

South Sub-Area Workshop #1 – Issues Checklist results summary

4/10/2014

At the South Sub-Area Workshop #1 on March 27, 2014, participants completed an Issues Checklist Worksheet to assess the top five issues in their sub-area.

The worksheet asked the question:

“For the potential route segments in the north sub-area, what key issues should the Sub-Area Committee consider?”

A list of issues was included, as well as the option to write-in any additional issues not listed (indicated by “Other: ____”). Where appropriate, these were tallied with the corresponding issue topics provided.

The table below summarizes the results from the Issues Checklist Worksheets that were collected. Issues are listed in order of most to least frequently selected, with results by segment. Note: No worksheets were completed for segments K1/K2 or N.

Issue and corresponding write-in (indented)	Segment L	Segment M	Total
Property values Other: Loss of property tax revenue due to lost property values	32	19	51
Visual impacts	27	11	38
Aesthetics Other: Impacts the look and character of the lake shore	26	11	37
Encroachments Other: Illegally acquired easement Other: No easement granted by me across my property Other: What properties would be condemned for L route? Other: Does PSE really have the easements? Haggert case. Other: Native American Treaty Rights Other: Easements are already narrow Other: Easement is for rail use only; rail line is being considered for other uses, the initial rail line easement did not transfer that right to other uses	28	6	34
Community character Other: Long term community impact Other: Impacts to parks, trails, and recreation Other: Impact to Coulon Park	22	8	30
Residential impacts Other: Noise Other: Will a pole be on my property? Other: Feet from doors/homes	17	12	29
EMF Other: Health hazard	20	9	29

Issue and corresponding write-in (indented)	Segment L	Segment M	Total
Environmental Impacts Other: Fish and marine impacts Other: Entire ecosystem negatively impacted Other: Eagles nesting, federally protected eagle nests along lake Other: Impact on ecosystem Other: Conflict with SMP	23	4	27
Design features Other: Design features underground Other: Take down existing poles	14	7	21
Number of properties impacted Other: Proximity to homes Other: Houses are very close to power line easement	15	6	21
Existing utility corridors Other: There is already an existing corridor that has "accepted" and "incorporated" the negative consequences of having power lines located there. People that live there and would move there have already incorporated those consequences. Other: Use of existing lines	15	3	18
Construction Other: Bedrock concerns Other: Potential damages to homes/foundations immediately adjacent to corridor from monopole installation	15	3	18
Cost Other: Cost of underground	10	3	13
Impacts to trees and mature vegetation	12	0	12
Need for project	2	2	4
Historic landmarks	2	1	3
Proximity to schools Other: Children live on it! Other: The M line goes right through the school Renton Technical College	2	1	3
Business impacts	1	1	2
Other: Soil viabilities and landslide	2	0	2
Other: Olympic pipeline safety and impact	1	1	2
Economic development	1	0	1
Other: Public safety	0	1	1
Other: Where is the example of other shoreline power poles?	1	0	1
Other: Bury and use profits from excess capacity sold to other areas to fund burying it	1	0	1
Other: Higher costs with a private entity with higher compensation and stockholder that want a return on their money very bad! Plus cut CEO compensation package.	0	1	1
Other: Alternative routes	1	0	1
Other: Unlimited expansion of voltage	1	0	1