

## Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

---

3/6/14

### Community Advisory Group Meeting #2

Wednesday, Feb. 12, 2014.

5:30 – 8:00 p.m.

Rainier Hotel and Conference Center, 1 South Grady Way, Renton, WA

### Community Advisory Group members in attendance

- Andy Swayne, Puget Sound Energy
- Barbara Sauerbrey, Woodridge Community Association (residential association alternate)
- Bart Phillips, One Redmond
- Bill Taylor, Liberty Ridge Homeowners Association (residential association alternate)
- Brian Buck, Lake Washington School District
- Darius Richards, Kennydale Neighborhood Association
- David St. John, King County
- David Chicks, Redmond Neighborhoods
- Debra Grant, Hopelink
- David Hoffman, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties
- Deirdre Johnson, South Rose Hill Neighborhood Association
- Floyd Rogers, Mountains to Sound Greenway
- Gregg Zimmerman, City of Renton
- Kyle McLeod, Bellevue School District (alternate)
- Jules Dickerson, Lake Lanos Community Association (residential association alternate)
- Lindy Bruce, Sunset Community Association (residential association alternate)
- Lynn Wallace, Renton Chamber of Commerce
- Marcia Isenberger, Coal Creek Family YMCA
- Mark Rigos, City of Newcastle
- Nicholas Matz, City of Bellevue
- Norm Hansen, Bridle Trails Community Club
- Pete Sullivan, City of Redmond
- Rob Jammerman, City of Kirkland
- Robert Shay, Wilburton Community Association
- Sam Baxter, Overlake Hospital Medical Center
- Steve O'Donnell, Somerset Community Association
- Steve Hanson, Renton Technical College
- Sue Stronk, Olympus Neighborhood Association (alternate)

### Members absent

- David Edmonds, Olympus Neighborhood Association
- Jack McLeod, Bellevue School District
- Jon Erik Johnson, North Rose Hill Neighborhood Association (residential association alternate)

## Other Attendees

- Leann Kostek, Puget Sound Energy, Senior Project Manager
- Jens Nedrud, Puget Sound Energy, Deputy Project Manager
- Gretchen Aliabadi, Puget Sound Energy, Communications
- Lindsey Walimaki, Puget Sound Energy, Communications
- Ray Lane, Puget Sound Energy, Communications
- Nate Caminos, Puget Sound Energy, Government and Community Relations Manager
- Carol Jaeger, Transmission Planning
- Denise Steendahl, PSE, Playbook Keeper
- Mark Williamson, PRW Communications
- Tim Roby, PRW Communications
- Tom Gentile, Quanta Services
- Sarah Langton, Langton Spieth
- Andy Bury, Tetra Tech
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, Facilitator
- Dana Olson, EnviroIssues, Public Involvement
- Laura Treadway, EnviroIssues, Public Involvement
- Lauren Dennis, EnviroIssues, Notetaker

## Meeting Purpose and Overview

The second Community Advisory Group meeting for the Puget Sound Energy (PSE) Energize Eastside project convened in Renton on Feb. 12, 2014. The meeting included a presentation of technical information about the selection process of the potential route segments. The meeting agenda included:

- Review and approval of the advisory group Meeting #1 notes and conditional approval of the revised Charter
- Feedback from advisory group members on constituent concerns
- Response to information requests from Community Advisory Group Meeting #1
- An overview of project routing and a follow up conversation on route segments
- An overview of the route segment evaluation process

## Meeting Summary

### Welcome, introductions and safety moment

Facilitator Penny Mabie welcomed meeting attendees and led an introduction of the community advisory group members and alternates. She clarified the role of alternates and residential association alternates:

- Each Community Advisory Group member representing a residential organization may have an appointed residential association alternate that represents a different neighborhood within their city.
- The five residential association alternates on the advisory group are intended to help balance representation from neighborhoods along the route segments.
- To participate in the advisory group meeting, residential association alternates can either provide their concern or question to their primary member to share with the advisory group or they may ask their primary members to yield their seat and let the alternate sit in to ask their question or make a comment during Community Advisory Group meetings.

- If a primary member is not able to be present for an advisory group meeting, his or her residential association alternate would take their place at the table.
- Penny reminded advisory group members and alternates that they are expected to represent all residential interests, not only interests specific to their neighborhood.

Penny noted that Cody Olson was replaced by Andy Swayne as PSE representative on the advisory group. She also noted that Sue Stronk was sitting in for David Edmonds (Olympus Neighborhood Association) and that Kyle McLeod was sitting in for Jack McLeod (Bellevue School District). Penny then introduced the presenters: Leann Kostek, PSE Senior Project Manager; Jens Nedrud PSE Deputy Project Manager; and Andy Bury, Tetra Tech. Penny overviewed the agenda, highlighting the technical nature of the meeting's presentations. She also reviewed the ground rules for the meeting.

Gretchen Aliabadi, PSE Communications, provided the PSE safety moment about the importance of practicing putting on snow cables and chains ahead of needing them.

## **Community Advisory Group business**

### **Community Advisory Group Meeting #1 Summary**

Penny asked the advisory group if anyone had comments on the Community Advisory Group Meeting #1 Draft Summary. No comments were raised, and the summary draft was accepted as final.

### **Community Advisory Group Charter**

Penny walked through revisions to the Draft Charter made in response to comments from Meeting #1, including language on property owners, the role of residential association alternates, and the areas of design where PSE has flexibility. Advisory group members and alternates had the following comments and questions, which Penny answered.

- Q: Does the addition of "property owners" in the first section of the first page extend to sending out routine mailings to all affected residents within a certain distance to the lines? We are concerned that many residences didn't know about this meeting. We should be communicating via mail in addition to news releases and website announcements to reach the most people. Is there a way to work with staff to get mailings out?
- A: The project team has several modes of external communications. A postcard is being mailed to announce the sub-area committee meetings, locations and times.
- Q: The charter should include information about the benefits and disadvantages of this project, especially to property owners. This is related to what route you select.
- A: The purpose of the Charter is to broadly describe the purpose of the project and the advisory group. Later in the meeting, we will start the conversation about considerations for selecting a route and how to weigh them.
- Q: What is the selection process for sub-area committees?
- A: There is no selection process. As the Charter states, all advisory group members, alternates, and residential alternates are members of the Sub-Area Committees respective of their geographic locations. In addition, neighborhood associations proximate to a route segment that are not represented on the advisory group are invited to participate on the committee. Non-residential interest groups represented on the advisory group have the option to participate in any or all of the committees. Sub-Area Committee workshops are open to the public. In the first two workshops, members of the public will be sitting side-by-side with Sub-Area Committee members

to review segments and share concerns and local knowledge. The third event is a formal meeting of the Sub-Area Committee, but the public is still invited to attend and observe.

Q: In the fourth bullet of the Purpose section and the fifth bullet of the Community Advisory Group section, could you change “community values” to “community/property owner values”? [No objections were raised to this addition.]

A: **Action item:** Revise the Charter to reflect this change.

Q: It would help us better represent our communities if the communications summary we receive included PSE’s answers. This would be an addition to the “PSE staff will” section.

A: **Action item:** PSE will consider including PSE responses in the communications summary.

Q: Can these meetings be videotaped and archived? That would be very helpful. This would be an addition to the “PSE staff will” section.

A: **Action item:** PSE will report back on this proposed amendment.

Q: I would like to know the willingness of PSE to consider changing the order of the project milestones in order to provide more data to the advisory group. For example, conduct the environmental impact study on all segment options before making routing decisions, in order to better inform decisions. I propose to revise the “PSE staff will” section to include a bullet that reads: “Listen and take into consideration recommendations from the advisory group with regards to providing data and requests for analysis and research during the advisory group process timeline rather than after advisory group meetings finish.”

A: **Action item:** PSE will report back on this proposed amendment.

With the exception of the last outstanding requested revision, the advisory group approved all other changes as final.

### **Advisory Group Round Robin on constituent feedback**

Penny led a round robin session during which the advisory group shared the following feedback from their constituents:

- We’ve gotten emails from folks interested and concerned about the permitting process on the routes. In particular, Lakeshore homeowners want to better understand the requirements PSE is facing on the railroad corridor, including from the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process, and how segments L, H, and F relate to separate plans for that corridor. PSE has easements; will there be interplay with that corridor process and those alternative uses for those segments? We’ve also heard feedback about view impacts and proximity of lines to properties.
- People in my community are interested in what poles will look like and what the new poles will be made out of.
- People around Kennydale and the lakeshore are asking if PSE has a right-of-way. The former Burlington Northern right-of-way is now managed by King County Parks, but there is conflict between what King County Parks wants to do with that strip, what PSE has proposed to do, and the long term high speed commuter rail. We’re curious to know whether there are easements and what the nature of them is.
- I attended the Kennydale Community Association meeting and concerns are about environmental issues, view corridors and eagle nests along the Lake Lanes alignment on segment L. I’m concerned that not all communities in Renton are as aware of the project as they should be, and

there is more outreach that needs to be done. One legal/legislative question from last meeting has to do with undergrounding. What is the exact requirement/citation that PSE mentioned regarding the need for local communities to pay the cost differential if the line was forced to be undergrounded?

- There are existing homes impacted by each route. Some routes go directly through backyards. Has PSE done a study of property impacts and property value impacts? My community is interested in a more detailed study on this.
- We have transmission lines across our parking lots. This has an impact on students, on the aesthetics of our campus, etc. It's the first thing that people see on our campus. It's hard to measure, but a concern for us.
- We've heard quite a few comments on how the proposed route runs parallel a few feet over from the Seattle City Light "Godzilla towers." This means there will be a new electromagnetic (EMF) field, impacted aesthetics, and towers in both front and back yards of many of our residents.
- We've had questions about towers, asking for clarification on number of lines, voltage on lines, view corridors, neighborhood character and sensitivity. There is big confusion on exactly how many lines will be placed on a tower, and what additional lines could be added to those towers in the future, e.g. broadband cable, telephone, etc. Would there be a public process if PSE later wanted to add additional uses to the alignment? What will be the capacity of the line in terms of adding kV in the future? In terms of power voltage and proximity to towers, health and safety and keeping with neighborhood character are concerns for all of us. The mono towers have a very industrial look, not in keeping with our community.
- We have lattice towers from Seattle City Light to the west of our neighborhood. Has PSE exhausted all efforts to get power down that corridor?

Penny thanked the advisory group for their feedback and noted that PSE will share with the advisory group both unique and repeated concerns heard throughout the outreach process.

### **Response to information requested at last meeting**

Leann Kostek, PSE Senior Project Manager, presented more thorough answers to some questions that came up at Community Advisory Group Meeting #1:

Q: What is the energy split for plug load – how do we differentiate between energy used for heating and everything else you plug in (like appliances, computers, etc.)

A: For the Eastside, we estimate during the winter, approximately 70 percent heating vs. 30 percent lighting and plug load during peak demand. Overall, the split is about 50/50. It's difficult to explain how a change in this split would affect the system since it is designed for overall Kilowatt demand and no differentiation is made between heating and plug load. If the question is whether a change in fuel source would affect the demand, then we should note that natural gas is the current choice of heating for homes and high-rise buildings, and that is already keeping the electrical demand down.

Q: What percentage increase in capacity would the project bring in 2018?

A: With the Energize Eastside project, the increase in capacity would be 25 percent.

Q: What is the total population (customers and houses) that would benefit from this project?

A: The answer is that 113,508 customer meters would benefit from this project. Since there could be multiple people living at a house or apartment building with one meter, the population is slightly

higher than the number of meters – 2012 census data indicates 227,647 people would benefit from this project.

Q: What are PSE's points of flexibility in design?

A: Just a reminder, these kinds of decisions will be made during the design phase of the project, after the preferred route is chosen. The areas where there is flexibility in the design include:

- o Span Length - i.e. how far apart poles are. The range is 400 feet to 700 feet.
- o Pole Height – span length drives pole height. We need to maintain clearance from vegetation.
- o Pole Diameter – also driven by span length.
- o Pole Configuration
- o Pole Spotting/Placement – average length is 425 feet, but can be flexible depending on constraints in the field.
- o Pole Material/Finish – wood (brown) vs. steel (shiny or wood-like patina)

The extent to which each of these design attributes is flexible depends upon the potential route segment and the characteristics associated with it. This flexibility comes in during the design phase.

Q: Are there new technology alternatives that could solve the problem?

A: PSE looked into other “non-wire” solutions. Unfortunately there aren't any viable alternatives to transmission lines to distribute the amount of power that the Eastside needs.

Q: Can battery storage solve the problem?

A: We are working on two energy storage pilot projects in other locations, e.g. Bainbridge. One .5 megawatt system requires a battery the size of a shipping container. Translated to our project, we would need batteries roughly the size of 200 shipping containers located somewhere in Bellevue and would still need to install lines from the batteries. Additionally, this technology is currently not cost competitive with other solutions and is not proven to be reliable at this high of a megawatt scale.

Q: How does this project fit in with the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP)?

A: PSE files its IRP with the Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) every two years. The 2013 IRP was filed May 31, 2013. Essentially, the IRP is about how much generating power is needed for customers. The IRP process evaluates projected customer needs 20 years into the future and develops a plan to provide resources such as electric generation or natural gas supply. In those cases where generation is provided from a location remote from PSE's load centers, it may be necessary to build new transmission lines or develop agreements to use existing transmission lines owned by other utilities. From this standpoint, the IRP did mention the Energize Eastside project under the Puget Sound Area/North of Echo Lake/Northern Intertie Improvements. Typically transmission projects needed just for PSE customer demand service would not be mentioned in the IRP.

Leann noted that a few other questions asked during the last meeting would be answered later in the presentation, including:

- o Is the I-90 corridor an option?
- o Could existing Seattle City Light (SCL) or Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) lines provide the needed capacity or route for the project?
- o If existing/potential industrial users conserve more, will that help meet the need?

## Public comment

- I suggest the advisory group look into tradeoffs of an undergrounding system in comparison to an overhead system, considering both upfront, nonrecurring costs as opposed to the long-term repeating cost of maintaining such a system. In Somerset, we have an underground system that PSE has replaced and it is running excellently. I'd like to see this considered in the long-term.
- I want to reiterate comments from the last meeting. PSE should have engaged the community on buy-in for the routes that PSE has pre-selected. I have not seen anything to create buy-in for those pre-selected routes.
- Are there going to be poles or tower structures? Is PSE prepared to take on the additional cost of those towers, which were insisted upon in Renton and the Factoria area? Elsewhere, there are just structured towers, which are very ugly.
- Who has the final say on which route is picked – UTC, PSE, or King County? I recommend we have underground lines – they are much more beneficial to everybody.
- I would like PSE to conduct studies about projected property value losses for the different routes. There should be good statistical data. Give us numbers about property value impacts.
- Regarding the discussion about 200 batteries, do they have to be located all in one place or could they be dispersed around the area? How far apart could they be? Are they stackable?
- I talked to a lot of people in my neighborhood and undergrounding came up over and over. If poles are running through our neighborhood, we will fight very hard against that. Some neighbors already really do not like the existing lines. We would really love to put them underground. We're told it's expensive and that seems to shut that option down. But we could work cooperatively to keep the lines out of environmentally-sensitive places. I hope we can get creative.
- The major thing that makes some uncomfortable is that so much is presented in a non-factual way. I know that the project is new and studies are being done. But we would like some third party to provide studies about cost to the community, to properties. Give us numbers. This is what makes people question you and your motives.
- I would like to see more data too. The route segments would have an impact on a large number of households – I want to see data on that.
- Is there a possibility for both undergrounding and poles? Does all of it have to go underground, or can it go up and back down in certain areas?
- We're wondering if a copy of PSE's original easement is available so we can understand what rights were given.
- I hope the advisory group is hearing that most of us don't want large power lines in our community ruining views. I hope you look at options from PSE and think that there might be a third or fourth option not presented. The Seattle City Light (SCL) north-south corridor is less than a quarter mile from some of the proposed segments. PSE can't use that space because SCL won't let them. I wonder if political pull can help in this issue so that we don't have three lines running through communities and it doesn't destroy our quality of life.
- I went to the PSE light bulb fair, turned in my old light bulbs for new LEDs and purchased my own. I also bought new vinyl energy star-rated windows. I feel like I've paid my share to help PSE out. Who benefits from this project? Why do we need more power? As far as I'm concerned, we can stop developing. The people moving into new developments need to pay mitigation fees and cover the cost of new transmission lines.
- The existing steel poles that run through Factoria have at least one arm that will take an extra cable. I've seen towers with three arms and three cables. Could we add new cables to that extra arm?
- This group meets only six times throughout the year. When you cut off dialogue with us and the advisory group, limiting our time to speak, you are doing a disservice to public process.

After a short break, Penny reminded members of the public to submit comment cards or comments via the website or email address. All public comments are sent to the advisory group ahead each meeting.

## Project routing overview

Jens Nedrud, PSE Deputy Project Manager, reviewed the project need and presented on the technical details of how PSE arrived at the solution and selected the proposed route segments.

Jens explained that growth is straining the Eastside's existing transmission system and that conservation alone is not enough to meet the challenge. Upgrades will power the Eastside's growth into the future. He then noted that once PSE identified the problem, the next step was to determine how to meet the Eastside's growing energy needs. Jens walked through each step of the solution identification process:

1. **What are the potential approaches to meet the Eastside's electricity needs?** PSE's planners and engineers brainstormed a variety of approaches to solve the problem of transmission capacity deficiency in the Eastside which will develop in late 2017. Potential solutions were conservation, local generation (via solar panels, wind turbines and a power plant), and upgraded infrastructure (transformer-only addition, or transmission lines plus transformer. This analysis is found in the Eastside Solution Study.
2. **What approaches provide enough electricity to meet the Eastside's needs?**
  - o First, the team looked at reducing demand through conservation. This includes reducing the need for power through conservation, efficiency, storing power for peak needs and other methods. The planning team determined that significant demand-side reductions were already included in the analysis since the effects of conservation were reflected in the demand forecast. Conservation proved to be an insufficient option – PSE already includes very aggressive conservation goals in its demand projections. Third party experts were brought in to review PSE's work and see if there were any additional conservation options. They found that there were not enough efficiency gains to meet the anticipated demand.
  - o Another solution type the team evaluated was local generation in King County. PSE looked at siting a 300 MW gas turbine power plant at three different sites on the Eastside. The plant would be larger than the existing plant in Goldendale. Due to environmental constraints related to noise and atmospheric conditions it was determined that this would be extremely challenging to permit in two of the three different sites. The third site, by the Cedar Hills Landfill, was retained for further analysis. This plant would require new transmission lines.
  - o The next solution the team looked at was adding a transformer. The planning team evaluated three substation sites to place an additional transformer. As these sites were modeled, studies showed numerous 115 kV overloads, which indicated a substantial amount of new 115 kV lines would still need to be constructed. As a result, the transformer-only solution was not deemed a viable alternative.
  - o Another solution the team looked at was a combination of transformers and transmission lines. The team looked at using existing transmission corridors - including existing Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and Seattle City Light (SCL) corridors – as well as a new corridor along I-90. Due to existing rights held by BPA and SCL and limitations from the Washington State Department of Transportation, none of these existing corridors proved to be viable.
  - o The planning team thus identified seven potential new 230 kV transmission lines and seven potential transformer sites (placed at a new or existing substation). Aligning the



transformer sites with the transmission line reduced the set of options to 27 different alternatives.

3. **What solutions best deliver electricity to the Eastside?** PSE and third-party experts identified possible alternatives for each solution type and perform detailed modeling of how power would flow in each of the alternatives to determine what approaches provide enough electricity to meet the Eastside's need. PSE used Powerflow analysis, a computer modeling tool, to measure how power flows through the system. The tool allowed the team to test roughly 700,000 contingency scenarios and push the system's breaking point, comparing the results from each of the alternatives. The evaluation metrics were:
- System performance – how well the alternative could address the need and how it compared to the others
  - Flexibility – how long it would take an operator to work through the problems
  - Longevity – how long the solution would solve the problem. Alternatives that would provide power into the 2030s were retained, while alternatives that would only work for 2-3 years were eliminated.

Using this evaluation, the team reduced the 27 alternatives down to 12. All of the 12 alternatives were a transmission line connecting through a transformer.

4. **What solutions can PSE move forward with?** Using non-electrical criteria, PSE reviewed the 12 transmission lines and transformer options and narrowed them down further. Four of the lines were along Seattle City Light (SCL) corridors. PSE talked with SCL about obtaining rights in the SCL corridor. SCL replied that they will need the rights for their own future needs, so these four lines were removed as alternatives. As a result of removing the SCL corridor from further consideration, one of the transformer sites, a proposed new substation in the Woodridge area, was also removed from consideration.
5. **Where could PSE build a solution?** PSE used the Linear Routing Tool (LRT), a computer-based modeling tool, to analyze geographic barriers, land uses, potential environmental areas and other factors to find where PSE could build a solution connecting the Sammamish Substation in the north to Talbot Substation in the south. Andy Bury, Tetra Tech, provided an overview of the steps involved with the route selection process:
- Define interconnections (the Sammamish and Talbot Substations) and study area
  - Collect existing publicly available Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data and professional input. Data included public land ownership, land use, public rights-of-way, environmentally critical areas, topography, and many others. The team of Linear Routing Tool experts – system planners, engineers, land use planners and environmental professionals – individually weighted various data layers of the model to reflect the degrees of constraints and opportunity for each data set. The team assigned values to data layers using a progressive scale of values ranging from the greatest constraint, such as endangered species, to the greatest opportunity, such as existing PSE transmission lines.
  - Identify corridors and alternative routes using the LRT. The LRT combined these data layers to create an output called the suitability grid, which represents the summation of constraints and opportunities for every point (or grid cell) across the entire study area. Preferred corridors of opportunity were used to develop route alternatives.
  - Compare route weightings. The information for all combinations of routes that would connect the Sammamish and Talbot substations was input to PSE's application that sorted and ranked the routes. The highest-scoring route combinations were selected. The scores of alternatives not selected were quite a bit lower than the selected combinations, and they were dropped because they were not seen as buildable or permissible.

- Refine routes. PSE looked at numerous factors to get the hundreds of options down to a manageable number. Constructability, permitability and environmental factors were part of the LRT analysis that provided the route segments. The combinations of segments that made up those highest scoring routes comprise the 16 segments that PSE and the public are currently evaluating.
  - Discuss routes with the public and agencies
6. **What does the public recommend?** PSE is asking the public to provide input on the route segments via a robust public outreach process. By using community-identified values, the Community Advisory Group will help combine the route segments into route options, then narrow the options to one advisory group recommended route.

## Questions and comments

The advisory group asked several questions and made several comments to the presenters:

- Q: Were property values and view corridors considered as criterion in the matrix? I'm impressed with the process, but am concerned that view corridors and property values were not part of the criteria. Property values are easily attainable from the King County website.
- A: We looked at publically available data for three broad factors: constructability, permitability and environmental considerations. Land use was considered as part of that – e.g. schools, industrial, commercial zones. In the analysis, industrial land use was considered an opportunity and schools were considered a constraint.
- Q: How does the LRT respond to an underground vs. overhead option?
- A: The analysis was conducted with an overhead system in mind.
- Q: Are constraints and opportunities weighted? How?
- A: Criteria were weighed on a scale from -5 to 5.
- Q: What weight was given to the Olympic pipeline? Was that a constraint or opportunity?
- A: We don't have that data available and will get back to you on that. The full report, with this level of specificity, is available and we are happy to share it with you.
- Q: What route is there for an underground line?
- A: That would be part of a whole different analysis.
- Q: 2030 is only 15 years from now. The existing lines have been there decades. Fifteen years does not seem to be a long-term solution. If 15 years from now PSE needs to come back to the community anyway, this seems to be the time to think about underground.
- A: The longevity of a solution is related to voltage. We focused on how this could be solved with overhead infrastructure. We are trying to solve the need facing us now. Fifteen years is considered a long time for major infrastructure like this. It is possible new technologies could come along during that time frame.
- Q: What was the professional input included in the route selection process?
- A: We brought experts including system planners, engineers, land use planners and environmental professionals together in the room, first to define which datasets to use, and then how to weight them.

- Q: You mentioned some avoidance bubbles – are they separate from this constraints and opportunities list?
- A: Yes, they are separate from the constraints and opportunities list as they are considered barriers the alignment cannot go through. Those are listed in the full report.
- Q: In the 15-year timespan, along some portions of the route, especially in the Bel-Red area where there is ongoing development; commercial areas will be converted to residential. Was that potential change incorporated into the analysis?
- A: No, only current land use was considered. Future land use was not.
- Q: I'm assuming there are regulations as to the easements you need. Do you have the easements?
- A: We are required to comply with the national safety code, which regulates, for example, how high off the ground wires are, where lines can be for wind conditions, etc. As far as where we would need new vs. existing easements, we can get that information to you.
- Q: The city of Redmond has a known hazardous liquid line. We can share the information on the location of that with you – it is critical for construction. Was that included as part of the analysis?
- A: I don't recall that as part of the analysis.
- [A: Later in the meeting PSE noted they are aware of this pipeline; they just know it by a different name.]
- Q: What were the barriers, the absolute blockage points that the line can't go through you referred to?
- A: We needed absolute barriers so that no matter what happens in other datasets, certain areas were off-limits.
- Q: Given that LRT didn't review underground, we should ask for a suspension of the process until undergrounding is analyzed. Submerged lines probably weren't considered either. AT&T has laid lines under the ocean for decades. Maybe you can contract further with Tetra Tech. We're in the 21st century. The idea that we can't think out of the box for the future here on the Eastside is upsetting.
- A: Undergrounding and submerging are possible but technically difficult. There is a significant cost delta and trade-offs.
- C: Let's remind ourselves that we are doing a tunnel in Seattle and running into problems. The question of undergrounding has come and gone – it's not on the table anymore.
- C: I'm interested in considering people's views whether to go underground or above ground. From what we've seen so far it is not a possible solution. We have hills, wetlands, and steel pipes in the ground. Putting in a tunnel and making it big enough for future needs will be more expensive and more intrusive than an overhead option.
- A: Our pipe that we need to put in the ground is much smaller than 60 feet, but terrain and topography do add costs and make it more difficult.

### **Route segment conversation**

Penny noted that advisory group members and alternates will be bringing solutions to their communities for public consideration, and then weighing the trade-offs of the benefits and disadvantages of each route

segment. When questions are brought up in an advisory group meeting, more information will be brought back to the next meeting. More information and data is forthcoming about undergrounding.

Penny reminded the advisory group of the process moving forward. Because it is too difficult to talk about specific segments as a full group, the advisory group is divided into sub-areas. The next step is for sub-area committees to delve into details about each route segment. Penny shared a map of the sub-areas, and noted that as a result of a public comment made at the last advisory group meeting, PSE changed the boundary between the north and central sub-areas to reflect a more inclusive process that is not tied to city boundaries.

Penny explained that the public will provide input in every step of the process and is invited to all sub-area meetings. At Sub-Area Committee Workshop #1, participants will look at each segment and identify issues and concerns for the advisory group and PSE, especially factors that PSE wouldn't already know about. At Workshop #2, participants will compare tradeoffs between route segments, noting which seem to have more issues or concerns and what should be considered to make a route recommendation. In the third set of meetings, the formal Sub-Area Committees will look at the input and determine a recommendation for the advisory group at its next meeting on April 30.

### **Evaluation process**

Penny explained that once the Sub-Area Committee recommendations are gathered, the advisory group will assemble a possible alignment. If more than one alignment is identified, the alignments will be weighed against each other based on community values. A multi-objective decision methodology will be used as a formal process to assist the advisory group in the evaluation process. This methodology follows several steps:

- Step 1: Determine community values for evaluation
- Step 2: Weight community values
- Step 3: Score each option using community values
- Step 4: Discuss and validate numerical results
- Step 5: Develop consensus recommendation

Penny noted that there are examples of how other advisory groups have used this methodology for other PSE projects, as well as example evaluative factors. She requested that advisory group members and alternates, as well as members of the public, begin to think about the values or factors they would like to see incorporated into the evaluation process for comparing route segments.

### **Questions**

- Q: Will the public have the opportunity to participate in the Sub-Area Committee meetings?  
A: At Workshop #1 and #2 everyone will be working together. The third meeting is more limited to the formal Sub-Area Committee process, but the public is invited to observe.
- Q: Will each Sub-Area Committee workshop have a facilitator?  
A: Yes.
- Q: We do not have enough data. Without data, it is hard to make decisions.  
A: As you work together as a group, you will develop criteria and the list of what data you need to evaluate options against the criteria.

Q: If we want an environmental study, will we get it?  
 A: PSE will work to get the data needed, though it may not be via new studies.

Q: Will there be post card notifications to communities about these Sub-Area Committee meetings, as was sent for the Open Houses?  
 A: PSE is sending emails, postcards, and press releases for the meetings. All three dates will be announced at once.

**Wrap up and next steps**

Penny reminded the advisory group to think about factors and criteria for evaluating the route segments. She noted that the next Community Advisory Group meeting is April 30. She invited all attendees to participate in the following Sub-Area Committee workshops and meetings:

Sub-Area Committee Workshops:

*[Ed. note: Since the meeting, the dates of these events have changed.]*

- North – Redmond, Kirkland and North Bellevue (Segments A, B, C, D)
  - Workshop #1: March 19, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Old Redmond Schoolhouse
  - Workshop #2: April 2, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Old Redmond Schoolhouse
  - Meeting: April 16, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Old Redmond Schoolhouse
- Central – Bellevue (Segments D, E, F, G1, G2, H, I, J, K1, K2)
  - Workshop #1: March 12, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., [Note: since the meeting, the location has been changed to the Hilton Bellevue Hotel]
  - Workshop #2: March 26, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Hilton Bellevue Hotel
  - Meeting: April 9, 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., Hilton Bellevue Hotel
- South – Newcastle and Renton (Segments K1, K2, L, M, N)
  - Workshop #1: March 13, 6:30-9:00 p.m., Renton Technical College
  - Workshop #2: March 27, 6:30-9:00 p.m., Renton Technical College
  - Meeting: April 10, 6:30-9:00 p.m., Renton Technical College

Penny invited the advisory group to ask for further clarifications on the information presented, if needed, and thanked all attendees for coming.

**Summary of action items and status updates**

Action item	Status
PSE will amend the draft Charter to include further proposals accepted by the advisory group and report back on outstanding proposed amendments.	In progress
PSE will consider including PSE responses in the communications summary.	In progress