

South Sub-Area Workshop #2 Summary

5/5/2014

Meeting information

Location: Renton Technical College
 Date: April 24, 2014, 6:30 to 9 p.m.
 Number of workshop participants signed in: 72

Purpose

On April 24, Puget Sound Energy hosted the second 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 K through N, provided input on the segments, and identified values that could be used to evaluate those segments. At Workshop #2, the South Sub-Area Committee and members of the public scored route segments K1, K2, L, M, and N 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 K1	Segment K2	Segment L	Segment M	Segment N
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	3.33	3.64	1.15	3.37	4.53
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3.25	3.43	1.09	3.49	4.47
3. Least proximity to residential areas	3.11	3.46	1.09	2.76	3.53
4. Most protective of health and safety	2.85	2.96	1.45	2.24	3.59
5. Least proximity to mature vegetation	2.64	2.93	1.07	3.34	3.90
6. Least effects on aesthetics	3.32	3.61	1.04	3.90	4.21

Notes:

- Several individuals wrote in and scored additional evaluation factors, including: underground, submarine, and Seattle City Light corridor.

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 K1	Segment K2	Segment L	Segment M	Segment N
1. Least proximity to sensitive community land uses	4.00	4.17	1.00	3.78	4.43
2. Least proximity to sensitive environmental areas	3.42	3.42	1.00	3.61	4.57
3. Least proximity to residential areas	3.83	3.83	1.00	3.11	3.57
4. Most protective of health and safety	3.08	3.38	1.44	2.22	3.43
5. Least proximity to mature vegetation	3.00	3.17	1.00	4.03	3.71
6. Least effects on aesthetics	3.37	3.87	1.11	4.36	4.29

Note:

- Several groups wrote in and scored additional evaluation factors, including: underground, submarine, and Seattle City Light corridor.

Worksheet comments

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

- Preferred alternative is to underground or submerge under Lake Washington.
- Preferred alternative is to use the Seattle City Light corridor.
- Concern that data provided is insufficient to score the segments.
- Concern that photo simulations are misleading and not representative.
- Trees are noise barrier to I-405.

Message to the South Sub-Area Committee

In groups, workshop participants drafted key messages for the South 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 South Sub-Area Workshop #2. Their inclusion here 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 messages in whole or in part. The workshop process, including the verbatim transcription of the South Sub-Area Committee groups' messages below, reflects 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**
 - *Infrastructure doesn't have to be negative.*
 - *Add infrastructure in a way that makes it better for the area.*
 - *Consider other options 1) submarine 2) underground.*
- **Group 2**
 - *PSE needs to keep on the table: underground, submarine, and/or share with Seattle City Light.*
 - *Final choice needs to be least impactful to people's lives.*
- **Group 3**
 - *Narrow the request to evaluate only the area we live in (e.g., Segment L).*
 - *Look at alternative power for all new buildings and that's safe for the natural environment.*

- *PSE take leadership in looking at alternatives.*
- *Community appreciates PSE involving the community.*
- **Group 4**
 - *Introducing new infrastructure in existing neighborhood will impact property values by 10 or 20%.*
 - *Don't create negative impacts on lake/trail & public areas.*
 - *Respect SMP (Shoreline Master Plan) guidelines for sensitive areas.*
- **Group 5**
 - *Data table needs to be reworked for more accurate info and decisions e.g. – number of homes that have views impacted, proximity to home structures (not just parcels), length of parks impacted, not just number of parks (e.g. Coulon Park), 600' distance reduced for churches, schools, businesses, industrial (makes no sense that far), condos should be counted each and same for apartments (not lumped as one).*
 - *PSE should offer underground and underwater solutions (especially in selected tight residential areas).*
 - *This process tonight was rushed with too much new data to digest that fast, and important data still missing entirely. We should be given the opportunity to do this meeting over, under more reasonable circumstances.*
 - *Have a public meeting with Seattle City Light about opportunities to work with them.*
- **Group 6**
 - *We don't have the right options to evaluate: submerge, SCL corridor, underground.*
 - *More wires do not make sense in the 21st century.*
- **Group 7**
 - *Pick a route with the least new adverse impacts.*
- **Group 8**
 - *Utilize existing infrastructure, i.e. City Light right-of-way.*
 - *Risk understanding (assessment as related to rating).*
 - *Routes with existing 115 kV infrastructure not introducing new lines in neighborhoods.*
 - *Cost analysis for each of the route segments.*
 - *Underground/submarine cable.*
- **Group 9**
 - *Impacts to drivers, cyclists, pedestrians, etc. is much greater along route L (Lake Washington Blvd) than any other, because it goes along the route vs. crossing it.*
 - *Undergrounding (where appropriate) and utilizing Seattle City Light corridor need to be re-evaluated.*
- **Group 10**
 - *Underground.*
 - *Not pit route segments against one another.*

Comment forms

Key feedback submitted on comment forms by participants included:

- Concerns that photo simulations are not representative.
- Concerns that data is inconclusive and misleading.
- Requests for additional data, including:
 - Total cost estimate and construction cost for each segment and total likely routes
 - Electrical capacity and life span of segments
 - Impact to all Eastside residents, commuters, and visitors
 - Aesthetics measures
 - An estimate per foot for undergrounding

- Cost estimate for submerging
- Number of residents, schools and churches built after the original 115 kV lines were installed
- Explanation of the underground cost estimate provided
- Willingness to pay double the current electric bill if undergrounding is pursued.
- Concern for views of lake enjoyed by hundreds of thousands per day.
- Concern about tree removal along Lake Lanes and associated loss of wildlife habitat and I-405 sound barrier and interest in a substitute buffer.
- Concern about tree removal on segment N.
- Concern about filling of water ponds and seasonal wetlands.
- Preference for submerged lines.
- Request to consider long range needs and solar for all new buildings.

Several comment forms also requested specific photo simulations of impacts to particular residences or view corridors. These were compiled and provided to the project team members responsible for development of photo simulations to identify representative locations for future photo simulations.

Public process feedback

Several participants also provided feedback on the public process. Comments indicated:

- Interest in reducing redundancy of presentations and provide shorter project overviews at each meeting.
- Interest in another Q&A session before or after next Community Advisory Group meeting.
- Concern from neighborhoods who feel they have not been reached out to.
- Interest in seeing all questions and comments provided on the webpage (similar to a blog format).
- Concern that PSE will not use community input.
- Concern that pace of the process is unproductively slow.