

Meeting Summary

Advisory Group Meeting #6

May 16, 2012 • 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Lake Washington Institute of Technology, Kirkland, WA

| Organization | Representative (s) in Attendance |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Aerojet | Dirk Lakin |
| City of Kirkland, Public Works | Rob Jammerman |
| City of Kirkland, Parks and Community Services | Linda Murphy |
| City of Redmond, Parks | Jean Rice |
| City of Redmond, Planning | Eric McConaghy |
| Evergreen Hospital | Lavon Weighall |
| Greater Redmond Chamber of Commerce | Danielle Lynch |
| Juanita Neighborhood | Ken Albinger |
| North Rose Hill Neighborhood | Don Schmitz |
| Puget Sound Energy | Andy Swayne |
| Sustainable Redmond | Cindy Jayne |
| Willows Rose Hill Neighborhood | Gary Wightman |

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
- LaWana Quayle, Puget Sound Energy, Transmission Engineering
- Julia Hughes, Puget Sound Energy, Corporate Communications
- Angela Wingate, Puget Sound Energy, Municipal Liaison Manager
- Lyn Keenan, GeoEngineers
- Joanne Markert, GeoEngineers
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, Facilitator
- Kat Ashbeck, EnviroIssues, Notetaker
- Diann Strom, EnviroIssues

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 May 16, 2012. The meeting included a SAG round robin about constituent feedback, a presentation from PSE on the modifications made to the route alternatives based on their feasibility review, and discussion of the

results by the SAG. The SAG also provided recommendations for the community meetings outreach, and on the decision-making process the advisory group will use to get to a preferred route recommendation. The meeting concluded with next steps for planning the June community meetings, as well as a follow up SAG meeting on July 18.

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda and Safety Moment

Penny Mabie welcomed everyone, led a round of introductions, and reviewed the agenda. Penny explained the purpose of tonight's meeting is to learn about PSE's modifications to the route alternatives based on their feasibility review and discuss next steps for the community meetings and the advisory group decision-making process.

Barry Lombard, PSE Project Manager, thanked the group for attending, and asked Kerry Kriner to give the safety moment. Kerry introduced sun glare as a driving hazard and reviewed some ways to combat it, such as a cleaning your windshield inside and out many times throughout the year, wearing 100 percent polarized sunglasses, and being aware of pedestrians on sunny days.

SAG Constituent feedback

Penny asked each SAG member if they had spoken with their constituents about the project. Constituent feedback included:

- There is general support for Alternative 3 from Sustainable Redmond.
- SAG members appreciate PSE's efforts to brief their organizations when requested to do so.
- The administrative team at Evergreen Hospital is aware that one of the route alternatives is routed by the hospital and is in support of getting community input.
- There is interest about keeping the routes out of residential areas.
- PSE briefed the City of Redmond regarding the challenges siting Alternative 3.
- Don Schmitz has been forwarding the meeting minutes to his email list. Don has suggested his constituents review the three route alternatives by driving the routes. He has heard general support for Alternative 3.
- PSE toured Aerojet's property and they are awaiting feedback from their corporate office regarding siting a transmission line on their property.

PSE Route Review, Challenges, and Suggested Modifications

Penny reviewed the process the SAG took to get to the three route alternatives recommended in February. Beginning last fall, the SAG learned about the project need, identified opportunities and constraints, and began using the GeoRoute model to develop sample model outputs which were shared with the community in December 2011. Then in January and early February, the SAG narrowed down route options from 30 possible outputs to three route alternatives, and asked PSE to evaluate of the three route options for feasibility and constructability.

PSE is here to share the findings of their study and discuss the resulting modifications to the three route alternatives, in order to ensure three viable alternatives are shared with the community in June.

Route Feasibility Study

Barry presented the results of PSE's route feasibility study. PSE considered a number of construction and feasibility issues while conducting the study through field trips, code and records research, initial survey work, and meetings or communications with neighborhoods groups, Seattle City Light (SCL), Aerojet, Washington Department of Transportation, Metro, the Greater Redmond Chamber of Commerce, and the affected jurisdictions.

The results of the study show how difficult it can be to site a route in an urban area. In general, the challenges to siting in the project area include the SCL and Interstate 405 (I-405) crossing, environmental impacts, and property restrictions.

Alternative 1

Barry discussed the results of PSE's study of the SAG-recommended modifications to Alternative 1. PSE determined the routing modification behind the buildings along Northeast 124th Street is not feasible due to impacts to wetlands and access issues.

The suggested modification along Northeast 90th Street is also challenging for a number of reasons. There is an existing transmission line on the south side of this road corridor, and there are trees and wetlands along the street right of way. To avoid impacts to trees and wetlands would require co-locating or double-circuiting the new line on the same poles with the existing line, which would pose an increased reliability risk.

For example, maintenance could require both lines to be taken out of service at the same time or if a tree fell on the line during a storm both lines could be taken out service simultaneously. To avoid the reliability risk we would end up with transmission lines on both sides of NE 90th Street. Tree and wetland impacts, reliability issues, and the proximity of existing residential buildings to the double-circuit line all led PSE to recommend no longer considering the Northeast 90th Street modification and instead focus on routing this segment of Alternative 1 along Northeast 95th Street.

SAG Comments

- Much of the feedback from the community recommends avoiding siting the line near Mark Twain Elementary School, which is located on Northeast 95th Street.
- Don recommended PSE consider a different route to avoid Mark Twain Elementary School. He recommended the line exit the Sammamish Substation west to Northeast 90th Street then going north on 128th Avenue Northeast to Northeast 95th Street to connect with Northeast 124th Street. Barry noted PSE is always looking at other options with less impact, and adjustments may still be made after input from the community.

Barry said PSE's recommendation is to take the Northeast 95th Street route forward to the community and acknowledge the concerns about Mark Twain Elementary School.

Alternative 2

Barry introduced Alternative 2 challenges to the SAG. These challenges include:

- Crossing SCL lines.
- Crossing I-405 and avoiding future roadway widening projects.
- Crossing at Slater Road will require a pole close to the SCL right of way in which the line must cross under. SCL has future plans for the corridor, so it is protective of the corridor and does not want any obstruction in it. Alternative 2 must cross these lines horizontally and not run parallel to the SCL right of way.
- In order to avoid removing or trimming a significant number of trees, PSE would need to overbuild on the east side of 124 Avenue Northeast.

In light of these challenges, PSE recommended continuing up 124th Avenue Northeast, crossing the SCL lines at the triangular property between 124th Avenue Northeast and NE 124th Street and following the railroad corridor across I-405 further south than the original route option suggested. This modified route would be buildable and constructible.

Questions

Could the line cross right to the railroad corridor from Northeast 120th Street, instead of crossing through the triangular property between 124th Avenue Northeast and NE 124th Street?

Unfortunately, there are wires crossing through that area and a SCL tower. Transmission lines cannot cross over the buildings and the buildings in this area are too close to place poles in between.

Alternative 3

Barry introduced the challenges to Alternative 3 to the SAG. He reminded the SAG that their original routing recommendation was to have the route sited on the west side of Willows Road behind the buildings to avoid the Willows Road view corridor.

Specific challenges to this route include:

- Building restrictions and setbacks. After meetings with Aerojet about their property, PSE learned the route cannot go behind some of their buildings due to building restrictions and setbacks.
- Two separate Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) easements are located along this route. The development rights for these areas were sold to a receiving site in downtown Redmond and are no longer developable. The areas are set aside in easements dedicated to the public for the purpose of protecting the underlying critical areas.
- Natural Growth Protection Easements (NGPE). Routing around the NGPEs is also challenging. NGPEs are also areas that are set aside in perpetuity for the benefit of the public in order to protect the underlying vegetation and critical areas. The development rights are not transferred off of the property, but are clustered elsewhere on the site.
- Willows Road view corridor. PSE met with the City of Redmond about routing challenges due to critical areas and other property constraints. PSE indicated that Willows Road might be a

fallback route. The City asked PSE to avoid routing a line on Willows Road; however, this route modification to Alternative 3 is permissible and constructible.

In light of these challenges, PSE decided to route Alternative 3 between the buildings in the Quadrant Willows business park north of the TDRs and NGPEs and along an access road on the east side of Aerojet's property. From an engineering standpoint, this modification is feasible; however, this modified route is dependent upon the willingness of property owners to allow a route through their property.

PSE will also present the fallback route along Willows Road to the community to gather feedback.

Comments

- Sustainable Redmond would prefer any route that avoids cutting down trees. They would prefer to route the line along Willows Road.

Questions

The City of Kirkland has purchased part of the railroad corridor - is there space for a transmission line and a recreation trail?

Barry said both PSE and the City of Kirkland have rights to the railroad corridor. The process for developing the railroad corridor includes working with multiple users of the space. There will be plenty of room for PSE's lines and recreation areas, and placement of the lines will have to be discussed with other stakeholders with rights to the corridor.

Next steps

Identifying a preferred route

PSE will host community meetings in June to share the alternatives, and PSE would like to meet with the SAG on July 18 to incorporate community feedback and begin narrowing the three alternatives down to one preferred route recommendation. The group agreed to the meeting date; however, Danielle Lynch said she may be unable to attend, so Penny asked her to make sure her alternate could attend.

To help prepare for the July 18 meeting, Penny asked the SAG to consider the type of decision-making process they want to use as they move from the three route alternatives to the preferred route recommendation. Penny suggested they could do a down-select weighing the pros and cons of each route as they did earlier this year, or they could use a more structured process called Multi-Objective Decision Analysis (MODA). The SAG decided to go ahead with the MODA decision process with the goal of determining the criteria via email prior to the July 18 meeting.

Comments and Suggestions for MODA

- Criteria considerations include the density of residential areas.
- Consider putting hard data into the MODA model, such as demographics and tree counts.
- The process is well documented, defensible and gradable without being black and white.

Questions

Would the decision process include cost estimates for each route alternative?

Barry said the costs to build the three alternatives would be similar and will not be a factor in determining the preferred route.

If the community comes back with a clear preference for an alternative, do we still proceed with the MODA process?

Penny responded that it could be beneficial to follow through with the process to ensure an informed decision making process, and members of the SAG agreed.

What is an example of criteria? How is this different from the criteria used for the model?

Penny noted that the group should focus on high level criteria which matter to the group and to the public. Possible criteria could include technical feasibility, community effects and environmental effects. The group will discuss and build a list of criteria before the next meeting on July 18.

Should neighborhood density be part of the criteria?

The SAG agreed that adding hard data would be beneficial to the process.

Preparing for the June Community Meetings

PSE will share the route alternatives with the community at two meetings in June, where community members will be asked to provide comments on the alternatives and ask questions. PSE will notify the community through letters to landowners within 500 feet of each of the alternatives, as well as a newsletter to be sent to the entire project area. PSE has not identified the exact meeting dates and times, but is looking at June 20, 21 and 23.

Penny asked the SAG for additional recommendations on ways to get community input on the route alternatives.

SAG members recommended:

- Comparing the routes against one another. Penny suggested having the community rank the route alternatives instead of comparing them.
- Posting an online comment form to gather more public feedback.
- Providing simulated views of the each alternative route so the public could better imagine what the lines would look like. PSE will work on this for the community meeting.
- Considering having a booth at a market or festival to further the outreach. There was concern about this method reaching the right people because the project area is so limited.
- PSE bring a gauss meter to the meeting to measure magnetic fields to illustrate electromagnetic fields are generated from ordinary electric devices.
- Obtain input from people who work by the routes as well as residents who live there.

Questions

Should the routes be shown as segments at the community meetings?

The SAG chose to leave the routes as is for the community meeting.

Can we get the number of landowner letters sent for each route?

PSE can get the total number of landowner letters sent.

Do we know the amount of people who come to the community meetings that work, not live, in the area?

No.

Public Comments

Members of the public presented comments which included:

- Concern about EMF specialist being biased towards PSE. Penny responded that Drew Thatcher, the EMF expert, does not work for PSE; rather he is an independent consultant.
- A question to the group as to how many people currently live by transmission lines. Four SAG members responded that they live near transmission lines.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Penny thanked everyone for their focused efforts in understanding the challenges and necessary modifications for each route alternative. The SAG members approved the minutes from the January 26 and February 2 meetings.

Penny described the next steps as:

1. PSE will prepare for the community meetings and use the SAG recommendations.
2. The SAG will review the [GeoRoute model criteria](#), consider any other relevant criteria and send options to EnviroIssues for the July 18 SAG meeting.
3. EnviroIssues will send a calendar reminder to the SAG members for the July 18 meeting. Those members who cannot attend will alert their alternate about the July 18 meeting in hopes that they can attend.