

## Community Advisory Group Meeting #3 Summary

---

6/18/14

### Community Advisory Group Meeting #3

Wednesday, June 4, 2014

5:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center, 16600 NE 80th St Redmond

### Community Advisory Group (in attendance)

- Andy Swayne, Puget Sound Energy
- Barbara Sauerbrey, Woodridge Community Association (residential association alternate)
- Bart Phillips, One Redmond
- Brian Buck, Lake Washington School District
- Darius Richards, Kennydale Neighborhood Association
- David Chicks, Redmond Neighborhoods
- David Hoffman, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties
- Deirdre Johnson, South Rose Hill Neighborhood Association
- Gregg Zimmerman, City of Renton
- Jack McLeod, Bellevue School District
- Lindy Bruce, Sunset Community Association (residential association alternate)
- Nicholas Matz, City of Bellevue
- Nicola Barnes, Hopelink (alternate)
- Norm Hansen, Bridle Trails Community Club
- Paul Lwali, Coal Creek Family YMCA (alternate)
- Pete Sullivan, City of Redmond
- Rob Jammerman, City of Kirkland
- Robert Shay, Wilburton Community Association
- Sam Baxter, Overlake Hospital Medical Center
- Scott Kaseburg, Lake Lanes Community Association (residential association alternate)
- Sean McNamara, Olympus Neighborhood Association (alternate)
- Steven Hanson, Renton Technical College
- Steve O'Donnell, Somerset Community Association
- Tim McHarg, City of Newcastle

### Members absent

- Bill Taylor, Liberty Ridge Homeowners Association (residential association alternate)
- David Edmonds, Olympus Neighborhood Association
- David St. John, King County
- Debra Grant, Hopelink
- Floyd Rogers, Mountains to Sound Greenway
- Lynn Wallace, Renton Chamber of Commerce

- Marcia Isenberger, Coal Creek Family YMCA

### **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
- Keri Pravitz, Puget Sound Energy, Community Projects Manager
- Jackson Taylor, Puget Sound Energy, Community Projects Manager
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, Facilitator
- Dana Olson, EnviroIssues, Public Involvement
- Lauren Dennis, EnviroIssues, Public Involvement
- Chelsea Ongaro, EnviroIssues, Notetaker

### **Meeting Purpose and Overview**

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) hosted the third Energize Eastside Community Advisory Group meeting in Redmond on June 4, 2014. The meeting agenda included:

1. Review of key questions and answers from PSE
2. Community Advisory Group business, including review and approval of the advisory group Meeting #2 summary and revised Charter, review of the decision not to videotape the meetings, and review of the work plan
3. Feedback from advisory group members on constituent concerns
4. Review outcomes and input to the Community Advisory Group from the Sub-Area Workshops and Sub-Area Committee meetings
5. Discussion and selection of evaluation factors for the Multi-Objective Decision Analysis to be conducted at Community Advisory Group Meeting #5 on October 1, 2014
6. Discussion of a blind evaluation scoring exercise
7. Public comment

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Welcome, safety moment and introductions**

Facilitator Penny Mabie welcomed meeting attendees and provided a safety moment about the importance of being a safe driver and bicyclist, especially as summer is approaching and children are getting out of school.

Penny noted two changes in Community Advisory Group membership:

- Tim McHarg replaced Mark Rigos as the City of Newcastle representative
- Scott Kaseburg replaced Jules Dickerson as the Lake Lanes Community Association residential association alternate

Penny then led a round of introductions of the Community Advisory Group members and alternates. She also introduced PSE staff seated at the table: Leann Kostek, PSE Senior Project Manager; Jens Nedrud PSE Deputy Project Manager, and Gretchen Aliabadi, PSE Communications. She also mentioned that

PSE staff were located throughout the room and were available to answer questions throughout the meeting. Finally, Penny conducted an overview of the agenda and the ground rules for the meeting.

## **Project overview; review of key questions and answers**

Jens Nedrud, PSE Deputy Project Manager, and Gretchen Aliabadi, PSE Communications, presented a project overview, including information about the need for the project and the project schedule.

Jens and Gretchen presented a list of key questions that PSE has been hearing over the past few months, including questions from the Sub-Area Workshops.

### **1. Local need for electricity – What is the local need for electricity?**

Jens explained that PSE studied the entire PSE service area with different scenarios forecasted into future years, including different levels of conservation and typical and extreme weather and growth projections. PSE repeated these studies specific to the Eastside area, and found that demand for reliable power will exceed capacity as early as 2017. The Eastside area has essentially outgrown the electric system that serves Eastside communities. Without substantial electric infrastructure upgrades, tens of thousands of residents and businesses will be at risk of more frequent and longer outages. Jens reiterated that there is a local need for the Energize Eastside project, with 92% to 97% of the power flowing through the new 230 kV transmission lines to be used by the local community.

### **2. Alternative solutions – Halt the Community Advisory Group process to revisit the need and alternative solutions.**

Jens explained that PSE has already studied and confirmed the need for the project. PSE also looked at many alternative solutions. Conservation alone is not enough because growth on the Eastside outpaces our ability to conserve enough energy. Third party researchers in California also confirmed that growth will outpace our ability to conserve enough energy. Battery technology is new and unproven at this scale, and is therefore not a solution to the current problem on the Eastside. PSE is interested in battery technology, and is moving forward with pilot projects using battery technology, but not at the scale needed to solve the Eastside's needs.

### **3. Undergrounding and submerging – Why doesn't PSE underground the Energize Eastside project?**

Gretchen explained that PSE is able to build an underground transmission line, and that option is still on the table. The decision to build underground transmission lines is for local communities to decide if they want to invest in undergrounding. Gretchen said communities will need to ask themselves if the aesthetic value of undergrounding is worth the cost of \$20 million to \$28 million per mile. If the answer is yes, PSE will sit down with those communities to discuss the options. Communities must decide how to pay for the costs up front, which may include raising property taxes.

### **4. Seattle City Light corridor – Why doesn't PSE build along the Seattle City Light (SCL) corridor?**

Gretchen explained that if PSE were able to build new 230 kV transmission lines along the SCL corridor, that approach would solve the problem. However, SCL has repeatedly told PSE they need to reserve that space for SCL infrastructure so PSE removed that option from consideration.

**5. Olympic pipeline** – Is it safe to build the 230 kV line along the Olympic Pipeline in the existing corridor?

Gretchen reiterated that building a 230 kV line along the Olympic Pipeline would be safe. The Olympic Pipeline has coexisted with PSE transmission lines in the Eastside corridor for decades. PSE has had discussions with the pipeline owners, British Petroleum (BP), and BP stipulated they need 5 feet minimum space to maintain their pipelines. If a selected route is comprised of segments that include the Olympic Pipeline, PSE will continue to work with BP during the design phase to ensure safety during and after construction.

**6. Property values** – Will PSE take into account impacts to property values?

Gretchen explained that PSE does not consider property values when siting infrastructure because of social justice issues. PSE does provide compensation when building on property that does not have an easement. If PSE is not building on someone's property, they do not provide compensation.

**7. Electromagnetic fields (EMF)** – Will this project produce harmful levels of EMF?

Gretchen stated that over the past 45 years, there have been many scientific studies conducted to determine if EMF from transmission lines have any effect on human health. The World Health Organization concluded that there are no substantive health issues related to EMF at levels generally encountered by members of the public. There is a range of public exposure limits; 2000 mG is the lowest of these values and 18.82 mG is the average 230 kV transmission line exposure when standing 50 feet away.

There were no clarifying questions from the Community Advisory Group.

## **Community Advisory Group business**

### **Thumb drives**

Penny mentioned Advisory Group members were provided with printed copies of all materials from Community Advisory Group meetings and the Sub-Area Workshop, and these materials are also available electronically. If members needed additional information added to their thumb drives, they could have them updated at the sign-in table.

### **Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary**

Penny asked the advisory group if anyone had any objections to finalizing the Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary. The summary was previously emailed to the group for review and there were no responses. No objections were raised, and the summary draft was accepted as final.

### **Community Advisory Group revised Charter**

Penny walked through revisions to the Draft Charter made in response to comments from Meeting #1, including language on property owners and PSE's consideration of requests for data and analysis. The Draft Charter was previously emailed to the group for review and approval, and the only responses received were affirmation that the changes were acceptable. No objections were raised, and the revised Charter was accepted as final.

### **Videotaping Community Advisory Group meetings**

Penny explained that there was a request at the Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 to videotape advisory group meetings. The group was asked for their thoughts over email through an online survey. Half of the group responded that they were comfortable with taping the meetings, while the other half responded that they were uncomfortable. Given that feedback, Penny proposed that taping the meetings should not be approved. There were no objections raised, and the group decided not to tape the meetings.

### **Community Advisory Group revised work plan**

Penny described the updated Community Advisory Group work plan, which was updated as of June 4. She explained that the work plan contains information about the Community Advisory Group meetings through the remainder of the advisory group's work, and the subsequent Community Meetings, where the progress of the group's work will be shared and the community will have the opportunity to comment. These meeting will be hosted up and down the Eastside corridor.

### **Public Communications Summaries**

Penny addressed the Public Communications Summaries from February, March and April in the Community Advisory Group binders. A request from a previous Community Advisory Group meeting was to provide questions from the public about the Energize Eastside project along with PSE's answers. All of the project communications that come through comment boxes, the website, and the project voicemail are summarized and provided along with PSE's responses. These summaries will provide the Community Advisory Group with frequently asked questions coming from the community and PSE's responses. Verbatim comments will no longer be provided. There will be about a three-week lag in order to complete these summaries. Community Advisory Group members will be receiving a Public Communications Summary each month moving forward.

### **Advisory Group round robin on constituent feedback**

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

- Paul Lwali noted that at the June 3 Bellevue City Hall information session, several attendees were still confused about the alternatives that PSE had picked, and had questions about why the Energize Eastside project is being done now.
- Rob Jammerman shared that things have been fairly quiet from the Kirkland perspective. The Kirkland community recently had a walking tour along 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, which resulted in discussion regarding the impacts of the route on those home owners.
- Deirdre Johnson, of the South Rose Hill Neighborhood Association, explained that the Kirkland neighborhood along other parts of the Kirkland B and C segments is having a walking tour in the next couple of weeks.
- The City of Redmond representative, Pete Sullivan, said that the Redmond community is awaiting more information about the spacing, height, and visual impacts of the project, and what the impacts will be to adjacent property owners.
- Community Advisory Group member and PSE representative Andy Swayne urged the group to look at the April Public Communications Summary, which will give them a good idea about what PSE is hearing about the project.
- Steve Hanson, the representative from Renton Technical College, noted hearing concerns about construction, building and development.

- David Hoffmann, of the Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties, seconded Steve Hanson's concerns and mentioned that there will be a meeting with builders and developers next Thursday to get an understanding of their concerns with the routes.
- Steve O'Donnell, shared that the CENSE website, mailbox, and bank accounts are up and running. This group represents neighborhoods from Redmond to Renton.
- One Redmond representative, Bart Phillips, is very impressed with the thoroughness of PSE's public participation process, but is starting to hear suggestions that the project should be delayed and that is concerning.
- Norm Hansen indicated that Bridle Trails had a general meeting with 120 people. Half of the people at Bellevue's forum last night were from Bridle Trails. They think that there are other alternatives. PSE says that these overhead options are the best, but the Bridle Trails community would like a third-party appraisal of the alternatives that PSE has decided not to pursue.
- Tim McHarg mentioned that Newcastle had its annual Town Hall meeting last night with 200 people, and 70% had heard about the project. The biggest concerns he heard were visual impacts from public vantage points and public safety in relation to the Olympic pipeline corridor. There will be two presentations for the Newcastle City Council, which will likely lead to a public statement by the council.
- Robert Shay shared that the Wilburton Community is well impacted with an existing power line on their eastern boundary and the SCL line going through the center of the neighborhood. They have experienced the building of power structures in the past and people are paying close attention to this process. He expressed that they have enough lines already. SCL is not a viable option for them. They have not yet had community meetings, but they are excited about this process.
- Brian Buck noted he is hearing health concerns from constituents in the Lake Washington School District. The school board will be briefed and he appreciates the information from PSE.
- Darius Richards explained that for people along the corridor from Coulon Park, to the Lake Lanes Community along the H route, the number one concern is the clear cutting of all of the trees, which totally changes the landscape forever.
- Nicolas Matz indicated that people in Bellevue want their interests shared and known. The Bellevue community forum was an opportunity for people to talk to each other about how to be informed. The City of Bellevue is working with partners to keep this going.
- Nicola Barnes, the alternate for Hopelink, indicated that she is hearing concerns about what the cost will be and how rates will go up.
- Sean McNamara, alternate for the Olympus Neighborhood, mentioned that there are questions within the neighborhood about the need and the options being presented, safety concerns about the Olympic pipeline, and the visual impact.
- Gregg Zimmerman shared that there is a lot of interest about some of the alternatives, such as underground, underwater, and the SCL route. There is a really strong and consistent message that the lake front is a cultural icon and an environmental, visual aesthetic. The Renton community wants to protect the crown jewel of the city, to protect the L route.
- Sam Baxter is pleased with the process and PSE's consistency in responses to comments.
- Jack McLeod mentioned that the end of J segment runs through the front yard of Tyee Middle School and that there are concerns about health issues.

Penny thanked the advisory group and noted that PSE appreciates hearing their feedback.

## Outcomes from the Sub-Area Workshops and Committee Meetings

Penny described the two Sub-Area Workshops and Committee Meetings in each of the three sub-areas. The Community Advisory Group members shared the following key thoughts and observations about the Sub-Area Committee Meetings:

- An advisory group member noted that two or three members of the sub-area committee pointed out that the statistical analyses that resulted from the scoring exercise were meaningless. Even PSE's representative pointed out at the Sub-Area Committee Meeting that there were real issues with the results.
- Some advisory group members reflected an apprehension about getting into a situation that was neighborhood vs. neighborhood.
- Doing this kind of outreach before the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) environmental process is commendable, but the level of information that people are asking for hasn't been developed yet.
- A member noted that, at the conclusion of their meetings, the Sub-Area Committees recommended that the Community Advisory Group consider the following topics: EMF, property value impacts, aesthetics, and visual impacts. The member thought this was valuable information for the Community Advisory Group to consider from all three Sub-Area Committees.

Penny referred the members to the Sub-Area Committee Meetings Overview for the most salient and valuable parts of each sub-area's committee meetings. Penny then explained that the intent behind the scoring process was to attempt to avoid pitting neighborhood against neighborhood so that people could objectively compare segments to evaluation factors rather than to each other. Statistical validity was never intended, but the information can be valuable.

### Evaluation factor discussion

Penny explained the evaluation factors, which are included in a table in the Sub-Area Committee Meetings Overview, separated by Sub-Area. The Sub-Area Committees were asked about their values, and these were then turned into evaluation factors at the Sub-Area Workshops. At the Sub-Area Committee Meetings, additional evaluation factors were suggested for the Community Advisory Group to consider.

Penny then described how the evaluation factors will be used as part of the Multiple Objective Decision Analysis (MODA) process at the Community Advisory Group Meeting #5. Penny explained that MODA is a proven process that will provide clear results; it is a tool that allows the group to look at multiple objectives. The first step in MODA is to determine which evaluation factors will be used. Penny also explained that the language of the evaluation factors shared at the Sub-Area Committee meetings was modified slightly for clarity, but that the meaning of the factors is the same.

Penny then led a discussion of the evaluation factors. Community Advisory Group members provided the following comments and questions, and clarifying answers were given when appropriate:

- Impact on business and residential community character should be considered.
  - Penny noted that it would be difficult to quantify this information with data.
- Undergrounding and submerging were not available as options.

- Penny reminded the group that they are currently discussing the evaluation factors, and not the alternatives or options to be evaluated.
- The original seven factors identified by the Sub-Area Committees are very similar to what is reviewed in environmental review (except opportunity areas), so these should be the foremost factors.
- Value should not be placed on them with the “least” and “most” language.
- Penny clarified that “maximizes opportunity areas” means looking for areas where there is already infrastructure, utility owned rights-of-way, etc. They are considered opportunity areas because PSE wouldn’t need to acquire additional rights-of-way in order to place the Energize Eastside lines.
- PSE should consider future need and how long the solution will last.
  - Leann confirmed that the longevity of the project is different route by route.
- At the early meetings, PSE said cost was already accounted for assuming an overhead line, so would cost not be a factor?
  - Leann explained that all of the routes presented solve the capacity problem on the Eastside, and PSE is open to constructing any of the routes presented. Cost is a factor when it comes to selecting a route, but it is not the main factor (i.e., if all else is equal when deciding between route options, cost would be a consideration). However, there are cost data available for each of the route options, so advisory group members could use cost as an evaluation factor should they choose.
- What about congestion, trails, and proximity to the Olympic Pipeline?
  - Jens explained that trails are part of sensitive community land uses and the Olympic Pipeline is part of health and safety.

**Additional evaluation factors**

Penny confirmed that there were no objections to the original seven evaluation factors and the Community Advisory Group finalized them as evaluation factors. Penny then moved onto the additional evaluation factors suggested for inclusion by the Sub-Area Committees. Penny explained that for an evaluation factor to be useful there must be data and information about that subject.

Least impact from construction

Penny asked if PSE would be able to provide information about impacts of construction that would allow the Community Advisory Group to compare and make decisions between routes. Leann said that PSE has been trying to develop something about construction impacts that the Community Advisory Group could use, but that they are still working on this. Penny asked the group if they would want to include “least impact from construction” as an evaluation factor if PSE is able to provide information on this subject.

Community Advisory Group members provided the following comments and questions, and clarifying answers were given when appropriate:

- Impact from construction is something you should consider after you have made the decision because it is a short term impact. We should be thinking about long-term impacts in our process.
- If one option is going to have significant construction impacts vs. another, everything else being equal, then it should be considered.
- What are the construction impacts of building an overhead line? It seems like it would be low impact.

- Leann said that PSE would bring information about the construction impacts of building an overhead line to the next Community Advisory Group meeting.

Other comments on evaluation factors:

- If the most expensive above ground option is \$300 million does that raise rates or is that money already forecasted, or set aside?
  - Leann explained that the project will cost \$150 million to 300 million, and the impact to rate payers will be about a 1% to 2% increase if the project is all above ground.
- Will we prioritize these factors based on what we think is important?
  - Penny explained that part of the MODA process involves weighting factors, applying weights and talking about results. MODA is not a decision-making process; it is a process to help the group assess and compare multiple considerations, taking multiple factors into account.
- There is a lot of confusion on uses of the power and whether it is for local or regional need.
  - Penny explained that regardless of the route selected, according to PSE the amount of power used regionally will be 3-8%.
- How much of the power will go outside the Eastside?
  - Jens explained that this transmission line is for local power, and that 3% to 8% of the power will flow through the line to be used regionally. The advisory group requested to know how much money PSE receives from these sales, and for PSE to bring data on the revenue equivalent of 3% to 8% power provided to the regional grid to the next Community Advisory Group Meeting.

The group agreed to set aside the “least impact from construction” evaluation factor for discussion at the next meeting when more information about construction methods would be provided.

#### Least effect on property values

Penny reiterated that for an evaluation factor to be useful, there must be data and information about that subject, and that PSE has said that they aren’t able to provide data on property values. Therefore, it would be difficult to use “least effect on property values” as an evaluation factor. Penny opened this topic up for discussion among the group.

Community Advisory Group members provided the following comments and questions, and clarifying answers were given when appropriate:

- There should be some mitigation economically.
  - Gretchen explained that if PSE cuts down a tree or rips up a yard, PSE restores it and that is mitigation, which is factored into the cost numbers.
- Do these data reflect the number of residents or the number of residential units?
  - Leann explained that the data provided is the number of parcels and the number of tax parcels on those lots. There is no good data source for the number of residents.
- Do you have data about apartments and condos?
  - Leann explained that condos have been included in the data. Individual apartments are not included, as the number of units would need to be counted. PSE will check with their real estate representative about this possibility.
- Is there any difference in the longevity of a solution?
  - Leann explained that each solution has a different longevity and PSE can provide those data.

- Is the cost of losses or property condemnations included?
  - Gretchen confirmed that the \$150 million to \$300 million estimate includes the costs for new easements, traffic control, construction, and other factors.
- Property values should not be used in this evaluation because the speaker was not sure how one measures that, and it's a social justice issue.
- The King County Assessor has estimates of values of all homes, including apartments and condominiums, along the line. The speaker suggested the Community Advisory Group should look at these data.
- Another speaker suggested that the Community Advisory Group could look at relative property value impacts, rather than absolute impacts, otherwise it is pitting some communities against others. It is important that those who are impacted are heard, but everyone benefits from the reliable power. Some should not be impacted unfairly.
- The North Sub-Area did not consider property values as an issue. The speaker would not like to see that as an evaluation factor.
- It is not right to use property values when determining what's necessary for the community. The speaker noted that there were SCL towers in the speaker's neighborhood and that he has seen property values continue to rise even through the changes.
- Perhaps the Community Advisory Group should consider the loss of tax revenue in each of the five cities affected.
- Property values are well addressed in "maximizes opportunity areas."
- The concerns with the impacts to property values are addressed in the "least affect on aesthetics" evaluation factor.

The Community Advisory Group agreed to hold the conservation on "least effect on property values" until a later date.

### Cost

Penny asked the group to discuss two new evaluation factors that were brought up during the evaluation factors discussion: cost and longevity. Leann explained that PSE's cost range is \$150 million to \$300 million, and that data about a least and most expensive route could be used to determine the preferred route.

Community Advisory Group members provided the following comments and questions, and clarifying answers were given when appropriate:

- Is undergrounding still on the table as an option? If so, that was the speaker's motivation for cost being a factor.
  - Leann explained that if communities are willing to pay the difference, undergrounding is still on the table.
- It's not a matter of overall cost. It's really the least cost to the ratepayer. This speaker suggested evaluating the cost to the rate payer.
  - Gretchen clarified that PSE can provide the cost to the rate payer for overhead transmission lines, but not for underground. Undergrounding does not affect the rate payer because it is paid for in a different way. The money for undergrounding must be paid up front, and PSE would only put in a rate increase for the rate payer in the amount that overhead would have cost.

- There was a request for information about the cost of each route. Penny explained that this would be shared after the blind evaluation was complete.

There were no objections to include “least cost to the rate payer” as an evaluation factor.

#### Longevity

Penny directed the group to discuss the second additional evaluation factor: longevity.

- Is there cost information comparing a 30-year option to a 15-year option? Life-cycle cost information could provide more detail about cost and longevity.
  - Leann said that the cost difference would not be that big over the life cycle of the project for overhead transmission. Leann noted that PSE has not looked at life cycle in that sense.

There were no objections and the Community Advisory Group agreed to include “most longevity” as an evaluation factor.

#### **Summary of the evaluation factors**

The evaluation factors that the Community Advisory Group agreed to include were:

- Least proximity to sensitive community land uses
- Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas
- Least proximity to residential areas
- Most protective of health and safety
- Least effect on aesthetics
- Least impact to mature vegetation
- Maximizes opportunity areas
- Least cost to the rate payer
- Most longevity

The “least impact from construction” evaluation factor will be discussed at the next meeting after PSE provides more information.

Penny explained that the last outstanding evaluation factor for consideration was “least effect on property values.” Consensus was not reached, and it was agreed that there would be further conversation at the next meeting, where the Community Advisory Group would see if all the needs that are being captured in the property value factor could be met by other factors.

#### **Key messages and topics for further exploration for the Sub-Area Committees**

- Penny suggested that key messages and topics for further exploration from the Sub-Area Committees have already been addressed during the meeting and are included in the evaluation factors. She then asked the group members if they had any comments or if any of these message and topics required further discussion. A Community Advisory Group member commented that Sub-Area Committees requested documentation from Seattle City Light about the use of its corridor.
- Two Community Advisory Group members asked for clarification about which evaluation factors existing corridors and rights of way, and the Olympic pipeline fall under

- Penny clarified that using existing corridors and rights-of-way falls under the “maximizes opportunity areas” evaluation factor and the Olympic pipeline falls under the “most protective of health and safety” evaluation factor.

### **Blind evaluation**

Penny explained that the Community Advisory Group would be doing a blind evaluation of the route options. This evaluation is designed to avoid pitting neighborhoods against each other. The evaluation will help the group to narrow down the route options for further discussion. Penny clarified that when the Community Advisory Group process started, PSE stated that there were 19 options. PSE then determined that there are actually 18 options, as one option circled back on itself.

The blind evaluation will help to look at the 18 routes without knowing which segments are included in each route, only using the quantifiable data that applies to all of the routes. Some data doesn't apply to all segments (e.g., the Olympic Pipeline), so the advisory group will not be using those for this exercise only. The factors that were removed because they do not apply to all segments will be reintroduced for discussion after the blind evaluation is complete.

Penny explained the blind evaluation overview and data table, including the tree names developed to represent each route. She also explained that this evaluation is just a tool to inform the narrowing of route options and is not a selection process. After this exercise, the group will be provided with the identity of the routes.

Community Advisory group members provided the following comments and questions:

- The blind evaluation process is flawed without including alternative options.
- A speaker wanted to see cost information about other completed underground and submerged transmission line projects.
  - PSE agreed to bring information about other completed underground, submerged, and overhead projects
- Penny asked the group if they thought the blind evaluation would be a valuable exercise. Two members commented positively and others indicated agreement non-verbally.
- If the results of the Community Advisory Group process are not satisfactory, can a minority group submit a minority opinion?
  - Penny explained that this is not a consensus process and that minority opinions would be welcomed.
- The evaluation factors read “avoids, avoids, avoids, protects.” A speaker was concerned that it will be confusing. Is there a difference between protects and avoids that was intended?
  - Penny explained that no difference was intended.

Penny asked that the Community Advisory Group members complete their blind evaluations by June 16, 2014 at 5 p.m. Those members who have residential alternates should work with them to complete this evaluation, so that both opinions are considered.

## Public question and comment period

Members of the public were in the audience and asked questions and shared their comments:

- I urge you not to think about today. This kind of decision is going to impact our neighborhoods until 2030. What do you want your children to see in 20 years?
- Which representatives represent which communities? If all representatives represent all neighborhoods, why is there more than one residential representative on the group?
- Can the public see the data and the things you handed out? [All meeting materials will be posted on the Energize Eastside website.]
- What is the data for the specific areas? How was that data generated? [Data came from public agencies and other third-party sources.]
- I just need to speak out. At the Sub-Area Committee North meeting, some people decided it should be done on the least expensive route on the current easement. I am a private owner on Segment C and this decision is offensive to me. Do you know what having an easement on private property is like? I don't think that these people [Community Advisory Group members] know because some of them are connected with businesses. Think about what it would look like on our private property. Having trucks coming and going, and what that yard would look like before and after. It would never be the same. We receive no benefit. The easement was signed in 1929. PSE pays no part of taxes for the privilege to occupy this space. I will send my comments to PSE and I will send them to all Community Advisory Group members.
- Some of the people that are sitting around this table are not paid; they are volunteers. They do not have vast experience drafting minority reports. You are tasked with speaking on behalf of the entire community. I would ask you to consider the concerns of the citizens when making this decision.

## Wrap-up and next steps

Penny reviewed the information that PSE agreed to bring to Community Advisory Group Meeting #4a on June 25:

- Information about the cost of completed undergrounding and submerging projects across the country
- Construction impacts of typical 230kV overhead lines
- Revenue equivalent of 3% to 8% power provided to the regional grid construction
- The differences in the longevity of the solution for each reach
- The possibility of counting the number of units in apartment buildings along the route.
- The cost to rate payers for overhead lines

Penny reminded the Community Advisory Group to complete the blind evaluations by **June 16, 2014 at 5 p.m.** Penny also invited the group to the Question and Answer Session on July 7 at a time and location to be determined.

Penny thanked the Community Advisory Group for staying longer to hear public comment and for their work at the meeting.