

ENERGIZE EASTSIDE  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING/PUBLIC TESTIMONY

6:00 p.m.  
Thursday, May 14, 2015

Renton City Hall  
1055 South Grady Way  
Renton, Washington

KIMBERLY MIFFLIN, CCR, CSR

NORTHWEST COURT REPORTERS

1415 Second Avenue, Suite 1107

Seattle, WA 98101

(206) 623-6136

[www.northwestcourtreporters.com](http://www.northwestcourtreporters.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PANEL MEMBERS

- JENNIFER HENNING - City of Renton
- MARK JOHNSON - ESA Consultants
- DAVID PYLE - Engergize Eastside EIS Program Manager
- CAROL HELLAND - State Environmental Policy Act Lead
- MARCIA WAGONER - Three Square Blocks

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

- CYMVELENE LUMBAO
- LORI ELWORTH
- DON MARSH
- SUE STRONK
- BRIAN ELWORTH
- FRED LUMBAO
- DALE HALL
- JENNIFER KELLER

1           CYMVELENE LUMBAO: Our concern is we just  
2 bought a house, you know, a brand new house for \$600,000  
3 less than 1,000 feet away. We've seen the power lines  
4 that were up and we had an EMF study done to make sure  
5 that it was safe. So our concern is, you know, the EMF  
6 that's coming out of there and how that's going to affect  
7 us, plus the view of bigger power lines drives our  
8 property value down. And those are our concerns. If we  
9 would have known beforehand that they were going to do  
10 this or they planned on doing it, we wouldn't have even  
11 bought a house there.

12           LORI ELWORTH: Hello, my name is Lori Elworth.  
13 I live at 8605 129th Court Southeast, Newcastle, 98056.  
14 I am opposed to Energize Eastside for a number of  
15 reasons. I will send written comments in. I have joined  
16 CENSE, C-E-N-S-E, .org. There is a lot of information on  
17 their site. There are a lot of smart people that have  
18 contributed to that site voluntarily. And we've been at  
19 this for over a year. There are some people here tonight  
20 that will speak, and I hope that the people that have  
21 attended will listen. Some of it they've heard before.

22           I'm kind of interested in knowing why this room  
23 isn't filled with people. I know Renton is a big city.  
24 I think a lot of people don't know about this project. I  
25 happen to know about it because I live along the easement

1 and I've lived in this area a long time.

2 I'm not a public speaker. I don't know how much  
3 longer I have, but I guess I'm done.

4 DON MARSH: My name is Don Marsh. I'm the Vice  
5 President of CENSE. And I'm going to be repeating  
6 remarks that I made on Tuesday night, partly because I  
7 was hoping we would have some new faces in the audience  
8 to hear them, but also because I'm talking about factors  
9 that should be evaluated in the EIS. And so far we've  
10 heard that maybe safety will be added, but there is some  
11 other ones that I'm concerned about.

12 So I'm speaking for many hundreds of residents who  
13 support CENSE, the Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods  
14 for Sensible Energy. We have opposed the Energize  
15 Eastside project for over a year. During this time we've  
16 frequently been stymied by the way PSE is gaming our  
17 system of government, and we want to be sure this EIS  
18 process isn't similarly tainted.

19 For example, we are very concerned that this EIS  
20 leaves out extremely important evaluation factors, such  
21 as the impact on earth, housing and the economic vitality  
22 of our communities. Let me illustrate. Suppose a  
23 resident is worried that the safety of her family is  
24 jeopardized by the huge poles and high voltages  
25 envisioned by this project in close proximity to the

1 aging petroleum pipeline that has already claimed lives  
2 in our region. Suppose she is worried about the  
3 increased danger this poses during a large and probably  
4 inevitable earthquake in the Pacific Northwest. Could  
5 she ask for this to be studied in the EIS, hopefully with  
6 safety? Maybe. But since the earth element is currently  
7 excluded from study, her question may not be considered  
8 relevant. That makes no sense.

9       Suppose a resident is concerned that the huge holes  
10 that need to be excavated to install these poles will  
11 change the flow of underground water springs in his  
12 neighborhood. As a result, his basement might now begin  
13 to flood at certain times of the year. This question  
14 involves movement of earth, and it will be ruled outside  
15 the scope of the EIS.

16       The fact that housing is excluded from study during  
17 this EIS is a concern for many of us. Those living close  
18 to the poles will find that potential buyers for their  
19 homes may not qualify for FHA loan guarantees. That's  
20 because FHA disallows homes within striking distance of a  
21 falling pole. And the increased height of these poles  
22 will expand the danger radius by a factor of two or  
23 three. Many home loans are based on FHA criteria, so  
24 this will disqualify a lot of buyers, decreasing the  
25 value of the home.

1           In fact, the exclusion of economic effects is  
2 extremely worrisome to us. This transmission line takes  
3 a direct route through dozens of neighborhoods. We have  
4 an estimate from the King County assessor that this could  
5 decrease the value of these properties by at least 10  
6 percent and probably more.

7           If you add up the total economic impact along the  
8 18-mile route, we are talking about permanently  
9 destroying tens or hundreds of millions of dollars on top  
10 of the hundreds of millions of up front costs for the  
11 project. If you don't account for this impact, you can't  
12 properly judge the value of alternatives that don't  
13 destroy property values. It is hard for us to understand  
14 how these important factors were left out of this EIS.

15           Let us be clear about this. Residents of Eastside  
16 cities will insist that earth, housing and economic  
17 impacts are studied in this EIS. If these factors are  
18 not added, this whole effort will be subject to  
19 litigation, wasting everyone's time and money. It will  
20 delay the ultimate decision and prolong the agony of  
21 residents who won't know what the future holds for their  
22 families and their neighborhoods. No one wants this to  
23 be the outcome.

24           In closing, I want to assure all of my neighbors who  
25 are gathered here tonight that CENSE will continue to

1 vigorously oppose this project by every means possible,  
2 in the EIS, in the city council, in local elections and  
3 if we have to, in court. Thank you very much.

4 CAROL HELLAND: I would like to just take a  
5 moment to clarify, because I think it's possible that I  
6 may have been misunderstood the first time. I want  
7 everyone to know that tonight is scoping. There has been  
8 no decision made about things that are in the EIS or out  
9 of the EIS. I just don't want to leave the perception  
10 that there is anything that has been excluded.

11 The purpose of this evening is for you all to tell  
12 us, and we've now heard housing, safety and earth and  
13 economic vitality several times, so we appreciate hearing  
14 that. But that's exactly the type of feedback we like to  
15 hear. The things that we listed were things that we knew  
16 were going to be important to all of you. If there are  
17 other things, that's what we would really like to hear  
18 about. So we appreciate those comments. Keep them  
19 flowing in. But nothing is excluded at this point.

20 SUE STRONK: Hi. My name is Sue Stronk, and I  
21 live at 12917 Southeast 86th Place in Newcastle. I have  
22 an e-mail here from Kim West of Olympic Pipeline that was  
23 sent to David Edmonds who was our representative for the  
24 Olympus neighborhood.

25 It says, Hi, David. I would like to offer my

1 sincere thanks and appreciation for inviting us to your  
2 Olympus Homeowner's Association meeting on Monday,  
3 February 24. It was an opportunity for us to learn about  
4 our shared concerns over future projects in Newcastle.

5 Then it goes on to say. Olympic has two pipelines  
6 that run approximately the entire length of segment C, E,  
7 J and M in a shared easement with Puget Sound Energy's  
8 electric transmission corridor. The location of the  
9 pipelines may be found anywhere within the easement from  
10 the center of the right-of-way to either side and can run  
11 together or separate. The route selection will be our  
12 prime concern for a variety of reasons, including safety,  
13 impact to landowners, future maintenance and customer  
14 impacts to name just a few. Therefore, I feel that  
15 segments B, F, H and L best address the concerns  
16 mentioned above.

17 So these were insights from Mr. Ed Cimaroli, vice  
18 president of Olympic Pipeline, as discussed in our  
19 Olympus Homeowner's meeting. Then, again, it says,  
20 Hopefully this e-mail will be the first step in a process  
21 to work towards a project of mutual concern.

22 Since PSE has zeroed in on the existing shared  
23 utility corridor, both electrical and gas lines already  
24 co-exist along the chosen routes, C, E, J and M. These  
25 are the routes Olympic Pipeline prefers not to be used in

1 the PSE project. Both utilities exist in an easement of  
2 only 100 feet wide between homes. In the space currently  
3 are two gas pipelines, 16-inch and 20-inch diameter, as  
4 well as two sets of 60-foot tall double wooden poles with  
5 115 kV lines on each set.

6 PSE proposes to replace those wood structures with  
7 130-foot tall poles on each side of the gas lines which  
8 run in the center through our neighborhood. Each new  
9 pole will be set 15 to 50 feet underground right next to  
10 these gas lines on an earthquake fault zone.

11 Looking online, I saw some siting and design  
12 considerations for co-locating utilities. It says high  
13 voltage electric transmission lines have the greatest  
14 effect on other utility systems, and hence, pose the  
15 greatest problems in joint right-of-way usage. It says,  
16 placing an electric transmission line in a corridor along  
17 an existing gas pipeline presents a greater problem and  
18 hazard than placing a pipeline along an already existing  
19 power line.

20 The reasoning is that there is great possibility of  
21 pipeline damage from the installation of the tower  
22 footings and the heavy equipment driving over the gas  
23 lines for installation. Also, power lines can induce  
24 currents in metallic objects adjacent to the line. This  
25 effect is particularly prominent in corridors with long

1 parallels. I think Energize Eastside's 18 miles of  
2 paralleling these utilities, gas and electric, would  
3 qualify as a long parallel in this instance.

4 Also shown was a table of utility interactions and  
5 joint right-of-ways. The system effect of pipelines  
6 co-existing with electric transmission lines was ranked  
7 as a great safety hazard. The rankings that they had for  
8 choice were small, medium and great.

9 Safety is of utmost concern, the No. 1 priority.  
10 Experts say it's dangerous to locate power lines next to  
11 existing gas lines. Take heed. This is why when PSE  
12 replaced a 60-foot tall wooden pole several years ago  
13 beside my house, they told me it would be best if I was  
14 not at home the day of the installation. These gas lines  
15 are only three to five feet underground. The chance of  
16 damage is so great with digging and heavy equipment and  
17 footings as close to gas lines in an earthquake fault  
18 zone. I wonder what amount of insurance is prudent for  
19 PSE to carry in case a catastrophe were to happen along  
20 the shared route.

21 DAVID PYLE: If you can make sure to submit a  
22 copy of that e-mail into the record, that would be great,  
23 just electronically if you could just forward it in, that  
24 would be awesome. Thank you.

25 MARCIA WAGONER: I let you go a little longer

1 because I realized you were actually representing a  
2 group.

3           BRIAN ELWORTH: Hello, my name is Brian  
4 Elworth. I live at 8605 129th Court Southeast,  
5 Newcastle. I'm on the Olympus Homeowner's Association  
6 board and represent the Olympus Homeowner's Association.  
7 I'm also an electrical engineer and have been an  
8 electrical engineer for 30 years.

9           Last time I talked about the analogy of the stack of  
10 coins and the Space Needle. I wasn't kidding about that.  
11 The actual electrical demand as specified by PSE is  
12 represented by a stack of eight pennies in comparison to  
13 the height of the Space Needle which is the magnitude of  
14 the energy capacity that they propose in their solution.  
15 Since I can't enter the Space Needle as part of the  
16 public record -- the earth is bolted to it -- I thought I  
17 would bring in an example scaled down so that I could  
18 give it to you.

19           Here is a board, 20 inches by 30 inches. This  
20 represents the 22,425,600 megawatt power capacity, energy  
21 capacity, of the proposed solution. It's kind of hard to  
22 see so I've got a magnifying glass. But in this  
23 magnifying glass is a tiny, little piece of paper that is  
24 six-tenths of an inch long by sixty-four thousandths of  
25 an inch thick. That is the area that represents the

1 magnitude of the electrical energy shortfall that PSE  
2 proclaims we have. This is a problem. And I've got the  
3 magnifying glass so you can actually read the numbers.  
4 It's about forty thousandths of an inch, so you need a  
5 magnifying glass.

6 This is the size of the problem we need to solve.  
7 This is the magnitude of their solution in terms of  
8 electrical energy. So this is Energize Eastside. When  
9 you talk about power and you see that curve that's sort  
10 of doctored, that's a different parameter. This is  
11 energy. This is like fuel in your gas tank versus the  
12 whole power engine of your car. This is energy capacity.

13 So where does all that energy go? Why are we doing  
14 something for the residents of that magnitude? I think  
15 every single alternative out there is far superior to  
16 that from a cost standpoint, from a safety standpoint,  
17 any way you look at it, the proposed solution is way  
18 overkill.

19 I'd like to propose an alternative. I'd also like  
20 to first of all state that I understand you're trying to  
21 be unbiased, but there is an inherent bias in the process  
22 in that PSE has had many years to develop their concept  
23 and they've used who knows how many millions of dollars  
24 of rate payers' money to develop their concept. The  
25 victims at ground zero, like myself and I think most of

1 the customers, are victims when you see that kind of  
2 solution costing \$200 million. The victims of this  
3 process have no funds available to us, very limited  
4 resources. You heard the people who want to get the  
5 information to analyze are precluded from doing so. We  
6 also have very little time. This EIS process is fairly  
7 short compared to the amount of time PSE was given. We  
8 don't have time to really develop and vet good  
9 alternatives. You've seen some good ideas, and I'll  
10 suggest one right now. Win/win situation.

11 You heard Sue talk about the coupling of the  
12 transformer effect of the parallel lines. If you ever  
13 take a piece of electronics equipment apart and lay it  
14 all out, you'll see -- in the transformer, you'll see two  
15 lines, a primary and a secondary. You pass alternating  
16 current through the primary. It creates an alternating  
17 magnetic field that induces a current in the secondary.

18 The overhead wires are the primary. The pipeline is  
19 the secondary. In the old days, nobody worried about the  
20 AC corrosion effects. Well, studies since the pipeline  
21 and power line came together have shown that that AC  
22 power line actually causes corrosion, and wherever there  
23 is a pin break in the insulation protecting the pipe from  
24 the surrounding terrain, you end up with a point source  
25 where current can flow through. That causes point

1 erosion.

2       You've heard about the little pinhole leak that was,  
3 I think, 10,000 gallons. A pipeline can't measure a leak  
4 that small. If it's less than 500 gallons an hour, it's  
5 not a leak. You can ask the pipeline guys what is their  
6 threshold for detection, you know, the pipe's surging, so  
7 they have sort of what are called false alarming where  
8 you ignore certain surges and whatnot. And you don't  
9 even detect things below 500 gallons an hour. That's  
10 pretty huge.

11       Anyway, so you have this transmission line effect,  
12 18 miles of transformer in one giant -- essentially an  
13 18-mile transformer.

14               MARCIA WAGONER: Are you close?

15               BRIAN ELWORTH: Can I propose my  
16 recommendation?

17               MARCIA WAGONER: All right.

18               BRIAN ELWORTH: What I recommend as an  
19 alternative, how about if we increase capacity to those  
20 lines 40 percent, we add 50 percent redundancy and we  
21 don't even touch those wires. What I recommend we do is  
22 we convert two three-phase circuits to three DC lines.  
23 What that does for us is those lines are 115 kilovolts  
24 AC. That's RMS. Is the electrical engineer here? He  
25 was here last time. He can explain all of this to you.

1           Anyway, there are 115 kilovolt lines. The actual  
2 peak voltage is 162 kilovolts. If you could look at it  
3 on an oscilloscope, you could see the peak is actually  
4 162 not 115. DC you can run at 162. That's a 40 percent  
5 increase in capacity just by switching to DC.

6           Also, since DC only needs two wires, not three,  
7 you've got six wires up there, so you've got three  
8 circuits. So now you've got instant redundancy. You can  
9 have a failure of one of the circuits and you still have  
10 two left. That's a monumental improvement in reliability  
11 of PSE's network.

12           You also eliminate that transformer effect. If you  
13 put DC voltage in a transformer, nothing happens.  
14 There's no induced current in the secondary. It's an  
15 alternating field that causes that induction of current  
16 into the pipes. So you put DC through there, the problem  
17 goes away.

18           So there's three -- that's a homerun in my view, and  
19 that can be done. You don't even have to have a meeting.  
20 They can just go do that on the ends of the lines and not  
21 even tell us about it. So I recommend that be brought  
22 forward as an alternative.

23           Thank you. I'll leave the data and the pill bottle  
24 here because the size of the problem is so small.

25           FRED LUMBAO: So I'm Fred Lumbao. I live at

1 3735 Northeast 23rd Place. I actually just bought a new  
2 house with our life savings for \$600,000. We're less  
3 than 1,000 feet from the current power line, and our  
4 concern was the EMF, you know, and the electromagnetic  
5 field causing cancer and stuff.

6 So we actually had an EMF study done before we ever  
7 bought. And we had no idea until the other day when we  
8 were walking our dogs that they were even proposing this.  
9 If we would have known that they were proposing this, we  
10 wouldn't have even bought there. Our concern is a big  
11 ugly line, and it's going to drive down the value of our  
12 property, but more of a health concern than anything and  
13 the cancer-causing effects of the power lines. And  
14 that's our concern.

15 DALE HALL: Hello, my name is Dale Hall,  
16 D-A-L-E, H-A-L-L. I live at 4818 134th Place Southeast,  
17 Bellevue, Washington. I just have to say, this is one  
18 idiotic project to do, idiotic. And it has to do with  
19 safety. I went to the placards outside, and safety is  
20 not even spelled out there. But this is just like a  
21 monumental catastrophe that's going to happen. If there  
22 is an accident here in a normal construction project,  
23 it's going to be labeled an accident.

24 But in this construction project, if there is an  
25 accident, it is going to be a catastrophe. It's going to

1 be on Fox, it's going to be on CBS, ABC, CNN and so  
2 forth. There's going to be an explosion. There's going  
3 to be homes destroyed.

4       There's gas probably already leaking within this  
5 area. And now we want to dig and have a lot of friction  
6 and construction companies. And I'm willing to bet that  
7 if we were to go ahead with this project that homes  
8 around these sites will have to be evacuated, that the  
9 construction companies will say, we're not going to be  
10 digging around these sites where we have children within  
11 hundreds of feet of the construction site. They're going  
12 to -- because of liability, they're going to want to get  
13 people away from this area. It's going to be a hazardous  
14 area. It's going to be a safety area. Safety is not  
15 even on the placard.

16       It's an idiotic project, idiotic. I just don't  
17 understand how these cities have got it to this point  
18 where we're in this situation of talking about this. The  
19 cities should have said no at the very beginning to Puget  
20 Sound Energy. Obviously, Puget Sound Energy has for the  
21 past two years dictated what they want to do. They're  
22 not even a U.S. company. They're a company out of  
23 Australia, I hear tell. It has no benefit to our  
24 community. We're going to pay for this thing, and the  
25 catastrophic impact, if there is a safety issue, is going

1 to be immense. It is your time to say no to this.

2 Thank you.

3 JENNIFER KELLER: Hello, my name is Jennifer  
4 Keller, K-E-L-L-E-R. My address is 115 146th Avenue  
5 Southeast in Bellevue, 98007. I see climate in the list  
6 of issues, greenhouse gasses in the list of issues. I  
7 just want to speak to that a little bit, three aspects  
8 that I just want to call out.

9 One is that building more transmission lines and the  
10 whole idea of non-distributed power system is the  
11 opposite direction that we need to go in terms of  
12 climate. We need to be able to generate power closer to  
13 where we use it and use all the new technologies that are  
14 available to do that as time goes on. So that needs to  
15 grow, our capacity to figure out how to use solar, wind,  
16 smart grid, bio gas, all of those things is really  
17 important. This is how we turn it around by beginning to  
18 use those and getting that curve, the changeover that  
19 we're in right now, getting that to really ramp up. So  
20 that's one thing. This is sort of backwards on that.

21 Another aspect is that trees, we need to reduce our  
22 emissions. We also need to be absorbing more of our  
23 carbon dioxide. We have cut down a huge amount of forest  
24 on the planet. It's kind of a known thing. A tree that  
25 is a little tree or a medium-sized tree, you think about

1 how much a tree puts on each year when it's sucking in  
2 carbon dioxide. And you think about a giant tree. A  
3 tree at the very end of its life isn't absorbing very  
4 much carbon dioxide, but a big tree is absorbing a lot of  
5 carbon dioxide. It is a huge impact to cut it down.  
6 This is something that is soaking up carbon dioxide in a  
7 way that we really, really need right now. That is  
8 another impact.

9       A third impact is just the way we think. So if we  
10 go with an alternative that helps everybody to understand  
11 if I can do my part in my home, I can reduce my  
12 electricity use or balance it out in a way or I can get a  
13 battery installed or I can get solar or whatever it is.  
14 It's the thinking of each person and of the cities and  
15 the utilities together to understand we need to make this  
16 shift over.

17       It's really interesting because we know -- these  
18 technologies are all known now. This is not like some  
19 secret mystery thing about how can we make the  
20 transformation from a fossil fuel-based economy to an  
21 economy where we're using less energy and we're using  
22 energy from sources that can go on and on and on into the  
23 future.

24       So we have the Colstrip plant that's providing some  
25 of our electricity. And the more that we can shift over

1 to solar and wind and bio gas and all of this, it gives  
2 our community the capacity to deal with what's coming in  
3 the future.

4 Thank you.

5 MARCIA WAGONER: Anyone else?

6 Then I will turn the meeting back over to Carol and  
7 David.

8 CAROL HELLAND: Just in closing, I would like  
9 to thank everyone for coming this evening and we  
10 appreciate your feedback and it will help us properly  
11 scope the range of issues to be discussed in the EIS and  
12 the alternatives that will be addressed in the EIS. We  
13 appreciate your time on such a nice, sunny day. Thank  
14 you.

15 (Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.)

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25