

# **MEETING NOTES**

## **PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1 OF CHELAN COUNTY**

### **Leavenworth (Bavarian) Substation Community Meeting & Project Update**

Leavenworth Fire Hall – November 2, 2016 – 6 - 6:50 pm

---

#### Attendees:

- Chelan County PUD Commissioners Bergren, Arsenault
- Chelan County PUD Staff: Chad Rissman, Shaun Seaman, Teka Sellers, Becky Jaspers, Gary Rice, John Stoll, Suzanne Hartman, Meaghan Connell
- Members of the Leavenworth substation community focus group include City staff and City Council
- Approximately 42 members of the public

Shaun Seaman opened the meeting at 6pm and provided an overview of the meeting purpose and desired outcomes:

- More community members informed about the process
- Additional input from the community
- Validated support for the process
- Support for the direction we are going
- Gather additional local knowledge of potential issues
- Other option(s) brought forward

Scott Bradshaw, member of the community focus group, presented on the need for the new substation.

- Thanked the PUD for involving the community in the new process
- The existing substations serving all of Leavenworth and parts of the Upper Valley is nearing capacity
- A new substation is needed in the next 3-5 years to support growth and development throughout Leavenworth and the Upper Valley areas
- The existing substation is “double-banked” meaning there are two transformers inside the same substation footprint
- All growth and development that has happened since 1986 has been served by the existing, double-banked substation
- PUD engineers identified the potential need for an additional substation in the Leavenworth area in 2013

Chad Rissman discussed the community partnership process

- Provided an overview of what a substation is – see “What is a Substation?” handout
- The PUD is responding to growth and development in the area
- The existing substations are at 85% capacity
- Explained the PUD is trying not to get ahead of the community in the decision making process
- Provided an overview of the community partnership process and site selection criteria and matrix
- Discussed the overall objective and provided a map with the identified three sites

Gary Rice and Chad Rissman presented on the consultants work

- If a substation were to be located in area 3, additional transmission would be required. The transmission renderings show an option for looped transmission, providing transmission redundancy. This is only an option and not a requirement. This option will be included in the consultant’s analysis.
- Chad discussed that a substation located in area 3 would serve the west end of the town and allow for the existing substation to pick up more load between Leavenworth and Peshastin/Dryden area.

## Questions from the public:

Q. What is the intent if the substation is at area #9?

A. The footprint may need to be changed but there would not be any transmission added.

Q. How would we expand the footprint at area #9? Blue Bird experiences the importance of redundancy.

A. There will be more information at the next phase to better know what this would look like, design variables, and what can be mitigated. This question further looks at the balances and issues the focus group is working on and all of the factors they are weighing through. Issues such as aesthetics and if the substation will be seen by the public along with landscaping that would be Firewise. Once a site is selected, all of these factors will be looked at.

Q. How many wires are on the lines in the rendering options? It looks less cluttered with underground distribution. Who bears the cost of burying the lines? Is it even possible to bury distribution lines?

A. There are various alternatives to providing transmission to area #3. Different rendering options were presented and are now on the website. The consultant's analysis will show the additional cost for the underground distribution option.

Note: A community member said that he worked at Grand Coulee and the underground lines did not work and had to be put above ground.

A community member felt he was told he did not need to join the focus group because the substation would not impact him. He stated he was appalled by the lack of outreach and felt the substation should be as far away from residential areas as possible. He noted that human health risks should be most important when considering where to put the substation.

There was a request to present renderings from different directions.

There was a request to include a line item cost for underground distribution leading out of the substation if overhead would normally be in place. The consultant will include this as a line item cost.

A community member commented that underground distribution is a benefit to the community.

A community member commented that power goes out a lot in Lake Wenatchee and there is quicker restoration with overhead distribution lines.

It was suggested by a community member that if the PUD would like more input they would need to provide more detail.

Susan Noland, member of the focus group said that she very much appreciates what the PUD has done throughout this process.

Shaun discussed next steps:

- The PUD heard public comment tonight and will take those into consideration when planning next steps. This meeting tonight was a step along the way
- The PUD will host another community meeting after the consultant has concluded their work
- The timeline will be updated and posted on the PUD's website