



# Energize Eastside Project

## Phase 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement

### Volume 2: Appendices

May 8, 2017

Prepared for the Cities of Bellevue,  
Newcastle, Redmond and Renton

Prepared by:  
ESA





For questions about public hearings or commenting, email [info@EnergizeEastsideEIS.org](mailto:info@EnergizeEastsideEIS.org) or contact: Heidi Bedwell, Environmental Planning Manager/Energize Eastside EIS Program Manager, City of Bellevue Development Services Department, 425-452-4862.

Following receipt and consideration of public comment on the Phase 2 Draft EIS, a Final EIS will be issued that incorporates the information from both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Draft EISs.

Thank you for your interest and participation in the environmental review of the Energize Eastside project. We welcome your comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Carol V. Helland".

Carol V. Helland, Environmental Coordinator  
Development Services Department  
City of Bellevue

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

FACT SHEET.....	FS-1
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY .....	1-1
1.1 Energize Eastside Project .....	1-1
1.2 Need for a SEPA EIS .....	1-3
1.3 Purpose of and Need for the Energize Eastside Project.....	1-4
1.4 SEPA Review Process for the Project .....	1-6
1.4.1 Phase 1 and Phase 2 EIS.....	1-6
1.5 How this EIS was Developed .....	1-7
1.6 Public Input .....	1-8
1.7 Objectives for the Energize Eastside Project.....	1-8
1.8 alternatives evaluated in the Phase 2 Draft EIS .....	1-9
1.8.1 No Action Alternative .....	1-9
1.8.2 Alternative 1: New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines .....	1-9
1.9 Next Steps in the Energize Eastside EIS Process .....	1-10
1.10 Elements of the Environment not Analyzed in the Phase 2 EIS .....	1-10
1.11 Key Findings of the Phase 2 Draft EIS (Summary by Element of the Environment).....	1-11
CHAPTER 2. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....	2-1
2.1 Phase 2 Project Alternatives .....	2-2
2.1.1 No Action Alternative .....	2-2
2.1.2 Alternative 1: New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines .....	2-3
2.1.3 Construction .....	2-45
2.2 Alternatives Considered but Not Included.....	2-52
2.2.1 Seattle City Light Transmission Line.....	2-52
2.2.2 Underground Transmission Line.....	2-53
2.2.3 Underwater Transmission Line in Lake Washington.....	2-54
2.2.4 New 115 kV Transmission Line .....	2-54
2.2.5 Seattle Public Utilities Water Line Corridor .....	2-55
2.2.6 Other Routes and Options .....	2-55
2.2.7 Alternative 2 and “Alternative 2B” .....	2-55
2.3 Benefits and Disadvantages of Delaying the Project .....	2-57
CHAPTER 3. LONG-TERM (OPERATION) IMPACTS AND POTENTIAL MITIGATION ...	3.1-1
3.1 Land Use and Housing .....	3.1-1
3.1.1 Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.1-3
3.1.2 Land Use and Housing in the Study Area .....	3.1-4
3.1.3 Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered.....	3.1-19
3.1.4 Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.1-20
3.1.5 Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.1-20
3.1.6 Mitigation Measures.....	3.1-46
3.2 Scenic Views and the Aesthetic Environment.....	3.2-1
3.2.1 Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations.....	3.2-3
3.2.2 Scenic Views and the Aesthetic Environment in the Study Area .....	3.2-4
3.2.3 Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered.....	3.2-18
3.2.4 Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.2-26
3.2.5 Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.2-26
3.2.6 Mitigation Measures.....	3.2-87
3.3 Water Resources .....	3.3-1

3.3.1	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.3-3
3.3.2	Existing Water Resources in the Study Area .....	3.3-3
3.3.3	Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered .....	3.3-11
3.3.4	Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.3-12
3.3.5	Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.3-12
3.3.6	Mitigation Measures.....	3.3-29
3.4	Plants and Animals .....	3.4-1
3.4.1	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.4-3
3.4.2	Plants and Animals in the Study Area .....	3.4-7
3.4.3	Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered .....	3.4-10
3.4.4	Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.4-12
3.4.5	Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.4-13
3.4.6	Mitigation Measures.....	3.4-33
3.5	Greenhouse Gases.....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Greenhouse Gas Compounds Considered in this Analysis.....	3.5-1
3.5.2	Carbon Sequestration .....	3.5-2
3.5.3	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.5-2
3.5.4	Greenhouse Gases in the Study Area .....	3.5-3
3.5.5	Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered .....	3.5-4
3.5.6	Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.5-5
3.5.7	Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.5-5
3.5.8	Mitigation Measures.....	3.5-10
3.6	Recreation .....	3.6-1
3.6.1	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.6-1
3.6.2	Recreation Resources in the Study Area.....	3.6-3
3.6.3	Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered .....	3.6-9
3.6.4	Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.6-9
3.6.5	Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.6-9
3.6.6	Mitigation Measures.....	3.6-33
3.7	Historic and Cultural Resources .....	3.7-1
3.7.1	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.7-2
3.7.2	Historic and Cultural Resources in the Study Area .....	3.7-6
3.7.3	Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered .....	3.7-13
3.7.4	Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.7-14
3.7.5	Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.7-14
3.7.6	Mitigation Measures.....	3.7-34
3.8	Environmental Health - Electric and Magnetic Fields .....	3.8-1
3.8.1	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.8-8
3.8.2	Magnetic Fields in the Study Area .....	3.8-9
3.8.3	Long-term (Operation) Impacts Considered .....	3.8-16
3.8.4	Long-term Impacts: No Action Alternative .....	3.8-17
3.8.5	Long-term Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	3.8-19
3.8.6	Mitigation Measures.....	3.8-34
3.9	Environmental Health – Pipeline safety .....	3.9-1
3.9.1	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations .....	3.9-1
3.9.2	Pipelines in the Study Area .....	3.9-7
3.9.3	Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Incident Data .....	3.9-17
3.9.4	Major Risks to Public from Unintentional Pipeline Release.....	3.9-27
3.9.5	Risks During Operation .....	3.9-30
3.9.6	Long-term Impacts on Resources .....	3.9-48
3.9.7	Mitigation Measures.....	3.9-52

3.10	Economics.....	3.10-1
3.10.1	Major Revenue Sources for the City of Newcastle .....	3.10-2
3.10.2	Cost of Undergrounding a Transmission Line .....	3.10-3
3.10.3	Tree Cover Along Transmission Line Corridor.....	3.10-4
3.10.4	Long-term Impacts from Operation of the Project.....	3.10-5
3.10.5	Summary.....	3.10-13
3.10.6	Mitigation Measures.....	3.10-13
<b>CHAPTER 4. SHORT-TERM (CONSTRUCTION) IMPACTS AND POTENTIAL</b>		
	<b>MITIGATION .....</b>	<b>4.1-1</b>
4.1	Land Use and Housing .....	4.1-1
4.1.1	Short-term (Construction) Impacts Considered.....	4.1-1
4.1.2	Short-term (Construction) Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	4.1-1
4.2	Scenic Views and the Aesthetic Environment.....	4.2-1
4.2.1	Short-term (Construction) Impacts Considered.....	4.2-1
4.2.2	Short-term (Construction) Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	4.2-1
4.3	Water Resources .....	4.3-1
4.3.1	Short-term (Construction) Impacts Considered.....	4.3-1
4.3.2	Short-term (Construction) Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	4.3-1
4.3.3	Mitigation Measures.....	4.3-10
4.4	Plants and Animals .....	4.4-1
4.4.1	Short-term (Construction) Impacts Considered.....	4.4-1
4.4.2	Short-term (Construction) Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	4.4-2
4.4.3	Mitigation Measures.....	4.4-10
4.5	Greenhouse Gases.....	4.5-1
4.5.1	Short-term (Construction) Impacts Considered.....	4.5-1
4.5.2	Short-term (Construction) Impacts: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	4.5-1
4.5.3	Mitigation Measures.....	4.5-2
4.6	Recreation .....	4.6-1
4.6.1	Short-term (Construction) Impacts Considered.....	4.6-1
4.6.2	Alternative 1: New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines .....	4.6-1
4.6.3	Mitigation Measures.....	4.6-14
4.7	Historic and Cultural Resources .....	4.7-1
4.7.1	Alternative 1: New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines .....	4.7-1
4.8	Environmental Health - Electric and Magnetic Fields .....	4.8-1
4.9	Environmental Health – Pipeline Safety.....	4.9-1
4.9.1	Risks During Construction .....	4.9-1
4.9.2	Risks During Construction: No Action Alternative .....	4.9-5
4.9.3	Risks During Construction: Alternative 1 (New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines) .....	4.9-5
4.9.4	Mitigation Measures.....	4.9-7
4.10	Economics.....	4.10-1
<b>CHAPTER 5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....</b>		
	<b>5-1</b>	
5.1	Land Use and Housing .....	5-1
5.2	Scenic Views and the Aesthetic Environment.....	5-1
5.3	Water Resources .....	5-1
5.4	Plants and Animals .....	5-2

5.5	Greenhouse Gases.....	5-2
5.6	Recreation .....	5-2
5.7	Cultural and Historic Resources .....	5-3
5.8	Environmental Health– Electric and Magnetic Fields .....	5-3
5.9	Environmental Health – Pipeline Safety.....	5-3
5.10	Economics.....	5-3
<b>CHAPTER 6.</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS.....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Land Use and Housing .....	6-1
6.2	Scenic Views and the Aesthetic Environment.....	6-1
6.3	Water Resources .....	6-2
6.4	Plants and Animals .....	6-3
6.5	Greenhouse Gases.....	6-3
6.6	Recreation .....	6-3
6.7	Historic and Cultural Resources .....	6-3
6.8	Environmental Health – Electric and Magnetic Fields .....	6-4
6.9	Environmental Health – Pipeline Safety.....	6-4
6.10	Economics.....	6-4
<b>CHAPTER 7.</b>	<b>ERRATA.....</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 8.</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 9.</b>	<b>DISTRIBUTION LIST.....</b>	<b>9-1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 10.</b>	<b>ACRONYMS AND GLOSSARY.....</b>	<b>10-1</b>
	Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	10-1
	Glossary .....	10-5

## **LIST OF APPENDICES (BOUND SEPARATELY AS VOLUME 2)**

APPENDIX A: General Construction and Access Description

APPENDIX B: Supplemental Information: Land Use

APPENDIX C: Scenic Views and Aesthetic Environment Methodology

APPENDIX D: Critical Areas Regulations by City

APPENDIX E: PSE Vegetation Management Standards

APPENDIX F: Recreation Policies

APPENDIX G: Supplemental Information: Historic Resources

APPENDIX H: Supplemental Information: EMF (Unique Uses in the Study Area)

APPENDIX I: Supplemental Information: Pipeline Safety



# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1. PSE 230 kV Transmission System in the Eastside ..... 1-2

Figure 1-2. Phased EIS Process..... 1-6

Figure 2.1-1. Alternative 1 230 kV Transmission Line Corridor Summary, by Segment (Conceptual) ..... 2-5

Figure 2.1-2. Conceptual Site Plan for the New Richards Creek Substation..... 2-7

Figure 2.1-3. Existing Conditions at the New Richards Creek Substation ..... 2-8

Figure 2.1-4. Typical Easement Widths for the Existing Corridor and New Corridor along Roadways  
(Conceptual)..... 2-17

Figure 2.1-5. Construction Sequencing ..... 2-47

Figure 2.1-6. Transmission Line Pole and Wire Installation ..... 2-51

Figure 3.1-1. Study Area for Land Use and Housing ..... 3.1-2

Figure 3.2-1. Scenic Views and Aesthetic Environment Study Area ..... 3.2-2

Figure 3.2-2. Examples of Commercial Building Types in the Study Area..... 3.2-17

Figure 3.2-3. Factors Considered for the Analysis of the Aesthetic Environment and Scenic Views .. 3.2-19

Figure 3.2-4. Locations of Key Viewpoints used in the Aesthetic Environment Analysis ..... 3.2-22

Figure 3.2-5. Existing Views for I-90 Crossing Locations ..... 3.2-24

Figure 3.2-6. Examples of Contrast ..... 3.2-28

Figure 3.2-7. KVP 1, Existing and Proposed Conditions of Richards Creek Substation from SE 30<sup>th</sup>  
Street Looking East..... 3.2-39

Figure 3.2-8. KVP 2, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Redmond Way Looking North..... 3.2-42

Figure 3.2-9. KVP 3, Existing and Proposed Conditions from NE 54<sup>th</sup> Place Looking North..... 3.2-45

Figure 3.2-10. KVP 4, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Main Street Looking North..... 3.2-48

Figure 3.2-11. KVP 5, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Main Street Looking West..... 3.2-49

Figure 3.2-12. KVP 6, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Bel-Red Road Looking Southwest ..... 3.2-53

Figure 3.2-13. KVP 7, Existing and Proposed Conditions from NE 8th Street Looking West ..... 3.2-54

Figure 3.2-14. KVP 8, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Lake Hills Connector Looking East. .... 3.2-55

Figure 3.2-15. KVP 9, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Richards Road Looking North..... 3.2-58

Figure 3.2-16. KVP 10, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Factoria Boulevard SE Looking North..... 3.2-63

Figure 3.2-17. KVP 11, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Coal Creek Parkway Looking  
Northwest toward the Intersection with Factoria Boulevard SE ..... 3.2-64

Figure 3.2-18. KVP 12, Existing and Proposed Conditions from SE 38th Street Looking Southeast .... 3.2-68

Figure 3.2-19. KVP 13, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Somerset Drive SE Looking West. .... 3.2-72

Figure 3.2-20. KVP 14, Existing and Proposed Conditions from SE Newport Way Looking West..... 3.2-75

Figure 3.2-21. KVP 15, Existing and Proposed Conditions from 128th Ave SE Looking Northeast..... 3.2-79

Figure 3.2-22. KVP 16, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Lake Boren Park Looking Southwest 3.2-80

Figure 3.2-23. KVP 17, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Monroe Avenue Looking North ..... 3.2-84

Figure 3.2-24. KVP 18, Existing and Proposed Conditions from Glennwood Court SE Looking North 3.2-85

Figure 3.2-25. Existing Views from the Cedar River Trail ..... 3.2-86

Figure 3.3-1. Water Resources in the Study Area ..... 3.3-2

Figure 3.4-1. Study Area and Land Cover for Plants and Animals..... 3.4-2

Figure 3.4-2. Vegetation Management Zones for 115 kV Transmission Lines..... 3.4-6



Figure 3.4-3. Vegetation Management Zone for 230 kV Transmission Lines .....	3.4-7
Figure 3.4-4. Vegetation Cover Types in the Study Area .....	3.4-8
Figure 3.4-5. Total Trees Surveyed, by Segment, and Trees in the Managed Right-of-Way Areas, by Segment and Option .....	3.4-9
Figure 3.4-6. Percentage of Surveyed Trees Subject to Removal, by Segment and Option .....	3.4-15
Figure 3.4-7. Total Trees and Significant Trees per Acre, Subject to Removal, by Segment and Option.....	3.4-15
Figure 3.4-8. Trees in Critical Habitats and Buffers, Subject to Removal, by Segment and Option ....	3.4-16
Figure 3.5-1. Sources of GHG Emissions in Washington State.....	3.5-4
Figure 3.5-2. Estimated GHG Sequestration Losses in Project Segments.....	3.5-6
Figure 3.6-1. Recreation Sites in the Study Area .....	3.6-2
Figure 3.7-1. Study Area for Historic and Cultural Resources.....	3.7-3
Figure 3.7-2. Statewide Predictive Model for Archaeological Sensitivity.....	3.7-4
Figure 3.8-1. Study Area for the EMF Analysis.....	3.8-2
Figure 3.9-1. Existing Electric Transmission Lines and Natural Gas/Petroleum Pipelines in the Study Area .....	3.9-10
Figure 3.9-2. Number of Reported Incidents by Cause, 2010–2015.....	3.9-23
Figure 3.9-3. Average Volume (Barrels) Per Release by Cause, 2010–2015.....	3.9-24
Figure 3.9-4. Cathodic Protection System Components .....	3.9-26
Figure 3.9-5. Shield Wire.....	3.9-27
Figure 3.9-6. National Fire Protection Association Ratings for Jet Fuel, Diesel, and Gasoline .....	3.9-28
Figure 3.9-7. Typical Pool Fire and Heat Flux Areas Diagram .....	3.9-29
Figure 3.9-8. Conceptual Illustration of the Risk Assessment Methodology.....	3.9-33
Figure 3.9-9. Individual Risk Criteria by Jurisdiction .....	3.9-36
Figure 3.9-10. Societal Risk Criteria by Jurisdiction Significance Thresholds.....	3.9-37
Figure 3.9-11. Change in Incident Frequency .....	3.9-39
Figure 3.9-12. Change in Incident Frequency (Combined) .....	3.9-40
Figure 3.9-13. Alternative 1 Individual Risk (of Fatality) Results .....	3.9-40
Figure 3.9-14. Annual Risk of Other Incidents, for Comparison .....	3.9-41
Figure 3.9-15. Alternative 1 Societal Risk Results .....	3.9-42
Figure 4.9-1. Change in Incident Frequency .....	4.9-2
Figure 4.9-2. Change in Incident Frequency During Construction (Combined).....	4.9-2
Figure 4.9-3. Alternative 1 Individual Risk (of fatality) Results .....	4.9-3
Figure 4.9-4. Annual Risk of Other Incidents, for Comparison .....	4.9-4
Figure 4.9-5. Alternative 1 Societal Risk Results .....	4.9-4
Figure 6-1. Areas with Significant Impacts to the Aesthetic Environment .....	6-1

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1-1. Alternative 1 Components, Segments, and Options ..... 2-4

Table 2.1-2. Summary of Proposed Pole Types ..... 2-15

Table 3.1-1. Land Uses, Zoning, Shoreline, and Housing Characteristics by Segment and Option ..... 3.1-5

Table 3.1-2. Comparison of Bellevue Central Options ..... 3.1-32

Table 3.2-1. Overview of the Affected Environment by Project Component (Substation, Transmission Line Segment, and Option)..... 3.2-5

Table 3.2-2. Key Viewpoints Selected for the Visual Quality Analysis ..... 3.2-19

Table 3.2-3. Assigning a Degree of Viewer Sensitivity ..... 3.2-25

Table 3.2-4. Consistency with Relevant Plans, Policies, and Regulations ..... 3.2-30

Table 3.2-5. Comparison of Bellevue Central Options ..... 3.2-59

Table 3.2-6. Comparison of Bellevue South Options ..... 3.2-76

Table 3.3-1. Streams in the Study Area ..... 3.3-4

Table 3.3-2. Wetlands in the Study Area ..... 3.3-7

Table 3.3-3. Comparison of Bellevue Central Options ..... 3.3-21

Table 3.3-4. Comparison of Bellevue South Options ..... 3.3-26

Table 3.4-1. Comparison of Bellevue Central Options ..... 3.4-25

Table 3.4-2. Comparison of Bellevue South Options ..... 3.4-30

Table 3.5-1. Comparison of Bellevue Central Options ..... 3.5-8

Table 3.5-2. Comparison of Bellevue South Options ..... 3.5-9

Table 3.6-1. Recreation Sites in the Study Area ..... 3.6-3

Table 3.6-2. Trees Removed at Recreation Sites by Bellevue Central Option ..... 3.6-20

Table 3.6-3. Trees Removed at Recreation Sites by Bellevue South Option ..... 3.6-29

Table 3.7-1. Age Thresholds Used for Identifying Unevaluated Historic Resources ..... 3.7-5

Table 3.7-2. Historic and Cultural Resources in the Study Area ..... 3.7-7

Table 3.7-3. Comparison of Bellevue Central Options ..... 3.7-25

Table 3.7-4. Comparison of Bellevue South Options ..... 3.7-30

Table 3.8-1. Exposure Guidelines and Levels from the ICNIRP, ACGIH, and IEEE ..... 3.8-9

Table 3.8-2. Calculated Magnetic Fields along the Existing Transmission Line Corridor based on 2013–2014 Loading ..... 3.8-10

Table 3.8-3. Existing Land Uses in the Study Area ..... 3.8-11

Table 3.8-4. Sites with Unique Uses within the Study Area ..... 3.8-15

Table 3.8-5. Calculated Magnetic Fields along the Existing Transmission Line Corridor based on 2027–2028 Loading ..... 3.8-18

Table 3.8-6. Comparison of Bellevue Central Options, Calculated Magnetic Field Levels ..... 3.8-26

Table 3.8-7. Comparison of Bellevue South Options, Calculated Magnetic Field Levels ..... 3.8-31

Table 3.9-1. Pipeline Safety Regulations ..... 3.9-2

Table 3.9-2. Reported U.S. Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Unintentional Release Leaks and Fatalities, 2010–2015 ..... 3.9-19

Table 3.9-3. Olympic Pipeline Reported Releases, January 2010 through December 2015 ..... 3.9-20

Table 3.9-4. UTC Reports on Olympic Pipeline Violations and Areas of Concern, 2012–2016 ..... 3.9-21

Table 3.9-5. Miles of Transmission Line and Olympic Pipeline Co-location in Study Area with Alternative 1, by Segment Option .....	3.9-47
Table 3.10-1. Existing Assessed Valuation (AV) Conditions .....	3.10-3
Table 3.10-2. Newcastle Property Tax Rates (2015) .....	3.10-3
Table 3.10-3. Current Ecological Value of Trees in Each Segment .....	3.10-6
Table 3.10-4. City Property Tax Implications if Assessed Value Decreases by \$10 Million .....	3.10-9
Table 3.10-5. Sensitivity Analysis: \$16 million in “Undergrounding Costs” (Average monthly cost per payee) .....	3.10-10
Table 3.10-6. Sensitivity Analysis: \$25 million in “Undergrounding Costs” (Average monthly cost per payee) .....	3.10-10
Table 3.10-7. Loss of Ecological Value by Scenario .....	3.10-12
Table 4.3-1. Impacts to Water Resources in the Study Area by Segment .....	4.3-4
Table 4.4-1. Impacts to Plants and Animals by Segment and Option .....	4.4-4
Table 4.6-1. Impacts to Recreation Sites in the Study Area by Segment .....	4.6-2

# FACT SHEET

---

## NAME OF PROPOSAL

Energize Eastside Project

## PROPONENT

Puget Sound Energy (PSE)

## PROJECT LOCATION

The project involves improvements to PSE’s electrical grid in the Eastside area of King County, to address a deficiency in electrical transmission capacity. The area identified by PSE as having a transmission capacity deficiency is situated between Redmond in the north to Renton in the south, and between Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish. The study area goes through the jurisdictions of Redmond, Bellevue, Newcastle, King County, and Renton.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the project is to address a projected deficiency in transmission capacity resulting from growth in electrical demand, which could affect the future reliability of electrical service for the Eastside. PSE proposes to construct and operate a major new transformer served by approximately 18 miles of new high-capacity electric transmission lines (230 thousand volts [kilovolts, or kV]) extending from Redmond to Renton. The proposed transformer would be placed at a substation near the center of the Eastside. Electrical power would be transmitted to this substation and the voltage lowered, or “stepped down” (transformed), from 230 kV to 115 kV for distribution to local customers. PSE has proposed a preferred alignment for the transmission lines, along with route and pole options within some segments of the alignment.

The City of Bellevue is overseeing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process in cooperation with the jurisdictions of Kirkland, Newcastle, Redmond, and Renton (collectively referred to as the Partner Cities). The City of Bellevue is the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) nominal Lead Agency. The Phase 1 Draft EIS (released in January 2016) broadly evaluated the general impacts and implications associated with feasible and reasonable options available to address PSE’s identified objectives for the project. This Phase 2 Draft EIS is a project-level evaluation, describing impacts at a project-specific level. This includes details of development at specified geographic locations, including a more detailed analysis of potential environmental impacts. The project-level Phase 2 Draft EIS incorporates the Phase 1 Draft EIS by reference. Although the City of Kirkland is a Partner City, no project-level analysis was evaluated in Kirkland because PSE’s proposed alignment for Energize Eastside does not pass within Kirkland city limits.

# SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES AND OPTIONS

## No Action Alternative

PSE would continue to manage its maintenance programs to reduce the likelihood of equipment failure, and would continue to stockpile additional equipment so that repairs could be made quickly. PSE would also continue its energy conservation program systemwide and for the Eastside.<sup>1</sup> As appropriate, conductor replacement on existing lines would occur. New 230 kV overhead transmission lines and a new substation would not be constructed.

## Alternative 1: New Substation and 230 kV Transmission Lines

New Substation	Construct a new substation, the “Richards Creek” substation, adjacent to the existing Lakeside substation in Bellevue.
New Overhead Transmission Lines	Construct approximately 18 miles of new 230 kV overhead transmission lines between the Sammamish and Talbot Hill substations. This would generally occur within the existing transmission line corridor connecting these two substations. Several options are also evaluated for the portion of the project extending through central and south Bellevue.

<sup>1</sup> Energy efficiency improvements described under the No Action Alternative apply to all of the alternatives.

## CONSTRUCTION TIMING FOR THE PROJECT

PSE intends to construct the project by the summer of 2018, if possible. This timeframe is based on a projected capacity deficiency that could affect system reliability by that date.

## STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT LEAD AGENCY

The City of Bellevue is the Lead Agency.

The following municipalities are SEPA Co-Lead Agencies for the project: Kirkland, Newcastle, Redmond, and Renton.

## SEPA RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL

Carol Helland  
Development Services  
City of Bellevue  
450 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE  
Bellevue, WA 98004

## EIS CONTACT PERSON

Heidi Bedwell  
Energize Eastside EIS Program Manager  
City of Bellevue  
450 110<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE  
Bellevue, WA 98004  
Phone: (425) 452-4862  
Email: [HBedwell@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:HBedwell@bellevuewa.gov)

## CONTACT PERSON FOR EACH CO-LEAD AGENCY

### City of Kirkland

Jeremy McMahan  
Development Services - Planning Manager  
(425) 587-3229  
[jmcmahan@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:jmcmahan@kirklandwa.gov)

### City of Newcastle

Thara Johnson  
Interim Community Development Director  
(425) 649-4143, Ext. 127  
[TharaJ@newcastle.wa.gov](mailto:TharaJ@newcastle.wa.gov)

### City of Redmond

Catherine Beam, AICP  
Principal Planner  
(425) 556-2429  
[CBEAM@redmond.gov](mailto:CBEAM@redmond.gov)

### City of Renton

Jennifer Henning, AICP  
Planning Director  
(425) 430-7286  
[Jhenning@rentonwa.gov](mailto:Jhenning@rentonwa.gov)

## GOVERNMENTAL ACTIONS

Potential approvals and permits that may be required for the project are listed below by jurisdictional level.

### Federal

- Section 10/404 permit—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Endangered Species Act consultation—National Marine Fisheries Service and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act Consultation – Triggered by federal nexus; lead federal agency must consult with Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

### State

- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction Stormwater General Permit—Washington State Department of Ecology
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification—Washington State Department of Ecology
- Hydraulic Project Approval—Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Utility Rate Approval —Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

## Local City or County

Local City or County	City of Redmond	City of Bellevue	City of Newcastle	City of Renton	King County
Shoreline Conditional Use Permit		●		●	
Zoning Conditional Use Permit		●	●	●	
Essential Public Facilities Permit	●				
Critical Areas Permit		●	●	●	
Building and Related Permits		●	●	●	●
Clearing and Grading Permit	●	●	●	●	●
Right-of-Way Permit	●	●	●	●	●

## AUTHORS AND PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTORS

This Phase 2 Draft EIS has been prepared under the direction of the City of Bellevue, in consultation with the Co-Lead Agencies.

Research and analysis were provided by the following consultant firms:

- Environmental Science Associates (ESA) – Alternatives development; analysis of land use and housing, scenic views and the aesthetic environment, water resources, plants and animals, greenhouse gas, recreation, historic and cultural resources, electric and magnetic fields (EMF), pipeline safety, and ecosystem services; and EIS document coordination and production.
- Enertech Consultants – Peer review of EMF modeling.
- FCS Group – Economic analysis.
- EDM Services – Pipeline safety risk analysis.
- Stantec – Peer review of pipeline corrosion analysis.

## DATE OF ISSUE

May 8, 2017

## END OF COMMENT PERIOD

All comments must be postmarked or emailed before midnight, June 21, 2017.