South Sub-Area Workshop #1
Transcribed Flipchart Notes

4/4/2014

On March 27, 2014, Puget Sound Energy hosted South Sub-Area Workshop #1 for the Energize Eastside project. Meeting attendees participated in small group discussions about the route segments, using questions listed below to guide conversation. Attendees recorded their responses on provided flipcharts. Transcriptions of the flipcharts are below.

The content of the verbatim transcriptions below reflect input from individuals participating in the Central Sub-Area Workshop #1. The transcriptions reflect a verbatim reproduction of the hand-written materials on the flipchart pages to the fullest extent of the materials' legibility.

The inclusion of the transcriptions is to maintain a record of the information and input received at this meeting. Their inclusion is not a reflection of Puget Sound Energy's concurrence or disagreement with the content of the comments in whole or in part, The workshop process, including the preparation of summaries including the Transcribed Flipchart Notes, reflect PSE's public outreach process to assist the Community Advisory Group and Sub-Area Committees in gathering input that will be used to inform a decision about route selection.

Guiding questions

Part 1: Route segment conversation
Question 1: For this segment, what key issues should be considered?

Question 2: For this segment, what are specific considerations, unique characteristics or any other information that you haven't already discussed that the Sub-Area Committees and Community Advisory Group should know about? Use the aerial maps on the table to identify specific locations.

Part 2: Evaluation factors
Values
Question 1: As a group, answers the question "what evaluation factors should be considered by the Sub-Area Committee when considering route segments in this sub-area?"

Factors
Question 2: Thinking about the factors you considered above, what data does your group think would be useful to make an objective comparison across segments?

Transcribed flipcharts

Segment L – Group 1

Issues

1. *Shoreline Management Act violations to segment L*
2. *Amount of adjacent park land is affected*
3. *Life cycle cost analysis of underground vs. above*
4. *Real impact on property values in real $*
5. *Loss of broader community coming to Renton Lake Washington shoreline effect on growth and quality of Renton community. Long term viability*
6. *Specific cost of underground (L) compared to above ground*
7. *Number of people effect and impact of image of Renton visibility (405) by others*

Segment L – Group 2

Issues

1. *Degradation of residential environment*
2. *Significant conflict with Native American Treaty Rights along Lake Washington shoreline*
3. *Which route has least new impact on eagle / falcon habitat, wetlands*
4. *Decreased property values - less revenue/tax dollars for city/county*
5. *The least number of NEW properties impacted*

Unique issues to L

- *L would destroy pristine landscape views of Lake Washington for residents, commuters, Mercer Island residents, parks - Coulon, Kennydale Beach, Newcastle*
- *Unavoidable very close proximity to shoreline residents*
- *Eastside rail corridor "ERC" conflicts with multi-use bike trails, path, light rail*
- *Much greater impact on property values: paid for views. New encroachments*
- *Eagle nesting and other wildlife impact not on other routes*

Values

- *Views*
- *Environment - Least impact on sensitive areas*
- *Property Values - Minimize negative impact*
- *Costs - Minimize further costs from multi-use acquisition*

What metrics (data) should PSE use in deciding route?

- *Number of new people who will see lines and equipment*
- *Number of visitors: trails, cars, bikes who will see new infrastructure*
- *Data available for EIS (Environmental Impact Statement)*
- *Appraisal of impact on property values*
- *Decline in property tax - school funding, emergency services*
- *Number of customers impacted: number of agencies using same corridor, number of easements, condemnations needed*

Segment L – Group 3

Issues
- *Existing utility corridor*
- *Property values*
- *Visual impacts*
- *Alternative route (In lake, underground)*
- *Environmental impact (streams, wetlands, wildlife)*

Q2, pt. 1
- *Kennydale Beach*
- *Newcastle Beach*
- *Habitat enhancements*
- *Eagle habitat - Kennydale Beach and beyond, along entire lake*
- *May Creek Park*
- *Coulon Park*
- *Wetlands*
- *Underground springs 32nd - 38th*
- *Washout 20 years ago between Ripply Ln and Hazelwood*

Values
- *Parks*
- *Pristine Lake Washington*
- *Safety*
- *Environment*
- *Broader community access*
- *Long term investment in superior infrastructure*

Questions
- *How many adjacent parks? How intrusive?*
- *What is the aesthetic and environmental impact?*
- *What is impact of EMF and pole/structures on nearby homes?*
- *What is impact on environmental sensitive areas?*
- *How will this impact broad community access, desire to parks, recreation and habitats?*
- *How much of this can be placed underground?*

Segment L – Group 4

Issues

- *Sale of railway easement was illegal! And already conflicts for use (trail, etc.)*
- *Visual view of entire community, not just neighboring*
- *Extreme close proximity to homes*
- *Damage to property values*
- *Health risk (EMF)*
- *Use existing corridor - less impact*
- *Environmental impact - wildlife, proximity to lake (eagles, osprey, etc. - federal protection)*
- *Many homes impacted*
- *Shoreline Management Plan regulations - 200 feet back*
- *FHA lending issues close to power lines*

Unique to neighborhood

- *Homes extremely close to proposed route*
- *View rights violated - of lake and Bellevue*
- *Impact on property values*
- *Environmental impact on eagles, other wildlife, trees, vegetation*
- *Numerous public parks along route*
- *Negative impact on resale value and ability to sell*
- *No high power lines currently so impacts many homes not currently impacted*

Factors

- *How many public parks are extremely close to the route?*
- *How many eagle habitats will be destroyed by the route?*
- *How many view rights will be violated? (Lake and city views) - owners, commuters, visitors, etc…*
- *What is mileage of segment that would disturb previously undisturbed lands?*
- *Number of homes newly disturbed?*
- *How much will this decrease property values, especially with so many currently undisturbed properties?*
- *How many new easements will this mean?*
- *How would this impact future uses of corridor (trail, etc…)?*

Data & info

- *Who should we call in regards to destroying eagle habitats?*
- *What percentage of value will our property values go down?*
- *Why isn't underground (water) cable an issue and what would it cost?*
- *Where are visuals showing actual homes, lines, towers, etc.?*
- *How many eagle habitats will be impacted? Other wildlife?*
- *How many homes now disturbed when not previously?*
- *Will all additional capacity be used by areas impacted? And none sold???*

Segment L – Group 5

Issues

- *Illegal easement*
- *EMF*
- *Property values down 10-20%*
- *Environmental impacts*
- *Long term community impact*
- *Future expansion up to 3 lines*
- *Parks and public use*
- *Visual impacts*
- *Private roads - Lakehurst, Pleasure Point, Hazelwood, Ripley, Lake Washington*
- *Eagles, great blue heron, kingfishers, otters, nutria, salmon, stickleback, deer, rabbits, coyote, opossum, raccoon*
- *Water uses by general public , fishing, kayak, SUP, boating, water skiing, canoe, windsurfing*
- *One lane roads*
- *Solitude and serenity*
- *Privacy*
- *Bad construction access*
- *Uneven topography*
- *Eastside Rail Corridor constituents*

Evaluation - values

- *Property value impacts - What is the decrease in compensation?*
- *Health impacts of EMF - How does PSE dismiss studies with negative EMF impacts? What specific studies is PSE using vs. studies rejected?*
- *Impact on views, public and private - Number and location of poles? Rights of public to have unaffected views?*
- *Interference from other agency work in the corridor (Eastside Rail Trail, Sound Transit) - How does this impact and locate Light Rail or high speed rail? How does serenity of trail get compromised?*
- *Requirements for Easements - Illegal sale of easement by port of Seattle*
- *Number of customers impacted*
- *Compliance with SMP - 100% of homes along route L impacted by new infrastructure*
- *How many poles and vaults to follow contour of right of way?*

Objective metrics

- *Least tax revenue impact for municipalities*
- *Population density in the corridor*
- *Proximity to houses*
- *Accessibility to lines and poles in terms of road width and public vs. private roads for services and construction*
- *Sensitive area/habitat regulations and requirements to be followed*

Segment L – Group 6

Issues

1. *Encroachments / Easements, Haggert decision*
2. *Environmental impacts - streams under houses, wetlands (Oso slide), wildlife (eagle, 6ft 3. wingspan), SMP, May Creek, Coulon Park, Kennydale Park, trees*
3. *Number of properties impacted - visual, $ value, including community impact - users*
4. *Design features - underground in residential area*
5. *Where is precedent? No other Lake Washington community has higher power wires (EMFs)*

Question 2

1. *Slides on hillsides onto RR track at 2700 block Mt. View Ave N*
2. *Underground streams from Lake Washington Blvd rushing down Mt. View Ave*
3. *Existing gas lines underground Mt. View along RR*
4. *Fiber optic cables underground*
5. *Eagles nesting*
6. *Steep slopes, freeway, pinch points, liquefaction*

- *Environmental stewardship*
- *How many parks*
- *How many people use these parks*
- *Size of parks*
- *Number of nesting eagles, ospreys, etc, raccoons*
- *Potential for geotechnical events percentage probability*
- *Noise pollution from lines perceived db levels at ground level*
- *Viewscapes - number of public using the corridor and enjoying views*
- *Number of trees impacted and what percentage get cut down*
- *Earthquake potential and number of residences affected*

Value

- *Property Rights*
- *Number of properties encroached upon*
- *$ value of decreased values*
- *$ value tax revenue lost*
- *Number of properties with potential legal issues re: easement*
- *Public Health*
- *Number of people (residents, users) exposed to potential health impacts.*
- *Views - number of new people (residents and community users) who will see new transmission towers*
- *Cost*
- *Number of scope of projects competing for corridor*
- *Number of easements and condemnations required*
- *Legal actions likely yes/n?*

Measure

- *Comprehensive EIS*
- *Full appraisals on all affected properties and NPV calculation*
- *Comprehensive study of EMF health impacts "in use" in our route.*
- *Also factoring the public health impacts of the other intended uses (light rail, etc.) on a cumulative basis*
- *Based on "worst case" scenarios (smoking was not considered unhealthy for many years)*
- *Study of number of park users and LWB recreational users*
- *Compare the cost of all objections, legal disputes, delays, etc…, with the cost of DOING THE RIGHT THING = UNDERGROUNDING (not a community expense)*

Segment L – Group 7

Issues

- *Property values*
- *Encroachments*
- *Environmental impact (SMP and construction pollution, silt and liquefaction)*
- *Cost*
- *Visual Impact / Aesthetics*
- *Negative impact of other users*

Question 2

1. *4 Public parks that are heavily used will be negatively impacted.*
2. *Indian burial grounds*
3. *Nesting eagles*
4. *Large numbers of the general public enjoy this corridor and its views*
5. *Spawning salmon could be impacted*
6. *Potential accident risk (as a new route, unknown risks)*

Community values evaluation

- *Views of Lake Washington - do other segments have views of the lake?*
- *Recreational / Public usage - how much public/recreational usage in each segment?*
- *Corridor usage - what is the best public usage of the corridor? Would adding power line prevent some better/other/future public use?*

Data needs for community

1. *Relative property values*
2. *Projected changes in property values*
3. *Measured studies of recreational / public usage - walking, cycling, jogging, etc.*

Segment L – Group 8

Issues

1. *Unstoppable land - possible landslides*
2. *Unreasonable encroachment - majority of homes within 50' of rail line center*
3. *Significant environmental impact - Shoreline management act, wildlife (eagles, lake otters, etc..), salmon runs, EMF*
4. *Property value drops 15 - 25%*
5. *Significant quality of life impact to the vast majority of all Lake Lanes residents and Seahawks*

Unique Issues

1. *Railroad biking keeps rail line location easement intact; 230kv line must be 50' from railway center line*
2. *Hillside stability*
3. *Landfill base*
4. *Water table at 3' below surface*
5. *All trees taller than 15' would be removed, hundreds would be removed*
6. *Loss of minimal sound buffering that exists today with loss of all trees*
7. *Major sewer line and trunkline on Ripley*
8. *No access on Ripley to service infrastructure*
9. *Business & residential impacts*
10. *Not enough easement to place 230kv lines a safe distance from existing homes*
11. *Neighborhoods in place since early 1900s infrastructure will overwhelm neighborhoods*

Community values

- *Views*
- *Cost*
- *Environment*
- *Economic*

Evaluation factors

- *Views are enhanced or at least not further impact*
- *Views - percentage of community impacted by new infrastructure should be minimized*
- *How probability of rework or interference due to other agency work in the corridor*
- *Percentage of new easements required does not impact existing community*
- *Least impact to environmentally sensitive areas*
- *Property values are enhanced or at least not negatively impacted*

Data needs

- *Number of new residents who can see transmission equipment from their homes*
- *Number of area travelers who will see new equipment*
- *Number and scope of other agency projects utilizing the same corridor*
- *Number of property owner easements or condemnations required*
- *Environmental regulations requiring exemptions*
- *Appraisers' estimate, not PSE, of property values*
- *Based on above: impact on city and school districts*

Segment L / M

Issues

- *EMF - High Voltage, case studies are not being done in these circumstances, we know many who live near power lines and are ill, medical device implants do not co-exist with high transmission lines*
- *Kills community character - views, trails, parks, visitors, residents*
- *Risk of catastrophic issues next to fuel lines (jet fuel) during construction*
- *Lines impacting existing easements as well as proximity of living space, severe encroachment.*
- *South of I-90 doesn't have the growth to merit the lines*
- *Conflicts with SMP on many levels*
- *Condemnation for peak load vs. using stored energy*
- *Property values over XXX years*
- *Destruction of property*
- *Why not store energy not consumed for peak load?*
- *Cost of condemnation will be >= underground*
- *Cost of underground over time vs. $13M easement already purchased E-SB in improvements planned*
- *Littering the sky with BPA, PSE, SCL squeezing into south area*

Unique

- *L - some established early 1900s, shared with rail in some area*
- *M - some areas old/established as well - not all of M has a corridor - close proximity to homes*
- *L - Squeezed by 405, rail use, T-lines, rails, gas, Sound Transit, hike, bike*
- *M - Historic miners cemetery*
- *M - Bedrock*
- *L - Large use by public - water, parks, unique and protected via SMP*
- *M - Pipeline Olympic in middle of corridor*

Values

- *M&L - Views are enhanced or at least not further impacted*
- *M&L - Percentage of new easements required doesn't impact existing community*
- *M&L - Risk to health and safety is protected during construction and maintenance and over lifetime*
- *M&L - For residents next to or impacted by power lines, there is no adverse impact - what is developed provides a better environment than exists today*

What we need from PSE

- *Honest renderings of development for both routes - poles, obstacles, risks*
- *Detailed property easement information*
- *Number of co-lo utilities developed and number of issues that occurred*
- *Number and scope of all utility projects from M to L existing and future*
- *Quantification of density by route - 1. Number of homes impacted / households 2. Number of people and homes along each route*
- *Trend lines: Forecast of energy demand by zip code*
- *What is the consumption forecasted by route for the new/increase of the line*

Segment M – Group 1

Issues

- *Cost*
- *Electromagnetic Fields (EMF)*
- *Property Values*
- *Residential Impact*
- *Views*
- *Noise*

Question 2: Other issues?

- *Gas pipeline*
- *UV flashes impacting animals, not humans*
- *Noise*
- *Vulnerability - accidents, earthquakes, lightning, ice storms*
- *Historical cemetery in Newcastle*
- *Wildlife - deer, coyote, bobcat, bear*
- *Church - Seattle revival center*
- *Bedrock and soil instability*
- *Need collaboration with Seattle City Light*
- *Hammering through bedrock causes damage via vibration*
- *No more easement space*

Evaluation factors

1. *Views are enhanced or at least not further impacted*
2. *Property values are enhanced, or at least not further negatively impacted*
3. *Health - probability of health risk*
4. *Safety risk*
5. *Livability - enjoy neighborhood*
6. *Environmental impacts*

Data

- *Number of houses with views impacted*
- *Proximity and number of people within a certain risk range*
- *Cancer caused by EMF*
- *Proximity of hazards to the lines (trees)*
- *Proximity to pipeline and risk factors to a 50 year old pipeline*
- *Number of people seeing clutter/equipment*
- *Number of schools within 1/2 mile*
- *Fly photo drone over Segment L/M so we can see issues*
- *Equity - number of low income residences line travels through*
- *Number of mature trees in proximity of the line*
- *Regulations requiring exemptions*

Segment M – Group 2

Top Issues

- *Aesthetics*
- *Design features*
- *Property values*
- *Visual impacts*
- *Construction*
- *Existing utility corridors*
- *Pipeline safety*

Unique issues

- *View*
- *View*
- *Proximity of corridor to residences*
- *Presence of 2 fuel pipelines in center of corridor*

Community values

- *Property values - What is the decrease in value of properties and how many will be affected?*
- *Restoration of corridor - Landscaping enhancements, security of corridor*
- *Public safety - How will pipeline be protected during construction?*
- *Damage to homes - Will PSE monitor construction impacts and pay for any damages to homes?*
- *View impacts - Some believe we should change state law, make PSE pay for undergrounding and divide cost among all ratepayers.*

Data for comparing segments

1. *Number of homes within 300 ft of corridor*
2. *Number of homes immediately adjacent to corridor*
3. *Cost of undergrounding, as verified by independent consultant or contractor*
4. *Presence of fuel pipelines in corridor and their age and condition*
5. *Ability to enhance landscaping in corridor*