I paid for 968 kilowatt hours \$144.00 last month, In California the average bill for 940 kilowatt hours is \$340. The only reason someone wants to build BESS is to take advantage of those markets. Washington will not receive any of this power unless we are the highest bidder, currently we have a substantial excess. I believe the gentleman from Tanaska stated they could store 1 million Kilowatts to power 600,000 homes for a day. If this goes through it will not be long before the investment in BESS starts paying off for Tanaska and their investors. Sedro Woolley will get all the risk and no benefit. I hope the Assistant Attorney will look and see there are no benefits for Washington and Sedro Woolley citizens only a small few. The BESS plant has nothing to do with reducing fossil fuels in Washington. The correct choice would be no BESS in Sedro Woolley.

Q5. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q7. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

Q8. **Upload your document or picture (optional)** not answered

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: change of land use
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 1:29:27 PM

From: Betty Moore <bettys@whidbey.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 1:20 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: change of land use

External Email

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

My family and I are strongly opposed to this plan and any other similar project. That area is noted for drainage problems and more excess water drainage is not needed. Farm land should not be destroyed. Lithium batteries are highly flammable, dangerous, and the materials used to produce them are in short supply as well as being produced by slave labor in poor nations. This plan could and will impact our environment. We vote no! and hope that our representatives making the decision regarding this will do the same.

Jim and Sharon Hinton, John and Kristen VanValkenberg and daughters, Betty Moore, Gary Hunsucker

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Comment on Goldeneye Project
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 10:04:01 PM

From: Andrew Ashmore <spomountain1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 10:03:36 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: EFSEC (EFSEC)
Subject: Comment on Goldeneye Project

External Email

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be required for the Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project. There were a number of environmental concerns raised in comments at the Informational Public Hearing that need to be analyzed and addressed.

Thank you,
Andrew Ashmore
PO Box 1121
La Conner, WA 98257

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Concerned citizen
Date: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 4:30:29 PM

From: Amanda Pederson <amanda.elijah0812@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 12:58 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Concerned citizen

External Email

To whom this my concern,

Hi I'm reaching out to voice my concerns on behalf of myself, my family, our community here at the Van Fleet Mobile Home Park and residents of Sedro Woolley, WA.

This proposal has raised huge concerns among many people who live near the surrounding area of this proposed project. If this project is approved the city of Sedro Woolley will be placing the lives of it's tax paying citizens in immense fear and uncertainty of the future for their lives and potentially at fault for the deaths of many. These dangers should be considered when it comes to protecting the lives of the people of our community.

I'm a full time single stay at home disabled mother of two young children. I own my mobile home in the Van fleet mobile home park but rent a space. I'm on a fixed income, how am I supposed to pay to move my home to insure the safety of my children. I cannot afford to sell and rent somewhere else with the way the economy is. I have searched every avenue possible and I found no solution for my situation if this proposal were to pass. Is this city of Sedro Woolley going to pay to move my home to a safer neighborhood?

All I want for my children is for them to be safe, healthy and happy.

I never thought I would have to stress over something such as this. I have Multiple Sclerosis and Fibromyalgia and stress triggers relapses so I'm really trying not to worry too much. I'm praying that God protects us and this situation.

I have many questions and if this passes I will be seeking legal advice and action, as well as many others.

Thank you for your time and God bless.

Amanda Pederson
360 941-1614
[Amanda.elijah0812@gmail.com](mailto:amanda.elijah0812@gmail.com)
24919 Hoehn Rd unit 48
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Energy Facility Sedro
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 6:43:13 PM

From: Barbara Smart <bsmart53@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 6:38 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Energy Facility Sedro

External Email

Water: site in a FEMA flood plain and with about 2 acres of wet lands.

The Skagit River provides drinking water for Skagit county west of the site.

1. What happens if there is leakage contaminates our drinking water.
2. What happens if there is a fire and all the water it will take to put it out drains into the wetlands and then into the Skagit River.
3. Why put facility on a flood plain. Why not a place away from river (drinking / fish).
4. You are taking 16 acres of agricultural land.

Barbara Smart
2419 Vista Lane
Anacortes Wa 98221
206-719-5016

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SITING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM PROJECTS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY (DISTRICTS: ALL)
Date: Thursday, July 18, 2024 4:53:28 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)

From: James DeLay <jamesdelay@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2024 4:21 PM

To: contact@duwamishcleanup.org; paulina@drcc.org; Robin Schwartz <robin@drcc.org>; Magdalena Angel Cano <maggie@drcc.org>; sframe@king5.com; John Ryan <jryan@kuow.org>; bkaczaraba@gmail.com; Larry Delaney [WA] <LDelaney@washingtonea.org>; JWhite@WashingtonEA.org; Aimee Iverson [WA] <aiverson@washingtonea.org>; mhowes@washingtonea.org; Rich Wood [WA] <rwood@washingtonea.org>; RTom@washingtonea.org; Lisa Kodama [WA] <LKodama@WashingtonEA.org>; Djibril Diop [WA] <DDiop@Washingtonea.org>; Mike Gawley [WA] <mgawley@washingtonea.org>; ATG MI CRC Complaint Processing <crc@atg.wa.gov>; catherine@toomanydogs.com; WA47DEMS@outlook.com; DOR Skagit County Leg Authority <commissioners@co.skagit.wa.us>; EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>

Subject: ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SITING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM PROJECTS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY (DISTRICTS: ALL)

External Email

Good afternoon,

Happy Thursday!

I hope you are all doing well!

Did you hear that the developer of the proposed Covington BESS has submitted their first BESS permit application through the EFSEC? It is for their Skagit location in a residential and farming area next to rivers and with wetlands on it- oh, and it is in an unincorporated area , just like the BESS proposed next to Mattson Middle School which is in Covington... I believe I told you that Tenaska withdrew all their local level BESS permit applications with local governments/permitting agencies and instead was planning to switch to the state level permitting process through the EFSEC where Jay Inslee is the ultimate and sole decision maker/approver. They are bypassing the will of cities and counties and going directly to Jay Inslee for approval (through the EFSEC process).

Here's the link to their recent application for their Skagit County BESS:

<https://www.efsec.wa.gov/energy-facilities/goldeneye-bess>

[Goldeneye BESS | EFSEC - The State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council](#)

Project background The Applicant proposes to construct and operate the Project in unincorporated Skagit County, Washington (Figure 1 in Attachment A). The Project is a stand-alone 200 MW/800 MWh BESS (Battery Energy Storage System), with related interconnection and ancillary support infrastructure. The Project is located just outside the eastern edge of Sedro-Woolley, off www.efsec.wa.gov

The only way you will know if a developer tries to bypass your will and local process and goes through the EFSEC permitting process instead, is if you subscribe to notifications through the EFSEC which can be found in that link.

With all that said, please read the following, as I feel that it gives excellent starting point to crafting safety-first BESS standards/rules for siting and cities and counties should definitely make a BESS ordinance/rule/regulation...

In light of San Diego County having three BESS fires at two of its three BESS (the Valley Center BESS had its first fire in 2022 and second fire in 2023) all of which forced evacuations and shelter in place orders- the most recent BESS fire at Otay Mesa had mandatory evacuations while it burned for two weeks- San Diego County's SUPERVISOR, FIFTH DISTRICT at the SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, Jim Desmond, recommends the following in drafting BESS Development standards for siting BESS:



JIM DESMOND
SUPERVISOR, FIFTH DISTRICT
SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA ITEM

DATE: July 17, 2024

08

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT:

ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SITING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM PROJECTS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY (DISTRICTS: ALL)

OVERVIEW

The County's vision for decarbonization through a transition away from traditional sources of energy, such as contemplated in the "Regional Decarbonization Framework" (RDF) gives considerable attention toward solar and wind generation capabilities interlinked by the grid. Due to the intermittent nature of these sources of energy, an inherent component of this vision – then - is the need for battery storage of the renewable electricity generated during off-peak hours to power homes and businesses throughout the night and to prevent black and brownouts. As this transition continues to unfold, demand for battery storage projects (typically referred to as "battery energy storage systems" (BESS) will only increase.

Currently, the County does not have specific definitions nor development standards in place to guide the review process for new BESS projects. Because of this, the County's department of Planning & Development Services (PDS) processes these types of projects consistent with the nearest comparable land use categories in the Zoning Ordinance, such as minor and major impact utilities. Land uses considered minor impact utilities include cellular antenna facilities, electrical substations, and small water tanks. Examples of major impact utilities include large wind turbines, water treatment facilities, and steam, fossil, or nuclear power plants. It is not unreasonable to accept that BESS projects are comparable in scope and scale to some of these land uses. However, certain aspects of BESS projects are especially unique and often utilize cutting-edge technology that must be specifically accounted for, such as the operating characteristics and safety requirements for lithium-ion battery storage.

Beyond the uniqueness of BESS facilities, these projects also often generate public controversy and opposition, particularly when located near existing residential neighborhoods. By and large, this is based on an understanding of the associated public health and safety risks, such as fire, thermal runaway, and release of toxic gases. For example, the 250-megawatt Gateway Energy Storage facility located in East Otay Mesa (District 1), approved by the County in 2018 caught fire in May of this year and continued to reignite despite efforts to contain it. This incident prompted an evacuation warning for nearby businesses, deployment of firefighters and HAZMAT teams to

SUBJECT: ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SITING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM PROJECTS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY (DISTRICTS: ALL)

put out the blaze, monitor air quality conditions and discharge of waterborne contaminants in firefighting suppression activities, and establishment of a 600-foot buffer from the site due to potential for release of toxic gases. In Valley Center (District 5) a much smaller, but nonetheless concerning fire occurred recently at the County-approved Terra-Gen BESS facility. This resulted in temporary road closures and evacuation orders for nearby homes. Clearly, public fixation on the health, safety and environmental risks posed by these facilities is well warranted.

Given the unique operating characteristics of BESS facilities, their inherent safety concerns, and a growing public awareness of their impacts – particularly when located near or within residential neighborhoods - the County must adopt specific development standards for guiding our review process of new BESS project applications. In this spirit, today's action directs the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to establish development standards for siting BESS projects in the unincorporated areas and orders a temporary pause on any new application submittals until standards have been developed and adopted.

**RECOMMENDATION(S)
SUPERVISOR JIM DESMOND**

- 1) Find that the proposed actions are not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to SCEQA Guidelines Sections 15060(c)(2) and (3), Section 15061(b)(3), and 15378(b)(5) because the action is an administrative action that does not commit County to a specific project and will not have a reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect effect on the environment.
- 2) Direct the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to establish development standards for siting battery energy storage system (BESS) projects in the unincorporated areas. This process shall be informed by community, industry, and all other relevant stakeholder input as deemed appropriate. At a minimum, standards should include, but are not limited to the following:
 - a) Avoid locating BESS projects in residential areas.
 - b) Avoid locating BESS projects near sensitive receptors, such as schools, day care centers, senior care centers and hospitals.
 - c) Incentivize locating BESS projects in commercial and/or industrial zones.
 - d) Incentivize BESS projects that can co-locate with existing utility facilities, electrical substations, etc., unless located in a residential area.
 - e) Specific safety requirements for thermal runaway, fire and explosion risks, emergency response, hazardous materials, toxic gases, and noise.
 - f) Specific development regulations for setbacks, building height, etc.
 - g) Specific design standards for aesthetics, community character, lighting, and landscaping.

SUBJECT: ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SITING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM PROJECTS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY (DISTRICTS: ALL)

- h) Consider exemption criteria based on project location, size, and/or other metrics as deemed appropriate and as consistent with sub-recommendations a – g (above).
- 3) Direct the CAO to work with applicants with BESS projects currently under review to align their submittals with today’s recommendations, to the extent feasible. The CAO shall also, at the next possible meeting, prepare and bring back an ordinance temporarily (45 days) pausing any new BESS project application from being accepted, pursuant to Government Code Section 65858 as an urgency measure to protect public health, safety, and welfare. This pause shall include two additional one-year extensions, each to be executed until BESS development standards have been adopted.

EQUITY IMPACT STATEMENT

Battery energy storage system (BESS) projects may pose significant health, safety, and environmental risks to surrounding communities, especially when located within or near existing residential neighborhoods. These risks range from acute noise nuisances to fire and thermal runaway hazards. To protect and buffer residential areas from these risks, and to ensure historically disadvantaged communities don’t bear the brunt moving forward, the County must adopt standards and guidelines for siting future BESS projects that considers their unique operating characteristics, potential health and safety risks, and appropriateness for locating them within close proximity to existing communities and other sensitive receptors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT STATEMENT

While there are many benefits of BESS facilities that contribute to the County’s sustainability goals, such as strengthening grid reliability and increasing energy efficiency, there are also several potential adverse consequences. These include fire and thermal runaway risks, managing the limited life cycle and degradation of batteries over time, and extraction of rare earth minerals that can have devastating environmental and societal consequences (unethical mining practices, etc.). The key here is striking a balance between the pros and cons of these facilities. Adopting rules for how we process and locate BESS projects in the unincorporated areas is a necessary first step.

FISCAL IMPACT

Funds for this request are included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-25 Operational Plan in Planning & Development Services (\$1.0 million) and San Diego County Fire (\$0.25 million). If approved, this request will result in costs and revenue of approximately \$1.25 million to establish development standards for siting battery energy storage system (BESS) projects, depending on the complexity of the environmental review required. The funding source is one-time General-Purpose Revenue. There will be no change in net General Fund cost and no additional staff years.

BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT

N/A

ADVISORY BOARD STATEMENT

N/A

SUBJECT: ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SITING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM PROJECTS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY (DISTRICTS: ALL)

BACKGROUND

Over the past few years, we have seen a growing increase in both proposed and approved/constructed BESS projects in the unincorporated areas. Since 2018 the County has approved three of them, ranging in size from 40 megawatts (MW) to 250 MW. Some of these have been in commercial or industrial areas like East Otay Mesa in District 1, while others have been located near residential areas such as in Fallbrook and Valley Center in District 5. Beyond those that have already been approved, there are *twelve* active applications currently under review with PDS in various stages of the process. What's more, utility companies such as San Diego Gas & Electric (SDGE) are building their own BESS facilities in the unincorporated areas, while often being able to circumvent the local permitting process. Now is the time to establish specific and transparent guidelines, and effectively telegraph the County's stance on permissible locations and intended standards for new BESS projects.

Given the County's reliance on intermittent sources of energy going forward, demand for BESS facilities will almost certainly continue to grow in the coming decades. For this reason, it's imperative the County adopt specific development standards while it's still relatively "early" enough to have any meaningful impact. Due to the public health and safety concerns, having appropriate standards in place will ensure new BESS facilities are designed, located, and constructed with safety as the top priority. Moreover, since BESS facilities are going to be a critical component in meeting future electricity demand, building and gaining the public's trust and acceptance of them appears to be a necessary requirement. To this end, standards would establish clear rules and definitions that will enable the County to gather more meaningful community input, provide better transparency for the public during the review process, and address specific safety and other environmental concerns such as fire risk, air quality, noise, and visual impacts.

Given the unique operating characteristics of BESS facilities, their inherent safety concerns, and a growing public awareness of their impacts, the County must adopt specific development standards for guiding our review process of new and future BESS project applications. In this spirit, today's action directs the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to establish development standards for siting battery energy storage system (BESS) projects in the unincorporated areas, and also orders a temporary pause on any new application submittals until standards have been developed and adopted.

LINKAGE TO THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO STRATEGIC PLAN

Today's proposed actions support the *Sustainability: Climate; Equity; Health; and Community: Engagement, Safety, and Quality of Life* Strategic Initiatives in the County of San Diego's 2024-2029 Strategic Plan.

Respectfully submitted,



JIM DESMOND
Supervisor, Fifth District

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT: ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SITING BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM PROJECTS IN THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY (DISTRICTS: ALL)

OVERVIEW

The County's vision for decarbonization through a transition away from traditional sources of energy, such as contemplated in the "Regional Decarbonization Framework" (RDF) gives considerable attention toward solar and wind generation capabilities interlinked by the grid. Due to the intermittent nature of these sources of energy, an inherent component of this vision – then - is the need for battery storage of the renewable electricity generated during off-peak hours to power homes and businesses throughout the night and to prevent black and brownouts. As this transition continues to unfold, demand for battery storage projects (typically referred to as "battery energy storage systems" (BESS) will only increase.

Currently, the County does not have specific definitions nor development standards in place to guide the review process for new BESS projects. Because of this, the County's department of Planning & Development Services (PDS) processes these types of projects consistent with the nearest comparable land use categories in the Zoning Ordinance, such as minor and major impact utilities. Land uses considered minor impact utilities include cellular antenna facilities, electrical substations, and small water tanks. Examples of major impact utilities include large wind turbines, water treatment facilities, and steam, fossil, or nuclear power plants. It is not unreasonable to accept that BESS projects are comparable in scope and scale to some of these land uses. However, certain aspects of BESS projects are especially unique and often utilize cutting-edge technology that must be specifically accounted for, such as the operating characteristics and safety requirements for lithium-ion battery storage.

Beyond the uniqueness of BESS facilities, these projects also often generate public controversy and opposition, particularly when located near existing residential neighborhoods. By and large, this is based on an understanding of the associated public health and safety risks, such as fire, thermal runaway, and release of toxic gases. For example, the 250-megawatt Gateway Energy Storage facility located in East Otay Mesa (District 1), approved by the County in 2018 caught fire in May of this year and continued to reignite despite efforts to contain it. This incident prompted an evacuation warning for nearby businesses, deployment of firefighters and HAZMAT teams to put out the blaze, monitor air quality conditions and discharge of waterborne contaminants in firefighting suppression activities, and establishment of a 600-foot buffer from the site due to potential for release of toxic gases. In Valley Center (District 5) a much smaller, but nonetheless concerning fire occurred recently at the County-approved Terra-Gen BESS facility. This resulted in temporary road closures and evacuation orders for nearby homes. Clearly, public fixation on the health, safety and environmental risks posed by these facilities is well warranted.

Given the unique operating characteristics of BESS facilities, their inherent safety concerns, and a growing public awareness of their impacts – particularly when located near or within residential neighborhoods - the County must adopt specific development standards for guiding our review process of new BESS project applications. In this spirit, today’s action directs the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to establish development standards for siting BESS projects in the unincorporated areas and orders a temporary pause on any new application submittals until standards have been developed and adopted.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

SUPERVISOR JIM DESMOND

1) Find that the proposed actions are not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to SCEQA Guidelines Sections 15060(c)(2) and (3), Section 15061(b)(3), and 15378(b)(5) because the action is an administrative action that does not commit County to a specific project and will not have a reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect effect on the environment.

2) Direct the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to establish development standards for siting battery energy storage system (BESS) projects in the unincorporated areas. This process shall be informed by community, industry, and all other relevant stakeholder input as deemed appropriate. At a minimum, standards should include, but are not limited to the following:

- a) Avoid locating BESS projects in residential areas.
- b) Avoid locating BESS projects near sensitive receptors, such as schools, day care centers, senior care centers and hospitals.
- c) Incentivize locating BESS projects in commercial and/or industrial zones.
- d) Incentivize BESS projects that can co-locate with existing utility facilities, electrical substations, etc., unless located in a residential area.
- e) Specific safety requirements for thermal runaway, fire and explosion risks, emergency response, hazardous materials, toxic gases, and noise.
- f) Specific development regulations for setbacks, building height, etc.
- g) Specific design standards for aesthetics, community character, lighting, and landscaping.
- h) Consider exemption criteria based on project location, size, and/or other metrics as deemed appropriate and as consistent with sub-recommendations a – g (above).

3) Direct the CAO to work with applicants with BESS projects currently under review to align their submittals with today’s recommendations, to the extent feasible. The CAO shall also, at the next possible meeting, prepare and bring back an ordinance temporarily (45 days) pausing any new BESS project application from being accepted, pursuant to Government Code Section 65858 as an urgency measure to protect public health, safety, and welfare. This pause shall include two additional one-year extensions, each to be executed until BESS development

standards have been adopted.

EQUITY IMPACT STATEMENT

Battery energy storage system (BESS) projects may pose significant health, safety, and environmental risks to surrounding communities, especially when located within or near existing residential neighborhoods. These risks range from acute noise nuisances to fire and thermal runaway hazards. To protect and buffer residential areas from these risks, and to ensure historically disadvantaged communities don't bear the brunt moving forward, the County must adopt standards and guidelines for siting future BESS projects that considers their unique operating characteristics, potential health and safety risks, and appropriateness for locating them within close proximity to existing communities and other sensitive receptors.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT STATEMENT

While there are many benefits of BESS facilities that contribute to the County's sustainability goals, such as strengthening grid reliability and increasing energy efficiency, there are also several potential adverse consequences. These include fire and thermal runaway risks, managing the limited life cycle and degradation of batteries over time, and extraction of rare earth minerals that can have devastating environmental and societal consequences (unethical mining practices, etc.). The key here is striking a balance between the pros and cons of these facilities. Adopting rules for how we process and locate BESS projects in the unincorporated areas is a necessary first step.

FISCAL IMPACT

Funds for this request are included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-25 Operational Plan in Planning & Development Services (\$1.0 million) and San Diego County Fire (\$0.25 million). If approved, this request will result in costs and revenue of approximately \$1.25 million to establish development standards for siting battery energy storage system (BESS) projects, depending on the complexity of the environmental review required. The funding source is one-time General-Purpose Revenue. There will be no change in net General Fund cost and no additional staff years.

BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT N/A

ADVISORY BOARD STATEMENT N/A

BACKGROUND

Over the past few years, we have seen a growing increase in both proposed and approved/constructed BESS projects in the unincorporated areas. Since 2018 the County has approved three of them, ranging in size from 40 megawatts (MW) to 250 MW. Some of these have been in commercial or industrial areas like East Otay Mesa in District 1, while others have

been located near residential areas such as in Fallbrook and Valley Center in District 5. Beyond those that have already been approved, there are twelve active applications currently under review with PDS in various stages of the process. What's more, utility companies such as San Diego Gas & Electric (SDGE) are building their own BESS facilities in the unincorporated areas, while often being able to circumvent the local permitting process. Now is the time to establish specific and transparent guidelines, and effectively telegraph the County's stance on permissible locations and intended standards for new BESS projects.

Given the County's reliance on intermittent sources of energy going forward, demand for BESS facilities will almost certainly continue to grow in the coming decades. For this reason, it's imperative the County adopt specific development standards while it's still relatively "early" enough to have any meaningful impact. Due to the public health and safety concerns, having appropriate standards in place will ensure new BESS facilities are designed, located, and constructed with safety as the top priority. Moreover, since BESS facilities are going to be a critical component in meeting future electricity demand, building and gaining the public's trust and acceptance of them appears to be a necessary requirement. To this end, standards would establish clear rules and definitions that will enable the County to gather more meaningful community input, provide better transparency for the public during the review process, and address specific safety and other environmental concerns such as fire risk, air quality, noise, and visual impacts.

Given the unique operating characteristics of BESS facilities, their inherent safety concerns, and a growing public awareness of their impacts, the County must adopt specific development standards for guiding our review process of new and future BESS project applications. In this spirit, today's action directs the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to establish development standards for siting battery energy storage system (BESS) projects in the unincorporated areas, and also orders a temporary pause on any new application submittals until standards have been developed and adopted.

LINKAGE TO THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO STRATEGIC PLAN

Today's proposed actions support the Sustainability: Climate; Equity: Health; and Community: Engagement, Safety, and Quality of Life Strategic Initiatives in the County of San Diego's 2024-2029 Strategic Plan.

Respectfully submitted,
JIM DESMOND
Supervisor, Fifth District"

https://bosagenda.sandiegocounty.gov/cobservice/cosd/cob/content?id=0901127e810e1fdb&fbclid=IwZXh0bgNhZW0CMTAAR2ZOnmMw1b1Ty-4fs9c7EHP7WRPoKI_WvJTZMyvIJODpiOHRXU1e1asns0_aem_beNGk_uo29rVM077PSpLYQ

Please note, he only mentioned one of the Valley Center BESS fires- not both...

We need to get laws, ordinances, and standards in place that protect people, wildlife, and the environment and have clear guidance for siting BESS.

Thank you,

James

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents
1. Introduction
2. Objectives
3. Methodology
4. Results
5. Discussion
6. Conclusion

Table of Contents

Table of Contents
1. Introduction
2. Objectives
3. Methodology
4. Results
5. Discussion
6. Conclusion

Table 1. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 2. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 3. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 4. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 5. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 6. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 7. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 8. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

Table 9. Sample Power Levels for the Modified Individual System of Decision

Table with 4 columns: Sample Size, Power Level, etc.

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Goldeneye battery storage system
Date: Thursday, August 8, 2024 2:17:58 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Jon Fleurichamp <jonfleur@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 8, 2024 1:43 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Goldeneye battery storage system

External Email

I am the property owner just south of the project along Hanson Creek. My only concern with the project is the stormwater runoff. I've lived on this property for 43 years and I have seen the Hanson Creek run at maximum a few times. My main concern is the culvert at Hohen Road, it is the choke point that runs at 100% at least 12 times a year, i've looked at the projects flood study. It talks about how the state straightening a creek between Highway 20 and Minkler it also talks about the covert at Minkler Road, which has been replaced with a bridge does not address downstream from the project again which is a choke point. be an idea for State to look at putting a bridge to replacing the culvert just my two cents worth I just don't want my house to get flooded thank you.

Jon Fleurichamp
Sent from my iPhone

From: [jon fleur](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: Goldeneye battery storage system
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 7:18:25 PM

External Email

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: jon fleur <jonfleur@yahoo.com>
To: "comment@efsec.wa.gov" <comment@efsec.wa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 at 07:04:06 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: Goldeneye battery storage system

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jon Fleurichamp <jonfleur@yahoo.com>
To: "efsec@efsec.wa.gov" <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 8, 2024 at 01:43:29 PM PDT
Subject: Goldeneye battery storage system

I am the property owner just south of the project along Hanson Creek. My only concern with the project is the stormwater runoff. I've lived on this property for 43 years and I have seen the Hanson Creek run at maximum a few times. My main concern is the culvert at Hohen Road, it is the choke point that

runs at 100% at least 12 times a year, i've looked at the projects flood study. It talks about how the state straightening a creek between Highway 20 and Minkler it also talks about the covert at Minkler Road, which has been replaced with a bridge does not address downstream from the project again which is a choke point. be an idea for State to look at putting a bridge to replacing the culvert just my two cents worth I just don't want my house to get flooded thank you.

Jon Fleurichamp

Sent from my iPhone

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: No to Sedro
Date: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 8:52:42 AM

From: Aprill Graham <aprill.graham@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 9:09 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: No to Sedro

External Email

No BESS in Sedro Woolley. Please and thank you. Homeowner, taxpayer, healthcare professional with 4 degrees, no!

Thanks

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to proposed Skagit County Battery Storage Facility, 2508 Minkler Rd., Sedro Woolley, WA
Date: Monday, August 12, 2024 8:28:07 AM

From: Ellen Bynum <skye@cnw.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2024 12:10 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Cc: Commissioner Ron Wesen, BOCC <ronw@co.skagit.wa.us>; Commissioner Peter Browning <pbrowning@co.skagit.wa.us>; Commissioner Lisa Janicki, BOCC <ljanicki@co.skagit.wa.us>; Mayor Julia Johnson <swmayor@ci.sedro-woolley.wa.us>; Sedro Woolley City Council <CityCouncil@sedro-woolley.wa.gov>
Subject: Opposition to proposed Skagit County Battery Storage Facility, 2508 Minkler Rd., Sedro Woolley, WA

External Email

Friends of Skagit County opposes the proposed battery storage facility at 25080 Minkler Road, Sedro Woolley, WA by Goldfinch Energy Storage.

The WA State Growth Management Act requires Skagit County to identify and conserve farmland zoned Agricultural - Natural Resource Lands (Ag-NRL) solely for food and fiber production in perpetuity.

Skagit County Comprehensive Plan, countywide policies and codes all uphold and enforce the requirements of the GMA. Conversion of Ag-NRL to any other uses, other than soil-dependent activities as accessory uses, is prohibited.

We ask that you fully deny the siting of this project in compliance with state and local laws that protect farmland solely for future food and fiber production.

Sincerely,
Ellen Bynum

Ellen Bynum, Executive Director
Friends of Skagit County
PO Box 2632 (mailing)
419 S. Main St., #207
Mount Vernon, WA 98273-2632
360-419-0988; friends@fidalgo.net
www.friendsofskogitcounty.org
"A valley needs FRIENDS"

Since 1994 - Common Goals - Common Ground - Common Good
DONATE NOW at Network for Good.

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Lithium Battery Storage
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 7:24:20 AM

From: Tarrence Molendyk <tjmolendyk@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2024 7:25 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Proposed Lithium Battery Storage

External Email

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing of my concerns as a Skagit County and Sedro-Woolley concerned citizen of a proposed Lithium battery storage facility. As a veteran who served in Iraq exposed to open burn pits, I see this as a catastrophic decision that will impact people, ecosystems, and land. I have witnessed first hand the dangers of the toxic smoke and suffer from its effects. Where this proposed storage facility is going to be is dangerous not only for Sedro-Woolley but also for the kids that attend schools. You do not and will not have any safe measures for when disaster strikes. Many of my fellow soldiers have died from health issues due to Lithium batteries being burned illegally. As for the ecosystem the leakage from the batteries will poison our drinking water and destroy the wetlands displacing many wildlife. The land will not be able to be inhabited because of the toxicity of the batteries. These batteries are dangerous and should be disposed of in other ways not stored until they get too hot or start burning which then becomes an even worse ecological disaster. People breathing this toxic smoke would die from cancers and lung diseases. Our children would be exposed to this and will have long lasting effects from this. I respectfully ask that you reconsider this and respectfully ask that our Governor will rescind his position in favor of this so called Lithium battery storage facility.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this message.

Sincerely,

Tarrence J Molendyk

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Say NO to the proposed energy storage facility in Skagit County
Date: Monday, August 12, 2024 9:43:59 AM

From: Stephen Aghjayan <saseacom@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2024 9:07 AM
To: Aghjayan Stephen <saseacom@mac.com>
Subject: Say NO to the proposed energy storage facility in Skagit County

External Email

I support an energy storage facility being built in Skagit County.

That being said it should NOT be built on farmland.

The Skagit County Code **prohibits conversion of Ag-NRL lands to ANY uses other than those related to soil-based activities**. Additionally, this project does not fit the County's criteria for siting a farm related accessory use.

https://www.goskagit.com/news/local_news/battery-energy-storage-facility-proposed-in-skagit-county/article_48314900-54de-11ef-97dd-7b2e77486ad4.html

Stephen Aghjayan
7344 Skagit View Drive
Concrete, WA 98237
360 202-3066
saseacom@mac.com

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Sedro Woolley Lithium Batteries Storage facility
Date: Thursday, August 15, 2024 11:34:17 AM

From: Earl Stanley <gratefulness93@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2024 9:20 AM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Sedro Woolley Lithium Batteries Storage facility

External Email

To Whom It Concerns:

It occurs to me that this matter "concerns" or affects MANY more people and generations to come than will ever read this message.

Why? Why put this facility right in the middle of a wetland, supposedly protected, that is fragile and floods regularly. An accident - which will surely happen; accidents always happen - will cause destruction all the way to Puget Sound. Destruction of some of the most fertile land in the country. WE fought off a nuclear reactor in the 70's. And we'll fight this. The pristine nature of Skagit Valley is why we live here. This is a threat, plain and simple. And being sneaky about avoiding local due process for a direct deal through the Governor's office (This one, or the next one?) only indicates that you all know good and well what you are trying to do, here. It doesn't even pass the smell test. Our infrastructure will not support this monstrosity. You are trying to jam a square peg into a round hole.

Why? Why not put your operation somewhere that is already damaged from failed promises of toxic enterprises such as this? Like Hanford, Gulf of Mexico/BP, Bhopal, Three Mile Island, Valdez, or wherever. That list of domestic environmental disasters is long enough. Do not bring your operation here! Not HERE, please!

Sincerely,

Tim Maloy
E Gateway Heights Loop
Sedro Woolley, WA 98284

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Skagit BESS Goldeneye
Date: Monday, August 5, 2024 3:11:17 PM

From: Nancy jorauch <sawdustnancy@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 5, 2024 1:56 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Skagit BESS Goldeneye

External Email

I'm wondering how the seasonal flooding, that exists for the proposed site on Minkler Road, will be handled. Especially curious if the water will be dealt with on-site, as opposed to flowing it to an adjacent property.

See you on Aug 13 meeting.

Thank you,
Nancy Jo Rauch
521 Ball St
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Statement Against the Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project
Date: Thursday, August 8, 2024 8:51:31 PM

From: N F <nfields1225@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 8, 2024 8:51:07 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Statement Against the Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project

External Email

Statement Against the Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System Project

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed Goldeneye Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Project in Skagit County. While the advancement of renewable energy is crucial, this specific project raises significant environmental, safety, and land use concerns that should not be overlooked.

First, the environmental impact of a large-scale battery storage facility in an unincorporated area of Skagit County is worrisome. The site chosen for this project is near sensitive ecosystems that could be adversely affected by the construction and operation of the facility. There is a potential risk of chemical leaks from the batteries, which could contaminate local soil and water sources. The proximity of this project to farmland and residential areas increases the likelihood of long-term environmental degradation, threatening both the local agricultural economy and the health of nearby residents.

Second, safety concerns regarding battery energy storage systems cannot be ignored. Despite advances in technology, the risk of fire or explosion in large-scale battery facilities remains a serious issue. The potential for such incidents poses a significant threat to the surrounding community, particularly in rural areas where emergency response times may be longer. Implementing this project without thoroughly addressing these safety concerns could lead to devastating consequences for both people and property.

Finally, the proposed site for this project does not align with current land use plans and zoning ordinances. Skagit County has a strong tradition of preserving its natural landscapes and agricultural heritage, which this project threatens to undermine. Allowing a large industrial facility in an area not designated for such use sets a dangerous precedent, potentially opening the door to further industrial encroachment in rural and agricultural zones.

For these reasons, I urge the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to carefully reconsider the Goldeneye BESS Project and explore alternative locations or approaches that would better align with the environmental, safety, and land use priorities of Skagit County. The potential risks of this project far outweigh the benefits, and it is imperative that we prioritize the well-being of our community and environment.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Dr. Nicole Fields
Sedro-Woolley Resident

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Stop BESS in Skagit county.
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 1:30:39 PM
Attachments: [STOP BESS.pdf](#)

From: Shawna Turcott <shawna@shelterpm.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 12:55 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Cc: Tony Branson <Tony@olsenlawfirm.com>; Mike Simonitch <mike@shelterpm.com>
Subject: Stop BESS in Skagit county.

External Email

Stop BESS in Skagit county. Save our county the Judy reservoir and the Skagit river from this potential disaster.

I manage Van Fleets MHP in SedroWoolley we have 75 families in our senior park. What about our septic systems and drain fields if they have to use 100's of thousands of gallons of water to put a battery fire out. I can not imagine the noise we will here at our park. This location is about a block away from the park .

Kind regards

Shawna Turcott

24919 Hoehn Rd Unit 35

Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Van Fleets Mobile Home Park 55+ Community, Manager

Please help STOP this BESS from endangering us, our families, our homes, and Sedro Woolley!



Industrial lithium Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facility is being located east of Downtown and on Hansen Creek.

This facility will house 10-acres full of 100s of containers full of dangerous lithium batteries (with loud AC units) and will try to keep them from overheating and spontaneously combusting & releasing deadly chemicals and gasses.

There is no known method of extinguishing Lithium battery fires- so when there is a fire, it can't be extinguished and the millions of lithium batteries could burn for weeks requiring evacuations for everyone within 2 miles and shelter-in-place orders for everyone within 5 miles until the fire extinguishes itself.

The toxins/gasses release by the Lithium battery fires are so dangerous that firefighters in HAZMAT gear wait for the gasses to thin out (get blown away by the wind) before getting close to the fire- here are a few of the gasses/toxins released during a lithium battery fire: **Hydrogen cyanide (HCN), Ammonia (NH₃), Chlorine (Cl₂), Hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and Hydrogen Fluoride (HF) aka hydrofluoric acid when mixed with water.**

When there is a fire, the gasses/smoke can kill everyone if not evacuated in less than 3 minutes of exposure to the deadly gasses/smoke.

Firefighters will spray up to 20 Millions gallons of water (as seen in the recent Otay Mesa, CA BESS fire) on nearby containers to attempt to keep them cool in the hopes to prevent them from spontaneously combusting- but water can NOT extinguish a Lithium battery fire and will only become contaminated and run off site..

Nothing can prevent nor extinguish Lithium Battery fires- so no Fire or Safety Codes can help.

They want to locate this massive industrial battery energy storage facility next to Hansen Creek on Minkler RD and close enough to downtown Sedro Woolley to force evacuations for all schools, homes, and businesses for **up to two weeks** when there is a fire..

This proposed industrial facility is called the "GoldenEye" BESS and it is bypassing local and county permitting requirements by seeking approval at the state level (going through the EFSEC- where Jay Inslee has exclusive approval powers and is being built by Tenaska- a Nebraska based oil, gas, and energy company.

If you want more info about risks/dangers/impact on your homes' value, there is a lot of data at another local group's FB group page "Stop the proposed Covington Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)"

What can you do to help?

Tenaska is giving their sales pitch to the EFSEC in Sedro Woolley TOMORROW **Tuesday (August 13th) at 5pm** You can show up in person, online, call in, AND please also email to voice your concerns-and to speak, please register before 5:00 pm on August 13, 2024.:

Please join in Person: Sedro-Woolley Community Center 703 Pacific St Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

Please join by Telephone: +1 (564)-999-2000. Conference ID: 507869111#

Please also email your concerns to: efsec@efsec.wa.gov

From: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: FW: Tenaska Request for a BESS in Skagit County
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 7:24:37 AM

From: kmweise@comcast.net <kmweise@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2024 7:44 PM
To: EFSEC (EFSEC) <efsec@efsec.wa.gov>
Subject: Tenaska Request for a BESS in Skagit County

External Email

Please do significant research regarding the addition of a BESS unit in Skagit County. We continue to push back in Covington and here is why:

Tenaska came to speak at the Covington City council meeting to inform of us of their proposal. Since that meeting we have found:

They lied about Lithium Iron Phosphate (LFP) batteries being safe- when, in fact, while only having a 100 degree higher ignition temperature- LFP actually releases a more deadly cocktail of smoke/gas and has proven to be the battery type involved in about 75% of recent BESS fires..

-They lied about sound levels- just like with the Sound Study provided for the Sedro Woolley BESS, they had the engineers run their sound study with the AC and other components operating at 40% capacity- when in Fact, the worst case daily operating levels will be in the 80%-100% capacity and will be exponentially louder (average sound levels for BEES are 96db to 106db) and they only provided the sound levels created by a single BESS container- not all the containers sound levels as a whole- as other BESS sound studies have shown here: <https://www.facebook.com/.../permalink/3479047982403050/>

-They lied about the BESS benefitting us locally- but said they would be selling the power out of state to "wherever the demand is highest" even if we were "dark" and out electricity was out. They should have to sign a contract saying NO power will be exported out of WA state- and if that isn't acceptable, then they should be charged a gross receipts tax (at a 80% or higher tax rate) for every kilowatt exported out of WA State- as exporting power for their private company's profits doesn't benefit WA state and especially Sedro Woolley....

-They lied and said they were building this to help WA state and PSE hit the State's CETA energy storage goals- but will be exporting the power other states- leaving thie batteries empty or depleted if/when we need the power. They will be charging and discharging (selling the power) the batteries as fast as they can running to make as much profit as possible- FYI, other state utilities have paid BESS owners as much as \$5,000 per kilowatt and this BESS will hold 800,000 Kilowatts in a single 4-hour charge (the equivalent of 200k homes' electrical usage) and could make \$4,000,000,000 (\$4 BILLION with one charge if sold at the highest recent prices)

-They lied about the tax revenues- The only taxes that will be seen are sales tax by construction

workers buying lunch if they don't bring their own lunches.

-They lied about jobs, the jobs will all last a couple months as the whole facility is plug and play after the gravel and concrete pads are completed with wiring. There is no long term benefit- only risks....

They lied about the risks- they minimize the risk for fire and events. They don't provide an evacuation plan. They don't even know what tactics will be used when there is a fire- but there will be a QR code for firefighters to read!

They didn't mention defensive fire-spray water run-off containment as there could be up to 20 million gallons of defensive water spray run-off

They didn't mention till the end of the Covington City Council presentation that they will try to sell the BESS to wipe their hands clean of any future risks. Nor did they mention their incident plan if they are still the owner- which is have GoldFinch Enrgy LLC FILE BANKRUPTCY and leave Sedro Woolley and Skagit holding the cleanup bill...

Please do not allow this facility to move forward. The cost to the citizens of Skagit County, the land and animals in the area is just not worth it.

Thank you,

Kristen Weise

From: [Nora Kammer](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Cc: [Brenda Clifton](#); atrain@swinomish.nsn.us; [Lily Eriksen](#); [Arianna Lapke](#); [Bridget Moran](#); [Scott Morris](#)
Subject: Goldeneye BESS - comments from SRSC
Date: Thursday, July 18, 2024 9:54:35 AM

External Email

To whom it may concern:

I submit these comments from the Skagit River System Cooperative (SRSC), a tribal consortium of the Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe and the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, on behalf of our two member tribes. These comments are in relation the Goldeneye BESS application submitted to EFSEC, proposing a standalone battery energy storage system sited near Sedro Woolley, Washington adjacent to Hansen Creek.

The project is sited adjacent to Hansen Creek, an important salmon stream and tributary to the middle Skagit River. SRSC has engaged in nearly 20 years of habitat restoration activities just upstream from the project site. Significant acreages along the stream have been acquired by our member tribe (Swinomish) and restored for the benefit of salmonids and watershed processes. Along with numerous watershed partners, such as Puget Sound Energy, Skagit County, Upper Skagit Indian Tribe, and Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group, the riparian areas along Hansen Creek are on a markedly upward trajectory for habitat values, while also significantly reduced drainage and flooding issues for neighboring properties. We take a keen interest in activities affecting Hansen Creek.

For this reason, at the behest of our member tribe (Swinomish), SRSC met virtually with the project team supporting the Tenaska/Goldeneye BESS project to discuss potential impacts to the stream. On June 26, myself as well as SRSC's botanist Brenda Clifton met virtually with a Tenaska team. We discussed the following topics:

1. The team indicated Tenaska's commitment to preserve a 200 foot buffer on Hansen Creek, including some infrastructure demolition and replanting and proposed to restore areas within the buffer. We discussed the weeds and blackberry along the stream channel.
2. We discussed the proposed horizontal direction drilling of utilities proposed for beneath Hansen Creek. I requested that the HDD be below the scour depth of Hansen Creek, so that there would be no eventual conflict with stream degradation endangering the buried utilities in such a way as to require eventual streambed armoring, which has negative impacts for salmonids. Tenaska agreed that this was already a priority, that the Geotech would provide a scour depth recommendation, and they expected a 'deep bore'. If implemented, this approach would satisfy this concern.

3. We also took the opportunity to express concern about the siting within the 100-year floodplain of the Skagit River and noted the antiquated (1980) flood maps in place in the Skagit which do not account for present day nor climate change conditions. The areas upstream of Sedro Woolley were heavily impacted by floodwaters in 2021 to the surprise of even longtime property owners, and it seems that watershed conditions, downstream development, and/or climate change may be aggravating flood conditions in the nearby reach of the Skagit River, with potential resulting impacts to flooding at the project site. I encouraged elevating the BESS cabinets above the 500-year floodplain to mitigate flooding impacts and hazards (flooding, fire, pollution) associated with flooded BESS facilities. There was no commitment to this, but the team acknowledged our concern.
4. Direct impacts to onsite wetlands would be mitigated at an off-site mitigation bank.

At the end of our discussion, the team indicated that they would be submitting permits with EFSEC promptly, which did occur the following day on 6/27.

This was a very encouraging conversation with project representatives, where our primary concern (impacts to Hansen Creek and its riparian buffer), seemed to be recognized with a response to not only avoid the 200-foot buffer area, but improve the buffer area.

Unfortunately, documentation for the project was submitted to EFSEC and uploaded for review did not fully represent the enhancement of the buffer that we had discussed. We reviewed Attachment C – Conceptual Planting Plan, but was disappointed to see the limited planting that was indicated within the Hansen Creek buffer area. After discussing the extensive blackberries lining the stream and the poor existing riparian conditions of the buffer area on 6/26, Brenda and I had both perceived buffer enhancement, not only buffer avoidance (other than the demolition areas of existing buildings/driveways within the buffer). We also made reply comments regarding species selection (increase conifer component).

In response to raising these concerns, Tenaska acknowledged the timing of EFSEC submittal had not yet allowed incorporating the planting elements discussed on 6/26, principally that buffer enhancement plan will include controlling non-native weeds and vegetation, that Tenaska will direct the landscape architect to include some conifers in the riparian area, and that Tenaska would like SRSC's input on that plan once it has been drafted. SRSC looks forward to reviewing a revised Attachment C for this project and discussing with the applicant.

We look forward to our concerns being addressed and incorporated into the project submittals filed with EFSEC.

Please get in touch if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Nora Kammer

Habitat Protection Program Director

Skagit River System Cooperative
PO Box 368, La Conner, WA 98257
Phone: 360.391.8472
Fax: 360.466.4047

SRSC's offices are open Monday through Thursday.

From: [Jon Fleurichamp](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: Sedro Woolley BESS
Date: Thursday, August 15, 2024 7:11:11 PM

External Email

good afternoon my name is John Fleurichamp. I live on a parcel land just south of the proposed battery energy storage along Hanson Creek.

I was looking online noticing that battery energy storage sites. Do have a reputation of catching on fire, May not be big ones but still require a lot of water to keep it under control. Where is the water going to go, that has toxic chemicals and it is it gonna get eventually flushed out to Hanson Creek

and into the Skagit river which is a wild and scenic river Department needs to get on the ball on this one

From: [John Sternlicht](#)
To: [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Subject: EFSEC Docket No. 240004
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2024 9:55:29 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[EFSEC Goldeneye 08122024.docx](#)

External Email

To whom it may concern:

Please include the attached letter of support in the package for the above-referenced matter.

Thank you.

Feel free to contact me directly with any questions.

Respectfully yours,

John B. Sternlicht, JD, CEc.D

CEO

Economic Development Alliance of Skagit County

1932 E. College Way, Suite B

PO Box 40

Mount Vernon, WA 98273

Office: 360.336.6114 x105

www.skagit.org

email: john@skagit.org

he/him

***EDASC carries out business attraction, retention and expansion,
and collaborative engagement to achieve a prosperous, sustainable
and equitable community while maintaining Skagit County's natural
beauty and quality of life.***



[Facebook](#)

<https://www.linkedin.com/company/economic-development-alliance-of-skagit-county>

[Sign Up for the EDASC Newsletter \(skagit.org\)](#)



August 12, 2024

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
621 Woodland Square Loop SE
PO BOX 43172
Olympia, WA 98503-3172

RE: Goldeneye BESS

Dear Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council:

I am writing to express our strong support for the Goldeneye Energy Storage project. This proposed battery energy storage system (BESS) presents a significant opportunity for energy resiliency, economic growth and environmental sustainability in Skagit County.

This project will bolster the local grid as we transition to intermittent renewable sources of power and work to protect our community from service interruptions caused by extreme weather events and increases in electrical demand spurred by electric vehicles, population growth, and other factors. Skagit County currently faces a power shortfall that hampers its ability to attract new businesses and foster growth. The Goldeneye project will serve as an anchor project within the region, attracting additional investment and development opportunities. The presence of a utility-scale BESS facility will ensure a stable power supply for households, businesses, and critical infrastructure, while sending a strong signal that Skagit County is a prime location for innovative projects, fostering economic activity and growth. The construction of the Goldeneye Energy Storage project will create new jobs for local union workers, ranging from skilled technical positions to various support roles. This influx of jobs, even though temporary, will stimulate the local economy and increase local spending by keeping workers and the wages they earn close to home. Once operational, the project will generate a new long-term source of tax revenue that can be used to spur investment and support public services for our residents.

We have met many times with the developer behind the project and have confidence in their approach to safety and sustainable development. They use the highest standards and work with both independent experts and local first responder agencies on the design of the project and all necessary safety plans and processes. The project is sited responsibly and is well-suited to coexist in Skagit County's landscape, with minimal environmental and social impact. BESS facilities are operationally quiet, do not generate air emissions or harmful radiation, and require a small physical footprint. The project will incorporate feedback from local environmental conservation groups to create appropriate fencing and landscaping that blend with the local community environment, ensuring it integrates seamlessly into the surrounding area.

Given these significant benefits and the robust EFSEC review process, we urge your favorable support of Goldfinch Energy Storage's Application for Site Certification (ASC). This initiative

represents a valuable opportunity to promote sustainable development, enhance grid reliability, and stimulate economic growth in our region.

Thank you for your consideration. Please let me know if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Sternlicht". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

John B. Sternlicht, CEO

From: [Nora Kammer](#)
To: [EFSEC \(EFSEC\)](#); [EFSEC mi Comments](#)
Cc: atrainier@swinomish.nsn.us; michael@sauk-suiattle.com; [Lily Eriksen](#); "[LeahForbes](#)"; [Richard, Alexander \(DFW\)](#); [Brenda Clifton](#); [Bridget Moran](#); [Ahmed, Zia \(EFSEC\)](#)
Subject: Comments for Land Use Consistency Hearing for Docket # 240004
Date: Friday, August 9, 2024 10:53:28 AM
Attachments: [Letter_20240813_SRSC_CommentLetter_Land_Use_Consistency_Hearing.pdf](#)

External Email

I am unable to attend the Land Use Consistency Hearing for Docket # 240004 (Goldeneye Battery Storage) neither in person nor virtually on the evening of 8/13.

As I have indicated in an email earlier today to Andrea Grantham (EFSEC Administrative), since I will not be able to attend I wish to submit written comments from the Skagit River System Cooperative on behalf of our two member tribes, the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community and the Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe.

The Hearing notice is posted here:

[20240805_GoldeneyeBESS_InfoMtgLUHNotice.pdf \(wa.gov\)](#)

Since I cannot attend the meeting, I have attached a PDF document with my written comment. I have post-dated the letter to the date of the hearing next week. Please ensure that these are provided for the Land Use Consistency Hearing. I appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on this proposal. Please get in touch if you have any questions.

Nora Kammer

Habitat Protection Program Director

Skagit River System Cooperative

MAILING: PO Box 368, La Conner, WA 98257

PHYSICAL: 11426 Moorage Way, La Conner, WA 98257

Phone: 360.391.8472

Fax: 360.466.4047

SRSC's offices are open Monday through Thursday.



Skagit River System Cooperative

11426 Moorage Way • P.O. Box 368 La Conner, WA 98257-0368
Phone: 360-466-7228 • Fax: 360-466-4047 •
www.skagitcoop.org

August 13, 2024

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
PO Box 43172
621 Woodland Square Loop
Olympia, A 98504-3172

Sent electronically via email to: efsec@efsec.wa.gov

RE: EFSEC Docket No. 240004, Tribal Comments for Land Use Consistency Hearing

To whom it may concern,

The Skagit River System Cooperative (“SRSC”) are submitting these comments to the Land Use Consistency Hearing Board for EFSEC Docket No. 340004 to develop a battery bank facility adjacent to Hansen Creek, a tributary to the Skagit River, in Sedro Woolley. In summary, the SRSC raises concerns regarding to the application as submitted because of the following reasons:

- 1) We understood in pre-application meeting between SRSC and our member tribes and the applicant that the development would not only avoid working within the riparian areas of Hansen Creek, but would also enhance them. This is not reflected in the application’s submittal to EFSEC (Conceptual Planting Plan - Attachment C).

We understand from both verbal and email correspondence that Goldeneye does, indeed, intend to both control non-native noxious vegetation in the riparian areas of Hansen Creek, and to install and maintain native vegetation in the riparian areas within 200 feet of the stream. We request that the officially submitted documents to EFSEC to reflect this commitment in the form of a revised Planting Plan. We expect that if that request were satisfied, that our shared vision for the riparian corridor would be reflected and our concerns about impacts to fish and fish habitat for the project as proposed would be satisfactorily addressed.

Background and setting for our objections and concerns

SRSC is a tribal consortium between the Swinomish and the Sauk-Suiattle Tribes that provides technical and scientific fisheries research, restoration and environmental services for the Tribes throughout the Skagit River watershed. On behalf of these two sovereign nations, SRSC works to actively improve fisheries recovery and restoration within the Skagit watershed.

The Swinomish Indian Tribal Community and Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribes are federally recognized Indian tribe and political successor in interest to certain tribes and bands that signed the 1855 Treaty of Point Elliott. These two tribes are situated in the Skagit River watershed, the largest river system draining to Puget Sound and the only river in the Lower 48 states that still has all species of wild Pacific salmon and steelhead spawning in its waters.

These sovereign tribes are guardians of the Skagit and Samish River basins and surrounding coastal areas. They are also co-managers of Washington fisheries along with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and have worked with WDFW and NOAA Fisheries for many years in this capacity to ensure protection and restoration of fishery resources in the Skagit and Samish basins. SRSC co-authored the federally-approved 2005 Skagit Chinook Recovery Plan (“Recovery Plan”) for the Endangered Species Act (ESA) “threatened” listing of Skagit Chinook populations with WDFW. Since the Recovery Plan’s adoption by NMFS, it has served as a blueprint for recovering Skagit Chinook salmon. The Tribes and SRSC have worked extensively with other tribal governments, local governments, state and federal agencies, and local stakeholders on a variety of salmon recovery, habitat protection, habitat restoration, and scientific research projects over the past three decades to protect, study, and actively restore the habitats needed to recover and sustain Skagit River salmon and steelhead.

Hansen Creek is a significant tributary to the Skagit River with extensive salmonid usage, including coho, chum, pink, Chinook (ESA-protected), and a spawning population of steelhead (ESA-protected). A number of entities have invested decades of work improving habitat and drainage conditions in reaches upstream from the project site. SRSC has implemented numerous habitat projects on parcels owned by the Swinomish Tribe. The Swinomish Tribe, Puget Sound Energy, and Skagit County Parks Department have acquired hundreds of acres of Hansen Creek and its floodplain in order to support a watershed level restoration effort. The Upper Skagit Indian Tribe has implemented numerous projects on reaches of Hansen Creek, and their tribal reservation is located along this important tributary stream.

As such, we take a keen interest in both protecting and restoring habitat conditions in and adjacent to Hansen Creek that have the potential to affect fish and fish habitat. We have met with Goldeneye Energy to communicate these interests.

Land Use Consistency Review is Inaccurate Regarding SMP Jurisdiction over Project

Several aspects of Section 4.6 are wrong. This stream reach is a Type S shoreline of the state, such that the Shoreline Management Act and the locally adopted Skagit Shoreline Master Program have jurisdiction over land uses within 200 feet of the stream bank.

RCW 90.58.030(2)(d) defines Shorelands to mean

...those lands extending landward for two hundred feet in all directions as measured on a horizontal plane from the ordinary high water mark; floodways and contiguous floodplain areas

landward two hundred feet from such floodways; and all wetlands and river deltas associated with the streams, lakes, and tidal waters which are subject to the provisions of this chapter; the same to be designated as to location by the department of ecology.

With this definition, activities that are within the plane of shorelands are subject to SMP jurisdiction.

Horizontal Direction Drilling within Shorelands and Shoreline

Shoreline jurisdiction extends to sub-surface developments, and Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) beneath Hansen Creek is within shoreline jurisdiction.

As we discussed with Goldeneye Energy, we understand that the HDD will be beneath (lower in elevation than) the scour depth of Hansen Creek, as determined by the applicant's geotechnical engineer. This is a concern because if the stream degrades over time and the stream bed approaches the bored transmission line, the owner will most certainly seek authorization to armor the stream bed with rock or other hard armor, with unfortunate impacts to fish and fish habitat. In order to avoid this potential outcome, utilities should be installed beneath the scour depth of the stream. Goldeneye has indicated that this will occur.

We are generally satisfied with the proposal for the HDD to be drilled beneath scour depth, however, there are construction risks with HDD that can result in direct and indirect impacts to fish and fish habitat that should be considered. If the HDD boring encounters unexpected rocky substrates, drilling can be obstructed. On occasion, if proceeding further with the drilling is not possible, the construction will revert to an open trench cut in order to proceed and accomplish the proposed design. This occurred about 10-15 years ago in a drilling effort beneath the Nooksack River, to the great alarm of tribal fish biologists.

Additionally, there is the unanticipated event of a 'frac-out' during HDD that can have impacts to fish and fish habitat. A 1998 report indicated that up to 13 out of 30 HDD activities resulted in mud releases¹. This is where drilling fluids are unintentionally returned to the surface during HDD. This work (even subsurface) would require a WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval, and should be conducted during the appropriate fish window in late summer in order to minimize any impacts to fish using the system. There are vibratory impacts to fish and invertebrates from the actions of drilling. HDD is generally the preferred approach to installing utilities beneath fish and wildlife areas and wetlands, but it is not without risks and concerns.

¹ Reid, S.M., and Anderson, P.G. 1998. HDD not the answer for all sensitive water crossings. Environmental effects of mud releases need further study to improve crossing method selection and best management practices. Pipeline and Gas Industry, July 1998.

Associated Wetlands are also in Shoreline Jurisdiction

Any wetlands associated with Type S Hansen Creek are also subject to SMP jurisdiction. I would suggest engagement with Washington Department of Ecology Shorelands staff to support determination of whether onsite wetlands area associated with Hansen Creek. It is important to note now and for the record, the identified wetland areas that are more than 200 feet from Hansen Creek may also be subject to the SMP regulations.

Skagit SMP for Utility Developments

The Skagit SMP requires that (SCC 7.18.1.B.4) utility developments should be located to avoid areas similar to that proposed (natural wetland, migratory corridor) unless it can be shown that non-shoreline alternatives are infeasible. Further, SCC 7.18.1.B.6 indicates electrical transmission cables should only be allowed to cross shoreline areas and water bodies only if it can be shown that non-shoreline alternatives are infeasible and that the proposed crossing site is consistent with this program. That would include fully mitigating any impacts. In the 'Design of Utilities' in Shoreline jurisdiction (SCC 7.18.1.C), item 1.c indicates that "Adequate buffer areas and/or setbacks should be designed and utilized for all utility development in shoreline areas." We believe that the commitment made by Goldeneye to manage weeds and install native vegetation within 200-feet of Hansen Creek satisfied this aspect of the SMP, but we would like to see the site plans and documentation updated to reflect this.

Summary and Conclusion

We are primarily concerned about the status of the riparian corridor along Hansen Creek that is squeezed between the substation and this proposed battery bank. We are comforted by the indication by the applicant that we have a shared vision for riparian improvements waterward of the development, but we would like to see this commitment clearly documented in their permitting materials. Please reach out if you have any questions about these concerns.

Thank you for the consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,



Nora Kammer, Habitat Protection Program Director
Skagit River System Cooperative

CC:

Michael Wolten, Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe

Amy Trainer, Swinomish Indian Tribal Community

Lily Eriksen, Strategies360

Leah Forbes, Skagit County Planning and Development Services

Alex Richardson, WDFW