

## North Sub-Area Workshop #2 Summary

4/30/2014

### Meeting information

Location: Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

Date: April 16, 2014, 6:30 to 9 p.m.

Number of workshop participants signed in: 42

### Purpose

On April 16, Puget Sound Energy hosted the second of two workshops in the North Sub-Area. At Workshop #1, the North Sub-Area Committee and members of the public learned about the project, examined route segments A, B, C and D, provided input on the segments and identified values that could be used to evaluate those segments. At Workshop #2, the North Sub-Area Committee and members of the public scored route segments A, B, C, and D 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 A	Segment B	Segment C	Segment D
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	4.57	2.41	3.03	2.83
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3.18	2.13	3.02	3.22
3. Least proximity to residential areas	4.05	2.17	2.70	3.42
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	4.36	2.20	2.67	3.42
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	4.43	2.67	3.73	2.54
6. Most protective of health and safety	3.91	3.32	2.48	3.26
7. Least effect on aesthetics	4.16	2.25	3.07	3.14

#### Notes:

- Three individual worksheets included write-in evaluation factors. Of those, two scored “cost” and one scored “other relevant factors.”
- Three 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 in table discussion groups. The table below displays the average scores resulting from the group worksheets.

Evaluation factor	Segment A	Segment B	Segment C	Segment D
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	4.80	1.97	2.83	2.57
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3.00	1.50	3.00	3.53
3. Least proximity to residential areas	4.20	2.17	2.67	3.93
4. Least proximity to mature vegetation	4.37	1.73	3.00	3.47
5. Maximizes opportunity areas	4.53	2.60	3.50	2.47
6. Most protective of health and safety	3.50	3.27	2.50	3.43
7. Least effect on aesthetics	4.48	2.03	3.17	3.37

Note:

- One group worksheet scored “cost” as a write-in evaluation factor.

### Worksheet comments

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

- Concern that the data does not accurately capture the number of residential units adjacent and near proposed routes (e.g. does not factor in condominiums and apartments)
- Concerns about electromagnetic fields (EMF), noise pollution, and property values
- Preference for taller, fewer poles
- Preference for using existing corridors
- Consider undergrounding
- Consider cost to taxpayers

### Message to the North Sub-Area Committee

In groups, workshop participants drafted key messages for the North 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 North Sub-Area Workshop #2. Their inclusion here is to maintain a record of the information and input received at this meeting and 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 messages to the North Sub-Area Committee, reflect 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**
  - *Minimize proximity to schools big priority*
  - *Prefer taller poles with greater spans*
  - *Open to neighborhood preference if different along route*
  - *Utilize existing lines/corridors (including City Light line)*
- **Group 2**
  - *Data is not a true representation of the make-up of the community*
    - *Ex: Segment C has more than 0 childcare facilities*

- *Ex: Segment C has private (in addition to public) recreational use areas*
- *Ex: # of trails near Segment C*
- *Ex: # of residents vs. parcels (6001)*
- *Residential units are most important data*
- *Consider number of residential units near and adjacent to each segment*
- *Prefer shorter poles*
- **Group 3**
  - *Focus on existing lines/corridors*
  - *Prefer taller poles/fewer poles*
- **Group 4**
  - *Use existing lines wherever possible, with minimal impact*
- **Group 5**
  - *Concern about interaction of transmission line on pipeline*
  - *Continued concerns about health*
  - *Continued concerns about aesthetics and property values*
- **Group 6**
  - *Preference: tall poles/long spans*
  - *Please consider cost to tax-payers, proximity to schools, and common sense*
  - *Build where there are existing poles/easements for the least cost/impact*

### **Public process feedback**

Several participants provided comments and feedback on the public process. Those comments indicated:

- Frustration with the scoring system and amount of time provided to complete the scoring exercises
- Appreciation for the data and visual representations provided