

## South Sub-Area Workshop #1 Summary

---

4/10/2014

### Purpose

On March 19, Puget Sound Energy hosted the first of two workshops in the South Sub-Area. At Workshop #1, the South Sub-Area Committee and members of the public learned about the project, examined route segments K1, K2, L, M, and N and identified factors to evaluate those segments.

### Meeting information

Location: Renton Technical College

Date: March 27, 2014, 6:30 to 9 p.m.

Number of workshop participants signed in: 103

### Key issues

Based on the results of the individual checklists, workshop participants identified the following top key issues within this sub-area (in order of most referenced). Group discussions reflected similar key issues.

1. Property values
2. Visual impacts
3. Aesthetics
4. Encroachments
5. Community character
6. Residential impacts
7. Electromagnetic Fields (EMF)

In addition, undergrounding or submerging the proposed transmission lines was also a key topic frequently mentioned in group discussions and comment cards.

### Specific considerations informed by local knowledge

Workshop participants provided the following responses when asked to identify key neighborhood characteristics and specific considerations that the Sub-Area Committees and PSE should know about. Below is a list of feedback provided by community members:

- Segment L
  - *Landslide due to steep slope and underground streams at 2815 Mt. View Ave N, Renton*
  - *Shoreline Management Act violations*
  - *Conflict with Native American Treaty Rights along Lake Washington shoreline*
  - *Conflicts with DOE rules and regulations*
  - *Would destroy pristine landscape views of Lake Washington for residents, commuters, Mercer Island residents, parks*
  - *Four public parks heavily used: Coulon Park, May Creek Park, Kennydale Beach, Newcastle Beach*
  - *Water uses by general public , fishing, kayak, SUP, boating, water skiing, canoe, windsurfing*
  - *Eastside rail corridor (ERC) conflicts with multi-use bike trails, path, light rail*

- *Railroad biking keeps rail line location easement intact; 230 kV line must be 50' from railway center line*
- *Eagle habitat along Kennydale Beach and beyond, along entire lake*
- *Area wildlife include eagles, great blue heron, kingfishers, otters, nutria, salmon, stickleback, deer, rabbits, coyote, opossum, raccoon*
- *Runoff into Lake Washington*
- *Spawning salmon could be impacted*
- *Water table at 3' below surface*
- *Underground springs at 32nd-38th St.*
- *Underground streams from Lake Washington Blvd rushing down Mt. View Ave*
- *Sea level rise*
- *Washout 20 years ago between Ripley Lane and Hazelwood*
- *Slides on hillsides onto railroad track at 2700 block Mt. View Ave N*
- *Steep slopes, freeway, pinch points, liquefaction*
- *Potential for geotechnical events, e.g. earthquake*
- *Homes extremely close to proposed route - majority of homes within 50' of rail line center*
- *No high power lines currently so impacts many homes not currently impacted*
- *View rights of Lake Washington and Bellevue would be violated*
- *Private roads - Lakehurst, Pleasure Point, Hazelwood, Ripley, Lake Washington*
- *One lane roads*
- *Uneven topography*
- *Existing gas lines underground Mt. View along railroad*
- *Major sewer line and trunkline on Ripley Ave*
- *No access on Ripley Ave to service infrastructure*
- *Fiber optic cables underground*
- *Indian burial grounds*
- *Neighborhoods in place since early 1900s - infrastructure will overwhelm neighborhoods*
- *Widening of I-405*
  
- **Segment M**
  - *Some areas old/established*
  - *Not all of M has a corridor - close proximity to homes*
  - *Historic miners cemetery*
  - *Historical cemetery in Newcastle*
  - *Church - Seattle Revival Center*
  - *Bedrock and soil instability*
  - *Olympic Pipeline in middle of corridor, vulnerability during construction and seismic events*
  - *No more easement space*
  - *UV flashes impacting animals*
  - *Wildlife - deer, coyote, bobcat, bear*

Specific characteristics were not identified for segments K1/K2 and N.

### **Evaluation factors**

Workshop participants identified value-based evaluation factors to use when analyzing potential route segments within their sub-area in Workshop #2. Evaluation factors were grouped into the following categories:

- Proximity to sensitive community land uses (number of parks, beaches, and trails; interference with other uses of the corridor)
- Proximity to sensitive environmental areas (impacts to eagle, osprey and falcon nesting habitat; impacts to other wildlife, wetlands, and streams)
- Proximity to residential areas (number of residences impacted; noise)
- Effects on aesthetics (view shed, number of view rights violated, number of people who will see new infrastructure, number/location of poles)
- Effects on health and safety (EMF impacts to homes, Olympic Pipeline, geologic events, e.g. landslide and earthquake)
- Proximity to mature vegetation (number and percentage of trees impacted, impacts to mature trees)

### **Data requests for each segment**

Workshop participants were asked to identify what route segment data would be useful to help compare the route segments in Workshop #2. Data requests summarized below combine duplicate requests and are arranged by key topic area.

#### Aesthetics

- Impact to aesthetics

#### Business impacts

- Impacts to light rail or potential high speed rail

#### Construction

- Number and scope of other projects planned in the corridor
- Number of agencies using same corridor
- Number of co-located utilities developed and issues that have occurred

#### Cost

- Number of customers impacted
- Total cost estimate of undergrounding transmission lines (verified by independent consultant)
- Total cost estimate of submerging transmission lines
- Total cost estimate of all legal disputes and delays (vs. cost of undergrounding)

#### Easements

- Number of new easements needed
- Number of condemnations needed
- Number of properties with potential legal issues re: easements
- Number of poles that would follow the right-of-way vs. off the right-of-way
- Percentage of new easements required that do not impact the existing community

#### Environmental impacts

- Impact to environmentally sensitive areas
- Number of nesting eagles, ospreys and raccoons
- Number of eagle and other sensitive habitat areas impacted
- Regulations requiring exemptions
- Impacts to salmon habitat

#### Health and safety

- Number of people (residents and users) exposed to potential EMF health impacts
- Current vs. future EMF exposure levels for nearby residences
- Proximity and number of people within a certain risk range
- EMF health impacts, factoring in the public health impacts of the other intended uses (e.g. light rail) on a cumulative basis and based on worst case scenario
- Number of schools within a half mile
- Percent probability for geotechnical events
- Presence of fuel pipelines and their age/condition
- Proximity of hazards to the line (e.g. trees)

#### Project need

- Energy demand forecasts by zip code
- Energy demand forecasts for customers along segment

#### Property value impacts

- Percent decrease in property values
- Percent decrease in property tax and effects on school funding and emergency services
- Appraisal on all affected properties and net present value calculation

#### Recreation

- Number of adjacent parks
- Number of visitors to adjacent parks
- Number of recreational users of Lake Washington Boulevard
- Number of visitors, trails, cars and bikes who will see new infrastructure
- Impact to community access areas

#### Residential impacts

- Number of households impacted
- Number of households within 300 feet
- Number of households immediately adjacent
- Number of people impacted
- Number of households newly impacted
- Number of low income households

#### Undergrounding

- How much can be placed underground
- Cost of undergrounding, verified by independent consultant

#### Vegetation

- Number of mature trees
- Ability to enhance landscaping in corridor

#### Views

- Number of view rights violated (lake and city views)
- Number of properties impacted
- Number of households who will see new transmission lines and poles

- Number of area travelers who will see new transmission lines and poles
- Examples of other shoreline power poles

Graphics or visual aids

- Photo simulation of proposed transmission lines along proposed segments showing homes, lines, towers, etc.
- Renderings of development for routes, including poles, obstacles and risks
- Fly photo drone over segments to illustrate issues

**Public process feedback**

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

- A question about whether PSE is required to solicit community input
- Belief that PSE has a preferred route and preconceived objectives
- Belief that PSE is biased against any underground solution
- Concerns about the information provided, including PSE's cost estimates for undergrounding
- Frustration with the facilitator
- Frustration with workshop design (i.e. too directed)