

ENERGIZE EASTSIDE EIS
FILE NUMBER 14-139122-LE

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING, KIRKLAND
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

6:00 p.m.
Tuesday, May 26, 2015
Kirkland City Hall
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, Washington

CAROL A. CHIPMAN, CCR
NORTHWEST COURT REPORTERS
1415 Second Avenue, Suite 1107
Seattle, Washington 98101
206-623-6136
email: nwcourtreporters@iinet.com

1 (Public comment period commenced at 7:01 p.m.)

2

3 SPEAKER NO. 1: LORI ELWORTH

4 I'm Lori Elworth. My address is 8605-129th Court
5 Southeast, Newcastle.

6 I oppose the project Energize Eastside. I feel it's
7 too big, it's too expensive, it doesn't really need to be
8 done for the Eastside residents. It sounds like it's a
9 much larger project than that, to sell power to Canada and
10 California, and I don't think that is a Eastside problem.

11 I also live along the shared corridor of the gas
12 pipeline and the power line easement and I am concerned
13 with safety, and I think that other people will be talking
14 about that tonight.

15 I belong to CENSE, and there's a lot of good
16 information, Cense.org.

17 Thank you.

18

19 SPEAKER NO. 2: SUE STRONK

20 My name is Sue Stronk. I live at 12917 Southeast
21 86th Place in Newcastle.

22 Safety is the number one concern. Issues to safety
23 concern construction equipment and digging along two aging
24 Olympic gas pipelines; setting new 130-foot tall poles dug
25 15 to 50 feet underground, right beside the gas pipelines,

1 with a 100-foot easement space house-to-house. Olympic
2 Pipeline wants to know the type of any vehicle and its
3 location if driven over any nonpaved section, according to
4 Joe Stone, as pipelines are buried only three to five feet
5 underground.

6 These two utilities coexist on this route for miles.
7 Many neighborhoods are in danger, not just mine. We live
8 along a major earthquake fault zone following the I-90
9 corridor. A catastrophe is not worth the risk.

10 Conservatively, those living along the route will lose
11 10 percent of their home values, and then we pay again in
12 utility rate increases.

13 PSE, a foreign-owned for-profit company from
14 Australia, is allowed to make 10.2 percent profit on any
15 infrastructure costs. 8,000 trees are slated to be cut in
16 the 18 miles. My trees and bushes are already tagged. A
17 complete waste of our money since the project has not yet
18 been approved or permitted. If this project is not
19 approved, we will appeal to the WUTC that these costs
20 prematurely incurred by PSE cannot be passed to ratepayers.

21 How a project gets to this point without state
22 oversight is a major concern. It is overscaled for the
23 local needs and there's several ways to address Eastside
24 power with projects less offensive and cheaper for us, the
25 ratepayers. The project title should be Energize Canada

1 instead.

2 The City of Bellevue hired an independent technical
3 consultant for \$100,000 to verify what PSE said is true.
4 However, that consultant used numbers fed to them by PSE,
5 hardly an independent study.

6 The CAG process, a community -- the Community Advisory
7 Group, a moderated -- moderator-controlled process right
8 down to the route PSE wanted chosen; a yearlong, one
9 million dollar waste of time and money, where PSE hired
10 Mark Williamson of PRW Communications, a PR firm from
11 Madison, Wisconsin, quoted on his website, says that he has
12 developed a strategic communications technique patterned on
13 election campaigning, which are tools he employed for years
14 to get utility projects approved.

15 Now it all makes sense. If you go to the website
16 FollowTheMoney.org, you can find the PSE campaign
17 contributions to our elected state officials. No wonder we
18 don't get email responses from them regarding the Energize
19 Eastside project. Are we, the ratepayers, paying for those
20 campaign contributions as well, hidden in project costs?

21 PSE pays for this EIS process also. Maybe that is why
22 our number one concern, safety, is still not listed on the
23 EIS website drop-down choices for making comments. Even
24 this process has flaws.

25

1 SPEAKER NO. 3: NORM HANSEN

2 I live in Bellevue, 3851-136th Avenue Northeast, and I
3 have some comments regarding Alternative 1.

4 With regards to land use, we feel it's incompatible
5 with residential use. Poles are substantially out of scale
6 with the neighborhood character and height restrictions,
7 and it substantially impacts neighborhood character.

8 Under plants, the tree canopy is drastically impacted
9 by removing up to 8,000 significant trees. Removal of tree
10 canopy on this scale is not compatible with the Bellevue
11 Comprehensive Plan.

12 Number 3, social and economic. Existing property
13 owners on Alternative 1 should not be asked to donate their
14 property to meet new residents' needs. Any overhead route
15 should utilize existing public right-of-way such as our
16 many roadway routes.

17 4. Aesthetics and view. The residential view will be
18 severely compromised. No neighborhood is left unscathed.
19 Looking at a 100-to-135-foot pole tower with seven wires,
20 including the communication line that's already there, is
21 repulsive to most neighborhood residents. They did not
22 locate their house for this industrial intrusion.

23 Number 5. Underground alternative. Undergrounding
24 provides not only the best reliability but provides for
25 needed security. Other jurisdictions are undergrounding as

1 the best practice:

2 Look at the utilities in New Jersey: 18 miles of 230
3 kV underground.

4 Washington, D.C. All 115 kVA lines currently being
5 underground in an economic manner.

6 In Anaheim, California, 20-year program, underground
7 electrical lines, especially as part of their roadway
8 construction.

9 Undergrounding only takes a six-foot-wide trench and
10 minimizes construction impacts. By locating two
11 transmission lines in the trench, EMF can be further
12 reduced.

13 Thank you.

14

15 SPEAKER NO. 4: STEVE WAGNER

16 Hi, my name is Steve Wagner. 13440 Northeast 45th in
17 Bellevue, along the existing planned route for the five
18 towers. We've lived there about 20 years. We've reduced
19 our footprint over that time, and as far as I'm concerned,
20 you could definitely use Alternative 2 to achieve all the
21 goals of this project.

22 I used to work in environmental planning and they are
23 almost always rigged so that there's only one alternative
24 that is viable.

25 I would suggest that you should be adding alternatives

1 to this scheme of things so that we look -- really look at
2 a buried alternative, we really look at costing
3 alternatives that charge different amounts to new customers
4 and existing customers, and that we break out the
5 Alternative 2 into specific goals because PSE said in their
6 study that they'd been doing all those things in
7 Alternative 2 and yet they couldn't meet the goals of the
8 project, so I really feel like it's kind of a trick to do
9 an EIS, because we've got a lot of technical decisions to
10 make, the environmental aspect of it is almost neither here
11 nor there.

12 We really have to look at the cost of this. PSE
13 doesn't deserve to make a 10 percent profit on whatever
14 size project they decide to build. You know, I wouldn't
15 mind paying more money than this project would cost if my
16 power wouldn't go out in every storm and I wouldn't have
17 to, you know, use my transfer switch and my generator to
18 provide myself with power.

19 I think that the emergencies that they're talking
20 about could be easily handled better than -- or more easily
21 more for a shorter period of time than what it takes for me
22 to deal with the storm situation.

23 So I find the buried alternative very appealing and
24 would like to see that as a serious alternative in this
25 plan. Thank you.

1 SPEAKER NO. 5: KEN HITE

2 So I'd like to comment on the EIS process up to this
3 evening.

4 Whether you like PSE or not, the process they ran with
5 the CAG groups was open and transparent. There was always
6 lots of information on their website, they sent out emails
7 detailing after every meeting what had occurred, and it was
8 easy to follow it.

9 As of last Friday -- and I don't know where it is
10 today -- but as of last Friday, Alternative Number 3 in the
11 various routes wasn't on the website operated by this
12 group.

13 And I think it's very opaque up to now, and I think
14 it's a disservice to the community to hold a meeting like
15 this and ask people to come in and give informed comment on
16 the alternatives when you haven't really put them out to
17 the public. And I think you, whoever "you" is, the City of
18 Bellevue or your hired consultant, needs to do a lot better
19 job of public communication because I think this is kind of
20 a ridiculous scenario. Thank you.

21 Ken Hite, H-i-t-e. 18 Bridlewood Circle in Kirkland.

22

23 SPEAKER NO. 6: DEIRDRE JOHNSON

24 My name is Deirdre Johnson. Deirdre is D-e-i-r-d-r-e.

25 And I live at 7538-125th Place Northeast in Kirkland.

1 I too would like to comment on Alternative 3.

2 While I know that the map we've seen in the lobby is
3 not set in stone, but you can't get from the Sammamish
4 station to Clyde Hill without going through (inaudible) and
5 Bridle Trails, which I think it's unfortunate that we've
6 just seen this information now. It would be nice to be
7 able to get more information on the specifics of these
8 alternatives earlier rather than later, and I think that
9 adding 50 miles of 115 new kV lines is possibly even more
10 damaging than adding 18 miles of 230 line.

11 So I participated in the Kirkland 2035 exercise where
12 residents of the community came together and looked at the
13 growth that was projected for the year 2035 throughout the
14 City of Kirkland, and because of that, when I look at PSE's
15 projections, I don't think they're too far off.

16 Thank you.

17

18 SPEAKER NO. 7: JENNIFER KELLER

19 My name is Jennifer Keller. My address is 115-146th
20 Avenue Southeast, in Bellevue, 98007. And thank you for
21 the opportunity to testify; appreciate it.

22 It's abundantly clear that we're in a time when any
23 time we consider building energy infrastructure, we must
24 consider climate impacts. Considering climate impacts
25 encompasses so much. For example, whether we want to have

1 crippling summer droughts in Washington State all too soon,
2 possibly starting this summer, we don't know. It means
3 considering what happens to the Sound and the ocean; the
4 impact of carbon dioxide, it dissolves in the ocean on tiny
5 organisms like baby oysters, many other organisms that are
6 so important to us for delicious seafood and for a healthy
7 ocean.

8 I say this just to touch on how real these impacts
9 are. They are not theoretical. They can't be ignored and
10 should not be ignored.

11 What does that mean for this project? We should look
12 at whether this project is aimed at the things we need most
13 right now. Right now we need energy efficiency, a smart
14 grid, rooftop solar, small-scale wind turbines, the
15 fantastic batteries that even now are becoming more and
16 more useful and more available. Alternative 1 is clearly
17 backwards in this respect.

18 Right now we also need involved citizens who think
19 about how to live well but use energy very efficiently.
20 The more we offer tools that allow citizens at home to
21 realize, you know, "Hey, if I make some changes, I can do
22 my part to use less energy," Alternative 1 is clearly
23 backwards in this also. It's really not focused at
24 equipping citizens with ways to be more aware of their
25 energy use.

1 And finally, right now we also need living trees. We
2 need to keep the big beautiful trees we have, because each
3 tree stocks away carbon in a layer of wood all over the
4 tree every year. The bigger the tree, in general terms,
5 the more carbon it's stocking away for us. We need not
6 just the trees we have, we need to not cut them down. We
7 need more than we have.

8 James Hansen himself emphasized that we need healthy
9 trees and wetlands and so on to absorb carbon, not just --
10 we need to not just cut our emissions but absorb that
11 carbon. Alternative 1 is also utterly backwards in that
12 respect. It's wrong for the time we're in.

13 For each alternative, we should be considering whether
14 it brings us these things that we need: energy efficiency
15 and resiliency, the ability of people at home to realize
16 how they can make a positive difference, and the numbers of
17 big healthy trees we're growing.

18 Please consider these impacts carefully. Thank you
19 very much.

20

21 SPEAKER NO. 8: JOHN MERRILL

22 Hi. John Merrill. I'm at 4800-134th Place Southeast
23 in Bellevue.

24 What I'd like to do today in my three minutes is
25 actually to ask you to add to the alternatives that you

1 have already put in; and I have four different -- actually,
2 five different categories of alternatives that I would like
3 to see added to the scope.

4 The first one is traditional wired alternatives, which
5 PSE's alternative is one -- just one of two other
6 traditional wired alternatives are, first of all, we have
7 an existing transmission line on the Eastside that has
8 plenty of capacity that is largely unused, that Energize
9 Eastside would unnecessarily duplicate. It is -- the issue
10 of who owns that line is totally irrelevant because it's
11 here, we could use it and it is in the community's best
12 interest to use it.

13 The second branch of the traditional wired
14 alternatives is to install a new transformer at the Lake
15 Tradition substation in Issaquah and run new 115 kV lines
16 to an Eastside substation, presumably the Lakeside
17 substation. This was actually the preferred alternative of
18 PSE and ColumbiaGrid for many, many years before PSE was
19 bought by foreign-owned corporations.

20 Undergrounding is a feasible alternative, as well as
21 submerging in Lake Washington. I'd like to see those in
22 the scope as well.

23 Second alternative is the local generation
24 alternative, and there are three subsets to that.

25 First of all, we should fully utilize PSE's westside

1 peaking station. They have plenty of capacity. They have
2 about 1400 megawatts of generated capacity to the north of
3 us, that they did not include in the model, or only at a
4 very, very low level. That is ridiculous because that's
5 why PSE built them in the first place, was to turn them on
6 during our very, very cold days. They're sitting there.
7 There's no reason they can't run during our peak demand
8 periods.

9 We could install a new gas-fired peaking plant on the
10 Eastside. Right next to the Lakeside substation would be a
11 place -- PSE also identified two other locations but
12 quickly dismissed those two other locations. The EIS
13 needs to look into those in a serious way.

14 Third, we could create a dispatchable diesel generator
15 network on the Eastside, analogous to what the City of
16 Portland and Portland Gas -- Portland General Gas and
17 Electric, whatever the utility -- I always get them mixed
18 up with a Southern California utility -- but they have 100
19 megawatt of dispatchable diesel generators that are all
20 networked together; and the Portland utility there, all
21 they have to do is flip a switch, they get 100 megawatts of
22 peaking power on demand. There's no reason we can't do
23 that on the Eastside as well.

24 The third alternative is to upgrade what we have. We
25 know that if we quit -- if PSE quits pretending that it

1 energizes Canada during the time when we need the power,
2 i.e., on those cold winter mornings and afternoons, that
3 there is only one piece of equipment on our present system
4 that is overloaded, and that's a transformer; there is
5 absolutely no reason why that transformer can't be either
6 increased in capacity or we can replace it with two
7 transformers and run a new power line.

8 MS. WAGONER: You are out of time but if you can
9 kind of wrap it up, that would be great.

10 MR. MERRILL: Okay.

11 MS. WAGONER: Thank you.

12 (Mr. Merrill continuing): So the fourth one is 21st
13 century alternatives, and in the interests of time I'll
14 just go through very, very briefly.

15 We could be much, much more aggressive about
16 conservation and efficiency programs. One of PSE's
17 contracts is to identify 56 megawatts of cost-effective
18 power that PSE has totally ignored to date. We could
19 install a dispatchable battery storage system from vendors
20 like AES and Tesla. The cost of these things is coming
21 down rapidly; and for the roughly 60 megawatts of power
22 that we need for the next 10 years, it will be much, much
23 less expensive than Energize Eastside.

24 We could also implement demand response programs,
25 smart grid time-of-day pricing and the like.

1 And then the last alternative is that combinations of
2 these four alternatives that I've read in can solve the
3 problems much, much, much less environmentally
4 destructively and much more cost effectively.

5 Thank you.

6

7 SPEAKER NO. 9: STEVE O'DONNELL

8 Good evening. My name is Steve O'Donnell. I'm the
9 president and cofounder of CENSE, the Coalition of Eastside
10 Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy, at Cense.org.

11 I'm at 13945 Southeast 47th Street, in Bellevue, since
12 1972.

13 I would echo the comments, the testimony already
14 presented, and agree with everything that has been
15 commented on.

16 Would add, would like to see some emphasis on studying
17 submarine cables, both in Lake Sammamish and Lake
18 Washington. I think that the cost-effective wired solution
19 could be put down the west side of Lake Sammamish from the
20 Redmond substation, it's a short distance to get there, and
21 then across to the Lakeside substation, and then a short
22 distance to the East Channel Bridge, and then run down Lake
23 Washington to Gene Coulon Park and up to the Talbot Hill
24 substation.

25 There's new technology for doing this. Those lakes

1 are [have a] relatively flat bottom, good bottom
2 conditions; there's new trench technology. And so it could
3 be done. It's being done. PSE's own consultant, Lowell
4 Rogers, is out of Sacramento, is working on such a project
5 for 230 kV line in the San Francisco Bay, as a redundant
6 line for [an] earthquake situation. So I think that that
7 is an important alternative to be studied.

8 Also, the safety issues have been brought up tonight,
9 especially with not only health and EMF. EMF has kind of
10 been looked over but I think that that needs to be part of
11 the EIS, certainly pipeline safety. We've heard some of
12 the concerns about the pipeline. BP Olympic Pipeline has
13 their own concerns. We have a letter on file from them and
14 I believe the City and PSE have that same letter.

15 I think that earth -- elements of earth, geotech and
16 seismic, in addition to the tree canopy reduction of 8,000
17 trees, but definitely geotech issues, need to be studied.

18 The -- probably one of the single biggest issues is
19 the degradation of neighborhood character of
20 neighborhoods -- nearly 40 neighborhoods over 18 miles
21 stretching from Redmond to Renton, running nine miles
22 through Bellevue, approximately two miles through Bridle
23 Trails, a mile plus through Somerset, a mile or two miles
24 through Olympus and Newcastle; and these are issues of land
25 use, issues of aesthetics, environmental degradation,

1 degradation of our neighborhood character. And I think
2 that those are very important elements to be studied in
3 addition to the natural environmental issues of hydrology
4 and geology and seismic and migration of -- those should
5 not be overlooked.

6 Finally, the building codes. I think the deficiency
7 in building codes should be looked at. We've mentioned the
8 Bullitt building in Seattle; it's been online, it has --
9 not only does it have a zero footprint, it has a positive
10 effect back into the environment and to the grid. And I
11 think that there could be architectural challenges and
12 awards for some 40 projects in [the] Bellevue downtown core
13 and the Bel-Red Corridor.

14 And some of these things need to be built into the
15 codes with a very visionary outlook. That could include
16 geothermal in the buildings, distributed generation in the
17 buildings, really alleviating this peak demand issue, and
18 would make Energize Eastside basically not necessary at
19 all.

20 So I see my time is up. Thank you very much for the
21 opportunity, and hope to see all of these elements in the
22 study. Thank you.

23

24 SPEAKER NO. 10: JIM ERCKMANN

25 My name is Jim Erckmann. I live at 26 Bridlewood

1 Circle in Kirkland, and I am the president of the Bridle
2 Trails Park Foundation which is a nonprofit dedicated to
3 supporting and protecting Bridle Trails State Park.

4 I wanted to express our opposition to Alternative 3 as
5 we understand it, and the key point here is "as we
6 understand it," because we don't understand it very well.

7 I -- we didn't hear anything about Alternative 3 until less
8 than two weeks ago; and not for lack of trying, I have
9 found out very little more about it. In fact, most of what
10 I know about Alternative 3, I learned in the lobby outside
11 tonight. It was not considered or discussed in any of the
12 public meetings that were hosted by PSE early on, some of
13 which I attended.

14 So this is kind of a new thing for us, and I wanted to
15 reinforce what Ken Hite said earlier, that it's very
16 difficult to assess Alternative 3 when you don't even know
17 what it is. And I have to say, even though I did spend
18 some time talking to the consultants before we met in here,
19 that I still don't know what it is, because we don't know
20 what the consequences of putting 115 kV lines through the
21 50 miles of neighborhoods actually amount to, how much
22 clearing would occur, and so forth.

23 So I think, based on what I'm guessing is the
24 alternative, since it will run across two sides of Bridle
25 Trails State Park, that the impact would be quite

1 substantial to the park. It would probably entail cutting
2 a lot of trees that are about 100 years old. There are
3 wetlands along 116th Avenue, very, very close to 116th
4 Avenue and trails, both of which could be severely impacted
5 by this project; and it runs across 60th Street as well, to
6 the north side of the park. So it could be very, very --
7 it could have very serious impacts to the park, and it also
8 strikes me as having potential for serious impacts to
9 neighborhoods throughout the 50 miles of 115 kV lines to be
10 constructed or upgraded.

11 So again, it's very difficult to assess the
12 alternative when one doesn't really understand what it is,
13 so I would urge the consultants to be clear on what it is
14 and kind of what's entailed with building lines of that
15 capacity. We've got a pretty good idea of what would be
16 entailed with building the 230 kV lines during the PSE
17 project, but we're right now clueless about the 115 kV
18 line.

19 So we will have more substantive comments and
20 extensive comments at a later time when we do get a better
21 understanding of what Alternative 3 is.

22 Thank you.

23

24 SPEAKER NO. 11: GARY DEVLIEG

25 Gary DeVlieg. I live at 13601 Southeast 7th Street in

1 Bellevue. I've lived there for 38 years.

2 We have an easement on our property through which the
3 power lines run, and also through which the gas line runs.
4 Also on that easement we have one of the rare shutoff
5 valves for the gas line.

6 My principal concern is safety. Locating the new
7 power lines near -- the new electrical lines near the
8 current gas lines I believe is a significant safety hazard.
9 Right on our property, a few years ago, Olympic Pipeline
10 actually paid us to leave our homes for some period of time
11 so they could go in and make repairs to the pipeline,
12 because right at that point it's on a hillside and the
13 hillside had -- was starting to suffer a landslide and was
14 shearing the pipe and breaking the pipe.

15 And you can imagine that if you had an earthquake that
16 then caused a landslide in that area and also brought a
17 power line down, that that could cause a catastrophic
18 safety issue in the area. I don't get the sense that this
19 has really been adequately studied or included in the
20 Environmental Impact Statement.

21 Just one other comment I want to make and that is it's
22 unclear to me, where there are these four alternatives,
23 whose alternatives are they? Are these the alternatives
24 that were presented by various people in the community who
25 are interested in how additional power could be brought to

1 the area, or are these filtered four alternatives that are
2 coming from the power company? In other words, they are
3 only putting forth the alternatives that are friendly to
4 them?

5 Thank you.

6

7 SPEAKER NO. 12: BARRY ZIMMERMAN

8 Hi, I'm Barry Zimmerman. I live at 5007 Somerset
9 Drive Southeast, Bellevue.

10 I've been a Bellevue resident for 25 years and I'm a
11 degreed electrical engineer and I've been following this
12 project rather closely, and I have a few remarks here on
13 the EIS scoping, particularly directed at the leaders of
14 the SEPA process.

15 During these meetings we've conducted to date, we've
16 heard quite a broad number of comments from a cross section
17 of the public who will be impacted by this project for the
18 remainder of their lives in King County. However, with
19 each new question and excellent point that's been made,
20 I've come to recognize that the public doesn't know what
21 they don't know, because there's a lot of complexity in
22 this whole thing. Many of us who don't do this for a
23 living don't know what questions to ask or how to filter
24 and prioritize the flow of data that we are getting,
25 however restricted it has been so far.

1 My remarks focus on the critical need for quality and
2 completeness in the Environmental Impact Statement,
3 particularly in the drafts where it will still be possible
4 for the public and the industry experts that the public is
5 going to hire, to provide feedback and drive changes
6 required to properly assess and document the impact of this
7 oversized regional and international transmission line
8 project.

9 In a number of past projects throughout the nation,
10 the power utility industry has commonly filed Draft EIS
11 documents that are incomplete in ways that prevent the kind
12 of detailed analysis that stake -- by the stakeholders. I
13 will be impacted, along with many others, and not
14 compensated for the very significant impact the
15 construction of these oversized regional towers and power
16 lines to the Eastside communities.

17 I am therefore making this request that the Draft EIS
18 include all the details necessary for stakeholders to
19 conduct further detailed analysis on the impacts of the
20 Energize Eastside and Canada and California, and et cetera,
21 et cetera.

22 To date, Puget Sound Energy is not really being held
23 accountable by any government body for the lack of quality
24 we've seen in the entire process over the past 18 months.
25 While we can expect that large, long-term financial rewards

1 for PSE and their foreign investors to drive the kind of
2 disingenuous relationship that they've developed so far,
3 it's become increasingly clear that these same residents
4 are the only people who are so far standing up to PSE to
5 make them accountable for their shoddy work.

6 Therefore, my EIS scoping input to the City of
7 Bellevue and the leaders of the SEPA process demonstrate --
8 that you demonstrate your leadership, and demand at least
9 the following details be included in the Draft EIS.

10 Number 1. Provide detailed coordinates for the
11 location of each new tower foundation along the 18-mile
12 route. This is especially important to provide for later
13 analysis of safety margins and easement with -- within the
14 dangerous segments of the route that are proposed to be
15 shared with the 50-year-old Olympic Pipeline.

16 Number 2. Provide discussion of possible conflicts
17 between the proposed actions and the objectives of federal,
18 state and local land use plans, policies and controls.
19 Where inconsistency exists, the document should describe
20 the extent to which the agency would reconcile its proposed
21 action with the plan or law. This particularly applies to
22 Alternative 1.

23 Number 3. Coordinate with federal agencies on the
24 Endangered Species Act prior to releasing the DEIS, to
25 fully assess impacts on endangered and threatened species.

1 Number 4. Include details on the decision-making
2 process regarding the proposed actions. Include details
3 [on] how the current alternatives were derived, and how
4 other alternatives may be added for consideration during
5 EIS review and approval process.

6 Number 5. Discuss in detail the remainder of the
7 decision process. What happens after the DEIS and what
8 criteria will be used to confirm the preferred alternative?
9 Will this happen after the Draft EIS review? Will
10 alternatives be reviewed in greater detail in the Final EIS
11 or just cover the preferred alternative?

12 How exactly would the decision be made and by whom?

13 Number 6. What neighborhood evacuation plans will be
14 in place, coordinated with cities and rehearsed with
15 residents, prior to construction, particularly along the
16 dangerous segments shared with the gas pipeline.

17 Number 7. The Draft EIS must include real project
18 management, risk identification and mitigation measures,
19 not the standard boilerplate or vague references to best
20 management practices, yada yada yada.

21 Number 8. The proposed routes --

22 MS. WAGONER: Wrap up, you're past your time.

23 MR. ZIMMERMAN: All righty. Sorry, I'll finish
24 up here in just a moment.

25 (Mr. Zimmerman continuing): The Draft EIS proposed

1 routes require substantial digging in areas near Coal Creek
2 Parkway where old coal mines exist. We expect to see,
3 along with the detailed coordinates of all the holes to be
4 dug in point 1, the impact or the mitigation of risk in the
5 lack of foundation strength because of the coal mines.

6 The point of my EIS scoping request here is to put the
7 SEPA panel on notice that the people cannot accept to be
8 determined or will wait for the Final EIS to add this scope
9 in any draft document, because that makes a mockery of the
10 review process. We want you to be accountable for their
11 unrealistic proposal, we want PSE to be accountable for
12 their unrealistic Alternative 1 proposal to build a
13 regional power line solution under false pretenses at the
14 expense of the people along the route. I'm just asking you
15 to do your job.

16 Thank you.

17
18 SPEAKER NO. 13: BRIAN ELWORTH

19 My name is Brian Elworth. I live at 8605-129th Court
20 Southeast in Newcastle. It's Olympus neighborhood. I
21 represent the Olympus Homeowners Association.

22 Two safety items. If we're considering safety, I've
23 got two I'd like to talk about.

24 PSE proposes replacing shorter, essentially insulated,
25 structures with very tall conductive structures. Those

1 conductive structures are essentially lightning rods.
2 Those lightning rods are grounded within dozens of inches
3 of a petroleum pipeline, so we have lightning rod spark
4 plug. At 70 -- at 700-foot spacing, that's about 270
5 lightning rod spark plugs we're putting along a hazardous
6 petroleum pipeline. Nobody in their right mind would do
7 that.

8 We want to know what is the mitigation for that. I
9 think you're going to find there isn't any. You just don't
10 do that kind of thing. Major safety issue.

11 Number 2. Those tall structures are essentially pry
12 bars prying in the ground adjacent -- like I said, dozens
13 of inches away from the pipeline.

14 So what are the constant forces on that pipeline due
15 to these tall pry bars stuck in the ground?

16 What are the oscillating forces due to winds or
17 whatever forces are applied to those?

18 Are there resonant frequencies? You know, when a
19 tuning fork hits a resonant frequency, that's where the
20 energy is strongest? Are there resonant frequencies that
21 are going to cause additional vibration into the soil
22 surrounding the pipe?

23 What's the response of the pipe materials and joints
24 to that kind of force? Does it become more hardened and
25 brittle?

1 There's essentially two different kinds of risks:
2 bounded risks and unbounded risks.

3 If it's not a bounded risk and you don't understand
4 it, it is an unbounded risk, and it is unacceptable to go
5 forward with any project that has unbounded risk.

6 Scope. I ask that you include the CCOPS, as
7 sanctioned by RCW 81.88.140, to get their relevant input to
8 this pipeline safety and adjacent power line construction
9 project.

10 The project itself should not pose any safety risks.
11 What that means is PSE needs to provide a complete
12 description of the mitigation and you need to assess the
13 impact of all that mitigation. Three essential parts of
14 that:

15 Electromagnetic. We have the corrosion; we talked
16 about that last time, about the transformer effect. We've
17 got a low-level corrosion going on right now that's eating
18 those pipes due to the AC current being induced into that
19 pipe along the length of the corridor.

20 We also have the high-energy events. Lightning.
21 Arcing -- you heard stories about arcing. And also power
22 line structure failing, where the power line hits the
23 ground and now you -- you heard the person talk about the
24 ground becoming basically petrified. Thermal. The
25 transmission line has about 10,000 times the arc voltage

1 required to melt ductile iron. I've got a welder, a 26
2 volt arc voltage. I can cut that pipe like butter. 10,000
3 times that voltage is going to be going through those power
4 lines. What's that going to do to the pipe when we get
5 contact?

6 Mechanically-induced failures. There's immediate
7 rupture; digging into the pipe and rupturing it
8 immediately. There's the construction-induced latent
9 failure; that's the Bellingham disaster. And there's also
10 the long-term stress. I talked about those poles vibrating
11 and putting constant pressure on the pipe.

12 Those need to be considered in the scope.

13 If PSE is required by law to provide complete truth,
14 and I mean hand-on-Bible truth, hand-on-Bible truth, then I
15 request that, as part of the EIS process, that PSE provide
16 full explanation of all the safety risk mitigations they
17 need to apply to make this a safe project.

18 In other words, what is PSE going to do to mitigate
19 the safety risks. And if they are required by law to do
20 this, to tell you the truth, then I ask that all PSE
21 assertions must be fully explained, all PSE source data
22 must be properly vetted, all reference standards must be
23 current and not historical examples, all applicable
24 regulations must be identified and properly dispositioned
25 by PSE. All PSE alternative studies must be based on

1 current state of the practice technology, not obsolete
2 methods of construction practices.

3 My font gets smaller and smaller as I had to cram this
4 down --

5 MS. WAGONER: You're also out of time so if you
6 can kind of wrap it up, I would appreciate it.

7 MR. ELWORTH: I don't get five minutes?

8 MS. BRADFIELD: Oh, we did give you five.

9 MR. ELWORTH: You gave me five?

10 MS. WAGONER: Yes.

11 MR. ELWORTH: Okay. If -- okay, I'll try to
12 hurry this up.

13 (Mr. Elworth continuing): Given they're not going to
14 tell you the truth, I ask that you use BPA standards. BPA
15 standards, and I'll quote:

16 Pipelines and cables should not be installed closer
17 than 50 feet to a BPA tower, any associated wires or
18 grounding systems.

19 That means those 100-foot corridors, with 50 feet of
20 gas pipeline running down the middle, are way too narrow.
21 They need to be about 100 feet wider. In my neighborhood,
22 that displaces 47 families and eliminates 47 homes in
23 our -- that's probably about 20 to 30 million dollars of
24 market value plus the displacements costs. That needs to
25 be considered.

1 I suggest you use the BPA standards for safety. PSE
2 doesn't publish their safety standards; I don't think they
3 have any.

4 Thank you.

5
6 SPEAKER NO. 14: JIM McELWEE

7 My name is Jim McElwee. My address, 12907 Northeast
8 78th Place in Kirkland.

9 Just a very few, roughly two and a half comments with
10 regard to the scoping of the EIS project.

11 I would suggest and ask that you choose items to work
12 on that concentrate on system reliability. System
13 reliability is extremely high in my point of view, or the
14 need for it is extremely high.

15 And that leads me to point 1.5, let's say, and that is
16 to say, minimize consideration and my dollars and your time
17 on looking at unproven technologies. And I think you
18 understand that unproven technologies would include, quite
19 frankly with regard to the full Eastside system, they would
20 include windmills, wind turbines, batteries, various and
21 sundry things, even to the extent of undergrounding.

22 There are numerous reasons for that. There's the cost
23 in dollars of actually achieving some of the goals that
24 have been stated. If anything goes wrong, there are
25 repairs and fees to be made, and total unknowns there.

1 There's also the issue of when things go wrong -- and
2 we don't know what might go wrong -- there's lost revenue
3 for our businesses.

4 And what this comes to is that we don't know what we
5 don't know about these technologies. And in the aerospace
6 business we would call those -- or did call those a number
7 of years ago, "unknown unknowns" or "unk-unks." The
8 unproven technologies, too many unk-unks.

9 I would also ask, point number 2, that in sorting out
10 what issues and routes you might consider in the Final EIS,
11 that you give no special consideration to residential
12 values. My affordable home is of no less value to me than
13 a two-million-dollar or a three-million-dollar home on some
14 hill in Bellevue is to its owner. We simply are looking at
15 human values here. We are not looking at one rich person
16 versus one poor person, or one person of middle income.

17 So thank you. That includes my comments.

18 MS. WAGONER: Thank you. Is there anyone else
19 that would still want to speak?

20 All right. Thank you for your comments.

21 (To Ms. Helland): Carol, did you have anything you'd
22 like to say?

23 MS. HELLAND: Sure. I just would like to thank
24 everybody for coming this evening. We very much appreciate
25 it. We will have two more meetings; one in Newcastle on

1 Thursday night, and another one in North Bellevue on
2 Saturday, from 2:00 to 4:00.

3 I did want to note Mark had put up on the screen the
4 locations where you could provide comments on the handout
5 that's available outside. Those notations are also
6 available at the bottom of the handout, in case you didn't
7 get those transcribed from the screen.

8 And I did want to let people know, just on the
9 alternatives, that all of your feedback is great because we
10 haven't put it out there yet. That's exactly what this
11 meeting is about, to hear your feedback so that we can take
12 that in and analyze it as part of the EIS moving forward.
13 So we appreciate new ideas that you have given us this
14 evening and some reiteration of some of the things that are
15 of great concern to you, such as safety issues, which we've
16 heard, so thank you very much again.

17 And thank you for our hosts from the City of Kirkland.

18 Goodnight.

19 (Public Scoping Meeting, Kirkland,
20 concluded at 7:51 p.m.)
21
22
23
24
25