

# Phase 2 Draft EIS Comment Record Report

## Part 3 Website Comment Form Entries

July 21, 2017

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
5/11/2017 9:45:02	Tom	McGoff	tmcgoff@hotmail.com	2050 132nd Ave SE, Unit 510	Bellevue	98005	Project Alternatives	I am completely against the Phase 2, Bellevue Central Segment Bypass Option 2. There is no reason this should be the new route. The existing route is already accepted as a "Utility" path and the easement is already established. The impact of bypass option 2 is terrible! It would visually pollute the Lake Hills Connector road and Kelsey Park nature area and be an awful eyesore along Richards Road.		
5/15/2017 14:32:23	James	Price	jprice@appraisalgroupnw.com	9131 122nd PI SE	Newcastle	98056	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	I believe that once the project is completed there will be minimal impacts to views and the aesthetics of the right of way as a result of the project. People, in general, won't really notice the project and the old wood supports that are hardly appealing will be gone. The corridor is fairly wide and there should be no problem in co-locating with the existing pipelines. An attractive trail could be constructed in the right of way that would add to the amenities of the neighborhood and quality of life in Newcastle. We need the electricity to meet our service needs for the future.		
5/17/2017 8:39:50	Jeanne	Warne	jeanne.warne@comcast.net	13608 NE 36th PL	Bellevue	98005	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	The Olympic Pipeline and power lines run right through the middle of established neighborhoods adjacent to many homes and even schools. In fact, my home is within 75ft. of the pipeline. I have not yet seen a fully independent and thorough assessment of the real risks of running a high voltage line in tandem with the pipeline - or having construction in the vicinity. This is not an inconsequential risk factor both in the short term during the construction and in the long-term with the impact of the magnetic impacts on the aging pipeline. As a parent, homeowner, neighbor and community member, do I not have a right to be adequately advised to the risks that I live with each and every day?  In addition, I have not seen substantial data that supports either the need for this specific location for the powerline - if in fact it is needed at all.  Furthermore, I'd like to know who PSE is regulated by and accountable to.		
5/21/2017 13:56:59	Karla and Dave	Herman	hermvel@comcast.net	8018 128th Ave S.E.	Newcastle	98056	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	Our home is adjacent to the power lines and pipe line. Our primary concern is safety due to the age of the pipeline and the additional population that has been added all along this corridor. It was fine for them to put the pipeline and power lines in over 60 years ago--no one was living here. Today is a different story. How can you possibly justify the existence of high voltage power line over jet fuel pipelines running through a residential neighborhood? What is your highest priority?		
5/23/2017 7:32:23	Roger	Orth	rkorth@comcast.net	4530 Somerset Drive SE	Bellevue	98006	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	Why 'railroad' a project into existence and degrade property values in scenic view neighborhoods when CENSE has shown the need is questionable at best. I am definitely against any change in present Somerset portion of the existing transmission line. I support CENSE.		
5/25/2017 8:04:03	Margaret	Makar		3550 140th Ave. NE	Bellevue	98005	Land Use & Housing	I am opposed to PSE's proposal for Bridal trails. They do not have our best interests at heart and are in it for profit or the almighty bottom line. Do not like using our land in an unnecessary way that put us in danger. Don't want anything like this remotely near the Olympic pipeline as was illustrated in Bellingham. Also a hiker that loves our trees and the beauty of our surroundings. Their proposal does not insure reliability and our electric needs our decreasing so the lights will not go out! Paying 1 billion for something that is not necessary it stupid! Margaret Makar		
5/25/2017 8:04:03	Margaret	Makar		3550 140th Ave. NE	Bellevue	98005	Land Use & Housing	I am opposed to PSE's proposal for Bridal trails. They do not have our best interests at heart and are in it for profit or the almighty bottom line. Do not like using our land in an unnecessary way that put us in danger. Don't want anything like this remotely near the Olympic pipeline as was illustrated in Bellingham. Also a hiker that loves our trees and the beauty of our surroundings. Their proposal does not insure reliability and our electric needs our decreasing so the lights will not go out! Paying 1 billion for something that is not necessary it stupid! Margaret Makar		
5/25/2017 9:54:45	Sam	Fetchero	sam.fetchero@gmail.com	920 129th PL NE	Bellevue	98005	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	We do not want these power lines going through our city!!!		
5/26/2017 15:31:05	Amos	Chen	chenamos@hotmail.com	11800 SE 4th PL, #200	Bellevue	98005	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	We prefer the original route/corridor that goes through the Central Bellevue area. It doesn't make sense to bypass the most direct route. In addition, the alternative bypass route would affect existing and new residential communities on SE 5th and 118th in Bellevue. Please consider the direct route only. Thank you!		
5/30/2017 9:41:24	Sangeetha	Rajendra	sarajendra@hotmail.com	8613 129th Cour SE	Newcastle	WA 98056	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	Sangeetha Rajendra 8613 129th Court SE Newcastle, WA 98056  Comments on Energies Eastside Environmental Impact Study – Phase 2. Firstly, I would like to say I feel a little redundant bringing up my concerns with issues that should have already been addressed during phase 1. I have two topics. One of the primary issue of the EIS Phase 2 is that it is supposed to be an environmental study. But how can an environmental impact study be conducted without these following important details. 1)The selection of the specific route 2)pole designs 3)pole locations 4)Or the list of trees that are to be removed or trimmed  You would expect this specific details to be listed in at least Phase 2. There are no pole designs that specify length or the width. Where are they going to be placed? In the existing spots or someplace farther or closer to my home, since I live adjacent to the power lines. Without these basic specific details, the validity and reliability of an environmental impact study is highly questionable.  Without the pole design or locations it is an inaccurate estimate as to how many trees are going to be cut or trimmed. The EIS has just thrown out a number of trees that could potentially be cut, but nothing about the types and locations of those trees, which can have a huge effect on the aesthetic and layout of neighborhoods and homes. In all, the lack of specifics and structure in the EIS-Phase 2 makes it hard to analyze exactly what the environmental impact is.  My second, but more stressing, concern is the unbalanced need vs effect. PSE has predicted that energy usage will increase rapidly in the next few years, however, in actuality, energy usage has NOT been increasing. This "need" for more electrical energy as massive as PSE claims should be presented with accurate data. It baffles me that we are even considering risking lives in possible explosions and fires that could result from instituting this project. The "need" for this project does not outweigh its possible consequences.		
5/31/2017 16:36:50	Ian	Scott	ianscott1337@gmail.com	131 146th ave se	Bellvue	98007	Project Alternatives	Have you made any action to move the line through Redmond and Bellevue along the new light rail line. With all the work they are doing you would be able to get a buried line all way to Factoria without much effort just a couple of buried power line.		
6/1/2017 11:21:21	Dave & Denise	Mickelson	DaveMickelson@comcast.net	4518 Somerset Drive SE	Bellevue	98006	Land Use & Housing	p3.1.1-Potential impacts to land use, shorelines, and housing. The study area includes parcels that are included in or abutting PSE right of ways well as those adjoining parcels—within a reasonable distance. If abutting parcel is large, then adjoining parcel to the abutting parcel was not included. The greatest potential to be impacted is the new easement acquisition (especially on option routes not currently in the existing PSE right of way corridor) and associated structure removal on PSE current or acquired easement property. p3.1.3-Impact of property values was referred back to Phase 1 EIS: which said in section 10.7.1.4 (that home values are economic not an environmental issue. Reviewing 25 articles, the EIS chose to quote from Mullins in 2003 because over 50 studies were included which stated in some cases a small decrease in values with proximity to a transmission line, in other cases no change, in some cases increased property values. Quoting From Kinnard 1990- potential to decrease value is small-6.3% or lower—lots next to line often benefit, where lots next to adjacent lots often have value reductions. Higher end properties are more likely to be value affected. KC Assessor does consider views of power lines in assessing property values. A 2012 study concluded 3-6% of value. Any effects seems to disappear at 200-300 feet.) Referring to EIS Phase 2 in section 3.10, Economics, p3.10-1 thru 3, Newcastle was studied for potential tax revenue loss due to property tax reduction. Of all EE cities, Newcastle would suffer most in property tax and lost ecosystem due to reduced tree cover because it is the smallest of the affected cities. Under grounding was studied as mitigation, but stated the replacement of higher voltage lines when lower voltage lines are already present would not result in a greater negative effect than the existing lines at present. PSE estimates cost differential to underground would be between \$16-\$25 million per mile and any city or property owner requesting under grounding would be required to pay for it as interpreted by PSE in the utility rate tariff rule. Development in proximity to utility infrastructure must comply not only with local municipalities comprehensive plans but also with PSE guidelines—which are shaped by the National Electrical Safety Code (NESC) standards. It noted Newcastle includes a new Utilities Element with policies that address collocations, limiting vegetation disturbance, and promoting conservation efforts. In the appendix B-2 it notes all four cities required a conditional use permit. The cities of Bellevue and Renton have Shorelines of the State within their boundaries. Any project inconsistencies are described in appendix B-Section 3.1.3. Under zoning districts, it is noted Newcastle has a required setback of 5 feet for all buildings and structures including transmission towers outside a defined typically 50 foot wide Olympic Pipeline easement which is generally centered down the PSE easement but does vary in location.		
6/1/2017 16:48:18	Thomas	Cezeaux	tcezeaux@yahoo.com	8403 128th AVE SE	Newcastle	98056	Project Alternatives	I don't believe that PSE seriously considered alternatives to the proposed project. The only other options allowed were pre-selected and dismissed out of hand.		
6/1/2017 16:49:37	Thomas	Cezeaux	tcezeaux@yahoo.com	8403 128th AVE SE	Newcastle	98056	Other	I believe the EIS process has been flawed from the beginning. How can you do an EIS if there are no concrete plans to evaluate?		
6/1/2017 16:51:14	Thomas	Cezeaux	tcezeaux@yahoo.com	8403 128th AVE SE	Newcastle	98056	Economics	Based on PSE's own numbers, there has been a decrease in the amount of electricity demand while the population of Bellevue has increased. The need for this project seems contrived and unnecessary.		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
6/6/2017 11:26:42	R. Court	Olson	court.olson@yahoo.com	15817 SE 26th Street	Bellevue	98008	Project Alternatives	<p>Dear EIS review authorities.</p> <p>I am an engineer and construction management professional. I am a long time resident of Bellevue and I have long worked in the commercial building industry. I provide project management consulting services to commercial building clients seeking to build high performance green buildings, or renovate existing buildings. Previous clients have included private and public clients, including several Washington municipalities. Related to this work, I have significant expertise in how we can make buildings highly energy efficient. Recently, for the past year, I've have been regularly attending the monthly meetings of the PSE 2017 Integrated Resource Plan Advisory Group. At these meetings PSE presents the details of their next developing 20 year resource plan that is scheduled to be issued at the end of this year.</p> <p>As I verbally commented in the June 3rd Energize East Side EIS public hearing at Bellevue City Hall, the justification for the Energize East Side project by PSE is in serious question.</p> <p>My primary comment related to the unsubstantiated PSE electrical demand projections. When I've projected PSE system wide electrical demand forward for twenty years at the same rate as population growth projections and then subtracted PSE's 2015 Integrated Resource Plan targeted energy efficiency savings, I have found the net electrical demand curve to be flat. There is no net demand increase. Here are a couple of calculation details:</p> <p>-- For the current PSE system wide electrical demand I used a calculated average demand from the most recent ten years, since PSE says that demand fluctuates yearly with the weather.</p> <p>--For the population growth rate projection I used the Puget Sound Regional Council's population growth rate percentage. (FYI, this growth rate percentage is larger than the growth rate projected by King County). Using population growth as a rate of electrical demand increase is highly credible and probably a slight overstatement, since for more than a decade now PSE per capita usage of electricity has been dropping. (FYI, PSE has admitted this steady drop in per capita electrical consumption in a recent 2017 IRP Advisory Group meeting).</p> <p>In my testimony I also commented that if there actually was a local future demand concern in the East Side, it could be easily remedied by PSE ramping up its energy efficiency program. Studies by the federal Department of Energy and by the New Building Institute (sponsored in part by the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance) show that the average potential for saving energy in our current building stock is about 50%. PSE's current energy efficiency savings plan targets approximately a 10% energy efficiency savings over twenty years. Much more could be done.</p> <p>Also in my hearing testimony I commented that I have been extensively reading and studying the climate change problem and solutions for the past 15 years. I said in testimony that we need to be planting many more trees, not extensively cutting them down as PSE's Energize East Side project proposes to do. Trees are our only proven CO2 sequestering tool, so they are our first line of defense to reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.</p> <p>In conclusion, there has been no proven demand justification for PSE's Energize East Side project. If there was a real proven projection of demand increase (which I seriously doubt is possible), the most environmentally friendly option to accommodate such a demand increase would be to increase energy efficiency savings targets. Such an efficiency increase plan would require no new transmission lines and no destruction of precious trees.</p> <p>I therefore urge rejection of the PSE Energize East Side project for lack of need justification and for serious environmental impact consequences. If requested, I can provide more information to back up my testimony.</p>		
6/11/2017 9:20:06	Eldon H	Graham	eldon.graham@hotmail.com	13629 SE 20th Street	Bellevue	98005	Environmental Health Electric & Magnetic Fields	<p>Chapter 3.8, Environmental Health – Electric and Magnetic Fields, of Puget Sound Energy's (PSE) Phase 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not address "corona discharge" and the radio frequency interference that such discharges create.</p> <p>To understand why corona discharge would be an adverse consequence of PSE's Energize Eastside proposal and my qualifications to comment on this matter, please see my previous comments dated March 13, 2016 and July 26, 2016.</p> <p>Corona is a phenomenon associated with all electric transmission lines. During wet conditions, water drops collect on power line conductors, and then the localized electric field at energized power line components and conductors causes the surrounding air molecules to ionize and produce an electric discharge called corona. Corona in turn produces radio frequency interference. Corona is more noticeable at higher voltages (above 110 KV).</p> <p>The Puget Sound climate is perfect for corona discharges.</p> <p>POWER Engineers, Inc. did an Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) study for the Energize Eastside project. The title of Appendix D of POWER's report suggests that it is capable of evaluating corona discharge but nowhere in the report is corona discussed. Why did Puget Sound Energy not ask POWER to address corona and design considerations that would minimize corona?</p> <p>Because corona discharges are a design issue, it is most important for PSE to focus on the matter now before it starts developing specifications, selecting material and letting contracts for construction.</p> <p>Design and construction with corona in mind would go a long way toward reducing the radio interference that corona would otherwise cause.</p> <p>Eldon H Graham 13629 SE 20th Street Bellevue, WA 98005 425-644-4282</p>		
6/16/2017 12:39:00	Sean	Cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Project Alternatives	<p>The discussion of alternatives in section 2.3 delays is not consistent with industry trends. New technologies are being adopted across the country reducing the need for traditional transmission lines. Transmission projects are being cancelled all over the country including here in Washington state. Please refer to the attached link, <a href="http://www.utilitydive.com/news/bpa-turns-to-non-wire-alternatives-in-cancellation-of-transmission-project/443125/">http://www.utilitydive.com/news/bpa-turns-to-non-wire-alternatives-in-cancellation-of-transmission-project/443125/</a></p>		
6/16/2017 12:42:20	sean	cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Water Resources	<p>The EIS does not address the impact to natural springs and runoff changes that will impact the steep slope areas that will impact residential homes along the path of the project. There exists potential for home flooding and land slides due to the impact of changing the water flow down steep slopes.</p>		
6/16/2017 12:44:24	sean	cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	<p>PSE has stated that they will not underground this transmission line in the phase I EIS and in the CAG review so it should not be included as a mitigation measure.</p>		
6/16/2017 12:47:53	sean	cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Plants & Animals	<p>The mitigation plan does not address the short term impact the project will have on wild life and slope erosion until the mitigation measures take effect which will take a minimum of several years for root systems to develop. Unfortunately during this time, irreversible damage will result.</p>		
6/16/2017 12:50:39	sean	cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>The EIS conflicts with the EDM report that stated there are significant risks associated with this project and the close location of the pipeline.</p>		
6/16/2017 12:55:02	sean	cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	<p>This project violates the Bellevue Comprehensive plan 2015. There will be significant impact for homeowners in Somerset but more impactful will be the scare that the loss of over 1600 trees will have along the path of the lines with the taller poles and thicker cables. This transmission line will become the defining feature of the view from downtown Bellevue, Mercer Island, and Seattle as you look east to see it towering over the existing structures and remaining trees.</p>		
6/16/2017 13:07:38	sean	cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Other	<p>PROCESS - Section 2020 states that the CAG put forward recommendations yet this document was never signed off by the CAG as has been done with previous PSE projects due. There wasn't clear consensus within the group therefore, PSE didn't follow there own process to avoid having to address this issue.</p>		
6/16/2017 13:13:27	sean	cox	seanozelcox@gmail.com	4538 Somerset Dr SE	Bellevue	98006	Other	<p>SAFETY- The EIS document does nothing to address the additional risk associated with this project due to the risk of earthquakes in this region and the fault lines that it crosses. The existing transmission line does not pose a significant risk to the adjacent homes due to the pole heights as when the lines fall they will not hit homes. With this proposal the pole heights are significantly higher and increase the risk to adjacent homes as now the natural arch will have them land on homes risking injury and death to the homeowners along with increased risk of fire and damage to structures. No structures should be located within this zone.</p>		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
6/16/2017 16:10:55	Robin	Jacobson	robinjacobson@msn.com	13601 SE Allen Rd.	Bellevue	98006	Land Use & Housing	<p>1. As a concerned resident of Bellevue and a property owner of a multi-family complex for over 35 years at the address above, it appears Willow 2 would have a direct and costly impact on this property. Referring to the EIS Phase 2 Draft, Property Values and Views, Chapter 2.1.3, page 45: Construction states: The construction period for the substation and 230KV line is estimated to be 18 months and over 2 summers. Estimates are 3-7 days within a 2 month period. There is no time frame for restoration! "Restoration will be coordinated with the property owner and relevant permitting agencies" This hangs the property owner out to PSE's desires and an unknown completion time, this is unimaginable!! In addition to the time frame, if the construction follows the existing corridor over Somerset, the entrance to the complex would be compromised. It is the only way in and out of the property, which would impact not only me, but the 9 resident families who live here also. If the project has the propensity to be on-going for 18-24 months, this would create a nightmare having to live under these circumstance for two years!! Also, the vegetation loss would be tremendous. Thirty five year old trees would be removed for the 230KV lines. Trees that have provided ecological benefits and environmental values. In 2015-2016, PSE inventoried 9,400 trees to be removed for their Energize Eastside Project. Trees are essential in keeping an ecological balance by reducing soil erosion, improving air quality, removing pollutants and providing food and habitats for birds and other wildlife. Perhaps most important providing beauty and aesthetics to our environment already blemished with "Progress"</p> <p>2. Pipeline Safety:</p> <p>The Olympic Pipeline runs Parallel with 136th SE, which runs along the Eastside of Tyee Middle School. The 230KV transmission line would run above 136th. endangering the hundred of students and numerous homes with the threat of an explosion looming. It would be horrific and catastrophic if the pipeline was caused to explode by an arc of lighting, faulty components of the gas line, a leak, a rupture and more. Statistics show there have been many pipelines over the years that have exploded, causing deaths and devastation to neighborhoods. Here are some... starting with the explosion of the Olympic Pipeline Co. In Bellingham, Wa. on June 7, 2009. Two young boys were killed, the city was in turmoil, rivers were heated to 85 degrees, killing hundred of fish ,crawfish and other species! June 7, 2010 a 36-inch gas pipeline explosion and fire in Johnson County Texas was caused by workers installing poles for electrical lines. One worker killed, six injured, 2014, March 12, East Harlem gas explosion in New York City...investigators found natural gas in the soil nearby, indicating the leak had existed for some time before explosion. January 14, 2015 a gas pipeline exploded near the Ross Barnett Reservoir in Brandon, Mississippi, creating a sizable crater in the ground and burning 6 acres of vegetation. The failure was due to a "hard spot" from manufacturing, that already had a repair sleeve on it. There are many more incidents throughout the country and world. PSE maintains the Olympic Pipeline is safe and well maintained and with minimal or no risk! However, uncontrolled circumstances occur and we're left with what could be life changing for so many. Why risk it?</p> <p>I sincerely hope PSE and the Energize Eastside project cans see the validity in an Alternative Solution, in lieu of the High Voltage 230KV lines they want to install. We want to keep the beauty of our five Eastside cities and still provide the necessary energy for our growing population. Please look at the alternative solutions CENCE has worked diligently on over the last 3 years. Our goal for all is to have an answer that will not destroy the beauty of the Eastside and still preserve the value of our environment and land!!</p> <p>With deep concern, Robin Jacobson June 16, 2017</p>		
6/16/2017 17:16:10	Robin	Jacobson	robinjacobson@msn.com	13601 SE Allen Rd.	Bellevue	98006	Land Use & Housing	<p>I just sent my comments in about an hour ago, around 4:00 To be a " Party of Record"</p> <p>I wrote with my concerns:</p> <p>Land Use and Housing and Pipeline Safety. Please if can, send me a response you received it.</p>		
6/17/2017 11:28:23	Diane	Rush	dianerush@comcast.net	8428 128th Avee SE	Newcastle	98056	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>I am writing about the Energize the Eastside EIS and my concern for our Olympus neighborhood safety along the proposed PSE route. To my knowledge, there still is not a seismic study and am fearful about the construction of new power poles/lines along the Olympic pipeline.</p> <p>I am a CENSE member and need more assurance for our safety and the de-valuation of our property values. Regards, Diane Y. Rush; 8428-128th Ave SE; Newcastle; (425) 985-5297</p>		
6/17/2017 16:04:18	Lara	Prior	prior.bbd@outlook.com	13606 SE 3rd PL	Bellevue	98005	Project Alternatives	<p>As a homeowner, voter and tax payer in the city of Bellevue, I do not feel this project is justified. The need has not been adequately demonstrated and alternatives have not been defined. Why have solutions employed by other areas, such as batteries in Southern California, been dismissed based on outdated data?</p> <p>PSE enjoys a monopoly on the residents, we have no choices or alternatives and PSE has no competition. PSE states, without this project, they will institute rolling black outs on our communities...YET they are exporting to Canada at the same time the Eastside is experiencing a major grid failure. Additionally, PSE also plans to export to California.</p> <p>In the seven years my husband and I have lived on the Eastside (in Bellevue) I do not recall a single initiative by PSE to encourage energy efficiency. We would happily put solar panels on our roof, at our own cost, or install other energy efficient upgrades...this has never been an initiative PSE has shared with their customers or made available. We currently pay for wind offset credits and would proactively work at conservation.</p> <p>In summary, I feel this project does not support the good of the Eastside or the community and strongly oppose the PSE Energize Eastside.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lara Prior</p>		
6/17/2017 16:12:40	Simon	Prior	simon.prior@virgin.net	13606 SE 3rd PL	Bellevue	98005	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>As a homeowner impacted by the PSE Energize Eastside, we fear for our safety with the proximity of our home to the fuel pipeline with the Bellevue Central route option. The DNV-GL pipeline safety report says PSE's preferred route, along my property has an "unpredictable risk rang".</p> <p>This is a well traveled trail with runners, children and animals all at risk for this unnecessary project. There is a strong need for additional studies for this project.</p> <p>We strongly oppose this project, there are better solutions that are environmentally friendly, this is what the community wants.</p> <p>Sincerely, Simon Prior (Cense member &amp; supporter)</p>		
6/17/2017 18:43:51	Sirisha	Dontireddy	Sirishareddy@hotmail.com	4617 135th PL SE	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>Our house is close to Olympic gas pipeline. We are losing sleep over the Energize Eastside's proposed 230kV transmission lines so close to aging pipeline. Pipeline safety during construction is a major issue for Energize Eastside. The 18 mile stretch of pipeline plus transmission line passes close to homes and a middle school in our neighborhood. If there were to be a failure of the pipeline and a major spill occurred during construction, how do you justify the loss of life?</p> <p>Appendix "I"-3 OLYMIC DATA REQUEST AND RESPONSES FOR RISK ASSESSMENT</p> <p>"Members of Olympics damage prevention team are located nearby at all times and are able to respond to certain types of events as quickly as traffic permits" This statement is not reassuring at all. What does "nearby" mean? What do you mean by "certain types of events"?</p> <p>"Olympic has contracted with National response corporation- environmental services to respond anywhere along its pipeline system within 2 hours" what is the greatest quantity of oil that can be released in 2 hours near my house? Page 3.9-18</p> <p>2,362 incidents were reported in 5 years, over many miles of pipeline. The risk may be very low for any particular mile of pipeline that is going through unpopulated areas but what are the consequences of pipeline failure in densely populated urban areas like Renton, Redmond and Bellevue? Absolute risk may be low but the potential consequences are very high that this increased risk is not acceptable to our community.</p> <p>Page 3.9-16 Pipeline leak detection system and controls.</p> <p>We have no information about shut off systems, how they work, what the actual maximum leak might be. This is unacceptable. What is the extent of potential risk to human life and property if a leak just smaller than the leak detection system can detect should occur?</p> <p>I am looking forward to your answers, thank you! Sirisha, 4254820539.</p>		
6/17/2017 19:36:10	Sirisha	Dontireddy	Sirishareddy@hotmail.com	4617 135th PL SE	Bellevue	98006	Plants & Animals	<p>Energize Eastside may remove up to 5400 valuable urban trees. And that is not a "less than significant" impact for the residents. Loss of tree canopy and the accompanying loss of 327 acres of vegetation results in reduced shading over streams and changes water temperatures as well as robbing fish of the shade cover they use to avoid predators. The loss of trees and other vegetation would have a significant impact upon the streams and fish habitat.</p> <p>Thank you for consideration! Sirisha</p>		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
6/17/2017 20:26:43	Sirisha	Dontireddy	Sirishareddy@hotmail.com	4617 135th PL SE	Bellevue	98006	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	<p>We have paid premium price for our home in Somerset community for its views. We are very concerned by the potential visual impact of Energize Eastside project on our property. Our property value will be impacted significantly. I myself wouldn't buy a property so close to high powered transmission lines. Construction and installation of industrial sized poles do not belong in residential neighborhoods. When taller poles are used, the pole diameter is increased from three feet to five feet. The ground level impact of clearing land and installation of new poles is not addressed sufficiently in the EIS. PSE traditionally makes money by building more stuff: put in a billion dollar substation and they can "rate base" it, making customers pay the cost, plus a ten-percent markup, for decades. A new wooden pole can generate that ten per-cent markup for the utility in the course of its fifty year life span. A pole makes money- hence, poles. This project is not needed by the residents of the Eastside. It's not just energy-inefficient, it's capital inefficient. PSE wants to lock us in to using outdated technology for the next 20 years or so. By what metrics will reliability be improved with EE project? PSE has stated that power outages will not be reduced. Battery storage now protects customers in Southern California from rolling blackouts. Why wouldn't that work for the Eastside? EIS contains no chart clearly demonstrating the need for the project while the recent data shows declining electricity usage. And this is earth quake prone area. What could happen if the Seattle fault slips up to 10 feet and ruptures the Olympic pipeline with increased voltage overhead?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration! Sirisha.</p>		
6/17/2017 22:29:43	Amy	Faith	amygfaith@yahoo.com	15210 NE 8th St Unit D4	Bellevue	98007	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>Dear Energize Eastside Representative:</p> <p>I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed transmission lines. I disagree with this project on many levels. Here are my primary reasons :</p> <p>Tree removal /Environmental impacts - We need to preserve, not destroy our tree canopy. Over four thousand mature trees are slated for removal under this project. Once they are gone, they are gone. Such trees cannot be replaced. The size of the trees to be removed take hundreds of years to reach that size. Wildlife habitat would be destroyed with the removal of these trees. Animals need that habitat to survive. Trees keep soil and vegetation in place. When removed, that puts the area at increased risk for erosion, landslides, and flooding. As a member of Cense, I know that an environmentally friendly solution exists that would save these trees . My family has lived in Washington for 30 years. We are originally from a little village in Minnesota. Minnesota does not have beautiful trees like Washington does. Instead , it has little stick trees, and tall power lines lining the open prairie. There is no reason to cut our beautiful trees and replace them with stick trees and tall power lines.</p> <p>Pipelines would be in close proximity to power lines- This is an accident just waiting to happen. It is not safe at all. There have already been explosions here in Washington due to this hazard. These lines with the pipeline would be going through densely populated areas including schools. Our emergency responders could not get to and assist fast enough to a disaster of that scope.</p> <p>There is no documented need for this project. PSE manipulated data to create the appearance of need for this, when there is none.</p> <p>PSE just wants that 9% return from this project. Instead, it should embrace the alternative proposed by Cense. Cense offers an alternative that is environmentally friendly, costs substantially less, saves the trees, and would provide our communities with reliable power.</p> <p>Amy Faith 425-653-1436</p>		
6/18/2017 6:58:21	Thomas	Coffee	thomasmcoffee@gmail.com	13301 SE 79th Pl	Newcastle	98059	Project Alternatives	<p>In terms of demand, PSE's own data indicate that electricity demand in Bellevue and other targeted communities is actually declining despite strong population growth; yet the projections PSE has published in the past (which no longer appear on their web site) forecast rapid growth in electricity demand (much higher than projected in Seattle). The current EIS provides no information to back up assumptions about demand.</p> <p>In terms of reliability, the EIS makes no measurable claims to any improvements. Indeed, PSE has stated that the project will not reduce power outages. Other major utilities have achieved more cost-effective improvements in reliability using flow control devices and grid storage batteries. The project thus appears unnecessary from this standpoint as well.</p> <p>In short, PSE has provided no data justifying any public benefits from the proposed project. The available data suggest that its only benefits will be to the bottom line of PSE's foreign owners, at massive cost to our environment and communities.</p>		
6/18/2017 7:12:41	Lara	Prior	prior.bbd@outlook.com	13606 SE 3rd PL	Bellevue	98005	Economics	<p>As a resident of Bellevue my only viable option for power is service with Puget Sound Energy. Because of this, there needs to be a balance of representation for the people, the planet and profit. The Energize Eastside project is only about profit, it's destructive to the environment, harmful to our community with no modern alternatives explored. PSE is a Bellevue, WA based, Australian owned FOR PROFIT company owned by the Macquarie Group. PSE claims without this project there will be rolling black outs to the community yet there has been no proof of why or where the power is going. Are we exporting to Canada and California? If so, why?</p> <p>My name is Lara Prior, I'm a homeowner, tax payer, Cense member and voter from Bellevue, WA and I oppose this project.</p>		
6/18/2017 7:22:26	Lara	Prior	prior.bbd@outlook.com	13606 SE 3rd PL	Bellevue	98005	Plants & Animals	<p>This project has not adequately addressed the environmental impact on our community, the impact on the water, the salmon that spawn in Kelsey Creek, the trees and animals that share our community. PSE has not provided specifics on final location, number of trees to be removed, pole locations or a final route. How can a project be evaluated properly without this information? Why is PSE allowed to move forward without providing the data to support the need and full impact on our community.</p> <p>What are the metrics to show how reliability will be improved? The Energize Eastside plan calls for removal of up to 5,400 trees, this is a significant impact to our community and should not be allowed when there are other alternatives that have not been adequately explored.</p> <p>My name is Lara Prior, I support Cense. I do not support Energize Eastside, it's a bad plan for our environment and our community. We need solutions that keep the integrity of our natural resources, plants, animals and environment</p>		
6/19/2017 13:50:47	Wei	Tung	aph172@hotmail.com	4089 131st PL SE	Bellevue	98006	Land Use & Housing	<p>The project should be routed to avoid residential area and the oil pipeline. Construction over pipeline definitely has risk. And something might happen usually will happen.</p>		
6/19/2017 17:59:48	Robert	Billing		5643 116th PL SE	Bellevue		Project Alternatives	<p>Please build the new power lines through Bellevue.</p>		
6/19/2017 17:59:50	Robert	Billing		5643 116th PL SE	Bellevue		Project Alternatives	<p>Please build the new power lines through Bellevue.</p>		
6/19/2017 21:49:00	Wolfgang	Loera	WOLF57327@COMCAST.NET	2381 132nd Ave SE	Bellevue	98005	Other	<p>It is my firm belief that the Willow One Route is the most logical route option available for the Energize Eastside project. I would also add that I vehemently oppose Bypass Route Two and I believe that both Bypass Route One and Bypass Route Two would be extremely detrimental to the City of Bellevue. That a special interest group like the East Bellevue Community Council could or would necessitate the creation of such ill conceived route options as Bypass Route One and the heinous Bypass Route Two is quite frankly a form of tyranny.</p>		
6/20/2017 2:49:53	Michael	Wong	mwong911@msn.com	8308 128th Avenue SE	Newcastle	98056	Project Alternatives	<p>It's incredibly disingenuous that citizens are expected to swallow the biased reporting of PSE-paid contractors. It is unconscionable that officials do so nothing to represent those who elected you. There's no semblance of accountability. Shame on you lackeys.</p>		
6/20/2017 8:03:20	Angela	Giboney		6448 138th Ave Ne 402	Redmond	98052	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>Additional electricity and pipeline is not a wise choice. Also Robert values are impacted for any property in sight lines of these large power lines, so any property owner where the looked are on their property or in sight of their property should be financially compensated for the reduction in property values. 5 percent of property value. Electricity should run on the existing corridor of similar large lines at a lower long term cost to maintain and no additional environmental or aesthetic impact</p>		
6/20/2017 8:03:21	Angela	Giboney		6448 138th Ave Ne 402	Redmond	98052	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>Additional electricity and pipeline is not a wise choice. Also Robert values are impacted for any property in sight lines of these large power lines, so any property owner where the looked are on their property or in sight of their property should be financially compensated for the reduction in property values. 5 percent of property value. Electricity should run on the existing corridor of similar large lines at a lower long term cost to maintain and no additional environmental or aesthetic impact</p>		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
6/20/2017 16:58:09	Jill	Sulzberg	jillsulzberg@me.com	4433 137th Ave NE	Bellevue	98005	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>Pipeline Safety during construction (and even afterwards) is a crucial issue demonstrating the unsuitability of Energize Eastside for our community. For most of its 18 miles, the transmission line (if approved) will run along the Olympi Pipeline, which carries about 10 million gallons of jet fuel and other petroleum products each day from refineries in the north to SeaTac airport and point further south.</p> <p>Anyone who purchased a home with easements for the pipeline and transmission lines should have done so with full knowledge of the encumbrances on their property. Most likely, the homeowners weighed the benefits of their particular purchase against the downsides to buying property subject to easements for pipelines and power lines. While the homeowners may have expected some changes over time to the pipeline or the power lines, Energize Eastside is a far too outsized a plan to have reasonably been anticipated and as such presents new and unexpected safety concerns.</p> <p>The 230kV transmission line poles require a much larger foundation than the existing 120 kV wooden poles. Placement will involve compromises, as the transmission line pass through mostly residential and business zones. Compromises will made in pole location and construction activity to maximize distance from structures and public areas, including minimizing the distance between the pipeline and the transmission lines. Inevitably, this will entail much drilling, digging, and heavy equipment close to the pipeline.</p> <p>An unfortunate consequence of this siting could be an increased risk of a pipeline release and fire during construction when compared with the No Action Alternative (see Section 4.9.1.2). While PSE states the probability of a pipeline release and fire remains low under Alternative 1, the potential environmental health and safety impacts would be significant if there were a release and fire--especially given that the pipeline is co-located with a 230 kV transmission line in a populated area.</p> <p>Energize Eastside's 18 mile stretch of pipeline and transmission lines passes through or very close to schools, parks, places of worship, shopping centers and suburban neighborhoods. In some areas, the pipeline and power lines are on slopes above these communities. A pipeline failure could result in fuel pouring down the the slope, catching fire and spreading rapidly.</p> <p>Equally concerning is the fact that damage may occur during construction but the effects may not be observed until later. Many disastrous pipeline accidents result months or years after the initial damage. While the EIS claims that crews will be vigilant and responsive to accidents during construction (as if there were there any other option), there is no provision for increased monitoring in the months or years following construction.</p>		
6/21/2017 9:03:50	Stephanie	Kristen	stephaniekristen@live.com	13268 SE 43rd Pl	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>The EIS must account for all risk factors resulting from the scale and intensity of the project and for the increased potential devastation due to the location of the project through neighborhoods and public places.</p> <p>My two major concerns come from living in-between the new two route "solution". A major concern for me in living below the pipeline. I am very afraid if we are doing construction of an old pipeline the safety issues surrounding that. It seems like dangerous idea to be building on decades old infrastructure.</p> <p>Secondly, The amount of trees removed and poles installed on Newport Way between Allen Road and Factoria is a major concern. I think the view impact to the folks that are living between Newport Way and Somerset Drive will be significantly impacted and affect home values.</p> <p>As a real estate agent, I worry for all of the homes on the hill and the values to their property, not only because of the view impact but especially because of the safety concern.</p>		
6/21/2017 9:07:33	Michelle	RICHARDSON	mkline_@hotmail.com	98 Cascade Key	Bellevue	98006	Project Alternatives	<p>I literally still cannot believe in today's day and age you would be putting up above-ground poles. I feel like we are taking a hundred steps backwards. It really impacts that look of our city to have hideous poles put up - particularly when they can be put underground. Why are we even discussing this? Why aren't these poles going underground, where every other new development that cares about aesthetics, puts them. I know it is more expensive, but really? What are we doing? Is this really a good idea? Who are we helping with this plan? Certainly we are not considering house values and desirability of potential homeowners who would like to live in our area. We can make up the money with higher resale values. While I am happy you are not coming closer to my neighborhood, I still vehemently disagree with putting up any additional above-ground poles. It's absurd. Thx.</p> <p>The PSE Proposal is flawed because it does not utilize industry best practices and best-of-class technology in energy efficiency and distributed energy resources. PSE is asking ratepayers to pay for investments that would not be needed if PSE adopted proven best practices and technology.</p> <p>Electricity demand is declining even as population is growing, both in our region and across the nation. We have just begun to tap the potential of Energy Efficiency in our homes and businesses. The PNW Power Planning Council has identified a lot of room for improvement if we make smart investments in more efficient systems for lighting, heating, cooling, and appliances. We can boost Energy Efficiency investment if we implement smart policies that promote education and awareness (see Portland's recent adoption of a Home Energy Score Policy), and introduce attractive financing options (see California's boom in PACE lending).</p> <p>We can also do a lot more to use modern data analytics and technology to smooth demand, like Grid Integrated Hot Water Heaters and off-peak charging of EV's. Finally, if we introduce pricing policies that reward consumers for managing peak use, we could have a big impact on peak generation requirements without investing in obsolete and expensive transmission capacity.</p> <p>Distributed Energy Resources can eliminate the need for expensive infrastructure. Look at the example set by Con Edison in Brooklyn. By investing in non-wires alternatives, Con Edison has been able to save ratepayers hundreds of millions of dollars versus investing in transmission lines. PSE should be pursuing a similar approach rather than saddling the Eastside with a huge bill for infrastructure that is not needed and will soon be obsolete. PSE should invest in building the Spring District as a micro-grid that uses CHP to meet it's electrical needs, and in community solar and batteries to meet the needs of neighborhoods, rather than building higher capacity substations fed by larger transmission lines that deliver electricity from far off sources. Including environmentally damaging sources like coal.</p> <p>Please go back to the drawing board and come up with an more credible proposal that fully employs industry best practices and best of class DER technology. The current PSE proposal amounts to a wealth transfer from Eastside citizens to the out of state owners of PSE.</p>		
6/21/2017 13:50:03	Jeff	Thiel	jeff.r.thiel@outlook.com	5215 146th ave SE	Bellevue	98006	Project Alternatives	<p>I am a member of CENSE.</p>		
6/23/2017 15:23:05	Mark	Davidson	msd101010@outlook.com	8418 127th Pl. S.E.	Newcastle	98056	Project Alternatives	<p>I support the "no action" alternative. If consideration of PSE's proposal is delayed for at least five years, it is likely that time will put a lie to its contention that additional power will be required. The recent BPA experience in Portland and Clark County demonstrates that electricity need estimates based on outdated assumptions are unreliable. Local governments should not cover in the face of PSE's perceived power and implied threat of lawsuits. They should stand up for what's right and for their citizens. Above all, Bellevue city employees should stop acting like PSE's partners in this proposed project. It is the lead environmental agency. It needs to be independent and to keep in mind the interests of Eastside citizens. PSE is a paper tiger. It is a monopoly and a for profit entity with a poor safety record. Do the right thing and delay or reject its proposal.</p>		
6/23/2017 22:07:27	Emanuel	Hertog	Mannyhertog@comcast.net	4304 158th Pl se	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Electric & Magnetic Fields	<p>We do not need the upgrade to energized or add more power lines.</p>		
6/24/2017 10:06:31	Gwen	Hanson	gs_hanson@yaoo.com	1508 143rd Ave NE	Bellevue	98007	Project Alternatives	<p>Reject the elimination of 6000 trees and the higher costs that will accompany PSE's unnecessary proposal to build new dirty infrastructure. Battery storage, wind, solar, and retrofits of homes and buildings will provide clean, reliable energy. I don't want to think this way, but the only reason I can imagine a city council member supporting PSE's plan is perhaps some type of enrichment they receive from that foreign, profit driven company. City council members will surely sleep better if they support the residents of Bellevue.</p>		
6/24/2017 10:08:31	Gwen	Hanson	gs_hanson@yaoo.com	1508 143rd Ave NE	Bellevue	98007	Project Alternatives	<p>Reject the elimination of 6000 trees and the higher costs that will accompany PSE's unnecessary proposal to build new dirty infrastructure. Battery storage, wind, solar, and retrofits of homes and buildings will provide clean, reliable energy. I don't want to think this way, but the only reason I can imagine a city council member supporting PSE's plan is perhaps some type of enrichment they receive from that foreign, profit driven company. City council members will surely sleep better if they support the residents of Bellevue.</p>		
6/24/2017 12:33:20	Sally	McCray	order1@mccray.ws	6815 Ripley Lane SE	Renton	98056	Project Alternatives	<p>If this project is built, and I believe that there are better alternatives, it should be built 100% in the existing corridor. In this century, there is no excuse for allowing a private utility company (or public) to build infrastructure outside the existing corridors. The eastside currently has TWO electric utility corridors. The responsible (but not profitable for PSE) way to manage electrical needs is to combine the corridors. It is disheartening that our local governments have not stood up for their constituencies and forced a combination. The next lowest impact for the people who live and work in the cities this proposed project traverses is to keep it in the existing corridor. None of the project alternatives should be approved.</p>		
6/24/2017 12:41:12	Sally	McCray	order1@mccray.ws	6815 Ripley Lane SE	Renton	98056	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	<p>The negative environmental impact of utility poles is incalculable. Who likes to look at them? The King County assessor reduces property values for proximity to utility poles, for that very reason. If this project is truly necessary, utility poles should not be allowed in any area that does not currently have them. It makes me sick to think of beautiful roadways like the Lake Hills connector being sullied for generations and centuries to come with utility poles. The lowest environmental impact for the Eastside would be to have the TWO existing electrical utility corridors combined. PSE wouldn't like that choice, but it is the right one.</p>		
6/24/2017 17:18:01	Jonathan	Shakes	jonathan.shakes@gmail.com	9211 SE 33rd St	Mercer Island	98040	Economics	<p>I oppose this project because I see no benefits that justify its environmental and economic costs. PSE has not shown the need for increased line capacity when electricity usage has been declining recently and new substitute technologies such as battery storage are on the horizon. PSE has also not committed to a quantified decrease in power outages, which I interpret as meaning there will be no improvement in reliability from the project.</p>		
6/26/2017 7:00:18	Martine	Smets	martine_smets@hotmail.com	2109 169th avenue NE	Bellevue	98008	Other	<p>Please do not go ahead with the project "Energize Eastside". There is no need to damage our environment further and cut more trees. Energy consumption has fallen between 2011 and 2015 by over 5%, so there does not seem to be any motivation from an energy need point of view to go ahead with that project. Regarding the need for reliability, there are alternatives much more environmentally-friendly than "Energize Eastside" (please learn from California, they use battery storage to avoid blackouts). So this project will be a needless destruction of our environment and a waste of resources. Please work to build a more sustainable future for the next generations instead of wasting resources and consumers money to pay for this project. Please invest instead in projects to develop alternative energies!</p> <p>Thank you for listening!</p>		
6/26/2017 7:00:21	Martine	Smets	martine_smets@hotmail.com	2109 169th avenue NE	Bellevue	98008	Other	<p>Please do not go ahead with the project "Energize Eastside". There is no need to damage our environment further and cut more trees. Energy consumption has fallen between 2011 and 2015 by over 5%, so there does not seem to be any motivation from an energy need point of view to go ahead with that project. Regarding the need for reliability, there are alternatives much more environmentally-friendly than "Energize Eastside" (please learn from California, they use battery storage to avoid blackouts). So this project will be a needless destruction of our environment and a waste of resources. Please work to build a more sustainable future for the next generations instead of wasting resources and consumers money to pay for this project. Please invest instead in projects to develop alternative energies!</p> <p>Thank you for listening!</p>		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
6/27/2017 8:55:31	Tom	McGoff	tmcgoff@hotmail.com	2050 132nd Ave SE, Unit 510	Bellevue	98005	Project Alternatives	I'm really trying to comprehend why you are choosing an alternate route to go down Lake Hills connector and route down Richards Road! Its such a peaceful natural landscape that doesn't need to be disturbed. Keeping the existing route make much more economical sense and leaving the existing area aesthetically pleasing. Have you considered producing a 3D animated visual of how this will look? I'm sure it would shock most citizens in the community. Or maybe that's why you wouldn't produce one! The home value impact this will have on the high density housing on the Richards Road corridor would be affected immensely!!	47.59222633	-122.1633339
6/29/2017 7:17:23	Marilyn	Mayers	mayersmarilyn@gmail.com	1907 161 Avenue NE	Bellevue	98008	Greenhouse Gases	The city, county and state should be doing everything possible to preserve mature trees and move quickly to increase energy efficiency and adopt alternative sources of energy. This is precisely the opposite of what Energize Eastside plans assume and project. Solar, battery, hydro, thermo are all sources that PSE should be promoting not this outdated plan.		
6/30/2017 13:42:15	Richard	PRESLEY	richpresley@yahoo.com	515 154th Avenue NE	Bellevue	98007	Other	The city of Bellevue should consider alternatives to this plan. This plan should be rejected because of all the reasons that have been talked about.		
7/2/2017 9:30:10	Calado	Brian	Brianacalado@yahoo.com	13508 Ne 29 Pl	Bellevue	98005	Scenic Views & the Aesthetic Environment	I remain concerned about ambient noise created by coronial discharge from high voltage lines. Being able to sit outside on our deck that is adjacent to the power line easement on our property with zero power transmission line noise is a very high priority. Anything less will be significant reduction in quality of life and property value. Outdoor living is a significant reason for high value properties in Bridle trails and this would be impacted by noise generating high voltage transmission lines.  I don't see any comments in the latest EIS statement by PSE on this topic and this is very concerning. The best solution to this problem is to come up with a design that produces zero noise based on latest engineering practices. Please make specific allowances in the process and design to make sure this happens.		
7/2/2017 16:36:18	Terry & Joan	Sinclair	twsinclair@comcast.net	4510 144th Ave SE	Bellevue	98006	Project Alternatives	We remain unconvinced that the Energize East Side project truly addresses a need. It appears to be an unnecessary project designed only to generate expense for the rate payers, and profits (9.8%) for the private, for-profit PSE. To do this project, PSE will <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Risk safety of residents by building new towers astride an active and aging petroleum product pipeline, in designated high-risk earthquake country</li> <li>•Destroy natural habitat and remove thousands of trees</li> <li>•Take private property and devalue dozens of others</li> <li>•And all without a realistic or thorough justification analysis while ignoring the questions raised by the affected and threatened citizens.</li> </ul> PSE has been dishonest in their claims of need (power consumption has gone down in spite of population growth; claims of no new powerlines yet three new have been built; no safety risk to planned right-of-way adjacent to a pressurized pipeline, etc.) The only urgency to this project is to serve the PSA shareholders at expense of property owners and rate payers. I ask the City of Bellevue and Bellevue City Council to side with Bellevue citizens in opposition to this unnecessary project. Please include us as a party of record.	47.5632761	-122.1440735
7/3/2017 11:19:00	Robert	Moloney		4551 135th Place SE	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	Background; We have lived in Somerset since 1978 and in our present home since 1987. Our house is located about a block above the PSE power lines and the Olympic pipeline. We are members of SENCE.  Pipeline Safety: Re; Section 3.9 Environmental Health-Pipeline Safety Studies This section studies many of the events which could lead to a tragic result and seems to conclude the risk is historically low when measured on the basis of how many chances in a million there are that an event will occur or what percent of the population will be effected. These statistics mean little to the folks like us, who, because of our close proximity to the pipeline will most probably be the ones who are injured or killed by a fire of burning fuel. It is foolish to assume that the process of installing the new gigantic poles and the presence of much higher voltage in the lines does not put us more at risk than we are at this time. Why do we have to bear the these risks to our families when PSE has other alternatives available? We are especially concerned about the much greater risk of fire presented by a pipeline break with fuel ignited by the high voltage in the new power lines following an earthquake in the Seattle Fault. The City of Bellevue recognizes the real risk presented by the Seattle Fault-so should PSE.  Property Value and Views-Scenic Views and Aesthetic Environment. We chose Somerset because of the terrific UNOBSTRUCTED views facilitated by the underground utilities. The new huge poles and heavy power lines will now stretch from north to south across our view. This obviously will have a catastrophic effect on our aesthetic environment and is in violation of the Bellevue Comprehensive Plan's recommendation that overhead lines be avoided in greenbelts or open spaces and that they minimize the impact on surrounding neighborhoods. Putting the power lines underground would save our views and maintain Somersets park like setting.		
7/4/2017 15:26:43	Pat	McGiffert	pmcgiffert@aol.com	13621 NE 42nd St	Bellevue	98005	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	The two large diameter Olympic Pipelines (Jet fuel) run through my back yard along with the current 115 kV lines. My concern is that doubling the 115 kV lines to 230 kV will also increase the electrical induced corrosion to the two aging pipes. Damage that may not show. The Bellingham disaster was caused by "minor" damage by construction machinery, resulting leakage and a spark was all it took. This part of the pipeline here goes through a beautiful mature treescape within a heavily populated area. The same or similar disaster as Bellingham would result in a much worse disaster here, as bad as that one was. Alternate options exist that are 20th century technology. Possibly batteries to store power, for heavy use times. I would like to see those alternative avenues pursued rather than 230 kV lines. Thank you for your consideration.	47.6475982	-122.1580124
7/4/2017 21:26:50	Wendy	Romanchuk-Czarney	czarney2@msn.com	15908 S.E. 46th Way	Belleue	98006	Other	Please consider alternative methods to increase reliability or to meet future needs for electricity other than the current proposal ENERGIZER EASIDE EIS. Increasing our rates are just driving more people out of their homes. The cost of living here has skyrocketed.		
7/5/2017 0:22:28	Jennifer	Keller	jankeller3@gmail.com	115 146th Ave SE	Bellevue	98007	Project Alternatives	Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on Phase 2 of the Environmental Impact Statement for the project called "Energize Eastside." My name is Jennifer Keller. My address is 115 - 146th Ave SE, Bellevue, WA 98007. I am part of the Coalition of Eastside Neighborhoods for Sensible Energy (CENSE). First, I would like to comment on chapter 1 and other places in the EIS where the need for the Energize Project is outlined. In describing the reason for the proposed Energize Eastside project, the EIS speaks of addressing a projected "deficiency in electrical transmission capacity during peak periods" that PSE claims to have identified. This claim has no backing in the EIS--no numbers, no charts. This hole in the EIS must be addressed, first and foremost. I am aware that PSE has made forecasts in the past to try to back up that claim, but these supposed forecasts have so far not come true, and information about them has quietly disappeared from PSE's website. The entire EIS has a shaky foundation, given that the supposed "deficiency" does not appear to exist. This shaky foundation should be looked at very closely. Even the source of the supposed "deficiency" is not supported. The EIS claims that the deficiency would result from "anticipated population and employment growth on the Eastside." Actual data from PSE over the 2011-2015 time period shows Bellevue population increasing by 7.3% while total electricity use DECREASED by 5.7%. This is actually a good thing--conservation and energy efficiency are helping us decrease our footprint. But it further shows how unsubstantiated (and misleading) it is to claim that we're somehow going to need more electricity year over year. There is absolutely no reason to ignore existing data and the existing trends when trying to evaluate the claims in the EIS. The EIS should be held to a higher standard than that. I also see that PSE claims a rate of demand growth (2.4% per year) that is at least 6 times higher than demand growth expected by Seattle City Light, the electricity provider for customers who live in Seattle. The PSE claim seems way out of line, and the EIS provides nothing to back it up. Again, the supposed "deficiency" in capacity provides, in theory, the entire foundation of the EIS--and that foundation is extremely weak, which weakens every claim this EIS tries to make that it's acceptable to let this project go ahead and damage our environment. (After all, that's the whole point of an EIS, to look at how much a project might damage our environment, so we can weigh whether the need for the project justifies the damage.) Continuing on, I've looked at the basic way that the EIS evaluates different Alternatives--one of the key parts of an EIS. According to SEPA, WAC 197-11-440 (P2-2) "The No Action Alternative provides a benchmark against which the impacts of the project and other alternatives can be compared." But in this EIS, the "No Action Alternative" is not defined precisely. This decreases its usefulness as a benchmark and undermines cost effectiveness comparisons. This EIS is lacking in this key element, and this should be addressed. Further, the EIS accepts, without explanation, PSE's dismissal of a number of viable Alternatives--but PSE disqualified these Alternatives by using outdated assumptions and faulty analysis. With every passing month and year, it becomes clearer how far behind the times PSE has become. This lack in the Alternatives in the EIS needs to be given serious review. Here is a clear example of the outdated assumptions and faulty analysis that PSE is using. A Southern California utility examined ways to protect itself from rolling blackouts, in case there was an uncontrolled release from a methane storage facility. They found they could protect themselves from risk by having Tesla install a grid storage battery, in only three months. A similar battery could potentially address the Eastside's need--possibly for less cost, less risk, and less environmental damage. If PSE is truly concerned about rolling blackouts, this appears to be a far better solution. But where is the analysis of this type of option? It appears to be completely missing from the EIS. Here's another example--in a major recent development, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), the federal agency in charge of the Northwest regional grid, canceled plans to build a \$1.2 billion transmission line between Oregon and Washington. The line was supposed to deliver increased electricity to California. BPA noted declining usage and new technology, and said a combination of flow control devices and batteries would save customers hundreds of millions of dollars. These decisions affect the amount of regional flow that PSE has included in its models. BPA's example shows how modern alternatives could play a bigger role than PSE anticipated five years ago when Energize Eastside was conceived. Where in the EIS is this accounted for? Other foundations in the project and in the EIS are weak. It appears that PSE assumes that 1,500 MW must be exported to Canada even if the Eastside is, at that moment, experiencing a major grid failure. This export is not required, not realistic, and would cause problems for the regional grid. It appears that PSE also assumes 2,850 MW must be exported to California during a major grid failure. But BPA just canceled a big transmission line that would increase service to California because better alternatives are feasible. Again, the need for the Energize Eastside project is undermined when PSE's claims are carefully examined, and this weakens all other parts of the EIS. Starting from the serious weaknesses in the EIS, described above, it's clear that this project should be held strictly to standards that are used for projects with better foundations (that is, clearly substantiated reasons for a project, plus full examination of current viable Alternatives). For example, there is no reason that the project should be allowed to sidestep requirements in the Bellevue Comprehensive Plan 2015, which emphasizes a "City in a Park."		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
7/5/2017 12:22:28 AM, cont.	Jennifer	Keller						<p>However, what I see is that the EIS project Alternatives basically ignore recommendations to "avoid overhead lines in greenbelts or open spaces" and do not make a serious attempt (for example, using battery technology) to "minimize impact on surrounding neighborhoods" (Plan Policy UT-8 and UT 69). The EIS project Alternatives also ignore recommendations that "streetscape design should promote a safe and comfortable park-like experience"--for example, on Bel-Red Road, Lake Hills Connector, Richards Road, Facteria Blvd SE, Coal Creek Parkway and SE Newport Way (Plan policy UD-70). Couldn't the use of battery and other improved technologies do just that? The EIS Alternatives include nothing about that.</p> <p>One of the things I love about Bellevue is the number of beautiful trees we have, and the fact that we have worked hard to keep our tree cover. The "City in a Park" concept reflects one facet of this, and regulations requiring tree retention reflect the fact that, project by project, we try to keep our beautiful trees standing and alive. Although our city does allow cutting or trimming of trees in relation to utilities, this EIS has an extremely weak foundation, including omission of a number of valuable Alternatives, including Alternatives that would require few or no trees to be cut. So we should not allow this EIS to slip by because of that word "utilities." Put another way, although PSE is a "utility," it appears to me to be offering unsubstantiated reasons for Energize Eastside, and also deliberately avoiding the mention of valuable Alternatives--so it should not be given free rein to cut magnificent trees that are a wonderful part of our city.</p> <p>There are also specific weaknesses in the EIS in the way it discusses trees and tree removal. The EIS does not take into account the risks for wind damage to large trees (including blowdown) when only some trees are removed and leave remaining trees vulnerable. The EIS does not take into account the loss in habitat due to tree removal.</p>		
7/5/2017 12:22:28 AM, cont.	Jennifer	Keller						<p>The EIS is inconsistent about the trees that will be removed according to its standard set forth in section 3.4.1.3 and the fact that trees above 70 feet that are outside of the managed right-of-way would be removed (p.3.4-6). In many places along the Bellevue North Segment there are many trees over 70 feet tall along this route that would be just outside of the managed right-of-way. This appears to be inconsistent with the graphic (map) shown in section 3.4.5.4, where much of the area with very tall trees just outside of the managed right-of-way area is depicted in blue (indicating "no clearing"). In addition, I would like a better explanation of what is meant by trimming or pruning trees "in a manner that ensures compliance with NERC standards." If these standards imply "topping" the trees rather than removing them, it will result in unacceptable aesthetic damage. In summary, PSE's description of tree removal for the Bellevue North segment does not seem honest or realistic.</p> <p>In section 3.4.6.1, it says that trees removed from critical areas in Bellevue and Renton may require mitigation monitoring. This statement makes no sense. Trees that have been removed from critical areas could not be "monitored." Critical areas will be permanently damaged--"monitoring" does not change this.</p> <p>In section 3.4.6.2, it says "In the Bridle Trails Subarea in the City of Bellevue, plant replacement trees as required under the City's Tree Retention and Replacement Code." There is no explanation of where this replanting would be done.</p> <p>In section 3.2.5.4, it says "Impacts to the aesthetic environment on the Bellevue North Segment would be less-than-significant." This seems callous to me--an avoidance of the actual reality. These impacts should be characterized as "significant." Many homes are situated within view of the powerlines, and many more nearby with residents who frequently walk and ride along the equestrian trails in this area. The destruction of existing trees, higher poles, and probable noise from crackling power lines will in fact do serious aesthetic damage to the area. The current H-frame poles are wooden, while the new poles will be twice as high, metallic, and will have an industrial appearance. This lack of honesty in the report should not be allowed to stand.</p> <p>Finally, in my comments, I feel compelled to discuss climate impacts, given that the EIS has the weak foundations as described above, and some of that foundation has to do with ignoring steps (such as turning to good battery technology) that can be, and need to be, taken immediately to move into a sustainable energy future. It's abundantly clear that in our current situation, when building energy infrastructure, we must consider climate impacts. We owe it to ourselves, to the young people of today, and to future generations. Climate impacts are real--we've already experienced a serious summer drought here in western Washington, very different from what we used to see in past years. Climate impacts also extend to the Sound and the ocean, and determine whether we will have living oyster beds, and healthy food webs that support our much-loved salmon and orcas. With too much carbon dioxide, all of this (and more) is at risk. So, when considering building energy infrastructure, we must take climate impacts seriously.</p> <p>That means that we should look at whether this project is aimed at the things we need right now. We need energy efficiency, a smart grid, rooftop solar, small-scale wind turbines, and the types of batteries that even now are becoming more useful and affordable. A well-designed and well-documented EIS for this project should contain Alternatives with a large amount of information about the potential for all these types of technologies in helping the Eastside move into the future. This is lacking in this EIS. In addition, at this moment in time, we need a huge number of living trees. James Hansen, the climate scientist, has emphasized that what's necessary right now is NOT just a transformation of our energy infrastructure--we also need to take care of forests (and wetlands and farmland, which can also absorb CO2). We need to preserve the trees we have, and in fact we need to expand our forest cover quickly, planting trees by the billions. This EIS ignores this reality, or treats it as inconsequential. In the EIS, it seems that the loss of trees is considered a matter of simply meeting the regulations of one city or another in a minimalist manner. But this project would involve cutting a huge number of established trees. Cutting these trees means going the wrong direction completely. In the past, we might have said that if we cut a tree and at the same time plant a tree, it's all the same. When it comes to climate, that logic is completely false, especially at this extremely critical time. A large healthy tree makes a layer of wood all over its big trunk and big branches, every year, capturing substantial amounts of CO2. Smaller trees take years or decades to catch up with large trees in this respect. So cutting large numbers of large trees is a backwards idea, completely out of line with the times we're in.</p> <p>In other word, in evaluating this EIS, I urge that we take seriously the reality of the situation we're in today in relation to greenhouse gases and climate.</p> <p>In summary, my view is that this EIS has an extremely poor foundation in terms of the basic justification for the project, ignores extremely important Alternatives, discounts the value of our magnificent trees, and seems to be written as if climate change did not exist. In my view, these flaws in the EIS are not acceptable and should not be ignored.</p> <p>I hope my comments will help in the evaluation of this EIS and the evaluation of the proposed Energize Eastside project itself.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		
7/5/2017 1:23:00	Julian	von Will	vonwill@gmail.com	4248 Lake Washington Blvd. SE.	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>July 5, 2017 Response to Second EIS By Julian von Will, PHD.</p> <p>The second EIS distorts facts, dismisses others and is either incomplete or neglects adequate details for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)Pipeline safety</li> <li>2)Location of towers to pipeline.</li> <li>3)What trees will be cut and their location to pipeline and towers (Your ledger map pole does not work!)</li> <li>4)What is the impact of these big canopy trees on many factors more than just air quality?</li> <li>5)Construction Roads and Public Roads and Traffic</li> <li>6)Skyline</li> <li>7)Eastside Reputation</li> </ol> <p>Moreover, this study, ironically, seems to advance PSE's claim. It does not get to the impacts and define the destruction this project will have on our fragile ecosystem. A spectral sellout document and testament to Corporatocracy. I feel this analysis negated its own responsibility and purpose. It's not science and it does not serve the public. It has failed to represent technological and environmental concerns in details of life and death. Pipelines and towers are technical and the location of towers and trees and the 'vibration' of the work do not add up. This study says all will be just fine. The pictorial depictions of the towers were out of scale, they looked like cave drawings. The professionalism in this work was lacking, this study was defeatist and questions are not out of line as to its honesty, effort and content. Old school capitalism, Soviet engineering and baroque corporate blitzkrieg encircle it. This project is putting lives at risk.</p> <p>PSE's arguments are contradictory, misleading, obscure and hidden in areas of serious safety concern. This will not work. It's bewildering but now well documented. But big business has everything to lose here with this regressive project and the Eastside turned into a scorched earth. The process has been completely one sided. A form of violence is being committed and improper and self-destructive sympathies have been conducted. Arguments made by CENSE reveal flaws, dangers and lies sufficient for major changes or cancellation of Energize Eastside. It's so ugly it leads most people to indifference and isolation. It's a bluescreen mindwar. The individual and reason are not heard. Reason is on autopilot and the system is going nowhere fast. The "quickenening" is taking shape. Better save those trees. But what is worse, is to see foreign own corporations dominate local governments. There is a hand full of foreign owned power companies in the United States, too bad one of them is here in Seattle threatening our beautiful big canopy trees. The manner in which they have conducted this has been thug like. They say the power has not been upgraded since 1960s, and it has, and yet they propose 1960 style upgrades threatening a massive jet fuel pipeline in the process.</p> <p>Progressive engineering and social commitments, as seen in Germany (Energiewende), reveal PSE's backward thinking. PSE is a Luddite with bad manners and gangster tactics. Anyone associated with it will be marked for life. Its overkill and remarkably rigid and demeaning. The project compounds centralism, hierarchy and slavery. PSE has put profit and shareholders before systematic projections. Energize Eastside will be an embarrassment for PSE and will destroy their future not ours. PSE plays on the growth factor while energy consumption dwindles, the argument's asked. They are trying to boost revenue and then sell the company in 2018. 7000 thousand trees, many of them mature territorial life supporting trees are under threat from Woodinville to Renton. That's a lot of trees! These trees belong to the general public. PSE will turn the Eastside into a Godzilla film set. It's a Potemkin village.</p>		
7/5/2017 1:23:00 AM, cont.	Julian	von Will						<p>Again, anyone directly or indirectly supporting PSE and its backwards engineering will have to answer for it. Only the next few years will prove to friends and family what a disgraceful project this is. This is a foreign colonial attempt to make shareholders money by inventing projects and exploring how far regressive capitalism sells out our children. Better to be poor by candle light than in league with a greedy system. The Bourgeoisie down under want their money though a faulty project and forced process. PSE has pushed over the local people's rights. Overtime this will unravel and retirement for those involved will be guilt and shame giving into a scam. Refusing more advanced engineering solutions, ignoring details and the realities of eco-systems leads to dystopia.</p> <p>Promoting Energize Eastside has no family. Its slavery to a foreign power.</p> <p>A few of these big trees down the people will rise up.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Julian von Will, PHD.</p>		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
7/5/2017 10:25:48	LI JIAN	YU	jimyu1988@gmail.com	13800 SE NEWPORT WAY	BELLEVUE	98006	Project Alternatives	<p>I am writing to oppose PSE's Energize Eastside project.</p> <p>The proposed project is over-done using outdated technologies. It is completely driven by profit instead of needs. Rolling blackout is just an excellent excuse to achieve the profits badly sought by PSE in the expenses of its customers over decades. Today, there are advanced modern technologies to transmit electricity reliably and sufficiently. By employing these advanced technologies, there will be much less negative impacts to the environment and the communities. However, PSE is not willing to use these modern technologies because the latest technologies are cost-effective, which means PSE will not be able to rip the maximum profits when outdated and costly transmission methods are employed.</p> <p>I urge PSE to consider CENSE's suggestions and to provide a better solution to meet future energy needs.</p> <p>Thanks Li Yu Member of CENSE</p>		
7/5/2017 13:16:54	Rachel	Molloy	rachel@safyredesign.com	18308 NE 107th St	Redmond	98052	Greenhouse Gases	<p>As we work to upgrade our Eastside electrical grid, it is worth noting the drive towards low-carbon emission demands and generation from solar in our community both in terms of the challenges to the natural environment, climate change, and to customer needs.</p> <p>Natural environment stresses on the grid structure: As temperatures warm, the Northwest is projected to see potentially more severe storms which could include increased wind shear (falling limbs), increased microburst and rainfalls totals (localized flooding), and heat waves (high heat demands and impacts on energy use and infrastructure) to a degree. <a href="https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/RisingCost/rising_cost5.php">https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/RisingCost/rising_cost5.php</a> <a href="https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/ClimateStorms/page2.php">https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/ClimateStorms/page2.php</a> <a href="https://climate.nasa.gov/news/897/severe-thunderstorms-and-climate-change/">https://climate.nasa.gov/news/897/severe-thunderstorms-and-climate-change/</a></p> <p>Climate Change and low-carbon Generation: With the scientific realities necessitating a move to low-carbon generation, how can the grid prepare in advance for distributed solar generation, micro-grids, community solar projects, home solar shingles and storage batteries, net-metering expansion, grid-tied inline storage, etc? How can our upgrades today help support air pollution reduction efforts on the state level? <a href="https://energy.gov/oe/services/technology-development/smart-grid/role-microgrids-helping-advance-nation-s-energy-system">https://energy.gov/oe/services/technology-development/smart-grid/role-microgrids-helping-advance-nation-s-energy-system</a> <a href="https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1601010.pdf">https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1601010.pdf</a></p> <p>As we upgrade, it is important to ensure every infrastructure project takes into account resiliency and it's ability to contribute to adaptation and mitigation, in addition to supplying a dependable power source for homes. Thank you. Rachel Molloy - Education Hill Resident</p>		
7/5/2017 15:49:16	Jessaca	Jacobson	jessaca_jacobson@yahoo.com	12569 SE 71st Street	Newcastle	98056	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	<p>As a resident of Newcastle living within close proximity to the proposed path running adjacent to the pipeline (in the segment just behind Newcastle City Hall and now next to the new Tria Apartment complex), I remain concerned about PSE's proposed power line on a number of key points. First, I do not believe that PSE has adequately addressed the dangers of co-locating this 230KV line with the gas line. In this particular section of the proposed line, a new 76 unit apartment building has been built within feet of the pipeline. On the other side of the line and within feet is our neighborhood of Newport Woods of approximately 98 homes. Should an explosion occur during construction or after construction, hundreds of lives could be risked in this small section alone.</p> <p>The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration data for the past 20 years regarding pipeline incidents does not demonstrate increased safety. The trend line appears to be worsening. Add the increased risk of a high voltage line and the risks are magnified. Worsening this still is the fact that we live in an area with seismic activity.</p> <p><a href="https://hip.phmsa.dot.gov/analyticsSOAP/saw.dll?Portalpages&amp;NQUser=PDM_WEB_USER&amp;NQPassword=Public_Web_User1&amp;PortalPath=%2Fshared%2FPDM%20Public%20Website%2F_portal%2FSC%20Incident%20Trend&amp;Page=All%20Reported&amp;Action=Navigate&amp;col1=%22PHP%20-%20Geo%20Location%22.%22State%20Name%22&amp;val1=%22%22">https://hip.phmsa.dot.gov/analyticsSOAP/saw.dll?Portalpages&amp;NQUser=PDM_WEB_USER&amp;NQPassword=Public_Web_User1&amp;PortalPath=%2Fshared%2FPDM%20Public%20Website%2F_portal%2FSC%20Incident%20Trend&amp;Page=All%20Reported&amp;Action=Navigate&amp;col1=%22PHP%20-%20Geo%20Location%22.%22State%20Name%22&amp;val1=%22%22</a></p> <p>Despite Bellevue's growth, declining consumption doesn't support PSE's assumption that population growth is causing similar growth in the use of electricity. Energy efficiency and conservation are having a big impact. With questions still being debated about the need for this line, putting so many lives in potential jeopardy is too high of a price to pay. What are the current projections for energy consumption?</p> <p>Second, the health considerations of EMF exposure remain a concern. While studies continue to be debated, it is the thousands of residents living within close proximity to these lines that may pay the ultimate price. PSE will be held accountable.</p> <p>Third, the aesthetic destruction of the eastside will have a significant impact on property values for the thousands of residents who have built these communities. Some have cited that property values could be negatively impacted by the adjacent location of these lines by 20-30%. Additionally, Eastside cities were designed to be woven into the natural beauty of the area. The destruction of thousands of trees without clear details and timing for mitigating this loss will have additional impact on property values. Declining property values will result in lower tax revenues for our cities resulting in loss of services to all communities - especially impactful for small cities such as Newcastle.</p> <p>Given that the Eastside will be forever impacted by the installation of these lines, PSE should be required to address the need by evaluating current up to date data. Given that thousands of lives may be at risk, the necessity of the project as proposed must be re-assessed.</p>	47.53916863	-122.1695888
7/5/2017 18:38:35	Marlene	Meyer	4mjmeyer@gmail.com	2408 131st Place NE	Bellevue	98005	Land Use & Housing	<p>I and my neighbors, including my immediate street, and friends on NE 40th Street, have asked me to comment that this study does not include enough specifics on what you will do to protect our neighborhoods, it is unclear on the map about who will specifically be effected, and what it will cost to our properties in future sales due to possible risks, vegetation removal, and eye sore.</p> <p>Also, in regards to section 3.4.10, there are no specifics as to how you are going to protect our beloved soaring eagles, owls, and bats. There is some reference that they are pileated and redneck sapsuckers and Northern flickers who enjoy pecking at poles. Will the poles be wood?, And, there was a statement that "the quality of the habitat and the species uses could potentially change." What specifically does that mean? These things make up the enjoyable life of our neighborhoods and it seems this plan will effect our Bridle Trails area in a very disruptive way for humans and wildlife. Please consider the lack of details of this report to be a real problem in the future. Bellevue is a wonderful combination of nice homes and nature, please keep it that way. Thank you.</p>		
7/5/2017 18:47:59	Marlene	Meyer	4mjmeyer@gmail.com	2408 131st Place NE	Bellevue	98005	Plants & Animals	<p>My neighbors and I, including my immediate street, and friends on NE 40th Street, have asked me to comment that this study does not include enough specifics on what you will do to protect our neighborhoods; it is unclear on the map about who will specifically be effected, and what it will cost to our properties in future sales due to possible risks, vegetation removal, and eye sore.</p> <p>Also, in regards to section 3.4.10, there are no specifics as to how you are going to protect our beloved soaring eagles, owls, and bats. There is some reference that they are pileated and redneck sapsuckers and Northern flickers who enjoy pecking at poles. Will the poles be wood? And, there was a statement that "the quality of the habitat and the species uses could potentially change." What specifically does that mean? These things make up the enjoyable life of our neighborhoods and it seems this plan will affect our Bridle Trails area in a very disruptive way for humans and wildlife. Please consider the lack of details of this report to be a real problem in the future. Bellevue is a wonderful combination of nice homes and nature, please keep it that way. Thank you.</p>		
7/6/2017 0:25:07	Tamra	Kammin	kammin@comcast.net	8604 129th CT SE	Newcastle	98056	Economics	<p>In section 3.10 of the Phase 2 EIS Draft, you review the economic impact of lost property tax revenue, cost of placement of underground transmission lines, and lost ecosystem services. You refer to the impact to the city but you do not refer to the economic impact to the PSE customers living in the affected areas. Your estimates of lost assessed value first uses an estimate of \$116,000 reduced value in each of the 86 adjacent homes in Newcastle. This would amount to a total impact of \$9.976 million. According to a study by Bottemiller and Wolverton in 2013, homes in the Seattle area that abutted a high voltage transmission line had a 11.2% negative impact. This would be a total of \$57,000 reduced value per home based on the median Newcastle home value in 2014 shown in table 3.10-4. This would still amount to a total impact of \$4.9 million to Newcastle PSE customers. This impact does not include the devaluation of the homes that are close but not adjacent to the transmission lines. Those homes would also see an economic home devaluation as the towers are twice as tall as the existing poles. These impacts are certainly significant and are not detailed in the document.</p>		
7/6/2017 7:30:15	James	Loring	jmsloring@gmail.com	1815 153rd Avenue South East	Bellevue	98007-6141	Project Alternatives	<p>In the 900 pages of documentation, Puget Sound Energy's Energize Eastside Phase 2 Draft EIS does not identify a preferred route (preferred alternative) the transmission lines will follow.</p> <p>This is a fundamentally flawed proposal and ill-formed environmental study. PSE should be required to re-submit its environmental documentation in standard form.</p>		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
7/6/2017 11:11:47	Maria	Vlachopoulou	mariaserios@hotmail.com	14708 SE 15th PI	Bellevue	98007	Plants & Animals	I would like to comment of the EIS section of Plants and Animals. My comment also relates to the Historic and Cultural Resources. Let me start by expressing my amazement by how keen to go ahead with this project the city of Bellevue is; a project that will destroy thousands of trees, when the city has set a 40% tree canopy target. Beyond the obvious lack of need for this project, the EIS describes the tree removal process with graphs, charts, and numbers. There is a major component of this that is completely missed by the EIS. The trees of the city are our history and part of our culture. PSE is going to remove all these trees with no real consideration of how the trees are the cultural heritage of the people and residence of our city. They are not just vegetation and wildlife habitat. The trees define our well-being, and promote our quality of life. If you want to include numbers and charts, why not include numbers and charts from multiple studies that have proven causality between high canopy levels and increased health and well-being metrics? PSE seems to have no regard for anything else than the infrastructure of a project that defies technological advances in renewable energy resources and new statistics of energy demand. PSE should have no right to destroy our cultural heritage that these trees provide and that make our city and our region a special place to live.  Thank you,  Maria Vlachopoulou (CENSE member)		
7/6/2017 11:57:30	Harlan	Kammin	hkammin@hotmail.com	8604 129TH CT SE	Newcastle	98056	Environmental Health Electric & Magnetic Fields	Section 3.8.2 states that Power Engineers, Inc. identified magnetic field strengths at 35 representative locations along the corridor... Which was it? If the field strengths were measured, what instrument was used? If analysis was used, has the method been shown to accurately predict near field magnetic field strength? I am a retired Boeing electromagnetic effects engineer.		
7/6/2017 12:56:57	Linda	Taylor	kucamunga@comcast.net	8443 128th AVE SE	Newcastle WA	98056	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	I believe that putting new transmission poles next to the aging pipeline is foolhardy, unnecessary and reckless.		
7/6/2017 14:19:31	Martha	Cross	mpcross07@gmail.com	280 145th PI SE	Bellevue	98007-51	Plants & Animals	3.4.1.4 PSE Avian Protection Program "PSE implements measures to minimize the effects of its transmission system on avian species through its Avian Protection Program, with particular emphasis on species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and the Endangered Species Act. The three primary mechanisms for harming birds are electrocutions, collisions, and problem nests (PSE, 2016b). In addition to the potential for harming birds, these incidences can cause power outages, fires, and other damage to the electrical system. Between 2009 and 2012, an average of about 1,500 bird or animal-caused outages occurred over PSE's entire distribution system. To improve system reliability and reduce wildlife impacts, PSE completes over 400 avian-safe system modifications each year system-wide and builds new facilities using avian safe standards. System modifications include adding safe perching structures, line markers, bird guards, perch discouragers, wire and equipment covers, and nesting platforms."  This is great! I additionally would like to know if in case of finding a nest of protected raptors (including Great Horned Owls, and Red-Tail Hawks) near existing or new corridors, it would be relocated with a nesting platform or nesting box for the owls.  3.4.3.2 Sensitive or Protected Fish and Wildlife "As described in the Phase 1 Draft EIS (Section 6.4), the study area provides potential habitat for several bird, mammal, reptile, amphibian, and fish species protected by federal, state, or local environmental laws and regulations (e.g., federal or state listed endangered or threatened species). The critical areas ordinances of King County and the Partner Cities also list species of local concern. A list of these species and their federal/state designation is provided in Appendix C of the Phase 1 Draft EIS. Species of local concern include the following: bald eagle, great blue heron, osprey, peregrine falcon, Vaux's swift, red-tailed hawk, northern goshawk, pileated woodpecker, purple martin, marbled murrelet, western grebe, merlin, green heron, Townsend's big-eared bat, Western big-eared bat, Keen's myotis, long-legged myotis, long-eared myotis, western pond turtle, Oregon spotted frog, western toad, Chinook salmon, steelhead, bull trout, and river lamprey."  Currently there are 1,027 protected bird species under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Common birds like the Great Horned Owl, Sharp-shinned hawk, Cooper's Hawk, Northern Flicker Woodpecker, Downy Woodpecker, Steller's Jay, American Crow, American Robin, Anna's Hummingbird, Black-capped Chickadee and many more are not mentioned. This should be added as a subsection of Appendix C (EIS Phase 1) for a list of common bird species to Washington State protected under the MBTA (even though they are not an endangered and threaten species). This a federal law, and these birds are also protected. What will PSE do to help these common birds protected under the MBTA and not just birds of local importance?  3.4.4.2 Loss of Habitat "Maintenance activities would require limited grading or vegetation removal in areas that currently provide wildlife habitat. Impacts from the direct losses of terrestrial habitat would vary depending on the extent of the impact (how much area is affected), the recovery time for replanted areas, and if listed species, species of concern, or priority habitats are affected. However, typical maintenance activities associated with the No Action Alternative are expected to be infrequent (typically every 3 years) and of limited scale (typically trimming and isolated tree removal), which is expected to result in less-than-significant losses of habitat or species displacement.  PSE's existing policy is to restore vegetation other than trees within transmission corridors using plant communities composed of low-growing native ferns and shrubs and small-scale native trees, particularly those that resist disease and insect infestations (PSE, 2014)."  I also suggest planting a pollinator garden with wildflowers.		
7/6/2017 2:19:31 PM, cont.	Martha	Cross						3.4.5.1 Impacts Common to all Components Potential Impacts to Animals and Critical Habitat "Of the more than 5,400 trees that could potentially be removed, depending on the segment or option combination, about 340 of these trees (6 percent) occur in critical areas (primarily wetland habitat), and about 1,070 trees (20 percent) occur in wetland and stream buffer areas (Figure 3.4-8) (The Watershed Company, 2016c). This would increase the potential disturbance of these sensitive habitats and reduce the shading provided by the trees. These numbers are based on the strict application of PSE's vegetation management standards (see Section 3.4.1.2), and represent a conservatively high rate of tree removal. PSE has the management flexibility of pruning rather removing trees where adequate clearance can be maintained. To the extent practicable, the number of trees removed from sensitive habitats would be minimized, and any removal would be mitigated as required by local critical area ordinances. With mitigation, the effects of impacts to critical areas would be less-than-significant."  This is not quite accurate. Nothing can mitigate the effects of impacts to critical areas; any loss of habitat would be significant to wildlife. The removal of several trees and old-growth trees in both critical and forested areas greatly affects ecosystems that thrive in this environment, and just like these trees, they won't be coming back.  If a project of this magnitude gets approved to be done in critical and forested areas during nesting season, one does not need to be a wildlife biologist to know that such project will have a quite significant impact in nesting birds. Since migratory and native birds are protected under the MBTA, would the removal of trees with active nests of protected birds under the MBTA during breeding season violate this treaty? This should be addressed.  Here is a link to an article I found on L.A. Times about the MBTA. "Tiny hummingbird egg stalls project to upgrade a Bay Area bridge" <a href="http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-hummingbird-bridge-20170131-story.html">http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-hummingbird-bridge-20170131-story.html</a>  Finally, the North American bird population is greatly declining in part due to habitat loss. According to CENSE there is no need for this project; leave critical and forested areas for wildlife. I am a CENSE member, and I think that wildlife needs their habitat for survival more than we need to "Energize Eastside". If PSE really cares about the impact this project has on critical areas and their wildlife, please do not destroy them. There are other solutions. Thank you so much for your time.  Sincerely, Martha Cross		
7/6/2017 17:35:37	simon	prior	simon.prior@virgin.net	13606 se 3rd place	bellevue	98005	Other	I am concerned that the Bellevue Mayor's public comments during a meeting of June 13 demonstrate a lack of fairness and a bias towards implementing this project. The environmental impacts and potential effects on property prices are a real risk, and there are not clear definite benefits from this project, such as no commitment regarding reduced power outages. In order to prevent there appearing to be a further and continued bias in favor of this project, I believe the council should take action to prevent this project proceeding.		
7/6/2017 20:32:24	Kathleen	Sherman	Kathleen.sherman@comcast.net	4741 132nd ave se	Bellevue	98006	Other	1.The document is full of statements with no data or method of calculation to back up the statements. An example home values will not be decreases due to EE. How was that conclusion arrived at? This is one example of many instances. 2. There is no building permit to evaluate which makes this process moot. The risk analysis is not specific to this project. It looks like an encyclopedia entry. There are no numbers, values, actuarial computations. There are. O names of insurers or reinsurers. There is no acceptance of responsibility for construction risk or long term co location risks.		
7/6/2017 20:32:25	Kathleen	Sherman	Kathleen.sherman@comcast.net	4741 132nd ave se	Bellevue	98006	Other	1.The document is full of statements with no data or method of calculation to back up the statements. An example home values will not be decreases due to EE. How was that conclusion arrived at? This is one example of many instances. 2. There is no building permit to evaluate which makes this process moot. The risk analysis is not specific to this project. It looks like an encyclopedia entry. There are no numbers, values, actuarial computations. There are. O names of insurers or reinsurers. There is no acceptance of responsibility for construction risk or long term co location risks.		
7/6/2017 20:43:07	Kathleen	Sherman	Kathleen.sherman@comcast.net	4741 132nd ave se	Bellevue	98006	Other	Where are only the studies in favor of energize eastside on the website? Why aren't opposing studies and opinions listed. Why isn't the Lockhart load flow study and others on the website? Why doesn't the city of Bellevue promote only one Puget Sound Energy and its foreign owners point of view? Is thd. It's objective? I want to see Puget sound energy revenue forecasts that include the guaranteed return on infrastructure investment and the return on energy sales outside of the Puget Sound service area.		

Timestamp	First Name	Last Name	Email	Address	City	Zipcode	Comment Category	Comment	Lat	Long
7/6/2017 21:05:58	Kathleen	Sherman	Kathleen.sherman@comcast.net	4741 132nd ave se	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	The question needing an answer: why was it decided to NOT include nor analyze seismic hazards as outlined in Phase 1 Draft EIS and determined that they were less than significant and left out of the Phase 2 Draft EIS? PSE has failed to adequately show a real need for this boondoggle to its rate payers. A number of Cense studies have shown that the PSE studies are fatally flawed. The system has been rigged to give PSE this avenue to pursue free money at the expense of the rate payers and the neighbors of this new system. This project will amount to a tax on the rate payers and neighbors. Surely there must be a higher bar required to allow such money grab project to proceed.  Beyond economics and lack of need this project will tear through our backyards where we walk our dogs and go to enjoy the outdoors. We would like to continue to do so and not be subject to the unnecessary interruption from construction and further without the continuous bombardment of unhealthy levels of radiation.		
7/6/2017 21:20:52	Joel	Glass	Joelglass@hotmail.com	4216 137th Ave NE	Bellevue	98005	Other	In short we don't need it - we don't want it- please go away!		
7/6/2017 22:33:55	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.1 * What about the albedo of the lost trees? Has that been measured? It might be small but it still has an affect.		
7/6/2017 22:34:00	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.1 * What about the albedo of the lost trees? Has that been measured? It might be small but it still has an affect.		
7/6/2017 22:34:17	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.3 * Which are 'Partner Cities'? The term is not defined		
7/6/2017 22:34:37	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.3 * Chapter 173-441 requires reporting for facilities emitting more than 10000 metric tons of CO2e, NOT just GHG as stated. This is a potentially huge difference given the differences in GH effects of different GHGs. ( <a href="http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-441-030">http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-441-030</a> )		
7/6/2017 22:35:07	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.3 Thanks Trump: "The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has withdrawn its final guidance for Federal agencies on how to consider greenhouse gas emissions and the effects of climate change in National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reviews, a Notice of Availability for which was published on August 5, 2016 (81 FR 51866). As explained in the Notice of Availability, the withdrawn guidance was not a regulation. Pursuant to Executive Order 13783, "Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth," of March 28, 2017, the guidance has been withdrawn for further consideration." ( <a href="https://ceq.doe.gov/guidance/ceq_guidance_nepa-ghg-climate_final_guidance.html">https://ceq.doe.gov/guidance/ceq_guidance_nepa-ghg-climate_final_guidance.html</a> )		
7/6/2017 22:37:12	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.3 * Regarding the statement: "Although PSE operates electricity generation plants, such infrastructure is not proposed in any of the alternatives. The newly adopted Clean Air Rule does not apply to the proposed alternatives and, given its relatively large threshold, is not applied in the following impact analysis", doesn't EE involved bringing new generation on-line?		
7/6/2017 22:38:41	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.5.1 * What does 'considerable' mean in "cumulatively considerable contribution" in "Impacts are assessed based on the project's potential to result in a cumulatively considerable contributions to the state and overall global GHG burden"?		
7/6/2017 22:38:52	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	Section 3.5.5.1 * when are potential mitigation measures warranted?		
7/6/2017 22:39:04	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	3.5.7.1 * When it is said that the emissions would be substantially below the reporting threshold of 10,000 metric tons, is that 10,000 metric tons of CO2e (same question for 3.5.7.2)? This is not clear in the document.		
7/6/2017 22:39:18	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	3.5.7.2 * The SF6 emission calculation is slightly off and would equate to 76.7 metric tons CO2e rather than the 75 tons as documented.		
7/6/2017 22:39:31	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	3.5.7.8 * The numbers in the table don't reflect the body of text (39 v 40). This is also true for Table 3.5-2.		
7/6/2017 22:39:45	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	3.5.8 * What is the distinction between "Mitigation measures specified by code" and those based on "state and local programs"?		
7/6/2017 22:40:09	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	3.5.8.1 * Why is the word 'would' used instead of 'will' in the first sentence of paragraph 2?		
7/6/2017 22:40:21	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	3.5.8.1 * Why would be long-term sequestration loss impacts only be POTENTIALLY offset?		
7/6/2017 22:40:31	David	Schwartz	davids58@gmail.com	13805 SE 58th Place	Bellevue	98006	Greenhouse Gases	3.5.8.2 * The less-than-significant GHG impact obviate the need for mandatory reporting. However, does this also imply that no mitigation measures may be required as suggested? Why couldn't mitigation be nonetheless required?		
7/6/2017 22:59:48	Diana	Wadley	cascadiawadleys@gmail.com	6860 123rd Ave SE	Bellevue	98006	Environmental Health Pipeline Safety	Thank you for providing this EIS. I've learned a lot by reading through much of it. I'll try to limit my comments to three main areas of concern: 1) Greenhouse gases. Yeegads, that sulfur hexafluoride is potent stuff! And transporting electricity long distances always results in a loss of electricity (exasperated by adding distance). Thus, this project that ships massive amounts of electricity long distances, and at the moment will utilize fossil fuels for much of its power source, is keeping us locked into the treadmill of conventional large power stations and loss-inherent delivery. With technologies that are both proven and advancing rapidly every day, this seems like a foolish path to take. Thus, I see this as a GHG issue, as distributed energy systems could help break us out of this mindset, and give us gains in broader, often less GHG impactful fuel sources, and less system loss (meaning more efficient fuel use in the end). How much sulfur hexafluoride would be needed in a more distributed energy system? How many trees would need to be reduced (since it says in this EIS that there would be negative GHG impacts (as in less sequestering) due to tree loss)? I sense less environmental impact via smaller, distributed energy sources. 2) The safety issue. Looks like Olympic Pipeline doesn't exactly have a stellar track record with the UTC. And the EIS notes that construction will likely place wear and tear on the pipelines, which seem to only get internal monitoring around every 5 years (which seems like a long time, to me). It's good that they have ongoing pressure monitoring, but I still have concerns. Furthermore, this project won't do anything to help with the relatively frequent (compared to when I lived in KS) power outages. Again, I'd prefer to see PSE invest its capital in structures and systems that diversify our portfolio of energy options, not hang them on some bigger, uglier wires. 3) The aesthetics. I can see the current lines from my house. I'm not thrilled about the artistic renditions of what may be coming. (Though at least now I understand why a shield wire is important.) I am a member of CENSE. Thank you again for the EIS, and for the opportunity to comment. Respectfully, -Diana Wadley		
7/8/2017 16:47:37	Lekshmi	Venu	Lekvenu@yahoo.com	13910 Somerset Blvd SE	Bellevue	98006	Economics	The cost of this infrastructure investment is being passed to consumers effectively as an energy tax. This is a tax which Eastside residents cannot vote on and do not benefit from. Eastside residents have no representation in this decision but simply must pay a higher rate. When supply increases, the price should go down. In this case PSE is promising a rate increase. For this infrastructure investment, PSE will receive tax benefits and will likely be able to leverage the assets to reduce its cost of capital. The economics do not benefit Eastside residents but clearly benefit PSE.		