

North Sub-Area Committee Meeting Summary

5/28/14

North Sub-Area Committee Meeting

Wednesday, May 7, 2014

6:30 – 9 p.m.

Old Redmond School House, 16600 NE 80th Street, Redmond

North Sub-Area Committee members in attendance

- Andy Swayne, Puget Sound Energy
- Bart Phillips, One Redmond
- Brian Buck, Lake Washington School District
- David Chicks, Redmond Neighborhoods
- Deirdre Johnson, South Rose Hill Neighborhood Association
- Floyd Rogers, Mountains to Sound Greenway
- Marie Emerson, Sixty-01 Condominium Associations/Grass Lawn
- Norm Hansen, Bridle Trails Neighborhood
- Pete Sullivan, City Of Redmond
- Rob Jammerman, City Of Kirkland
- Jeff Fleming, Overlake Hospital Medical Center (alternate for Sam Baxter)
- Warren Halverson, Canter Green Neighborhood

Members absent

- David Hoffman, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties
- Jack McLeod, Bellevue School District
- Jon Erik Johnson, North Rose Hill Neighborhood Association

Other attendees

- Leann Kostek, Puget Sound Energy, Senior Project Manager
- Jackson Taylor, Puget Sound Energy, Community Projects Manager
- Suzette Gradilla, Puget Sound Energy
- Lowell Rogers, POWER Engineers
- Drew Thatcher, independent health physicist
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, Facilitator
- Dana Olson, EnviroIssues, Public Involvement
- Alayna Linde, EnviroIssues, Notetaker

Meeting Purpose and Overview

The North Sub-Area Committee Meeting for the Puget Sound Energy (PSE) Energize Eastside project convened in Redmond on May 7, 2014. The meeting included:

- Project overview
- Key questions and PSE responses
- Clarifying questions from the Sub-Area Committee
- Review of workshops #1 and #2
- Committee discussion on the outcomes of the Sub-Area workshops

Meeting Summary

Welcome, introductions and safety moment

Facilitator Penny Mabie welcomed the group and thanked them for coming. Penny started the meeting with a safety moment, reminding people to watch out for bikers during bike to work month and led the group in a round of introductions. After presenting an overview of the meeting agenda, Penny reminded attendees that the purpose of the meeting was to provide time for the North Sub-Area Committee to meet and deliberate as a body, and therefore did not include time for public comment or questions and answers.

Penny introduced the committee members to the materials in their binders, including summaries from North Sub-Area Workshops #1 and #2, a summary of the online Sub-Area Committee survey results, the data requests from Workshop #1, the response to data requests and data provided at Workshop #2, and the scoring results from Workshop #2. She informed them that their binders contained a flash drive, with electronic copies of all the materials in the binders, as well as the visual simulations from Workshop #2.

Presentation

Senior Project Manager Leann Kostek started the presentation with a brief project overview. She next summarized attendance at North Sub-Area Workshops #1 and #2, stating that there were 44 and 42 attendees respectively. Leann then presented to the committee six key questions Puget Sound Energy has been hearing from the community and shared PSE's responses to those questions.

1. **Alternatives selection process**— How did PSE arrive at the potential route segments that have been presented for consideration?

Response: Leann briefly explained the six-step process through which the route segments were identified:

- 1) PSE's planners and engineers generated a list of all solutions that could solve the need for growing electrical demand and increased reliability on the Eastside, which solutions included conservation, local electricity generation, and new infrastructure.
- 2) PSE evaluated those solutions to see which would provide enough electricity to meet the Eastside's needs. A combination of conservation with local generation and conservation with infrastructure were identified as possible solutions.
- 3) Then, PSE and third-party experts studied those solutions and found that the best way to ensure the area's electric transmission system will reliably meet growing demand is by bringing new higher capacity electric transmission lines and a new transformer to the Eastside. Local generation was ruled out at this point.
- 4) Next, PSE reviewed three general routing possibilities: Seattle City Light's existing corridor, PSE's existing corridor and new right-of-way were all considered. Of these three possibilities, the Seattle City Light was not available for PSE's use. PSE's existing corridor and a new right-of-way were both deemed feasible options.

- 5) From that point, PSE's engineers and third-party routing experts used an analysis tool called the Linear Routing Tool (LRT) to determine potential routes. The LRT processed more than 50 layers of GIS data for opportunities and constraints, different criteria were weighted, and routes were scored. After generating hundreds of possible routes, the LRT identified the best possible route options, which included two general north/south route paths with multiple crossover points – one along PSE's existing corridor and one along a combination of roadway and rail corridor.
- 6) The two remaining route paths were broken into 16 constructible route segments that could be configured in a number of ways. PSE brought the potential route segments to the public to ask what they recommend. PSE does not have a preferred route in mind.

2. **Undergrounding**— Why doesn't PSE underground the Energize Eastside project?

Response: PSE has proposed overhead transmission for the Energize Eastside project due to significant cost differences between constructing underground and overhead transmission lines. Underground construction is estimated to cost \$20-28 million per mile compared to \$3-4 million per mile overhead. Leann pointed to PSE's regulating tariff with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) that stipulates that the requesting entity pay the cost difference between undergrounding and overhead, because the aesthetic benefit does not benefit all rate payers.

Leann also reminded the group that there is a difference between undergrounding distribution lines and transmission lines. To underground distribution lines costs roughly only \$1 million per mile. Undergrounding of distribution lines happens more often in new developments and large public improvement projects. In new developments, the developer pays 100 percent of the cost to underground the existing overhead distribution line. In the case of large public improvement projects, there is cost-sharing between local jurisdictions and PSE to underground the distribution line.

3. **Seattle City Light (SCL)**— Why doesn't PSE build along the SCL corridor?

Response: Leann explained that PSE has reached out to SCL several times, but SCL company representatives have said repeatedly that they need their corridor to meet their future needs on the Eastside and it is not available for PSE's use. The two companies met as recently as two weeks ago, on April 25, 2014. Leann likened the situation to asking your neighbor if you could build something in their yard; if they say no, you cannot build there.

4. **Olympic Pipeline**— Is it safe to build the 230 kV line along the Olympic Pipeline in the existing corridor?

Response: Safety is PSE's top priority. PSE knows how to install transmission poles along a gas pipeline, as PSE itself is an owner and operator of natural gas lines. Leann noted that PSE has safely installed transmission poles along gas pipelines for other projects, and 5-6 years ago safely replaced 300 poles right next to the pipeline on the existing Eastside alignment.

5. **Property values**— Will PSE take into account impacts to property values?

Response: Leann explained that PSE will not use property values as a criterion for making route decisions on this project. She explained that whether a home is a \$1 million dollar home or a \$300,000 home, everyone loves their homes, regardless of how much it is worth. For that reason, it is not equitable to use property value as criteria.

6. **Electromagnetic fields (EMF)**—Will this project produce harmful levels of EMF?

Response: PSE knows that some Eastside residents have concerns about electromagnetic fields, or EMF. 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. To date, this large body of research does not show that exposure causes adverse health effects.

Clarifying questions

Leann asked for clarifying questions from the North Sub-Area Committee members regarding the key questions and responses. They had the following comments and questions, which Leann answered (Q: question, A: answer, C: comment).

Q: My neighbors and I are concerned about property values. Even with the long term decline in property values, we will not have compensation from PSE?

A: That is correct. We will not compensate for losses in property value.

C: The people along these route segments feel that they are carrying the burden for 98% of the other folks. I would like you to take this back to your chairman, and work with the King County Assessor to come up with an equation for providing compensation for lost property values.

Q: I have a piece of property before the King County Assessor. The power lines depreciate property values up to 30%. Would you take back to the Community Advisory Group that we would like to have a King County representative evaluate the amount of money lost to the property owners? They could get their taxes lowered or at least evaluated.

A: We will pass along your request.

Q: We have been deeply concerned about the Olympic Pipeline. I appreciate hearing that you've had no impacts so far in working along the pipeline, but I still have not heard anything regarding my request for information about setbacks. In terms of a pipeline, what are the best practices for setbacks away from that pipeline; what are the best practices for 120-foot pole setback; and, combining those two, what are the best practices for pole setbacks from the pipeline?

A: We have been communicating with Olympic Pipeline. At a minimum, Leann said that they would need space between their pipe and our pole foundation to fit a shoring box.

Q: Could we get something from Olympic Pipeline and PSE in writing regarding that the best practices will be followed?

A: We will investigate that, but I can't promise it at this time.

Q: The first undergrounding estimate costs that you presented were lower than those you are sharing now. There is a project in northern New Jersey that is putting an 18-mile line section of 230 kV distribution line underground. Would PSE go back and look at their budget to do a cost-comparison? We would appreciate it.

A: We will look into that project.

Review Workshops #1 and #2

Penny led the North Sub-Area Committee through a review of the activities and results from the North Sub-Area Workshops.

Workshop # 1 – Penny described Workshop #1 as a listening workshop: attendees identified priority issues and considerations for the sub-area, identified community values, and compiled a list of data requests to use to score the potential route segments. In addition to the workshop, there was also an online survey that asked some of the same questions related to issues and segment-specific concerns.

Results: The top issues identified by workshop participants and survey respondents for the North Sub-Area were EMF, property values, residential impacts, aesthetics, number of properties impacted, and visual impacts. Other issues mentioned included design features, proximity to schools, construction, cost, community character, environmental impacts, encroachments, and impacts to trees and vegetation.

The key themes from the workshop and survey input were turned into evaluation factors for the North Sub-Area. The evaluation factors were:

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

Discussion of evaluation factors

Penny invited the committee members to share their thoughts about the evaluation factors. She asked if they found the evaluation factors a valid representation of the values in the north part of the project area. They had the following comments and questions, which Penny answered.

- C: I noted that some of the environmental categories were scored lower than visual or other issues. Environmental values aren't necessarily tied up in number of trees, so I'm not sure that was a good way to measure it. Environmental groups are okay with cutting trees—they'll grow back as long as they are replanted—so I'm not sure environmental impacts were that accurately captured.
- A: Just to give some more definition to the environmental factors, the data that was provided for workshop two included data on a variety of environmental factors, such as wildlife, wetlands, and stream crossings.
- C: As one of the people that attended both workshops, we had very little time to review all of the data and make our selections. I think for virtually everyone at the table it was not enough time to review the data much less apply them to the factors.
- C: One of the things we see here is a generalized category of the environment. For example, Bridle Trails is taken care of and cared for by the community. Bridle Trails wants trees; Somerset doesn't want trees because they want the view. The size of trees you can cut down in Bridle Trails is controlled by the City of Bellevue. I'm not sure that is captured in the weighting. When we try to talk about the environment as a dataset, it can lose its impact and its meaning.
- C: The environmental measure does not consider that small, isolated wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas are not as good as one large one. Conservationists are trying to shift boundaries around to put environmental features in larger areas.

- A: The data provided for this exercise was very coarse; it wasn't finely detailed. The intent was to pull out values specific to the north, rather than to select values to be applied across an entire route.
- C: Most of these evaluation factors are probably long term, and a lot of people have concerns about construction impacts. We didn't evaluate if one segment would have more or fewer construction impacts than another.
- C: I wanted to raise construction impacts as another factor. Though I realize that design will come later and bring more about construction, it still seems like an important consideration.
- A: Construction was mentioned as one of the "other" issues, but without as much frequency as some of the others. It is challenging to predict construction impacts now, before routing and design have been completed.
- C: Construction has impacts to more than just people.
- C: People are looking at the long term for construction impacts. In Bridle Trails, we had people trimming trees recently. Some of the trees along the transmission line measured 120-125 feet. If they were cut down, they would really change the nature of the neighborhood.
- C: Regarding trees and vegetation affected, I don't recall any discussion about how restoration would take place and when, and who would pay. That's a huge impact, because it is literally in our backyard and our only green space and needs to be discussed. If you plant a 2-foot tree to replace what you cut down, that's not going to help. We are concerned about property value impacts up front, then tree and vegetation impacts in the long run.
- C: We have a tight tree ordinance in the City of Bellevue. There is a process for evaluating trees that are cut down without a permit. Some trees could be evaluated at \$12,000 for replacement. A lot of people are thinking of moving.

Workshop # 2 – Penny led the group through the activities and results of the second workshop, which focused on scoring the route segments. At the workshop, PSE presented data that had been requested at workshop #1 and also shared representative visualizations. Using the data, participants were asked to individually score each segment using the evaluation factors. The scoring exercise was also repeated at the tables as a group.

Results: Penny presented the results of the averages of the individual and group scores. She explained that darker colors in the chart signified higher average score, and that a score of 1 meant a segment least meets the evaluation factor while a score of 5 meant a segment most meets the evaluation factor. She explained that no weighting was introduced, and just the raw scores were averaged.

Discussion of workshop #2 scoring

Penny facilitated the committee in a round robin to gather their feedback about the scoring results from workshop #2. The answers below were provided by Penny.

- C: Everyone had a really difficult time figuring out what they were doing at workshop #2. And when you add in homogenization of the key values into evaluation factors, I would be concerned about publishing these segment scores as reliable or conclusive results.

- A: We wanted you to be able to peer into the numbers, so we also provide the scores in a different way. We've presented the raw numbers for every segment: how many 1s, 2s, and 3s it received. This way of presenting the data allows you look into the numbers to see if there are trends. I share your concern with the validity of the numbers. Some people only scored one route segment. Some people clearly scored two segments against each other, such as all 1s versus all 5s.
- Q: I have trouble with all this information being presented to this group and asking us to make a recommendation about two alternatives. The data is informative in that it helps boil down the evaluation factors, but the sample size is a concern, as with any exercise. What are we going to do with all of the input that is being provided about the sub-area? Are we making a recommendation to the advisory group about one segment over another?
- A: We are not asking you to make a recommendation. We are going to ask you for your feedback on the evaluation factors, what key points the advisory group should consider, and what should the advisory group explore further? We want the committee to tell us what is important for the advisory group to know coming out of the workshops.
- Q: There are two evaluation categories: environmental and health. There are some funny numbers there. I would have expected health to be a high-value issue for people there. It looks like the scores flip-flopped in B and C on health. I think we need an answer why they aren't consistent in the vertical column.
- A: You can go to the second sheet of score results to see how they were scored, but we don't know people's motivations for giving the scores that they did.
- C: These scores are subjective; it's hard to be objective. I attended the central group and it was almost like a stacked deck. There's a direct correlation to scores based on who showed up at the meeting. I would not like to see these scores as criteria for making the decision.
- C: I attended the workshops and participated. We had very little discussion at our table, but used the data to fill out our scores. I feel that the time I invested in workshops #1 and #2 was very valid, and reflected in the criteria that came out. Of course it is subjective, but how could it not be?
- C: I think the scores are subjective, and should be; they are being interpreted through people's personal perspectives. The evaluation factors were spot on, that's what people said was most important. That was very valuable. And the data points, as to how to gauge the evaluation factors, were spot on. Where it broke down was people working within the system to get the outcome that they preferred. I don't think the scores are very useful, but I might find some neutral person to look at the criteria and the measures to score the segments. That might be very useful; to have the evaluation from someone that doesn't have a dog in this fight.
- C: I think an independent scoring would be interesting. I would like to hear what the people in the group think the Community Advisory Group should know about, such as a series of bullet items or things to consider as a recommendation.
- C: I do think it will be very difficult to make a recommendation, and I don't think it should be done. I'm very familiar with validity studies, so I'm not sure you can draw conclusions with statistical significance from this data. What I'm trying to express is that while this study is inconclusive and flawed, we can maybe find four things that should be considered from the north to take back to the Community Advisory Group.

- C: Andy Swayne (PSE's representative on the committee) said that he did not participate in the workshops as PSE didn't feel it was appropriate to participate in the scoring exercises intended for the community.
- C: I'm digesting the data and looking for the project to be completed for economic reasons and community growth.
- Q: One of the questions I raised when I saw the data sheet was the way Segment C was scored for number of parcels was way off base. With no opportunity to correct anything on the spot, that's the issue that jumped out at me. I do have concerns about the validity of the scoring results.
- A: What is being referenced here is that the data for residential impacts looked only at the number of parcels and did not include condominiums or multi-family homes. Those data points were provided at the Central and South Sub-Area Workshops. Your feedback was captured during workshop #2, and is captured again for the Community Advisory Group through this meeting.
- C: Our table at workshop #2 was similar in how we processed this. We had not realized that along the existing corridor, the existing lines would be removed and put onto new poles. That information influenced our table a lot in our scoring.
- C: My table was not very happy with the way the second workshop went, but most of us had not been at the first workshop so we were very confused. The scoring data is not valid.
- C: I think the scoring data is valuable in the table, but not in the grid. When presenting the scores to the advisory group, maybe you could take the numbers off and leave the colors, or take the scoring slide out entirely.

Key themes and messages to the Sub-Area Committee

In addition to assigning numbered scores, several individuals and groups wrote comments on the scoring worksheets from workshop #2. Penny summarized the key themes from these comments and provided answers to questions:

- Preference for taller and fewer poles (versus shorter and more poles), though not universal
- Preference for using existing corridors
- Concern that the data does not capture the number of residential units
- Concerns about EMF, noise pollution, and property values
- Consider cost to taxpayers

Q: Are these key themes an example of the sort of information we should provide tonight?

A: Yes, it could be.

Lastly, workshop #2 participants were asked to draft key messages for the North Sub-Area Committee with their table groups. Penny presented the key messages organized by table group.

Q: Group 6 made reference to common sense. Can you shed light on what they meant?

A: Unfortunately no, we do not know what they meant.

C: We're supposed to make recommendations to the Community Advisory Group. Let's share some performance standards based on the commonalities from these factors and key messages.

After a short break, Leann responded to questions raised about vegetation and restoration.

A: PSE does restoration whenever vegetation removal is called for. PSE will work with the homeowner to develop a restoration plan. Though we can't replace a 15-foot tall tree if it is under the line, we can replace it with a height-appropriate plant.

Q: Obviously there's going to be restoration during the construction process, but I don't think people realize how disruptive underground construction would be. Would you replace invasive species, such as English ivy, with non-invasive species during the restoration process?

A: I will ask our vegetative management staff that question.

Discussion of key points for the Community Advisory Group

Penny led the Sub-Area Committee members in a round robin to elicit what they considered as key points for the Community Advisory Group to consider. Penny answered questions as they arose.

C: I'm interested in the number of schools that are impacted. Also, there is data related to percent of miles of existing corridors. Related to that, it might be helpful to know the number of poles per segment: will there be fewer poles, more poles, new poles? Also important to consider would be if any of these routes would add new lines to someone who already has lines in a different part of their yard.

C: They should look to minimize the overall impact and number of people affected. By overall impact, I mean in terms of vegetation, trees, and amount of change to neighborhoods, including visual and aesthetic changes.

Q: Will the recommendations of the committee to the Community Advisory group be something outside of the workshop scoring results?

A: They could be. You can share anything you consider a key message.

C: I want to make sure my concern about some of the data points is heard regarding the number of residences, individual dwelling units, and people affected, because this is a permanent change to each of those neighborhoods. I would encourage all of the advisory group members to take a really good look at the area between Redmond Way to the south and Bridle Trails to the north. Consider the distance to dwellings, impacts to vegetation, and how near it is to the Olympic corridor.

C: I like the key workshop themes that were presented; I think they're important things to consider. I would like us to caution the advisory group that the scoring numbers cannot be used as the absolute choice. Any recommendation should be based more on themes than on numbers. I think we need a pros and cons list of construction impacts. Underground is going to be really messy, and I don't think people are really thinking about what it would entail. I also want to emphasize connectivity between trails and wildlife corridors and restoration.

C: I think maintaining existing corridors is a key message, in order to help keep the cost down.

- C: What I come away with are three themes: 1) strike balance between existing corridors and impacts to properties along them; 2) configuration—finding the right balance between numbers of poles and distance between poles (to limit viewshed issues); and 3) that concerns from the residential neighborhoods were the highest concern expressed by these folks.
- C: Though there are no impacts from EMF along these lines, people have still expressed schools as a major concern. I find that incongruous, but I'm for kids, and if that's an emotional response, that's okay. My comment is that the Community Advisory Group was set up to be a balance of property owners and other interests. I would like the advisory group to do more for property owners in terms of considering tax values, property values, duration of construction, and replacement value. The Olympic Pipeline goes through this whole corridor. It is to PSE and Olympic's self-interest that nothing happens to that corridor. Undergrounding has been brought up time and time again. I think the public would like to help you pay for it, but so far there is no creativity around the process. There should be a discussion of how you would pay for it, and a building of camaraderie around it. PSE should do studies looking at undergrounding as a solution, not an obstacle. I appreciate the information brought forth so far.
- C: There are a certain number of folks that are going to carry the burden of this project, perhaps three to four thousand people. There should be some accommodation, some value-exchanged, to compensate those folks for the burden that they carry for the rest of the public. Out of being a good neighbor, or as a business consideration, PSE does not want to anger three to four thousand people. That message needs to go to the Community Advisory Group: can we do something that helps mitigate the impacts to property owners.
- C: Reinforcing what has been heard, I would say the Community Advisory Group should consider minimizing impacts to neighborhoods by using existing corridors, minimizing existing corridor expansion, and minimizing construction and ongoing maintenance impacts.
- C: Focus on use of existing corridors and easements, build with the least cost to ratepayers, and a preference for taller and fewer poles, as an aesthetic and potentially a cost issue.
- A: As we stated, we did not exclusively hear a preference for fewer, taller poles at the workshops. Would you like to clarify the diversity in responses?
- C: I think that since one group wanted shorter poles for aesthetics, you need to temper that with cost.
- C: Preference for pole height will depend on the particular neighborhood. These poles will be twice the height as the existing poles. That will top many of the trees in our areas. I would like to see more work in individual neighborhoods—more visualizations of individual areas, and how the taller poles versus not quite as tall poles will look from various perspectives in each neighborhood. I don't want fewer poles if the taller poles would totally dominate the view. When the process gets to that point, I think PSE needs to help each neighborhood make a really informed decision.
- A: Pole height deliberation comes mostly once the alignment is done. PSE will work closely with neighborhoods at the design stage to make those decisions.
- C: A key message is to minimize the impact of this project; replacing six lines is less impact than putting in three new lines.

Discussion of recommendations to the Community Advisory Group for further consideration

Penny asked the committee members if they had any specific recommendations for the Community Advisory Group to explore further, focusing on the data and results of the workshop series. Penny provided answers to questions.

Q: You said that the evaluation factors were what this sub-area decided upon, and they may be different in the central and south. Won't the Community Advisory Group ultimately have to synthesize routes across the sub-areas?

A: What I haven't talked about yet tonight is the process for the advisory group going forward. They will:

1. Digest input from sub-area workshops and tonight's meeting.
2. Start looking at all of the segments to determine if they can put together combinations of segments into potential routes.
3. Evaluate the pros and cons of potential routes to see if they can do some narrowing. At that point, the routes will be brought to the community for evaluation.
4. Then that input will go back to the advisory group for a Multi-Objective Decision Analysis process. They will use evaluation factors, weight them, and then go through a process that helps them assess their route options to score them.

The advisory group's process will be much more objective, with stop-points for sensitivity analysis. The advisory group will not use the scores from the Sub-Area Committee for evaluation; it will simply be another piece of information for the advisory group to consider from each of the sub-areas.

C: One thing some folks have wondered about is capacity for future growth: which segment would accommodate future growth better than another segment? In terms of electrical load, are we going to be back in this room in the next 5-10 years? And what redundancy does PSE have based on the route that is built? I think the advisory group should further investigate these questions.

C: I'm interested in the pole-height trade-off: from how far away would you be able to see a 100-foot span. I don't know, and that's a topography and tree height exercise. I think that's a city-wide visual impact that should be investigated.

C: I would like the advisory group to take a really good look at what the Key Observation Points (KOPs) from the visualizations may show, to see what the true impact would be from various heights and locations.

C: I would recommend the advisory group make sure that some of those KOP points of view are from a distance, not just along the corridor.

C: There have been almost no conversations about substations. Please share more information about substations with the Community Advisory Group. Also consider that Bridle Trails is being put in a difficult place environmentally. Make sure these various projects such as a water tower, increased traffic, etc., are being done in concert.

Q: Regarding the Lake Washington folks that filed a lawsuit, can you give us an idea the process that will be involved? Will it mean Segment L is no longer under consideration?

A: We can't comment on ongoing litigation. However, at this time, Segment L is still one of the potential route segments for consideration.

C: I'm disappointed that you're not working with Seattle City Light and we aren't hearing more of those conversations.

C: I think overall, utilities should communicate more about how they will work together. The Community Advisory Group should be sure to look at equity between the three sub-areas.

C: To add to the Seattle City Light conversation, I think it would be helpful to the advisory group to see SCL's 50 year plan for their corridor.

Q: Has PSE taken a look at what other organizations around the country have done during similar public siting processes? What did you consider when setting up this process?

A: We've hired firms that work around the country to tell us what other groups have done.

As a follow up, Leann asked Lowell Rogers of POWER Engineers to speak from his experience regarding other transmission line projects around the country:

A: Most of my experience comes from consulting for utilities in California. Generally, the utility does an internal routing analysis with some elected or neighborhood outreach, although not nearly as formal as this. The utility chooses a preferred alternative that then moves forward to the environmental review stages. I haven't seen a utility go through this early stage of non-required public process before.

Wrap up and next steps

In closing, Penny reminded the North Sub-Area Committee that they as a body were not tasked with coming to a decision between routes, as it is too complicated for their one meeting together. She observed that one take away from the workshop scoring process could be that there are no easy answers.

Penny reminded the group that the Central and South Sub-Area Committees would convene on May 14 and 15. Summaries of all three Sub-Area Committee meetings will be provided to the Community Advisory Group at its next meeting on June 4, at the Old Redmond School House. She thanked the Sub-Area Committee and members of the public for attending and for their time and energy spent devoted to their involvement in the process. Penny additionally reminded the Sub-Area Committee that the meeting summary would be posted to the project website when completed.