

## Meeting Summary

Advisory Group Meeting #6

February 2, 2012 • 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Baymont Inn and Suites, Kirkland, WA

Organization	Representative (s) in Attendance
Aerojet	Dirk Lakin
City of Kirkland, Public Works	Rob Jammerman
City of Redmond, Planning	Eric McConaghy
Evergreen Hospital	Lavon Weighall
Juanita Neighborhood	Mary Pong Dunphy
North Rose Hill Neighborhood	Don Schmitz
Proctor International, Inc.	Fred Proctor
Puget Sound Energy	Andy Swayne
Sustainable Redmond	Kathy Lowe (alternate for Cindy Jayne)
Willows Rose Hill Neighborhood	Tom Matthews

### Other Attendees:

- Barry Lombard, Puget Sound Energy, Project Manager
- Jason Van Nort, Puget Sound Energy, Government and Community Relations Manager
- Jim Swan, Puget Sound Energy, Senior Real Estate Representative
- Carol Jaeger, Puget Sound Energy, Transmission Planning
- Kerry Kriner, Puget Sound Energy, Municipal Land Planner
- Elaine Babby, Puget Sound Energy, Senior Land Planner
- Lyn Keenan, GeoEngineers
- Joanne Markert, GeoEngineers
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, Facilitator
- Diann Strom, EnviroIssues
- Kat Ashbeck, EnviroIssues, Note taker

### Meeting Purpose and Overview

The sixth stakeholder advisory group (SAG) meeting for the Puget Sound Energy (PSE) Sammamish-Juanita 115 kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line Project was convened in Kirkland, Washington on Feb. 2, 2012. The meeting included a SAG round robin about constituent feedback, and comments from the public. The bulk of the meeting included review and discussion of the six remaining model outputs, the four PSE-generated model output adjustments, and narrowing of routes based on public feedback, advisory group preferences, and identified trouble areas with the goal of producing three potential route options to present to the public. Through focused and collaborative discussion the advisory group

narrowed the route options down to three. The meeting concluded with next steps for PSE to conduct engineering studies on these three route alternatives.

## Meeting Summary

### Welcome, Introductions, Agenda and Safety Moment

Penny Mabie welcomed everyone, led a round of introductions and reviewed the agenda. Penny noted the goal of the SAG meeting is to narrow the route output options to three route alternatives, where PSE may then be able to conduct engineering analysis on the chosen routes in order to present them to the public. However, Penny noted that a meeting on Feb. 16 may be needed if the advisory group requires more time to decide on the three route alternatives.

Barry Lombard, PSE Project Manager, introduced himself and gave the safety moment. He distributed materials about cell phone safety while driving a vehicle. Barry shared a number of interesting facts about the dangers of talking and texting while driving. For example, Barry explained that by the time it takes a person to read a text, they have already traveled the length of a football field without looking at the road. Barry stressed to be safe by always using hands-free devices when using a cell phone while driving a car.

### Public and Constituent feedback

Penny asked if there were any members of the public who wished to make comment to the SAG; no one asked to address the SAG. Penny then asked each SAG member if they had spoken with their constituents about the project, and asked what they had heard since the last SAG meeting. Constituent feedback included:

- There is concern about the removal of trees during the process of building the transmission line.
- More and more people are becoming interested in the final outcome and how it will personally affect them.
- Business owners do not necessarily care where the line goes as long as there is reliable electricity, because rolling black outs negatively affect business.
- There are still concerns about preserving views along Willows Road.
- There is concern about lines going down Northeast 95<sup>th</sup> Street.

## January 26 Meeting Recap

Penny recapped the Jan. 26, 2012, meeting for those who could not attend. The SAG worked with the weightings, balancing the two endpoints and the 30 potential routes that came from the GeoRoute model. PSE added two other possible endpoints, one at Northeast 124<sup>th</sup> Street and one at Northeast 128<sup>th</sup> Street, which offered more route options. The SAG reviewed the 30 model outputs and removed duplicate route options. The advisory group discussed the pros and cons of each remaining output and eliminated those that created the most concerns, as well as the endpoint at Northeast 128<sup>th</sup> Street.

By the end of the meeting, the SAG reduced the number of potential model outputs to six, with a goal to narrow the options down to three by the next meeting. The SAG requested PSE review the six remaining outputs to see if they could be combined and/or modified.

## Refinement and Selection of Route Options for PSE Feasibility Study

### Discussion of Remaining Six Routes

SAG members were given print copies of the six remaining model outputs and a worksheet with comments from the Jan. 26 meeting. Penny encouraged SAG members to use the worksheet to help them track their outputs discussion.

Penny led the SAG in a discussion of pros and cons in regards to each model output. The comments are listed below by output. (See [Model Output Map Showing Six Remaining Route Alternatives under Consideration](#), dated Feb. 1, 2012).

#### *A2 Comments*

- This route goes through Totem Lake Mall.
- There is an overgrowth of trees on current existing lines on Northeast 132<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- There are more than 60 houses on Northeast 132<sup>nd</sup> Street facing the street where A2 would pass through on the way to the Juanita Substation.
- There is a “mess of lines” on both sides of 132nd Avenue Northeast.
- 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast is the border between Kirkland and Redmond, and if the line is placed there then both jurisdictions could “share the burden.”

#### *C2 Comments*

- The SAG was concerned that C2 crossed into residential areas.
- There were concerns about the line crossing in front of Mark Twain Elementary School on Northeast 95<sup>th</sup> Street.
- C2 avoids Totem Lake Mall.
- The last segment of C2 stays in a commercial area before crossing Interstate 405 (I-405).
- Property owners on the east side of 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast would have transmission lines on both sides of their property.
- The west side of 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast has less tree cover and most of the houses are setback from the roadway.

#### *D1 Comments*

- Necessary acquisition of easements and the complex threading around warehouses concerned the SAG.
- Avoids the Willows Road view corridor.
- Some SAG members suggested it could be easier to obtain easements by placing the lines in the back of a property (which could be less invasive than in the front of the parcel).

- This segment is more commercial than originally thought, and seems to avoid tree cutting, which could be a problem. It also avoids residential areas.
- Andy Swayne noted although most of the route options will require easements, this one will require more easements over an extensive private property area. These easements would be long, linear and cross completely within the private parcels, compared to easements along the property lines, which split the required transmission corridor between private property and public right of way.
- Native growth protection easements (NGPEs) and wetlands were also identified as issues along D1 located here.

### ***D2 Comments***

- This route option is less impactful to residences than all of the others, but it impacts the view corridor. Eric McConaghy explained the issue with the view corridor is that City of Redmond's comprehensive plan protects view sheds. He explained that view sheds are similar to water sheds. Tom Matthews added that there is an incredible view of Mt. Rainier from the view corridor.
- Fred Proctor and Dirk Lakin noted that they have heard that many property owners in that area have issues with this route option.

### ***D3 Comments***

- This option tried to avoid trouble areas discussed in some of the other route options.
- There were concerns about D3 crossing through natural or protected areas. Tom stated he could not support a route that crossed through a NGPE. There are trails throughout the area and his neighbors love the wildlife.
- This option does avoid the view corridor.
- Cuts through most continuous tree canopy.
- Goes by the Totem Lake Mall.

### ***F1 Comments***

- F1 avoids Totem Lake Mall.
- D1 and F1 are similar.
- Fewer residential impacts.
- Cuts through continuous tree canopy.
- The north end goes through commercial, not residential.
- Requires more easements across private property parcels.

### ***Questions***

*Is there an option to move lines underground?*

Andy replied that it was a possibility for distribution lines. He noted, however, if the city requested this option, they could be responsible for 40 percent of the cost and homeowners could be subject to an estimated \$3,000 to \$5,000 fee to bring the service line from the route to their homes.

*Why do options A2 and C2 curve north when they exit from the west side of the Sammamish Substation?*  
Penny reminded the group that the model created these outputs based on different weighting scenarios and therefore segments can be different from other similar options.

*Will we have an opportunity to talk about the segments of each route?*  
Penny explained that once the options have been narrowed to three alternatives, there will be opportunity to discuss the segments of each route.

*If PSE is building a line through a greenbelt area, what kind of access does PSE need?*  
Barry explained that in order to build a transmission line of this size through a greenbelt area, PSE would need to clear large trees from the area surrounding the lines. Barry also added that PSE would need access to each pole location but not necessarily to the lines between the poles.

## Elimination of Routes

After an open SAG discussion outlining the pros and cons of the six remaining model outputs, Penny led the group through a discussion to compare these route options to one another to identify the best route options.

Based on their discussions, the group recommended eliminating the following options:

- C2 because it crossed through too many residential areas.
- D2 because of the impact on the view corridor.
- F1 due to engineering difficulties and because it is similar to D3.

The group chose to keep A2, D1 and D3 as the remaining options.

- D1 was retained because it crossed very little residential area.
- A2 was retained because the SAG thought it was incrementally better than C2.
- D3 was retained because it follows a more commercial route.

## PSE - Modified Routes

Barry thanked the SAG members for their hard work and dedication to this process. He explained that based on a request from the last SAG meeting, PSE reviewed the six remaining model outputs in more detail to see if there were possible combinations or modifications that made more sense. As a result, PSE suggested modifications to four of the six model outputs.

The key modifications PSE made to the alignments are as follows:

- Avoided the main trouble areas identified by the SAG members over the past meetings, such as steep slopes, tree corridor and NGPEs.
- Eliminated segments where the line crossed over or through buildings.
- Take advantage of the railroad corridor to better avoid residential areas.

- 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast as an alternative to the segments located near Totem Lake Mall.

Barry described the four route options that PSE developed from the six model outputs selected during the Jan. 26 SAG meeting (See map titled [PSE Generated Model Output Adjustments](#) dated Feb. 1, 2012.) Penny led the group in a discussion of each. The comments are listed below by route options.

#### ***Route Option 1 Comments***

- Route Option 1 is a variation of C2.
- There were recommendations to examine rerouting the line along Northeast 90<sup>th</sup> Street west from the Sammamish Substation to avoid Mark Twain Elementary.
- Another possible option for this route would be to direct the route north on 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast.
- There was a question about where PSE's existing lines are between 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Northeast and 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast. Andy replied that PSE does have an existing transmission line from the Sammamish Substation that extends east-west along Northeast 90<sup>th</sup> Street that connects to the Norkirk Substation.

#### ***Route Option 2 Comments***

- Route 2 is a variation of A2.
- Barry explained this route option avoids some of the other trouble spots such as crossing over buildings or routing through Totem Lake Mall by coming across the Northeast 124<sup>th</sup> Street interchange. However, this route could be in jeopardy if the Washington State Department of Transportation expands I-405 in the near future.
- The same pros and cons for A2, which included concerns about residential areas, are also applicable to this route.
- The extension of Northeast 120<sup>th</sup> Street is a potential opportunity.

#### ***Route Option 3 Comments***

- Route 3 is a modified variation of the D1 route.
- Eric commented that he was pleased to see an option that avoided the view corridor on Willows Road and affected only small areas of residential.
- Andy commented that this route could be logistically difficult, but was a good D1 option in that it avoided the wetlands as well.
- Property owners at the north end of the segment immediately south of Northeast 124<sup>th</sup> Street (Dirk and Fred) are agreeable to the alignment west of Willows Road.

#### ***Route Option 4 Comments***

- This route is a modified version of D2.
- Eric expressed concern about the segment which goes through the City of Redmond's view corridor.
- Kathy suggested an alternative could be to jog back to Willows Road north of the view corridor.
- The route differs from D2 by utilizing the rail corridor where PSE has an easement.

## **Comparing Route Options for PSE Feasibility Study**

Since PSE used segments of the six remaining model route outputs to create their route options, the SAG decided to compare their three remaining model outputs (A2, D1 and D3) with the PSE suggestions (1, 2, 3 and 4). The goal would be to decide which one was the better of the two, effectively narrowing down from the current seven options to the three preferred options.

### ***Route Option 1 v. C2***

Due to C2's similarities with Route 1, C2 was brought back to be compared with Route Option 1. The SAG discussed that Route Option 1 follows Northeast 95<sup>th</sup> Street, in front of Mark Twain Elementary School. As an alternative to Northeast 95<sup>th</sup> Street, SAG members recommended PSE consider a using Northeast 90<sup>th</sup> Street. The SAG also chose to consider another alternative segment behind businesses on Northeast 124<sup>th</sup> Street to avoid adding additional overhead lines along the road as much as possible. These two alternatives will be further reviewed for feasibility.

The group chose to leave behind C2 and keep Option 1 with modifications.

### ***Route Option 2 v. A2***

Don commented that A2 passes through more residential areas than any of the other remaining options. Other SAG members agreed that A2 was problematic and chose to leave it behind, moving forward with Option 2.

### ***Route Option 3 v. D1***

Eric commented that Option 3 was an improvement over D1 because the option passed behind buildings effectively avoiding the view corridor. Don suggested the Northeast 124<sup>th</sup> Street end point was a better option than those that traveled through Northeast 132<sup>nd</sup> Street to the Juanita Substation. Option 3 also avoids the Totem Lake Mall area. The SAG chose to move forward with Option 3 and leave behind D1.

### ***Route Option 4 v. D2***

In comparing Options 4 and D2, Eric commented D2 should be left behind because Route Option 4 was a better compromise than D2. The SAG decided to leave D2 behind.

### ***Route Option 2 v. Route Option 4***

In order to narrow down the options to their goal of three, SAG members chose to keep Option 1 and Option 3 and discussed whether to keep Option 2 or Option 4 in the mix. As a way to move the decision forward, Penny suggested the SAG members consider community comments if they brought Options 1, 2 and 3 to the community members.

The SAG discussed that they could expect the community to express concerns about Route Option 2. However, Eric reminded the group that Route Option 4 has a protected view corridor, so he could not support the option. Eric added that Redmond has 18,000 commuters per day that travel through or work in the view corridor. Dirk added that he was very fond of the view from Willows Road. Rob Jammerman commented that if PSE could not get the easements necessary for Route Option 3 and

Route Option 4 was eliminated, there would no longer be a commercial option. The SAG recommended we keep the two end points alive for public input.

## Decision

After much discussion, the SAG recommended PSE evaluate three options – PSE’s Route Options 1, 2 and 3 – along with the suggested modifications to Route Option 1. (See map titled, Map: [Stakeholder advisory group recommended route alternatives.](#))

## Public Comments

Members of the public presented comments which included:

- Concern about possible increases in interference on electrical devices with added lines. Penny responded that PSE would respond to the question individually after the meeting.
- Concern about how the SAG’s work is being shared with the community and whether the community is aware of the process and project progress.
- Initial frustration to see so many route options at first, but appreciation on seeing PSE and the SAG narrow the options to only three.

## Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Penny wrapped up the meeting thanking everyone for their focused efforts in getting down to three remaining route options. Because the group was able to get to these three options, Penny stated that the Feb. 16 meeting was no longer necessary.

Penny added that PSE will now begin evaluating the three route options for engineering and constructability. PSE may need to make minor modifications as they go through the evaluation. However, if PSE finds fatal flaws in any of the remaining three, the SAG will be reconvened to provide guidance in selecting another route option.

Once PSE completes its evaluation and there are three solid route alternatives, PSE will host a community meeting to gather feedback on the alternatives. Following the community meeting, PSE would like to meet with the SAG again to develop a preferred alternative.