Sammamish-Juanita 115 kV Project
Advisory Group Meeting #7

July 18, 2012
Tonight’s agenda

- Overview of route alternative selection process
- Public comment to the advisory group
- What have we been hearing
- Preferred route selection process
  - Validate decision criteria
  - Identify preferred route east of Interstate 405
  - Identify preferred route west of Interstate 405
- Next steps
Stakeholder advisory group process

**Fall '11**
- GeoRoute Model
- Develops and compiles data

**Nov '11**
- Input into model
- GeoRoute Model
- Public Meeting and Feedback

**Dec '11**
- Potential Route Options

**Jan/Feb '12**
Stakeholder advisory group process

Fall '11

Dec '11

Jan/Feb '12
# Stakeholder advisory group process

**Puget Sound Energy Sammamish-Juaniita 115 kV Project**  
Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Route Option Tracking Worksheet - Feb. 2, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Outputs</th>
<th>End Point</th>
<th>Weighting Scheme</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Recommend further study?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A2            | West Sam - End Juanita Sub | 60 Av/40 Opp     |                     | • Many open areas are along 132nd Ave NE  
• Runs along I-405/Totem Lake | • Wires are on both sides of 132nd Ave NE  
• More homes are on the front of this route than on 124th Ave NE |                          |
| C2            | West Sam - End 124th St | 60 Av/40 Opp     |                     | • Uses 124th Ave NE, a main arterial and wider street  
• Avoids more residential area than C1 |                                                                  |                          |
| D1            | NE Sam - End Juanita Sub | 70 Av/30 Opp     |                     | • Least residential of all routes | • Impacts Willows view corridor |                          |
| D2            | NE Sam - End Juanita Sub | 60 Av/40 Opp     |                     | • Might be a good combination to try to avoid issues  
• Cuts across steep slopes and wooded area  
• Could have over-use ATV impacts  
• Impacts Totem Lake Mall |                                                                  |                          |
| D3            | NE Sam - End Juanita Sub | 50 Av/50 Opp     |                     | • Least residential impacts | • Crosses Totem Lake Mall  
• Cuts through slope and trees |                          |
| F1            | NE Sam - End 124th St  | 70 Av/30 Opp     |                     |                                                                      |                                                                      |                          |
Stakeholder advisory group process

May ‘12

Potential Route Options

Public Meeting and Feedback

+ Recommends preferred route

Jul ‘12

Preferred Route

Public Meeting and Feedback

Aug/Sep ‘12

Final Route

Begin design and permitting

Fall ‘12

Advisory Group
Puget Sound Energy
Public
Stakeholder advisory group process

Value Weighting Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Criteria List</th>
<th>Value of Importance (1 - 6)</th>
<th>Total Value of Importance Score (all stakeholders)</th>
<th>Prioritized List</th>
<th>Weighting Percentage (Starting Point)</th>
<th>Final Weighting Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least proximity to residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least impact to mature vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least proximity to critical areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least proximity to community sensitive land uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In the highlighted column above (Value of Importance), please rank the criteria from 1 through 6 where 6 is the most important criterion and 1 is the least important criterion. Please only use each number once.

The third column represents the sum total value from all stakeholders, upon which the fourth column (Prioritized List) will be based. The fifth column (Weighting Percentage) is meant to provide a starting point for determining the Weighting Value to assign the criteria in the last column (Final Weighting Value).

The Final Weighting Value will be to score the concepts based on how well they meet the criteria. The master decision matrix will use raw scoring multiplied by the Final Weighting Value giving each concept a total weighted value score.
## Scoring Worksheet - East of Interstate 405

### Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sammamish-Juanita 115 kV Project</th>
<th>Route Alternative 1</th>
<th>Route Alternative 2</th>
<th>Route Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria List</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least proximity to residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least impact to mature vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least proximity to critical areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least proximity to community sensitive land uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Max of 30 points per alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please score each of the above concepts for each of the criteria based on the following scoring table:*

**Scoring Key**

- 5 points = Exceeds the criterion
- 4 points = Meets the criterion completely
- 3 points = Mostly meets the criterion
- 2 points = Mostly doesn't meet the criterion
- 1 point = Completely fails to meet the criterion*
# Stakeholder advisory group process

## Decision Matrix

7/18/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted Score Results</th>
<th>Route Alternative 1</th>
<th>Route Alternative 2</th>
<th>Route Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria List</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Weighted Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least proximity to residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least impact to mature vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least proximity to critical areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least proximity to community sensitive land uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps for the siting process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2012 Summer**: Review comments and recommend preferred route.
- **2012 Summer (TBD)**: Input on preferred route.
- **2012 Summer**: Stakeholder advisory group meetings.
- **2013 Fall**: Select final route.
- **2013 Fall**: Design and permitting.
- **2013 Winter**: Community meetings.
- **2014**: Construction.
- **2014**: Project complete.

**Legend**:
- Orange: Stakeholder advisory group meetings
- Green: Community meetings
- Blue: Puget Sound Energy
Public comment

- What would you like the SAG to hear before they start their work?

- Be respectful of your time and others

- The advisory group is in *listening mode* and will not respond to questions or comments
Public comment from audience
Lots of input – key themes heard

- Avoid residential areas, playgrounds, parks, wetlands and schools
- Use commercial and industrial areas to reduce impacts to residential areas
- Combine alternatives and consider new route paths
- Residential impacts are greater than impacts to City of Redmond’s designated view corridor
- Concerns about health, property values, aesthetics and safety
Multi-objective decision analysis process

Criteria
- Discuss and agree on evaluation criteria

Weighting
- Rank importance of each criterion
- Develop weighting of each criterion

Scoring
- Score each alternative against each criterion
- Apply weighting factors to develop final scores
- Discuss and select recommended alternative
Multi-objective decision analysis process

Criteria under consideration:

- **Proximity to Residential Areas** – The location of the transmission line in relation to homes.
- **Impact to Mature Vegetation** – The amount of mature vegetation that must be removed or trimmed for construction and operation of the transmission line.
- **Public Support** – Public support for the transmission line route balanced against established Comprehensive and Functional Plans adopted by both cities.
- **Opportunity Areas** – The location of the transmission line in relation to the Kirkland railroad corridor, arterial streets (by classification or traffic counts), and existing utility lines/corridors.
- **Proximity to Community-identified Sensitive Land Uses** – The location of the transmission line in relation to schools, parks or similar sensitive land uses.
- **Proximity to Critical and Designated Areas** – The location of the transmission line in relation to critical areas such as wetland, streams, steep slopes, designated view corridors, Native Growth Protection Areas and Transfer of Development Rights, etc.
Multi-objective decision analysis process

Other criteria suggested:

- Proximity to schools (as a separate criteria)

- A broader consideration of proximity to homes, businesses and schools with numbers of residents, workers, and students per each

- The cost of each route relative to the others, including construction as well as maintenance (Note: PSE has indicated this level of cost detail is not available at this stage of planning. A range of $6-8 million for any of the three alternatives is the current cost information. The actual costs will vary depending on route selection, engineering, construction, property rights, etc.)
Multi-objective decision analysis process

- Rank criteria by importance to you
  - Lowest number equals least important
  - Highest number equals most important
Example value weighting worksheet

Value Weighting Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria List</th>
<th>Value of Importance (1 - 6)</th>
<th>Total Value of Importance Score (all stakeholders)</th>
<th>Prioritized List</th>
<th>Weighting Percentage (Starting Point)</th>
<th>Final Weighting Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rajiopf jik;jiuw jjsk:jrr ddkkji</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iksk sk juwe uujmt yuj jklijhh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolup eunrlpj jn;lnj;jdfjdhhh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purriy Iskjerjnm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiue seruj jipul; yuy;ije ghghgji</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leres ouu rjuu jkoo0oo jji</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS:** In the highlighted column above (Value of Importance), please rank the criteria from 1 through 6 where 6 is the most important criterion and 1 is the least important criterion. *Please only use each number once.*

The third column represents the sum total value from all stakeholders, upon which the fourth column (Prioritized List) will be based. The fifth column (Weighting Percentage) is meant to provide a starting point for determining the Weighting Value to assign the criteria in the last column (Final Weighting Value).

The Final Weighting Value will be to score the concepts based on how well they meet the criteria. The master decision matrix will use raw scoring multiplied by the Final Weighting Value giving each concept a total weighted value score.
Multi-objective decision analysis process

- Score each alternative against each criteria
  - Use scoring table to assign points based on how well the alternative meets each criteria
  - Assign up to 5 points per criteria for each alternative
  - Better the alternative meets the criteria, the higher the points given
  - Total score cannot exceed 30 points for each alternative
### Example scoring worksheet

**Scoring Worksheet - Selection of an important thing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria List</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Scoring</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Scoring</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lukij a;lsyu fessfg lijul usiojr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujci;lu fjiuul lkjh seete uijij;j;j</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polu serr uoj ui jklsuop j tghjkl;jja;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rijhi kuljb ljhikj ujhsh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adsks sjuisk kljsje up jurjeju</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoh HKLukdah ehsh yohk ryat y hkyo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jioj siuoij sere siujnkluu sedread</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Max of 35 points per alternative)</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please score each of the above concepts for each of the criteria based on the following scoring table:*

**Scoring Key**

- 5 points = Exceeds the criterion
- 4 points = Meets the criterion completely
- 3 points = Mostly meets the criterion
- 2 points = Mostly doesn't meet the criterion
- 1 point = Completely fails to meet the criterion*