

Central Sub-Area Workshop #2 Summary

5/5/2014

Meeting information

Location: Hilton Bellevue Hotel

Date: April 23, 2014, 6:30 to 9 p.m.

Number of workshop participants signed in: 102

Purpose

On April 23, Puget Sound Energy hosted the second of two workshops in the Central Sub-Area. At Workshop #1, the Central Sub-Area Committee and members of the public learned about the project, examined route segments D through K2, provided input on the segments and identified values that could be used as evaluation factors to evaluate those segments. At Workshop #2, the Central Sub-Area Committee and members of the public scored route segments D through K2 using each of the evaluation factors identified during Workshop #1.

Individual segment scoring

Workshop participants were asked to individually assign scores to the segments for each evaluation factor identified in Workshop #1 on a scale of 1 to 5 where “1” does not meet the factor at all and “5” best meets the factor. The table below displays the average from all scores assigned by individual participants in this exercise.

Key: *White* = 1.0-1.99; *light blue* = 2.0-2.99; *medium blue* = 3.0-3.99; *dark blue* = 4.0-4.99

| Evaluation factor | Segment D | Segment E | Segment F | Segment G1 | Segment G2 | Segment H | Segment I | Segment J | Segment K1 | Segment K2 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 1. Least proximity to residential areas | 2.94 | 2.00 | 2.60 | 2.56 | 2.90 | 2.35 | 2.69 | 1.23 | 2.29 | 2.38 |
| 2. Maximizes opportunity areas | 2.38 | 2.51 | 2.55 | 2.33 | 2.33 | 2.39 | 2.97 | 1.84 | 2.42 | 2.48 |
| 3. Most protective of health and safety | 2.76 | 1.63 | 2.73 | 2.53 | 2.61 | 2.64 | 2.89 | 1.28 | 2.58 | 2.62 |
| 4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses | 2.14 | 2.45 | 2.50 | 2.27 | 2.54 | 2.80 | 2.55 | 1.41 | 2.20 | 2.14 |
| 5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas | 2.76 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 2.41 | 2.35 | 2.17 | 2.77 | 1.62 | 2.22 | 2.18 |
| 6. Least effect on aesthetics | 2.37 | 2.28 | 2.58 | 2.66 | 2.71 | 2.59 | 2.63 | 1.25 | 2.53 | 2.56 |

Note:

- Several individuals wrote in and scored additional evaluation factors, including: underground, submerged cables, use Seattle City Light line, Bonneville Power Administration Partnership (lines in Sammamish Plateau), “co-generation,” and other alternatives.
- Several individual worksheets were submitted without scores but included marks that were not applicable or comments. Those comments are shared in the “workshop comments” section on page 2.

Group segment scoring

Workshop participants were asked to repeat the scoring exercise as groups in discussion at tables. The table below displays the average scores resulting from the group worksheets.

| Evaluation factor | Segment D | Segment E | Segment F | Segment G1 | Segment G2 | Segment H | Segment I | Segment J | Segment K1 | Segment K2 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 1. Least proximity to residential areas | 2.70 | 2.10 | 2.40 | 2.10 | 2.70 | 1.82 | 2.63 | 1.08 | 2.36 | 2.73 |
| 2. Maximizes opportunity areas | 2.20 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.30 | 2.50 | 2.09 | 3.17 | 2.00 | 2.45 | 2.82 |
| 3. Most protective of health and safety | 2.60 | 2.00 | 2.40 | 2.50 | 2.70 | 2.18 | 2.83 | 1.58 | 2.64 | 2.73 |
| 4. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses | 1.80 | 2.50 | 2.35 | 2.50 | 2.45 | 2.27 | 2.46 | 1.75 | 2.45 | 2.41 |
| 5. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas | 2.50 | 2.10 | 2.30 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 1.73 | 3.04 | 1.83 | 2.09 | 2.45 |
| 6. Least effect on aesthetics | 2.30 | 2.40 | 2.30 | 2.70 | 2.65 | 2.14 | 2.79 | 1.38 | 2.82 | 2.55 |

Note:

- Several groups wrote in and scored additional evaluation factors, including: undergrounding, Seattle City Light corridor, and submerge.

Worksheet comments

In addition to assigning numbered scores, several individuals and groups wrote comments on segment scoring sheets. Key themes across these comments include:

- Preference for longer poles
- Preference for shorter poles
- Preference for undergrounding or submerging the transmission line
- Partner with Seattle City Light in right-of-way on I-405
- Partner with BPA in Sammamish Plateau
- Consider the alternatives of conservation, distributed generation, and co-generation
- Need to see data on how PSE projected growth

Message to the Central Sub-Area Committee

In groups, workshop participants drafted key messages for the Central Sub-Area Committee. The key messages are organized by group and presented below in a verbatim reproduction of the hand-written materials to the fullest extent of the materials' legibility.

The content of the verbatim transcriptions below reflects input from groups participating in the Central Sub-Area Workshop #2. Their inclusion here is to maintain a record of the information and input received at this meeting. Their inclusion is not a reflection of Puget Sound Energy's concurrence or disagreement with the content of the messages in whole or in part. The workshop process, including the verbatim transcription of the Central Sub-Area Committee groups' messages below, reflects a means of outreach to assist Puget Sound Energy in gathering input that will be used to inform a decision about route selection.

- **Group 1**
 - *Think about/consider property values. Property values ARE objective.*
 - *Study other alternatives with same vigor & expertise.*
 - *Need for project could be obviated with conservation.*
- **Group 2**
 - *The options on the table are not acceptable (100% above-ground).*
 - *Get serious about undergrounding in residential neighborhoods (then your proclivity to ignore property values impact becomes a non-issue) or use Seattle City Light corridor along I-405.*
 - *Submerging in Lake Washington covers 80% or more of the route.*
 - *Property owners will not tolerate big towers in their view corridors. And there are a LOT of impacted property owners.*
- **Group 3**
 - *None of the segments are acceptable.*
 - *Consider: conservation, targeted underground, submerged line.*
- **Group 4**
 - *Explain why BP pipeline that is east of "J" is not an option.*
 - *Why is pipeline not shown in K1 & K2.*
 - *Provide data on underground cost reduction using Canadian input.*
 - *Study impact of earthquakes and rain on slope stability in section "J"*
 - *Consider underwater option for section "L".*
 - *Add evaluation factor for residential property values.*
- **Group 5**
 - *How much will this process affect the executive decision?*
 - *Use existing PSE available ROWs.*
 - *Minimum power along "D"; keep it that way.*
 - *Ideal route: A, C, E, G2, I, K2, M, N.*
 - *Bypasses Somerset neighborhood which has strong objections to view impacts.*
 - *"J" high political impact area.*

- *Prefer G2-5 [photo simulation], higher pole longer span.*
- **Group 6**
 - *Too many unknowns at this point about property values and aesthetics.*
 - *Aesthetics and views is objective to those who live there.*
- **Group 7**
 - *Directly address all the options.*
 - *Consult with realtors re: view impacts.*
 - *Will PSE compensate?*
 - *Lots of schools and kids in the area.*
 - *Neutral technical consultant to answer questions.*
 - *Live forum so people can see questions and answers.*
- **Group 8**
 - *Concerned about the stability of the slopes, as well as the visual impacts concerned about the health and safety.*
- **Group 9**
 - *Keep coal out.*
 - *Conservation is key – change lifestyle – habitat.*
 - *Incentivize less energy use.*
 - *Sustainable business model while using less energy.*
 - *Require solar on new construction.*
 - *Local energy.*
 - *Rethink infrastructure.*
- **Group 10**
 - *Property value impact is an objective criteria that must be considered.*
 - *Aesthetics is an unacceptable subjective criteria that does not capture visual impacts.*
 - *Want alternatives (underwater or underground, in lake).*
- **Group 11**
 - *We want to see alts to PSE proposals: conservation, SCL partnership, partnership with BPA, undergrounding, submerging, co-generation, battery farm.*
- **Group 12**
 - *[We are] really disappointed that no alternatives to PSE proposals have been included for consideration. For the community outreach activity (workshops etc.) to be productive additional alternatives suggested by the community need to be addressed.*
- **Group 13**
 - *It is disappointing that other alternatives that do not involve contributing to industrial blight through so many residential neighborhoods. Surely some of the alternatives that I've heard being put forward could have been explored further, with more effort. Instead we are being asked to choose amongst options that the members of the community have already made abundantly clear are totally unacceptable. Running industrial height high-power lines through residential neighborhoods does not serve our community as a whole. It merely serves those who would profit financially from it in the short term, but leave a blight on our communities for decades to come.*

Comment forms

Key feedback submitted on comment forms by participants included:

- Concerns that photo simulations and data presented are not representative.
- Concerns that data is insufficient, especially for the Sub-Area Committees and on topics including electromagnetic fields and property value impacts.
- Concerns about property value impacts and views.
- Request to consider other alternatives, including cooperation from Seattle City Light, more aggressive conservation efforts, and other technologies.
- Interest in forthcoming undergrounding and submerging reports.
- Request for PSE assistance in getting impacted neighborhoods together to consider whether undergrounding benefits all in the project area.
- Suggestion that segment H needs representation on Sub-Area Committee.
- Recognition that segment H is slated to be a trail for the entire length of the corridor.
- Concern that Segment J will ruin views and property values.

Several comment forms also requested specific photo simulations of impacts to particular residences or view corridors. These were compiled and provided to the project team members responsible for development of photo simulations to identify representative locations for future photo simulations.

Public process feedback

Several participants also provided feedback on the public process. Comments indicated:

- Request for another Q&A session after the three Sub-Area Workshops.
- Concern from neighborhoods who feel that they have not been reached out to.
- Concern that residents' input and scoring will not have an impact on PSE's recommendation.