

Sub-Area Committee Meetings Overview

5/28/14

The Sub-Area Committee Meetings

Puget Sound Energy hosted meetings of the North, Central and South Sub-Area Committees to review outcomes from Sub-Area Workshops and develop recommendations for the Community Advisory Group to consider for the Energize Eastside project. This document outlines evaluation factors identified and discussed for each sub-area, key points shared with the Community Advisory Group, and topics for further consideration by the Community Advisory Group.

Sub-Area Committee Meetings took place at the following dates, times, and locations:

North Sub-Area Committee Meeting

Wednesday, May 7, 2014
6:30 – 9 p.m.
Old Redmond School House
16600 NE 80th Street
Redmond

Central Sub-Area Committee Meeting

Wednesday, May 14, 2014
6:30 – 9 p.m.
Hilton Bellevue
300 112th Ave. SE
Bellevue

South Sub-Area Committee Meeting

Thursday, May 15, 2014
6:30 – 9 p.m.
Renton Technical College
3000 NE Fourth Street
Renton

Evaluation factors

Key community values identified in Sub-Area Workshop #1 were turned into evaluation factors for Workshop #2 attendees to score the route segments. The evaluation factors identified for each Sub-Area are included in the table below. At the Sub-Area Committee Meetings, committee members discussed the evaluation factors and made some suggestions to existing factors and recommendations for additional factors to consider.

Note: Some evaluation factors were not identified by all Sub-Areas. These are noted in the below table.

Evaluation factor	Factors used during Sub-Area Meetings			Sub-Area Committee member suggestions
	North	Central	South	
Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	✓	✓	✓	N/A
Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider that individual environmental factors, such as wildlife, wetlands and stream crossings may have different priority levels for different communities Include impacts during construction
Least proximity to residential areas	✓	✓	✓	N/A
Most protective of health and safety	✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider as the top factor

Least effect on aesthetics	✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider undergrounding and submerging
Least impact to mature vegetation	✓		✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include vegetation restoration plans
Maximizes opportunity areas	✓	✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While this factor was not originally identified as a top evaluation factor in the South, during the South Sub-Area Committee Meeting there was a request for this factor to be used

During the discussion of evaluation factors, additional evaluation factors and suggestions for consideration were identified by Sub-Area Committee members. These additional evaluation factors and suggestions are noted below:

Additional evaluation factors	Factors suggested during Sub-Area Meetings (but not used)			Sub-Area Committee member suggestions
	North	Central	South	
Least impact from construction	✓		✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include relative impacts between segments and construction time
Least effect on property values		✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider property rights, inverse condemnation and easements

The Sub-Area Committee members also provided additional comments about the process of selecting and using the evaluation factors, which included:

- Rank and weight the evaluation factors based on their importance for each community
- Concerns about the limited amount of time during the workshops that was given to consider the factors

Key messages for the Community Advisory Group

At each Sub-Area Committee Meeting, committee members were asked to provide key points for the Community Advisory Group to consider. Key points are provided for each of the North, Central and South Sub-Areas.

North Sub-Area key points

- Minimize project impact in terms of the number of people, schools, visual and aesthetic changes, and environmental factors affected
- Use existing corridors
- Consider undergrounding, including the construction impacts of that process
- Utilize the evaluation factor data to measure the preferences of the Sub-Areas with caution due to the subjectivity of the data
- Find the right balance between the number of poles and the distance between poles that will be a fit for each community
- Consider the most cost-effective option
- Consider accommodations to help mitigate the impacts to property owners

Central Sub-Area key points

- Work with PSE and Seattle City Light to utilize the existing Seattle City Light corridor
- Consider alternative technology and conservation
- Consider undergrounding
- Minimize project impact to visuals and aesthetics
- Incentivize conservation
- Consider accommodations to help mitigate the impacts to property owners
- Consider the most cost-effective option
- Utilize PSE and other existing rights-of-way whenever possible

South Sub-Area key points

- Consider health and safety as the most critical evaluation factor
- Consider accommodations to help mitigate the impacts to property owners
- Minimize project impact to visuals and aesthetics
- Consider undergrounding, submerging the line and sharing the corridor with Seattle City Light
- Consider the environmental impacts of undergrounding and submerging
- Gather data about the permitting and environmental review process, easement acquisition, and construction impacts for consideration
- Discuss with PSE the stipulation that undergrounding must be paid for by the affected community
- Recognize that this process is pitting neighborhoods against neighborhoods and that an objective process is needed

Topics for further exploration by the Community Advisory Group

The Sub-Area Committees provided topics, including recommendations and questions, for further exploration by the Community Advisory Group. These topics included:

North Sub-Area	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share more information about substations. • Maintain equity between the three sub-areas. • Written confirmation from Seattle City Light about their response is requested.
Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which segments can best accommodate future growth? • How will pole height affect Key Observation Points and views city-wide, not just along the corridor? • How will the lawsuit affect the use of Segment L as a potential route option? • How is PSE working with Seattle City Light? What conversations have taken place relating to this project and what are Seattle City Light’s future plans for this corridor?

Central Sub-Area	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Community Advisory Group may not be able to select a preferred route because a preferred route might not exist. • What would the cost of undergrounding be if it were shared across the whole region vs. paid for by the affected neighborhood? More specific data about the general cost of undergrounding is requested. • Cost should not be the only factor considered.
Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are the “lock-out” areas that were identified using the proprietary GIS mapping tool? • What are the costs of each segment? • What are the environmental impacts of each route? The results of the Environmental Impact Study should be considered in route selection. • Is there a true need for the project? What are the power need forecasts? Communities need to understand the need for the transmission lines. Population [density] data from the Puget Sound Regional Council is needed in graph form. • How much power will be sold to other areas? • How much do impact fees go into this issue? How much more of an impact fee should commercial people and developers pay to help offset this cost? • Why isn't WSDOT allowing power lines along I-405 and SR-520?
South Sub-Area	
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More specific data about the general cost of undergrounding is requested. • Written confirmation from Seattle City Light about their response is requested. • Collect more representative photo simulations. • The Community Advisory Group should be expanded to include more neighborhoods. • More time is needed for the scoring exercise and citizen input. • Information from an objective third-party is requested. • More information on submerging is requested. • More information on energy sources and demand. • Advance information about the process moving forward is requested.
Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would the cost of undergrounding be if it were shared across the whole region vs. paid for by the affected neighborhood? • How is PSE working with Seattle City Light? What conversations have taken place relating to this project and what are Seattle City Light's future plans for this corridor? • What are the environmental impacts of each route? The results of the Environmental Impact Study should be considered in route selection.