

NOTES & ACTION ITEMS

Meeting No. 2 – January 12, 2016

North Shore Chelan Substation Community Focus Group

Attendees: Sue Crinklaw, Guy Evans, Fred Cleveland, Steve Firman, Tom Anglin, Craig Gildroy, Wendy Isenhart, John Dyer, Mike Cooney, John Stoll, Andy Wendell, Chad Rissman, Suzanne Hartman, Teka Parks, Gary Rice

1. Meeting Summary:

- Began the meeting with a roundtable discussion.
 - Some potential areas on the “bench” near Boyd Rd.
 - A member was familiar with utility corridors in Canada, where all utilities are placed in the same corridor
 - Members began talking to neighbors and some were unaware of the project and need for a substation
- Reviewed the focus group objective and the kick-off meeting
- Discussed work done by PUD and group members between kick-off meeting and now
- Discussed the proper timing for a community meeting to bring information forward
- Discussed the proper timing of performing outreach/engagement with customers and property owners in the areas where we are interested in property - after the narrowing process
- Suggested visiting possible site areas as well as existing substation(s)

2. Site Selection Criteria

- Accomplished an objective of meeting and major milestone = agreed on and finalized Site Selection Criteria
- Discussed how we should “weight” the criteria
- Reviewed the criteria by category and added criteria based on group input
 - Statutory Requirements – most agreed, added “Critical areas – wildlife corridors”. Craig mentioned that the City keeps track of critical areas, including wildlife corridors and would take this into consideration during the permitting process.
 - PUD standards – most agreed, added “up to” on the first bullet. There was discussion about the possibility of siting different size substations rather than the standard 28 MVA. Chad confirmed that noise mitigation is fairly standard around the country and the newest technology is available.
 - Site Variables – most of the discussion was surrounding this category. The focus group will have the most influence on this category. This category helps us answer the question, “Why do we value one site over another site?”. We added the following bullets:
 - Proximity to existing density – already existing homes/neighborhoods
 - View – how does it impact the view of neighboring property owners
 - Wildlife corridors – outside of what would be considered a “critical area”
 - Outreach to impacted customers/property owners – how and when would that discussion happen
 - Design variables – most agreed, added timing and impact of construction. The design variables will be applied to the identified sites, but most likely will not be applied in the narrowing process.

3. Possible site areas

- Accomplished a second objective of the meeting = review the list of possible site areas on the map and add any areas that focus group members suggested
- The PUD originally performed alternative analysis on 9 areas, PUD staff added an additional 5 based on input from the kick-off meeting for a total of 14
- Focus group members added an additional 4 for a total of 18 possible site areas
- We left the hard-copy map in the Chelan office for group members to reference and Teka will email a copy
- The PUD will email an updated map to focus group members

4. Applying Site Variable to possible site areas

- Accomplished a third objective of the meeting = determine the method/process for applying the site variables to the possible site areas
- The PUD has alternative analysis on 9 areas. We looked at this matrix as an example as well as a blank matrix.
- The group valued the work the PUD had completed in the alternative analysis and felt this was the most reasonable approach for the additional areas.
- The focus group members requested the PUD inform the group about the majority of the site variables such as proximity to transmission, ground slope, etc. It isn’t reasonable to expect the group members to know this type of information.
- The focus group has requested PUD staff to:
 - Update the rows on the matrix based on the finalized site selection criteria
 - Re-evaluate the scale that was used in the alternative analysis and determine a new scale
 - Discuss a way to “weight” the site variables as part of the analysis
 - Re-evaluate the 9 areas that were included in the alternative analysis based on the updated criteria
 - Evaluate the additional 9 areas that were added since the alternative analysis

- Email the completed evaluation matrix to the group for their review
- The group will review the matrix and at the next meeting and determine any changes that need to be made

5. Next steps and action items

- The next meeting will be scheduled in February. Teka will email a doodlepoll to determine the best date.
- This will add an additional meeting to the original schedule.
- PUD staff will update the map with additional areas and email to the group.
- PUD staff will update the evaluation matrix and complete for all 18 areas.
- The objectives of the next meeting:
 - Review and discuss the evaluation matrix as a group
 - Narrow the list of 18 areas
 - Possible field trip to visit areas and substations