

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. Background

The City of Newcastle (Newcastle) is one of five Partner Cities (including Bellevue, Redmond, Kirkland, and Renton) that analyzed Puget Sound Energy, Inc.'s (PSE's) Energize Eastside Project in a comprehensive, Phase I and Phase II Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), which are available at <http://www.energizeeastsideeis.org/library.html>. PSE expects that the Final EIS will be published in the first quarter of 2018. Comprehensive need, alternative technology, and pipeline safety analysis documents are also available in the Partner City's Project library.

The Phase 2 DEIS is an in-depth analysis of the project segment located in Newcastle. The Final EIS presents additional analysis of a new alternative in Newcastle in the event that Newcastle grants a variance from a regional utility corridor set-back requirement (NMC 18.12.130.C). PSE is pursuing a variance to reduce average transmission pole height from 95-feet to 82-feet and to increase the distance between proposed pole locations and existing adjacent uses.

At Newcastle's request, in addition to the DEISs and the Final EIS, PSE submits the following State Environmental Policy Act ("SEPA") Environmental Checklist. This Environmental Checklist incorporates by reference all analysis set forth in the Phase I and Phase II DEISs and the forthcoming Final EIS. PSE is also submitting a Newcastle Critical Areas Report ("CAR") as part of Newcastle's permitting review, which contains information relevant to the checklist below. Where relevant information is provided in the DEISs or CAR, PSE provides a reference to those documents rather than duplicating the information here.

- 1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:** Energize Eastside Project - Newcastle Segment
- 2. Name of applicant:** Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (PSE)
- 3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:** Brad Strauch, P.O. Box 97034, EST-3, Bellevue WA 98009-9734, (425) 456-2556
- 4. Date checklist prepared:** November 2017
- 5. Agency requesting checklist:** City of Newcastle. Newcastle is also co-lead on the Energize Eastside Phase I DEIS, Phase 2 DEIS and Final EIS.
- 6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):** PSE will submit a Conditional Use Permit application package for the Newcastle Segment in November 2017. PSE's objective is to begin project construction in Newcastle in 2018.

The Newcastle segment is one portion of what ultimately will be an 18-mile transmission line upgrade (the Energize Eastside project). To best ensure the consistent delivery of reliable power, PSE is proceeding with the permitting and construction of the 18-mile transmission line project in two phases. The Newcastle segment is part of the first phase of the Project, which PSE seeks to permit and construct first, with the second phase (running from Redmond to Bellevue) to follow. PSE does not propose any phasing of construction within Newcastle.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

Construction activities in Newcastle will be limited to the Newcastle segment. However, the proposed project is part (1.5 miles) of the first phase of the Energize Eastside project that will also include the construction of the Richards Creek substation in Bellevue and an additional 7.3 miles of transmission line upgrade between the new substation and the Talbot Hill substation in Renton. The second phase of the Energize Eastside Project will occur entirely outside of Newcastle and includes upgrading an additional 9.2 miles of transmission line from Bellevue to Redmond. By constructing the project in two phases, PSE helps to ensure that reliable power will continued to be delivered to the Partner Cities during project construction. The entirety of the Project (including the 18-mile transmission line and new substation) is analyzed in detail in the Project DEISs and supporting documents (see links above and below).

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

For more than five years, PSE has undertaken a rigorous review of Energize Eastside project alternatives and related environmental impacts. Documents containing environmental information can be accessed at two online Project libraries:

<http://www.energizeeastsideeis.org/library.html> and
<https://energizeeastside.com/documents>.

As reported above, SEPA review of the Energize Eastside project is being led by the city of Bellevue in partnerships with Newcastle, Redmond, Kirkland, and Renton. The Partner Cities work together through an Interagency Agreement for EIS preparation. During the environmental review process, two draft Environmental Impact Statements (DEISs) have been prepared and issued: a programmatic EIS on the broad options for addressing PSE's objectives and a project-level EIS. Both assessed the impacts of the project through Newcastle. The DEISs document the identification and evaluation of probable adverse environmental impacts from the proposed project. A Final EIS is forthcoming and publication is anticipated in the first quarter of 2018.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

No

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

Conditional Use Permit, Critical Area Decision, and a Variance.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The Newcastle segment requires the upgrade of approximately 1.5 miles of existing 115 kV to 230 kV transmission lines. The upgrade is located entirely within PSE's existing 100-ft utility corridor. Upgrading requires replacing 52 existing wooden H-frame poles with 24 steel poles, located near the outer edges of the right-of-way. After deliberate review and extensive stakeholder input, PSE proposes to undertake this work in the existing transmission line corridor rather than siting a new corridor through Newcastle communities. Within the existing utility corridor, the proposed pole locations for the rebuilt lines will generally be in the same locations as the existing poles, typically about 600 ft. apart. Selective tree removal will also be required within the managed corridor to meet federal vegetation management requirements and PSE standards. Use of the existing corridor (which has housed

transmission lines since the 1920s and 30s) minimizes environmental impacts and impacts to adjacent uses to the fullest extent feasible. To minimize the height of the upgraded transmission line poles, PSE is seeking a variance from Newcastle's 5-ft. setback requirement from regional utility corridors for 10 of the 24 poles in Newcastle. PSE's project will maintain the existing utilities uses in the transmission line corridor.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

Along PSE's 100-ft easement between Newcastle Way and SE 95th Way in Township 24N, Range 05E, Sections 28 and 33 (See assessor's maps).

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth

a. General description of the site:

Flat
 Rolling
 Hilly

Steep Slopes
Mountainous
Other: _____

See additional discussion of landscape characteristics in Phase I, DEIS at 11-8-11-11 and Phase II DEIS at 3.2-77-80. Landslide, erosion and seismic hazards are analyzed in depth in the CAR. See CAR pp. 20-22; 31-33, Appendix A, and Appendix C; Geoengineers, *Revised Targeted Critical Areas Geologic Hazard Evaluation* (July 24, 2017) ("*Revised Targeted Critical Areas Geologic Hazard Evaluation*"), available at http://www.energizeeastsideeis.org/uploads/4/7/3/1/47314045/energize_eastside_project_revised_targeted_critical_areas_geologic_hazard_evaluatio_-_newcastle.pdf.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

The area of steepest slopes is within the May Creek drainage south of SE 89th Place and north of SE 95th Way, where slopes greater than 40 percent and with a 10-foot vertical elevation rise are present locally. Landslide, erosion and seismic hazards are analyzed in depth in the CAR. See CAR pp. 20-22; 31-33, Appendix A, and Appendix C.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

Soil types in the project area predominantly include silty gravel and silty sand, except for fine sand and silt. See Phase I DEIS at 3-3—3-5.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

During geohazard investigation, no indication of slope movement was observed in the PSE right-of-way. See *Revised Targeted Critical Areas Geologic Hazard Evaluation*; CAR pp. 20-22; 31-33, Appendix A, and Appendix C.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Grading includes excavating holes for utility pole placement, typically using a vactor truck. Once the pole is placed in the hole, locally sourced clean material will be backfilled around the pole. There are 24 poles to be installed.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Erosion hazard areas in the project area are mapped within the utility easement from SE 76th Place, south to SE 95th Way. Clearing of vegetation and installation of poles will implement best management practices (BMPs) during construction and site restoration to minimize erosion. See CAR pp. 20-22; 31-33, Appendix A, and Appendix C; *Revised Targeted Critical Areas Geologic Hazard Evaluation*.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

The project is a linear facility that traverses 1.5 miles in Newcastle. The only impervious surface impacts are at the base of each transmission pole. The project replaces 50 poles with 24 poles for a net decrease in impervious surface (the pole) of 27 sq. ft.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Site activities include vegetation management and tree removal (associated with the pole replacement activities and wire clearance requirements), to the extent possible, will be completed between May 1 and September 30. Sites where vegetation will be removed or trimmed will be accessed by foot when possible and vegetation debris will be chipped and remain in place. Disturbed areas will be reseeded with herbaceous species and property owner landscaping will be accomplished using electrical transmission line and pipeline compatible species.

Options for mitigation of vegetation management and tree removal in geologic hazard areas include limiting disturbance to these areas by large equipment (access by foot and hand-cutting with chainsaws), leaving cut stumps in place, and chipping or scattering tree debris where feasible. On private property, coordination with the property owner will direct mitigation strategies to be implemented. In the May Creek drainage, when removing trees, GeoEngineers recommends trees are felled across the fall line and left perpendicular to the slope, tree debris is scattered upslope of the riparian buffer zone, and erosion control measures be implemented to reduce erosion of material from the slope into May Creek.

Where vegetation clearing is required to reestablish access on existing trails or old access routes, BMPs will be implemented. These BMPs may include, but are not limited to outsloping road surfaces, crowning road surfaces (where appropriate, such as at ridge tops and where roads climb gently inclined surfaces), and installing water bars or rolling dips at regularly spaced intervals to avoid concentrating surface water flow along the road surface. After construction, disturbed areas would be graded to a stable free-draining configuration, treated with appropriate erosion control measures, and seeded. Most, if not all, new access routes can be abandoned following construction using erosion control measures and seeding.

Pole replacement activities are proposed in erosion hazard areas and in landslide and steep slope hazard area buffers. For pole replacement activities, the disturbed area will be stabilized using BMPs that reduce potential impacts including plant replacement, seeding, or hog fuel application in areas of bare soil and scattering chipped wood or tree debris. Soil removed from new pole excavations will be scattered into vegetation and away from landscaped areas. If the work area is wet or has standing water, driving mats may be used under equipment and the soils excavated for pole installation will be removed from the site

for offsite disposal. The requirements of a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan will be addressed in the Project-specific Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) Plan and Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (CSWPPP). Additionally, for poles located in geological hazard areas or associated buffers, the old poles may be cut off approximately 1-2 feet below the ground surface and the remaining portion of each pole left in place. See also CAR at Appendix C

2. Air

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

See Phase I DEIS at Ch. 4 and the Phase II DEIS at 3.5.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

PSE does not have any knowledge of off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect the proposal.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

See Phase I DEIS at Ch. 4 and the Phase II DEIS at 3.5.

3. Water

a. Surface Water:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

A total of two wetlands are located along the proposed Energize Eastside corridor in Newcastle. Wetland MN01 is a small wetland (542 sq. ft.) located northwest of Lake Boren. Wetland MN02 is also a small wetland (456 sq. ft.) located north of SE 95th Way. Wetlands will not be directly impacted as a result of the Project (see CAR at Section 7).

A total of three streams are located along the proposed Energize Eastside corridor in Newcastle. Stream MB01 is mostly located in the city of Bellevue, but extends into the northern portion of Newcastle. Stream MN01 is adjacent to Wetland MN01, northwest of Lake Boren. Stream MN02, or May Creek, is located between SE May Creek Park Drive and SE 95th Way at the south end of the study area. Streams will not be directly impacted as a result of the Project (CAR at Section 7). See also, Phase II DEIS at Ch. 3.3.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

In wetland and stream buffers, permanent impacts (i.e., poles) will be reduced by 10 sq. ft. compared to existing conditions; 21 trees will be removed resulting in 2,859 sq. ft. of vegetation community conversion impacts; and 3,981 sq. ft. of temporary disturbance will occur. Impacts were minimized by utilizing the existing transmission line corridor, limiting disturbance and implementing best management practices (BMPs) when working in critical areas and installing transmission lines between poles with minimal site disturbance.

The majority of wetland/stream critical area impacts, which are exclusively buffer impacts, occur in the May Creek buffer. Project impacts to wetland and stream buffers

largely result from vegetation management (i.e., tree removal). Impacts will be mitigated on an areal and functional basis in the May Creek buffer, per the Final Mitigation Plan.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

PSE does not propose the fill or dredge of surface water or wetlands in Newcastle. See *a/so*, Phase II DEIS at Ch. 3.3.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

No, the Project does not propose a surface water withdrawal or diversion. See CAR.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

No. See CAR at 5.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

No, the project does not involve any discharge of waste materials into surface waters. See Phase II DEIS at Ch. 3.3.

b. Ground Water:

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

No groundwater will be withdrawn as part of the Project.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

The Project does not contemplate any installation or work with a septic tank.

Accordingly, no Project-related waste materials will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection transport/conveyance and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

The Project encompasses discrete disturbance primarily related to pole installation, which will not materially alter the landscape, sources and transport of runoff including stormwater will remain unchanged during operation. During construction, stormwater will be managed in accordance with a Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (CSWPPP). See Phase II DEIS at Ch. 3.3. The Phase II DEIS concluded that, “[o]nce installed, poles would not affect stormwater runoff, groundwater infiltration, or shallow groundwater flow. The new poles would be steel and would not generate substances that could contaminate surface or groundwater. Where old poles treated with a wood preservative are removed and replaced with steel poles, a potential source of groundwater and water contamination would be removed.” Phase II DEIS at 3.3-17.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

As concluded in the Phase II DEIS, “[o]nce installed, poles would not affect stormwater runoff, groundwater infiltration, or shallow groundwater flow. The new poles would be steel and would not generate substances that could contaminate surface or groundwater. Where old poles treated with a wood preservative are removed and replaced with steel poles, a potential source of groundwater and water contamination would be removed.” Phase II DEIS at 3.3-17. Therefore, no permanent BMPs will be implemented to avoid material entering surface or groundwater.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

No, the project will not alter drainage patterns because the localized pole installation does not materially affect the landscape. PSE will implement a Project-specific Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) Plan and CSWPPP.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

Standard construction BMPs will be implemented to avoid impacts to water, such as avoiding construction during the rainy season, limiting clearing, and mulching, reseeding, and planting disturbed areas. During construction, stormwater will be managed in accordance with a CSWPPP.

During operation PSE will implement Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plans during maintenance activities (for poles, the transmission corridor, and access roads) to prevent spills or leaks of hazardous materials, paving materials, or chemicals from contaminating surface or groundwater.

4. Plants

a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

In Newcastle, 31 regulated trees are being proposed for removal under PSE preferred configuration; however, a variance would be required. If a variance is not issued, then the number of regulated trees would increase to 32.

PSE is committed to fully complying with all mitigation required in the City’s code and permit conditions. Specifically, PSE will mitigate those impacts identified in the Critical Areas Report, as well as tree impacts that are necessary to meet federal transmission line operational standards. PSE will work with affected property owners, the City, and other stakeholders to replace trees in the most effective manner that meets the permit conditions. Where individual property owners decline to have new trees planted onsite, PSE will work

with the City to place additional trees offsite. Mitigation specifics are presented in the associated Critical Areas Report (provided under separate cover).

c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The Newcastle CAR provides an in-depth review of information related to species on or near the Project site. As reported in the CAR, “Endangered Species Act (ESA) documentation for the south segment of the Project which includes the South Bellevue Segment, Newcastle, and Renton, addresses federally-listed species. As summarized in that document, the proposed Project will have no effect on ESA-listed species based upon lack of documented use, lack of suitable habitat, and/or avoidance of in-water work.” The Table 2 (CAR at 15) lists potentially affected ESA-listed species, but concludes that no species has overlapping distribution or appropriate habitat in the Project-area.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

Property-specific landscaping with 'transmission friendly' vegetation will be applied to affected land owners and native species, including pollinator habitat enhancement, will be used for revegetation of disturbed areas. See May Creek Buffer Mitigation Plan in CAR Appendix E.

5. Animals

a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

Examples include:

Birds: Hawk Heron Eagle Songbirds other:
Mammals: Deer Bear Elk Beaver Coyotes
 other:

Although no heron rookeries or herons have been observed, there is some chance that heron could use habitat are the Project site. As reported in the CAR (pp 48-49):

Online resources do not map any heron rookeries or raptor nests in or near the transmission line corridor, consistent with field observations. In general, existing use and maintenance of the transmission line corridor precludes the development of potential nest trees in the Project area. While raptors may utilize man-made structures (*i.e.*, utility poles) for nesting and herons could use habitat in the vicinity of the Project area for breeding, none were observed during field work activities, and none are known to PSE avian biologist in the vicinity of the Project.

If heron rookeries or raptor nesting trees are observed within the Project area, PSE avian biologists will develop and implement a strategy to prevent impacts to the respective species in coordination with WDFW. PSE implements an Avian Protection Plan to protect avian wildlife from harmful interactions with their utility equipment. The Plan includes preventing the creation of potentially harmful nests and monitoring known nest sites when construction activities occur in close proximity during the nesting season (Puget Sound Energy n.d.). Potential Project impacts to birds that could be expected to utilize habitat in the Project area are mitigated through the PSE’s bird protection programs and procedures.

b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The transmission lines crossing of May Creek will be made near the upstream limits of documented Chinook salmon presence, but the Project will have no effect on ESA-listed species based upon lack of documented use, lack of suitable habitat, and/or avoidance of in-water work. No state-listed species are in the project areas. See CAR at 15 (Table 2).

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

According to WDFW's online databases (PHS on the Web and SalmonScape) salmonid species known to occur in May Creek are cutthroat trout, sockeye salmon, Chinook salmon, steelhead, and coho salmon, thereby establishing May Creek as a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area (FWHCA). Streams MB01 and MN01, as Waters of the State, are also FWHCAs.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

By using the existing corridor, PSE prevents new impacts to existing open spaces, wildlife habitats, recreational facilities, and natural and scenic resources and maintains those recreational facilities and open spaces already collocated with the utility corridor. As set forth in detail in the associated Critical Areas Report, impacts to wildlife habitat and critical areas are avoided to the extent feasible, and will be fully mitigated through habitat restoration around May Creek. See *Newcastle Critical Areas Report— Puget Sound Energy: Energize Eastside Project* ("CAR") at 26.

If the variance is granted, the net impacts and proposed mitigation are summarized as follows. In wetland and stream buffers, permanent impacts (caused by pole placement) will be *reduced* by 10 sq. ft. compared to existing conditions; 21 trees will be removed resulting in 2,859 sq. ft. of vegetation community conversion impacts; and 3,981 sq. ft. of temporary disturbance will occur. Impacts were minimized by utilizing the existing transmission line corridor, limiting disturbance and implementing BMPs when working in critical areas and installing transmission lines between poles with minimal site disturbance.

The majority of wetland/stream critical area impacts, which are exclusively buffer impacts, occur in the May Creek buffer. Project impacts to wetland and stream buffers largely result from vegetation management (*i.e.*, tree removal). Impacts will be mitigated on an areal and functional basis in the May Creek buffer, per the Final Mitigation Plan.

Accounting for conversion impact ratios the required minimum buffer mitigation in the May Creek sub-basin is 1,431 sq. ft. As set forth in detail in PSE's Final Mitigation Plan, PSE proposes enhancing 6,258 sq. ft. of May Creek buffer. Buffer enhancement will include installation of native trees (2,280 sq. ft. of shrub mix and 3,978 sq. ft. of mowable herbaceous pollinator mix). In addition to native plantings, buffer enhancement will include creation of habitat snags, hinge-felled trees, and placement of downed woody debris in the May Creek Buffer. These mitigation activities will increase native plant cover, decrease invasive species prevalence, improve native species diversity, and provide food and other habitat resources for wildlife. PSE's buffer enhancement will be maintained and monitored for five years. Per NMC 18.24.130. See CAR at 43 and Appendix E.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

See Phase I, DEIS at 7-2 (describing PSE's energy mix as 32% hydro; 31% natural gas; 28% coal; 7% wind; and 1% nuclear or other).

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

No.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

The Energize Eastside Project proposes the construction of a new substation, upgrading of 18-miles of existing 115 kV power lines with 230 kV lines. These construction activities, combined with an aggressive conservation measures, will help to ensure that PSE meets regulatory requirements for providing safe and reliable power to the eastside's growing communities and businesses. As described in the Phase I DEIS:

PSE's level of conservation is higher than other nearby utilities. For example, PSE expects to conserve about 500 MW cumulatively from 2013 to 2023, which represents approximately 15 percent of their projected average demand (load) of about 3,300 MW for that year (PSE, 2013). Seattle City Light (SCL) expects slower load growth than PSE, and total cumulative conservation from 2014 through 2023 to represent approximately 9 percent of average load (SCL, 2014). Snohomish Public Utility District (PUD), which expects load growth of approximately 2 percent per year, projects its total cumulative conservation since 2014 to represent approximately 9 percent of average load in 2024 (Snohomish PUD, 2013). ...

To achieve its electrical conservation goals, PSE expects to incentivize the following types of measures:

- Energy Efficiency: weatherization, efficient lighting, etc.;
- Fuel Conversion: converting from electric to natural gas;
- Distribution Efficiency: implemented on PSE distribution systems;
- Distributed Generation: customer combined heat and power (CHP), solar, wind, etc.; and
- Demand Response: capacity savings programs.

Energy efficiency is the largest contributor to total energy savings in PSE's conservation program, accounting for approximately 90 percent of total energy savings systemwide by 2024. Fuel conversion (from electric to natural gas) and distributed generation (smaller sources of power such as solar, wind, and other generation types) represent a small but growing component of PSE's conservation program, jointly comprising less than 10 percent of existing energy savings but projected to increase to approximately 14 percent of energy savings by 2024. Figure A-1 in Appendix A provides additional detail. Distribution efficiency can include conductor replacement and conservation voltage reduction. Conductor replacement on existing lines could occur under the No Action Alternative as part of normal maintenance. However, these improvements would not substantially increase overall system capacity because capacity issues driving this project are typically associated with transformer overloads rather than conductor overloads. PSE would continue the current practice of using advanced systems, such as conservation voltage reduction, to improve system efficiency and reduce overall loading. Conservation voltage reduction refers to controlling PSE's distribution voltage at slightly reduced levels to conserve energy. The other components of PSE's conservation program comprise relatively small percentages of their conservation target at present. Distributed generation and demand response are two of the components that are included in Alternative 2 and are discussed in further detail in Section 2.3.3.

Phase I DEIS at 2-13—15.

7. Environmental Health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal?

The Phase II DEIS at Ch. 3.8 and 3.9 and Phase I DEIS at Ch. 8 contain a detailed assessment of potential environmental health impacts. The DEISs focus on potential impacts related to electric and magnetic fields (EMF) and pipeline safety (due to the collocation of PSE's proposed transmission line with Olympic Pipeline Company's (OPL) fuel pipeline.

With respect to EMF impacts in Newcastle, the Phase II DEIS states the following:

Relative to the No Action Alternative, magnetic field levels would decrease under Alternative 1 in the Newcastle segment. The calculated magnetic field levels generated by the project along the Newcastle Segment would be well below industry guidelines; therefore, impacts would be less-than significant.

DEIS at 3.8-32. With respect to pipeline safety, the Phase II DEIS utilizes information from multiple independent safety assessments and concludes the following:

Based on the results of the risk assessment, the probability of a pipeline release and fire occurring and resulting in fatalities remains low under Alternative 1. However, the potential public safety impacts could be significant if this unlikely event were to occur. Under Alternative 1, the probability of a pipeline incident could be slightly higher in some locations when compared with the No Action Alternative. In these areas, testing, monitoring, engineering analysis, and implementation of mitigation measures would lower these risks. In areas where AC current density could be a concern, testing and monitoring would be conducted and mitigation measures (e.g., grounding mats) installed to reduce AC currents to acceptable levels. In areas where the pipelines would be within 13 feet of transmission line pole grounds, additional engineering analysis would be conducted and mitigation measures implemented to reduce fault risks (e.g., arc shielding protection). See Section 3.9.7, Mitigation Measures for measures that would lower the risks.

Phase II DEIS at 3.9-47. The Phase II DEIS also contains analysis of spill and fire risks related to the collocated pipeline facilities. See Phase II DEIS at 3.9-48—52. With respect to potential impacts, the DEIS concludes that “the likelihood of a pipeline rupture and release remains low under Alternative 1, and implementation of regulatory requirements (Section 3.9.1) and mitigation measures (Sections 3.9.7 and 4.9.4) would further reduce the probability of a pipeline incident occurring.”

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

None.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

As reported in the Phase II DEIS with respect to pipeline safety, OPL, as pipeline operator, is responsible for operating and maintaining their pipelines in accordance with federal standards. PSE, as project applicant, has responsibilities (some of which may be imposed by jurisdictions with permit authority) to coordinate and cooperate with OLPC, but has limited authority to influence specific mitigation measures undertaken by OLPC related to pipeline operation or monitoring... As part of ongoing coordination between PSE and OLPC, additional mitigation measures may be identified during final design.” Phase II DEIS at 3.9-52.

The Phase II DEIS did not include proposed measures to reduce EMF, because “the calculated magnetic field levels would be sufficiently low enough to avoid known health effects, and therefore considered consistent with Bellevue and Redmond policies. There are no known health effects from power frequency EMF at the levels expected from the No Action Alternative or Alternative 1. For all proposed segments and options in Alternative 1, the calculated magnetic field levels would be at least 1,800 mG below the lowest industry guideline for magnetic field exposure for the general public (Power Engineers, 2017). This includes all of the unique sites listed in Table 3.8-4. Therefore, for all proposed segments and options under Alternative 1, impacts would be less-than-significant. Please refer to Chapter 8 of the Phase 1 Draft EIS for the complete discussion.” Phase II DEIS at 3.8-20.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

None.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Phase I DEIS, Chapter 9 contains an analysis of potential noise impacts related to the construction and operation of the Newcastle segment. The analysis on pp. 9-10—9-11 (including Table 9-5) contains analysis of potential noise impacts related to construction activities. See the discussion on page 9-14—9-15 for an analysis of operational impacts.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

No potential significant adverse impacts with respect to noise were identified with respect to construction or operation activities. As such, PSE does not propose any noise-related mitigation at this time. To the extent that potential impacts are identified in the future, PSE will work with Newcastle to develop appropriate mitigation.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The current use of the proposed site is as a transmission line utility corridor. The proposed upgraded transmission lines are adjacent to areas where the existing land uses are predominantly vacant (59%). Non-vacant land uses are mostly comprised of single-family residential uses that are located adjacent to the existing transmission line. Approximately 112 parcels are immediately adjacent to the existing corridor. Unique land uses include Newcastle City Hall, Seattle Revival Center, and May Creek Park (on the Newcastle/Renton border). The Newcastle segment goes through the residential neighborhoods of Del Mar Village, Newport Woods, Eden’s Grove, Donegal, and Olympus. A portion of the segment also goes through the Community Business Center – Lake Boren Corridor, and is within the Community Business Center overlay. Del Mar Village is an apartment complex near a commercial center. Donegal and Olympus are single-family residential developments. A government building and a park (May Creek Natural Area) are also along the segment.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

No. PSE designed the Project to use the existing transmission line corridor that was established in the late 1920s and early 1930s, which predates the incorporation of Newcastle (1994) and the current uses adjacent to the corridor. To PSE’s knowledge the site has not been used for agriculture.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The site is currently occupied with two 115 kV transmission lines.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

Yes. The existing 115 kV transmission lines will be demolished and upgraded to 230 kV transmission lines.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

A summary of existing uses in Newcastle can be found in the Phase II DEIS at 3.1-17. As reported there:

Existing land uses are predominantly vacant (some of which are associated with May Creek Park). Non-vacant land uses are mostly comprised of single-family residential (see the chart below for the percentage of the total study area in the Newcastle Segment that each land use represents). Approximately 112 parcels are immediately adjacent to the existing corridor. Unique land uses include Newcastle City Hall, Seattle Revival Center, and May Creek Park (on the Newcastle/Renton border).... The existing corridor is located in six zoning districts in Newcastle, including single-family residential, commercial, and recreation/open space.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

A summary of existing uses in Newcastle can be found in the Phase II DEIS at 3.1-17. As reported there:

The Newcastle Comprehensive Plan land use designations within this portion of the study area include Single-Family Residential and Multi-Family Residential. This indicates that the neighborhoods will continue to have residential land uses along the existing corridor into the foreseeable future. The policies specific to the Newcastle Comprehensive Plan indicate intent to preserve the current residential character while providing for concentrated growth where necessary.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Newcastle incorporates the King County Shoreline Master Program by reference. NMC 14.10.010. The proposed site does not cross or propose construction in a jurisdictional shoreline.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “Environmentally sensitive area” or “critical area?” If so, specify (if unsure, check with the City).

The CAR contains a full description of critical areas in the project area. As reported above and in the CAR, a total of two wetlands are located along the proposed Energize Eastside corridor in Newcastle. Wetland MN01 is a small wetland (542 sq. ft.) located northwest of Lake Boren. Wetland MN02 is also a relatively small wetland (456 sq. ft.) located north of SE 95th Way. Wetlands will not be directly impacted as a result of the Project (see CAR at Section 7). May Creek and two unnamed streams and two unnamed wetlands are within the project corridor. See EIS for more detail; see Newcastle Segment, Critical Areas Report.

A total of three streams are located along the proposed Energize Eastside corridor in Newcastle. Stream MB01 is mostly located in the city of Bellevue, but extends into the northern portion of Newcastle. Stream MN01 is adjacent to Wetland MN01, northwest of Lake Boren. Stream MN02, or May Creek, is located between SE May Creek Park Drive and SE 95th Way at the south end of the study area. Streams will not be directly impacted as a result of the Project (CAR at Section 7). See also, Phase II DEIS at Ch. 3.3.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

None.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

Not Applicable.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

PSE designed the Project to use the existing transmission line corridor that was established in the late 1920s and early 1930s, which predates the incorporation of Newcastle (1994). The current uses adjacent to the corridor developed over time as areas were annexed into the City and these areas became more dense and populated. The utility corridor is part of the existing character of these areas. By selecting this route through Newcastle, PSE limits new impacts and ensures consistency with the existing uses, which already accommodate a utility corridor.

PSE's proposed transmission line upgrade design involves replacing the existing H-frame wood 115 kV transmission poles (which has two or three poles at each location) with steel monopoles to accommodate 230 kV conductors (e.g., wires). The replacement poles will generally be installed in the same location or in close proximity to the existing poles. This design provides a more than a 50% reduction in transmission poles within the corridor. The reduction in poles reduces aesthetic impacts to adjacent uses by eliminating visual clutter.

PSE's proposed pole design is taller than the existing poles, but reduces height to the extent feasible. PSE's proposed average pole height is well-below the height evaluated in the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Phase I and Phase 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS) (82-feet rather than 100-feet).¹ This reduction mitigates significant aesthetic impacts concluded in Phase 2 DEIS to a less-than-significant level. Indeed, the Phase 2 DEIS recommended shorter poles as a potential mitigation measure. Phase 2 DEIS at 3.2-87 ("Position poles and adjust pole height to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible. In Newcastle, a variance from the setback requirements would allow the poles to be positioned farther away from the houses. This would also allow for shorter poles.").

This reduced height would require issuance of a variance from the City to allow the proposed poles to be located within 5-feet of the OPL's easement. With the variance, the new poles will also have a smaller diameter and can be installed using direct embed construction techniques rather than having to place the poles on foundations. Direct embed construction has a lower ground disturbance footprint than when foundations are required. Additionally, poles installed on foundations require more than a month longer construction time.

PSE will also work with the City to assess various pole finishes (e.g., galvanized, Corten [self-weathering], painted) to limit impacts to adjacent uses. This design decision was recommended mitigation in the Phase 2 DEIS at 3.2-88. To facilitate 'gateway' visual appeal near the City Hall, PSE modified its design by moving a pole from its originally designed location farther from the roadway. PSE will work with the City and property-owners to identify preferred species of replacement vegetation, with a focus on native species, so as to enhance adjacent uses to the extent possible.

¹ The Phase I and Phase II DEISs are available at <http://www.energizeeastsideeis.org/library.html>.

The Newcastle Comprehensive Plan land use designations within this portion of the study area include Single-Family Residential and Multi-Family Residential. This indicates that the neighborhoods will continue to have residential land uses along the existing corridor into the foreseeable future. The policies specific to the Newcastle Comprehensive Plan indicate intent to preserve the current residential character while providing for concentrated growth where necessary (HO-P2 and LU-P13). The consistency of the proposed transmission lines with other uses in the vicinity was confirmed by the Phase 2 DEIS, which concluded that “the potential impacts to land use and housing for the Newcastle Segment would be less-than-significant because it is consistent with city plans, and would not adversely affect existing and future land use patterns.” Phase 2 DEIS, Section 3.1.5.14 at page 3.1-42-43. All potential SEPA impacts must be assessed against the existing transmission line and the existing property rights granted with the establishment of the utility corridor. See, *Chuckanut Conservancy v. Washington State Department of Natural Resources*, 156 Wn. App. 274, 292-93, 232, P.3d 1154,1163 (2010).

The City’s Comprehensive Plan also minimizes compatibility impacts by requiring that compatible utilities be co-located:

LU-G13. The City shall identify lands useful for public purposes such as utility and transportation corridors, landfills, sewage treatment facilities, storm water management facilities, recreation, schools, and other public uses. (emphasis added).

UT-P3. The City shall promote collocation of major utility transmission facilities such as high voltage electrical transmission lines and water and natural gas trunk pipe lines within shared utility corridors, to minimize the amount of land allocated for this purpose and the tendency of such corridors to divide neighborhoods. (emphasis added).

Consistent with these Comprehensive Plan provisions, PSE proposes utilizing the existing high voltage transmission line corridor, which is co-located with nature gas lines.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

None.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

None.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

None.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

No occupied structures are proposed. The tallest pole will be approximately 110 feet (non-variance option) or approximately 105 feet if a variance is issued.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

The Phase II DEIS identified significant adverse aesthetic impacts in Newcastle where the proposal contemplated transmission lines that were 100-feet tall.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

PSE requests a variance to mitigate potential aesthetic impacts related to the Energize Eastside Project (Project). The Project entails replacing two existing 115 kV transmission lines (and associated poles) with new poles that support two 230 kV transmission lines. The upgraded transmission lines would be located in the regional utility corridor that has operated since the late 1920s and early 1930s, and traverses the City of Newcastle (“City” or “Newcastle”) in a north-south orientation. Under consent from PSE, OPL has easements for the operation of two petroleum pipelines in the utility corridor.

The City has interpreted NMC 18.12.130.C. as creating a separate regional utility corridor for the OPL pipelines located within PSE’s regional utility corridor.² This interpretation, which PSE believes to go beyond the code’s plain language, requires the upgraded transmission line poles to be installed a minimum of 5-feet from the outer boundary of OPL’s easements.

The boundary of OPL’s easement and the location of the pipeline within the easements vary widely throughout the corridor, which makes it difficult to site poles under a non-variance scenario. In other words, OPL’s easements are not a uniform width and a 5-foot setback from OPL’s easement boundary in no way dictates a consistent distance between PSE transmission line poles and the pipelines. This requirement has made it necessary for PSE to revise the design through Newcastle in order to meet this set-back requirement. In general, this will increase the pole heights and in most instances, place the poles closer to residences. PSE preferred design would minimize pole heights, keep the poles closer to the center of the corridor and maintain safe clearances from the pipelines; however, a variance would be required.

PSE hired a third-party expert to assess AC interaction between the pipelines and the replacement transmission lines. The assessment helped identify optimized pole placement, design, and operational parameters that minimize AC interaction between the two utilities. These parameters have been incorporated into PSE’s design for the Project, including PSE’s preferred design, which would require a variance.

Nonetheless, without a variance, the pole locations need to be pushed generally towards the outside of the corridor. In order to accommodate wire “blow-out” or movement (primarily due to wind) and meet required clearance distances from adjacent uses, PSE was required to move the transmission lines (wires) towards the middle of the corridor and place them all on the same side of the poles. Since this non-variance design stacks the wires all on the same side of the pole, the required separation between the top and bottom wire would be 29 feet as compared to approximately 15 feet for the variance design. Accordingly, without a variance, in order to accommodate the stacked wires, the transmission line pole heights would average 95 feet in the City. The taller and wider, Newcastle-specific configuration was analyzed in the project-level Energize Eastside Phase 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The DEIS concluded that there would be significant adverse aesthetic impacts due to the increase in transmission line pole height from the existing proposed configuration to the proposed Newcastle-specific configuration.

² The staff report that was prepared for the July 5, 2016, Newcastle Council Meeting, provides the City’s interpretation of NMC 18.12.130.C. The interpretation states that “...a required setback of five feet for all buildings or structures from utility property or easement lines delineating the boundary of regional utility corridors would apply to the electrical transmission towers...” Additionally, the report states that the OPL easement is a 50-foot easement that is centered within the 100-foot PSE easement. The city interpreted this information in the context of the municipal code for the purpose of regulating electrical transmission towers. The 50-foot OPL easement would be considered as the regional utility corridor and therefore, all electrical transmission towers (considered structures) would be required to be set back 5 feet outside the boundaries of the OPL easement.

If, however, the City grants a variance from the 5-foot easement setback requirement, PSE can move the poles away from residences on either side of the corridor and place the wires on both sides of the poles while still meeting engineering and safety requirements.³ The alternative wire configuration provides for greater wire separation due to the geometric configuration, thereby reducing the pole heights to an average of around 82-feet (see Figure 1), while still maintaining a safe distance between the poles and the pipelines.

PSE has also undertaken additional aesthetic design work to ensure no materially detrimental impact to adjacent properties and uses. The new poles will be steel monopoles that are generally installed in the same location or in close proximity to the existing poles. In most cases, the number of poles will be reduced from two poles to one pole, which reduces visual clutter. The consistency of the proposed transmission lines upgrade with the subject property was confirmed by the Phase 2 DEIS, which found that impacts to land use will “be less-than-significant because [the proposed project] is consistent with city plans, and would not adversely affect existing or future land use patterns.” (Phase 2 DEIS at 3.1-42).

PSE will also work with the City to powder-coat the steel monopoles to limit impacts to adjacent uses. Because the poles are taller, replacement vegetation can also be taller, which can help to obscure aesthetic impacts. PSE will work with the City and property-owners to identify preferred species of replacement vegetation so as to enhance adjacent uses to the extent possible.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

Not Applicable.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

None.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Not Applicable.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

The Phase II DEIS lists the following recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project: the Waterline Trail, China Creek Trail (proposed), Lake Boren Park, Cross Town Trail, Olympus Trail, and May Creek Natural Area. See Phase II DEIS at 3.6-7.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

³ PSE retained Det Norske Veritas (U.S.A.), Inc. (DNV-GL), a national pipeline safety expert, to provide design input for the Energize Eastside project. DNV-GL performed an induced AC (alternating current) interference study to investigate the possibility for AC interference effects between the proposed electrical transmission lines and the two OPL pipelines. Additionally, OPL was involved with the development of the study and provided field data. The DNV-GL study provides recommendations related to minimizing AC interaction between the Energize Eastside Project and OPL pipelines. PSE has incorporated these recommendations during the design of the transmission line project, which also follows the requirement in the National Electric Safety Code (NESC).

No, the Phase II DEIS concluded that although the change in pole configuration and height may “change the user experience,” the use of the trails would remain the same. See Phase II DEIS at 3.6-30 (summarizing findings with respect to Newcastle recreational opportunities). The Phase II DEIS then concludes that impacts would be less-than-significant.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

See EIS (link in Earth 1.A). PSE will work with the City to identify opportunities to address potential impacts to recreation areas.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on - or proposed for - national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

The DEIS fully analyzed impacts to historical and cultural resources in Newcastle. DEIS at Ch. 3.7. The DEIS focused its analysis in Newcastle on the Newcastle cemetery and the Eastside Transmission System.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

The now inactive Newcastle Cemetery meets the state law definition of a significant historic resource. It also meets the definition of a protected historic archaeological resource under state law (Chapter 27.53.30(9)). The Newcastle Segment would construct poles approximately 30 feet southwest and 300 feet northwest of the Newcastle Cemetery. If unmarked graves are discovered during Project construction, this would be a significant impact and if disturbance is unavoidable, an excavation permit from the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) would be required.

The Eastside Transmission System is recommended eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district. PSE will evaluate this resource during a historic property inventory and request an eligibility determination from DAHP. If determined eligible by DAHP, impacts to contributing elements would be significant if unable to be mitigated. Mitigation measures will be developed by PSE and DAHP that address significant features of the resource. In the experience of the EIS Consultant Team and PSE, retention of H-frame structures is not a typical mitigation measure.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any.

PSE is working with Newcastle to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place with respect to each potential historical and archaeological resource.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The proposed transmission line upgrade in Newcastle is located within the existing utility corridor. The existing utility corridor largely traverses what, in effect, becomes a green belt, but has road crossings at Newcastle Way, SE 73rd Pl, SE 80th Way, SE 84th St., 129th Ave SE, SE 86th Pl, and SE May Creek Park Dr. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic associated with the construction and maintenance of the upgraded transmission line will be minimally disrupted and in line with current conditions.

Vehicular access to pole replacement sites will be off of existing roads and will utilize existing or constructed temporary access roads. A traffic control plan will be implemented to minimize temporary vehicular traffic impacts during construction. Access to adjacent

land uses will be maintained. Trails along the Newcastle segment include the Waterline Trail, China Creek (proposed), Cross Town Trail, Olympus Trail, and May Creek Trail. Trail access will be limited in the vicinity of each set of poles during replacement during the pole installation period. Access may also be temporarily restricted when wires are strung as a safety precaution.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Not Applicable.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?**

None.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).**

No.

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

No.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal?**

None.

1. If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur: Not Applicable.
2. How many of these trips occur in the AM peak hours?
3. How many of these trips occur in the PM peak hours?

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:**

Mitigation of impacts to pedestrians during construction may include the following: avoiding construction during peak trail usage, providing alternative points of access and detours, 2-week advanced notification of temporary trail closures, and signage of temporary closures along trails or park entrances at least one week in advance of closures. Bicycle and pedestrian use of roads or sidewalks may be temporarily restricted while poles are replaced or wires strung along roads. During design, PSE has worked to locate poles near existing accessible routes to minimize impacts to traffic from Project construction. PSE will work to maintain access to roads and recreation sites while providing a safe working area for crews and the public. During individual pole replacements and wire stringing, the public may be temporarily inconvenienced by construction activities; however, impacts will be short in duration at each site and less-than-significant as concluded by Phase 2 DEIS at 4.6-2 and 4.6-13. Mitigation of potential impacts could include "maintenance of traffic" plans that identify traffic control and detours to maintain mobility and safety for vehicular and non-motorized travelers and maintain access to properties (Phase 1 DEIS at 1-44).

15. Public Services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

No. See Phase I DEIS at 15-9—15-10; 15-15—15-19 (concluding impacts, if any, would be minor).

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

As no impacts were identified, PSE does not propose any mitigation related to public services at this time.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:

electricity natural gas refuse service water telephone
 sanitary sewer septic system other _____

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Project is an electrical transmission line replacement and upgrade.

C. Signature

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature:  for PSE
Name of signee Brad Strauch
Position and Agency/Organization Program Manager / PSE
Date Submitted: Nov. 9, 2017