

**Bavarian Substation
Public Comment
Last updated: 10/2/17**

Transmission		
Adam DiPetrillo	As a property owner, I ask the PUD and County Administrators to balance the need for infrastructure development with the duty of maintaining the beauty of our natural surroundings. Please route transmission & distribution lines along existing routes along the train tracks or Highway 2. If routing cannot following existing routes, please bury the cables to ensure that the natural beauty of our community is not lost. Thank you.	8/1/2017
Holly Roberts	Thank you for allowing us to correspond by letter. We would like to voice our concerns in person, but are traveling on the East Coast at this time. We are property owners on Fox Road in Leavenworth. We have served in the Armed Forces all over the world, but the place we have always desired to settle is Leavenworth. We plan for our children to complete their middle and high school education in the Cascade School District. Having grown up in the valley, Holly knows the value of raising children in a strong, vibrant community in a land of natural beauty. As a physical therapist and cyber security expert, we also feel we will have a lot to offer our chosen, permanent community. The placement of transmission lines across Fox Road may greatly impact our view and our property value. Most importantly, it will impact our quality of life. This is the view we treasure. It is the view we dream about as we finish our last four years in the military and we intend for this to be our "forever home". Our dream does not include looking out onto transmission power lines. We purchased our property in 2012 in good faith that our view and the surrounding landscape would only change as individuals developed the property around us, not with the addition of large transmission poles and power lines. We urge you to reconsider the location of the power transmission line across Stevens Canyon. If the project continues, our recommendation is to consider plans with less of an aesthetic impact on the valley such as installing a less visible substation on the west end of town using existing cable infrastructure or use existing cable corridors along Highway 2. As property owners, we would be willing to pay higher property taxes in order to support infrastructure that preserves and maintains the unique beauty of the Wenatchee Valley. Our concern is not only for ourselves, but for our neighbors and for the surrounding community.	8/1/2017
Holly Roberts	I am sending a separate email with my public comment. I would like to receive email updates on the Bavarian Substation project. Thank you.	8/1/2017
Steve Stroud	Thank you for the informative meeting at the Leavenworth PUD office last evening in regards to the substation and transmission lines. I live at 10587 Fox road, exactly 1/2 mile up Fox road from North road. Of the 3 potential routes for the power lines, I am strongly in favor of Alt 3 (Old RR Grade Route). From what I could gather at last night's meeting, this route would have the least impact on the fewest number of residents that live in the Fox road area. Alt 2 (Cemetery Road Route) is the most detrimental to my property, not only in terms of slicing the stellar view I have of the Enchantments, but adversely affecting my property value and quality of life. This would also be true for a dozen of so of my neighbors. It also appears to be the longest of the 3 proposals, which I understand may also mean it is the most expensive. Alt 1 (Fox Road Route) also adversely impacts the neighborhood as it places the power lines significantly close to and in front of numerous homes. Fox road is a quiet friendly neighborhood cherished for its rural setting, its close proximity to town, and its spectacular views. I hope the PUD will fully consider the detrimental impact that Alt 1 and 2 would have on our neighborhood and do what it can to run the power lines through Alt 3 (Old RR Grade Route)	8/3/2017
Katy & Gary Kriewald	Thank you for your time and consideration. I spoke with you at the substation meeting Aug. 2, about the placement of existing and future power poles along our property. The lines border the NW portion of our property which is hillside property, ID #30192 and #30114. It also appears that res. T2/A12 and T2/A11 follow the same path. Gary and I ask that you consider moving the existing poles, and any future lines back to the other side of the North Road. Our most urgent concern is fire danger. The North Road used to provide a fire break from events caused by the power lines. The county has a 90' ROW from the center line, up a steep, heavily wooded hill adjacent to our property. A fire would destroy ALL of our property and our home. Another factor is the plan to place a sidewalk where the poles were placed. Right now those wires are the view from my kitchen window and lines 10' higher would be my view from the living room. Thanks for your time, I'm tied up today, but available for contact by phone, email, etc., after that.	8/3/2017
Ron & Kay Larson	Ron spoke with Teka Sellers on Monday, August 14. Teka explained the Transmission (T1) line as well as the Transmission (T2) alternatives. Ron's preference of the three alternatives: Alt 2 is first preference, Alt 3 is second preference, and Alt 1 is least preferred.	8/1/2017
Mauvy & Shannon Hafemann	As Leavenworth residents hoping to eventually build on a lot purchased on Arrowleaf Lane, we would like to comment on the several routes proposed for the new substation transmission lines. We request that the southernmost path be utilized, for the following reasons: 1) The northernmost and the middle alternatives would both have a substantial visual impact upon the numerous current and future residences to the north, northeast, or east of these lines. These properties all derive a substantial amount of value and appeal from their currently unobstructed views across native greenery and towards the mountains to the south/southwest. High-voltage lines through this area would have a significant negative impact on their value. (From the county's perspective, we may also point out this could have a negative effect on property tax revenues.) 2) The northernmost alternative would eventually run high across the hillside and therefore be at greater risk from fire. We have already seen one close to this location, just across Stevens Canyon. This route would also significantly affect the view and value of the several lots on Arrowleaf Lane. 3) The southernmost is the shortest route (and therefore the least expensive). It also parallels an existing route, resulting in the least environmental impact both in terms of scenic and land-use costs. It would appear to make the most aesthetic and economic sense. For the reasons listed above we respectfully request that Chelan County PUD prioritize the southernmost alternative as the chosen route for its new transmission line.	9/6/2017
Anonymous	Property owner is in favor of Alt. 2. Feels it would be the least impactful to the area as a whole. Mentioned that stakeholders don't understand that Alt. 3 will create an "industrial look" to the area by adding an additional transmission line with a separate set of poles.	9/12/2017
Ken Larson	Shared by phone conversation with James Caldwell, PUD Transmission Department.	9/21/2017
Ted Butler	I was just going over the Sept. 6 meeting notes and agree with the majority that Alt 3, followed by Alt 2, would be most preferable. Alt 1 would have the most visual impact for our property on Fox Rd. Thanks I think that I am frustrated with the decision making process to choose the routing of the transmission lines to Leavenworth. 1. Is there a real need for this additional substation? We have lived here 17 years and have experienced one hour blackout and numerous momentary blackouts. 2. If the PUD commissioners are really interested in public input, why aren't they attending these meetings? 3. The commissioners are elected so they probably have little knowledge of power needs. Are they the best decision makers? Are their decisions based on professional analysis and advice, or to satisfy some political agenda? For example: in our current situation, it is apparent to me that Route 3 is the overwhelming favorite choice. This alternative is feasible, cheaper, less impact on current residents, and is preferred by the vast majority of the current residents. If say, for instance, some influential developer had his eye on some property that would be impacted by alternative 3, he could influence the board to choose a different route. Then the decision is purely political. I'm sure there is nothing you or I can do to improve the decision making process, but if alternate 3 is not chosen, then the political influences have won and these meetings have been a waste of time.	9/24/2017
Sheila Harris & Alan Chilcoat	I am writing to voice my preference for the location of the powerlines for the new Leavenworth substation. My neighbors brought by a map with Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. We have been gone during the neighborhood meetings. I strongly prefer Alternative 3. My house is on Fox Rd and could potentially have the new lines run directly across my view to the south. A major reason we purchased here is due to the fabulous view. The powerlines that exist are already an eyesore for many in Stephens Canyon and Fox Road. Alternatives 1 and 2 would directly impact all of our views. I believe either could impact our property values. This is such a beautiful valley and it makes a lot more sense to keep the lines minimized along the side of the valley and in the lowlands near the river. In addition, the map shows that Alternative 3 is also the most cost effective. It has fewer homeowners impacted and, therefore, a larger population of happier customers. Thank you for keeping this open for discussion.	9/25/2017
Sarah Rosselet & Chris Allen	As residents at Fox Hollow Road in Leavenworth we would like to make our preference known regarding the potential route change from existing transmission lines to the new Leavenworth substation. We requested that Alternate 3 (the southernmost path) be utilized for the following reasons: 1. The Alternate 1 (Fox Hollow) and Alternate 2 (northernmost) both have substantial visual impact on the numerous current and future residents to the north, northeast, and east of these lines. Many of these properties derive a substantial amount of value and appeal from their currently unobstructed or minimally obstructed views across native greenery and towards the mountains to the south/south east. High-voltage lines through this area would have a significant negative impact on the homes and property values. From the county's perspective we may also point out that this would have a negative effect on property tax revenues. 2. The Alternate 2 (northernmost) is proposed to run high across the hillside and therefore have a greater risk from fire. As you may know a short on the existing transmission lines in this area likely started the recent Stevens Canyon fire that threatened many homes and additional lines would result in increased fire risk to the homes in this neighborhood. 3. Although the PUD dismisses any health concerns regarding high voltage transmission lines in close proximity to residences, scientific studies have been "inconclusive" at best. We have been told by PUD engineers that living under a high voltage powerline is "like standing in front of a microwave." To this, we ask you: would you stand in front of a running microwave oven 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? Would you have your children stand in front of a running microwave oven for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? 4. The Alternate 3 (southernmost route) is the shortest route and the least expensive. It follows the existing transmission lines and then parallels the secondary route. It remains on existing utility easements and property owned by the utilities resulting in the least impact environmentally, aesthetically, and financially. It makes the most sense. For the reasons listed above we respectfully and strongly request that Chelan County PUD prioritize Alternate 3 (southernmost) as the preferred route for its updated transmission line to the new substation in Leavenworth.	9/26/2017
34 PUD Customers Sent by Angela & Kyle Kellev (10541 Fox Road)	Attached is a copy of the petition circulated through the Fox Road neighborhood supporting the Old RR Grade Route (T2, Alt3) as the most reasonable plan for transmission lines serving the new Bavarian Substation. The consensus of the residents signing stated the following reasons: 1. Alternative 3 is the least costly. 2. Alternative 3 affects the least amount of current residential properties. 3. Alternative 3 requires the least Right of Way purchase using more existing transmission lines. Please present this to the PUD Commission. We are sending the original signatures to the PUD Commission via U.S. Mail today.	9/28/2017
Camilly & Josh Fletcher	I am a homeowner at 10460 Fox Road and I would like to express my concern about the Leavenworth Substation Transmission line route. I am voting to have the T2_Alt3 route passed. In my point of view, T2_Alt3 Route is the best route because avoids going over private ownership properties going over PUD and County property only. To have the power lines going over private ownership would devalue the properties and causing a loss of capitol for the homeowners.	10/2/2017

Public comments from Feb.-May 2017		
	Hi Teke, I will be unable to attend the meeting on the 13th but would like to get any additional information about Site 9 plans. As I have previously discussed with PUD staff I don't think our neighborhood should have another substation adjacent to our residential area. I understand that no one wants a substation as a neighbor; I get the NIMBY problem but we have already done "our share" of sacrifice for the PUD infrastructure. We don't need the additional light and noise, as well as the EM issues, not to mention potential property value impacts. In addition as PUD staff have noted it makes more sense from a power distribution system perspective to site the substation some distance from the existing facility in Area 9.	
Nick Ceto	I look forward to seeing updated details as they become available. Thanks	2/12/17
Tina Rieman	Site 9, the PUD Site, seems the most reasonable to me. But then we would not be affected by any of the sites.	2/13/17
	Highly recommend site 9 will not disrupt lands/wetlands at 8a and 14	2/13/17
	Site 14 lousy location in wetland, housing too important	2/13/17
	Site 8a concerned about location existing/aesthetic housing impact	2/13/17
	Site 8a best for future development, better to have a second site developed	2/13/17
	Site 14 best for future development, best for a second development site	2/13/17
Margaret Neighbors	Aside from the water issues this seems like the best choice	2/13/17
Ken Pittrof	Site 14 (Pro)	2/13/17
Cheri Farivar	I really like site 14 - MEND site. 1) willing seller - no condemnation 2) level site 3) Immediate access for building 4) Good location for redundancy.	2/13/17
	I attended your meeting in Leavenworth this evening concerning proposed locations for a new substation station site in the Leavenworth area. After listening to the discussion and reviewing my notes, I recommend that you choose site 8a for your sub station. I base my recommendation on the following considerations: a. Duplication transmission lines by different routes. Most important. b. Sufficient area for expansion and room for an additional power station. c. Located on higher ground. d. The are should be easily concealed by growing a screen of trees.	
David Klingner	I consider the higher price a con which should be acceptable in the view of the other advantages. Thank you for giving the citizens of Leavenworth an opportunity to express an opinion in this matter.	2/13/17
	To Whom It May Concern, I'm writing about the Leavenworth substation. I appreciate your efforts to solicit feedback. I attended the 2/13 meeting. It was the first time I participated, largely because Shaun reached out to me personally which I appreciate. I was discouraged from earlier participation because I received the impression that the members of "task force" if that's the right term were identified and invited to join the team early on, and I was not asked. My experience with public involvement in Leavenworth when there is small handpicked group like that has not been positive. But I may have been misinformed about the way people joined your group. So please accept my apologies if I am asking you to retrace some ground. Based upon what I heard at the 2/13 meeting I believe there are important reasons to do so right away. 1. Because the total costs for all 3 sites are within 10% of each other. At this stage in a planning process the bottom line price difference is insignificant. We could have spent more time on more important details I'll go into below. 2. What about the price of buying the land in locations you don't already own? As explained at the meeting in response to my question, the task force said not to consider that area because it was zoned for light industry. Apparently the hypothetical possibility of jobs someday, somehow made it fall off the list. A quick skim of the Co Assessor's website shows upstream industrially-zoned parcels in that area. The Co gravel pit is not the only place out there where the dream-of industry could set up shop. In the nearly 15 years I've lived here there's been very little activity in that general area anyway, and according to the City Council member with whom I spoke after the meeting there is no proposal pending. So, the task force seems to be going by what-ifs and that's where you landed? While I appreciate their efforts, please go back to the drawing board on this one. This is no way to drop a large site where a substation could be well hidden especially when you seem to be running out of options. 3. The matrix with pros and cons was not as helpful as I'm sure it was intended. For example, on one hand site 8a earned two cons for earthwork, even though during Q&A you said they were not show stoppers, and yet site 14 portions of which are sopping wet for part of every year didn't earn any cons, about which you said during Q&A you could work around. These challenges should be rated as roughly equivalent. Sites 8a and 14 somehow earned a "neutral" for site visibility and future housing development? They are both clearly "con". In general, a matrix at a public meeting could be a good idea but it needs to be very carefully evaluated beforehand otherwise it makes your decision process even more complicated and encourages skepticism about its even-handedness. 4. Site 10 was not on your short list which I respectfully suggest indicates a major problem. As explained at the meeting in response to my question, the task force said not to consider that area because it was zoned for light industry. Apparently the hypothetical possibility of jobs someday, somehow made it fall off the list. A quick skim of the Co Assessor's website shows upstream industrially-zoned parcels in that area. The Co gravel pit is not the only place out there where the dream-of industry could set up shop. In the nearly 15 years I've lived here there's been very little activity in that general area anyway, and according to the City Council member with whom I spoke after the meeting there is no proposal pending. So, the task force seems to be going by what-ifs and that's where you landed? While I appreciate their efforts, please go back to the drawing board on this one. This is no way to drop a large site where a substation could be well hidden especially when you seem to be running out of options. 5. The photo of the site in Winatche should not have been shown all by itself. To have a frank discussion about aesthetics, multiple angles, distances, etc. must be used and other locations must be shown. There should never be anyone who says the words "substation" and "pretty" in the same sentence, as happened at the meeting. Maybe because of photos like that one? Yes a fence a few trees that won't interfere with your wires should be planted. But let's agree to say it's never going to look remotely pretty and let's show lots of pictures of all the best substations we can find to prove this point. That will help us put things in true perspective. 6. There's been a great deal of attention in Leavenworth about the lack of affordable housing and for good reason. Taking up an acre at site 14, which was until recently slated for more mixed-income housing and it seems reasonable to conclude it will again someday reasonably soon (at least it's more likely in the foreseeable future than the factory at site 10, right?), should be getting a lot more attention in your discussions. Aldea Village, Alpine Heights, and other nearby examples have 10, 20, or more housing units in areas of similar size. Furthermore the loss of an acre is not full the extent of the hit to potential housing if you proceed here because it would likely reduce the value of the surrounding land and discourage more building in a bigger area, at least anytime soon. 7. Site 9a as presented is clearly not viable for technical reasons but that it partly because you crammed it next to the existing facility. The Site 9 circle and the nearby site 11 circle give you more room to compensate for the problems at 9a. And CPUD already owns the land which was not mentioned until I brought it up. 8. Site 11 includes the 11 acres at your office owned by CPUD including the gentle hill to the N which extends to Site 9. If hilly Site 8a is viable, then so is this area. Plus it'd be well hidden from view, and seems unlikely to become home sites, factories, etc. Please add Site 11 to your short list. I think your decision really boils down to this: • Is the site technically viable? • Is it reasonably cost effective? • What else is likely to be done with that land reasonably soon? • Is it an eyesore?	
David Morgan	And I think the community would support you if you chose a site based on these criteria.	2/17/17
John Agnew & Patti Hubert	Per Shaun Seaman: I met with John Agnew and Patti Hubert about the Bavarian Substation last Sunday. I provided them with an overview of the process and the three sites. We spent most of our time discussing Sites 14 and 8a. Their concerns and questions were from a perspective of having been a part of the Meadowlark project and now as a land owner. They wanted to know about transmission and distribution lines, noise, lighting and visual impacts. They were not too concerned about loss of building sites, but did think that Site 14 needed to be set on the land in a way that it is in the corner of the property. If it was Site 8A visual mitigation would be important.	2/19/17
Adam Pfeleger	I am for the new substation at site 14, for several reasons. One it helps out upper valley mend sell some of its property, the best organization we have for our community, whose support is needed from the PUD. Secondly if collaborated, that area could have a through road, which is much needed, and ideally a park or open space. All the other sites don't have the potential to support our community in such a positive way, which is a nice twist for a substation installation. Thanks	2/23/17
Anne Hessburg	As a Leavenworth resident, Planning Commissioner, and Residential Advisory Committee member, thank you for all the time and attention you have taken to reach out to our community and listen to our responses. I have experienced it first hand on several occasions. I know this is a complex process and I appreciate your willingness to work with our community to find the best location for this new substation. If I remember correctly, one of the three final location options was along Chumstick Highway on City owned property adjacent to the MEND/Agnew property. I believe this to be a better location for the substation than option 14 near Titus Road. With future plans for residential lot development on the MEND property, a substation would be less than aesthetically pleasing near the entrance to a new development, likely will reduce property values, and may make it more difficult for the lots to sell. Alternatively, the location along Chumstick Highway is already near existing industrial zoning and development and would fit with the current land uses far better. Please reconsider this location. Thank you for your time.	3/30/17
David Morgan	Good move. Chumstick site appears superior to me.	5/12/17
	My wife and I own a piece of property across the Chumstick Highway from the piece you recently purchased as a possible site for the new substation in Leavenworth. I believe it is known as the Fishburn site. Our property lies between the Chumstick and the MEND property on the west. We purchased our property for the sole purpose of supporting MEND in the development of affordable housing - one of the most critical needs in the Upper Valley. We actually donated land to the city to build the sewer lift station, and the trail along Chumstick Highway. The city used the savings from our donations to purchase the Duncan property to the south of ours. We understand the need for a new substation and are not opposed to the location you are exploring on the west side of the MEND property. Choosing that site would serve several major community goals and preserve the chance that Upper Valley MEND could still provide some sorely needed housing on the remainder of their property. If you choose to build on the Fishburn site you may save some money in the short term, but we do not think it will be the best decision for you or the community in the long run for several reasons: - The MEND sight is in a much less intrusive location. Very few present or future home sites are impacted negatively. - It should be part of the mission of the PUD to exploit synergies in the communities served. In this case, building on the MEND site supports several important infrastructure needs at the same time as serving PUD needs - In our personal view the Fishburn site significantly degrades the value of our property in several ways. While we were willing to grant the city the gifts we did to support affordable housing, we will not accept the degradation of value we anticipate if you build the substation on the Fishburn site. We hope you will take all of these factors under consideration and make the decision to acquire the MEND site and thus significantly advance your goals as well as those of the people who live and work in the Upper Valley. Finally, we would like to be informed in advance of any meetings of the Commissioners wherein the Leavenworth substation will be discussed. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.	
John Agnew & Patti Hubert	I'm getting in touch today regarding the PUD's upcoming decision between possible locations for a new substation in Leavenworth. I'd like to express my support for the PUD to choose one of the following two options: Build the substation on site 14 (Upper Valley MEND's property) Build the substation on the Chumstick property (Fishburn property) and install any current or future utilities between Titus Road and Chumstick Highway during substation construction. Regardless of which site is chosen, I ask that any current or future underground utilities that need to be installed between Titus Road and Chumstick Highway be installed during substation construction, instead of waiting until a later date. This would allow other parties to participate in the utility ditch through the property, thus allowing for progress to be made toward road and infrastructure connection between Titus and Chumstick. This infrastructure and road connection would provide significant community benefit in regards to traffic, safety and multi-family housing development. The Chelan County PUD touts itself as a valuable community partner that considers the whole community in their approach to utility work. It is my hope that in considering locations for the future substation, the PUD will take the opportunity to be seen as a community partner and to provide utility infrastructure up front that will benefit the entire Leavenworth community. In this, the PUD would be living up to their stated value of trustworthiness, resulting in actions that promote community respect for the PUD. Thank you for taking the time to consider these requests. We look forward to working with you in the upcoming months as partners.	5/18/17
Kaylin Bettinger - Executive Director, Upper Valley MEND		5/25/17
Debra & Jake West	Would like to encourage the selection of the Chumstick Site for the substation. All of the factors - cost, convenience and less impact to the public - would indicate that is the logical site. Please base your decision on what is best for the citizens of Leavenworth and not a particular private interest group i.e. MEND.	5/25/17

Public comments from Sept.-Nov. 2016		
Roy Schiferl	After receiving my info in the mail about the 3 proposed sites for the Leavenworth substation, I would be opposed to Area 8a. The other 2 sites are fine.---Thank You for allowing input	9/27/16
Cathryn Lockwood	Teka summarized comments provided via phone - asked Cathryn to edit summary via email <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second paragraph of the letter is misleading as it relates to the three site options. We mention in this paragraph that a "new substation" is needed and then we say that one option is to add an additional transformer to the already existing double-banked substation on PUD property and for that reason the paragraph is misleading. The existing double-bank substation serving this area is nearing capacity. A new substation is needed in order to redistribute existing electrical load and to anticipate further growth during the next decade. It is a prejudicial statement for the PUD to say "the new substation is needed to redistribute existing electrical load" Area 9 is most cost-effective for the PUD because no land would need to be purchased and a new substation footprint would not be necessary The PUD did not plan property for the need for a new substation and therefore the PUD customer-owners will be required to absorb the cost for the current planning process Transmission and distribution routes ("plans") -- overhead and underground -- related to area 3 (west end of town) PUD needs to be careful when investigating privately owned property as there is financial gain by private property owners willing to sell for the purpose of siting a substation, whereas building on public property would preclude the financial gain of a private property owner Feel the PUD has "already made up its mind" regarding the placement of the substation according to the letter Feel strongly about placement of the substation in area 9 <p>Hi Teka my name is Niki McMahon my husband Dennis McMahon and I own the Heidleburger Drive In in Leavenworth. We are very concerned about the new substation placement down next to the Heidleburger. We just feel it would not be a great for our business at all to be right next to a substation. I totally understand trying to find a spot in Leavenworth is hard to find being the property is hard to get. But being right on the highway frontage doesn't seem like a great spot for this. Being off the highway hidden somewhere seems like the best spot. We appreciate you informing us on the locations that you are thinking about. We are so hoping you will not put this next to our business. Thanks for your consideration.</p>	9/27/16
Niki & Dennis McMahon Heidleburger Drive In		9/26/16
Nick Ceto	Nick called Teka on 9/20/16 after receiving a Constant Contact email update. He was concerned about a "new" substation to be built near the Alpensee Strasse neighborhood. The email made it sound like private property in area 9 would be evaluated. Teka informed Nick that area 9 was to include the analysis of adding a third transformer to the existing substation footprint. Teka used Nick's input to edit the letter that would go out to all neighbors in the vicinity of the three sites. Nick forwarded the information via email to his neighbors and suggested they become members of the email distribution list.	9/20/16
No name or contact information provided	Putting a substation at one highway entrance to a tourist supported town (site 3) seems short-sighted (regardless of how well the substation is screened). That parcel of land could be used to further enhance the resident and guest experience as they visit / travel through town.	9/16/16
Torey "Skeet" Couper	I appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the placement of the new substation in Leavenworth. I am a homeowner that owns the old Mill House at 247 West Commercial St. I do not live in Leavenworth full time, but I have a full-time tenant who does. While our home is not near the top 3 sites under consideration, I would urge staying within the existing substation location, the third option (Area 9). I feel that property within Leavenworth (both private and public) is a scarce resource, and when possible should be allocated to best leverage its impact in enhancing and enriching the community by furthering the reputation of Leavenworth as both a destination for relaxation and fun, and as a first-rate place to live full-time. While I understand that energy infrastructure is also a necessity, in my view the top priority of unused space should be community and commercial related--housing, commercial space, hospitality, vacation property, parks, green spaces, botanical gardens, community centers and tourism related space--restrooms, bike paths, curbs, trails, streetlamps, bike racks, art installations. Similar to our codes which mandate a Bavarian themed atmosphere, and limit sprawl-like signage, the visual impact of any new structure needs to be carefully considered--yet in this case, we have the option of not building new at all, and minimizing the footprint of our infrastructure to remain within an area where it's impact has already been long established and expected. While I have no doubt that the substation design would be attractive and relatively low impact visually, I believe it's best to stay within the existing location for this new addition, and preserve unused space for future structures or open spaces which serve our town in the above-mentioned ways. I thank you for your time.	9/28/16
Jennifer Gillespie	I write as a concerned Alpensee Strasse resident. My family and many of my neighbors are not happy with the thought of another substation going in so close to a residential area. We hope that you will seriously consider placing it further away from residential areas. The health risks of adding another one to Alpensee area really worries me, not to mention the decrease in property value. Thank you for taking this into consideration.	9/30/16
David Gee & Julie Kawakami	I am responding to a letter I received dated September 22 from Chelan PUD regarding input from property owners in the immediate vicinity of the three sites being used for further analysis. We own a condominium located in the Icicle Village Resort complex. As a property owner near 'Area 3' (property near the Heidleburger Drive-In), I think this site is the least desirable of the three sites under consideration. This site is located in the gateway to Leavenworth for all drivers heading into the town from the Puget Sound region. The sight of a electrical power substation would not be attractive first view of a town so dependent upon tourism. While I believe that the current properties on the north side of highway 2 are unattractive, they all seem to be properties that can later be developed into more attractive properties. The construction of an electrical power substation would be permanent and forever scar the entrance into Leavenworth. The other two identified potential sites would largely be invisible to tourists visiting Leavenworth as well as those entering the town from the east. In my opinion, Area 3 is the least desirable of your three sites. Thank you for allowing me to comment on this important project.	10/1/16
Chris Clark	I want to give my input on the need for additional substation in Leavenworth. I can't think of a reason to put it anywhere other than the existing substation which, apparently, has room for expansion. The other locations would be an eyesore, expensive to buy more real estate and unnecessary. Thanks for listening!	10/2/16
Heidi Bard	I am writing to give my feedback on the proposed substations in Leavenworth. I strongly urge the PUD to build the substation at the existing station. As property owners, we specifically chose to buy property away from the substation since we do not like the aesthetics of a power line and I do not want my children to live close to large powerlines. We purposely did not buy property on Alpensee Str, even though we loved the location because of the substation. It is best for property owners to build at the existing station because those owners bought with the knowledge and view of a powerline, where other property owners do not. I also think that the Leavenworth town proper is a huge tourist draw and people love it for its views of the mountains. Tourists are constantly stopping along the highway 2 corridor to take scenery pictures and a powerline would severely affect that beauty and views of the town.	10/4/16
William & Stephanie Hedrick	We are unable to attend the November 2nd community meeting and public comment opportunity, so please accept this as our public comment on the proposed PUD substation site. We are residents of the Boulder Condominiums on 1509 Alpensee Strasse, which borders the PUD property which encompasses proposed sites 9 & 10. The PUD property containing proposed substation sites 9 & 10 is completely bordered by our neighborhood on the southeast and northeast sides of the PUD property. Thus, we have significant concern about the potential negative impacts an additional substation could have on our properties. Our neighborhood is unique in the Leavenworth community in that it is isolated, quiet and visibly very appealing. It is the peacefulness and beauty of this neighborhood which has drawn most of its residents to live here. The development of a second substation on this PUD property threatens not just the aesthetics of our neighborhood, but also could potentially have a negative impact on our property values. In reviewing the current Site Selection Criteria Evaluation Matrix, we believe that with regard to the "Aesthetics and Neighborhood Values" section insufficient consideration has been given the likely impacts of proposed sites 9 & 10. The potential impact on our neighborhood should significantly drive down the ratings of this section and thus, would substantially affect Sites 9 & 10 as potential sites. Of the sites still under consideration, it appears that Leavenworth neighborhoods are most impacted by sites 9 & 10. On the face of the PUDs evaluation criteria, we believe that the objective grading of these two potential sites should be downgraded.	10/10/16
Becki Subido	Thank you for asking for our input related to the new Leavenworth Substation. I think it would be best to expand the existing Leavenworth station (same location) as it appears to offer the least footprint for the expansion.	10/13/16
Ron Gonsalves	My comments would be for the PUD to create a new separate location for the Leavenworth Substation expansion as this would provide for the best security for uninterrupted service if there was a failure of any sorts at a single location. If a second location was selected and developed for Leavenworth needed expansion this would allow power to continue to the residential community as well as create a better option for the fruit packing warehouses located in the Peshastin area if power needed to be rerouted to satisfy an unexpected outage. For the Leavenworth community to experience a major outage during the winter months the PUD customer base would be better serviced in the shortest time frame by having this second option to divert with multiple sub-stations within the Leavenworth distribution grid. Thank You Ron Gonsalves President, Blue Bird Inc Peshastin.	11/2/16
Niki & Dennis McMahon Heidleburger Drive In	Hi Teka, Dennis and I were at the meeting last night we are thankful you are keeping us informed on the planning of this substation. We are the owners of the Heidleburger Drive In we are definitely worried about the substation going in next to us it looked like you guys were aiming it that way. I totally understand no one wants this next to them. The Alpensee Straus neighbors have known this is there neighbor for years this isn't anything new for them they new when they bought the property. I'm sure everybody wants it down behind the Heidleburger away from everyone. We would like to see it anywhere but there. We really feel this will lower our property value for the Heidleburger. We really hope you will reconsider this location. Thanks Niki & Dennis McMahon, Owners of the Heidleburger Drive In	11/3/16
Michael Cummings	I think the South substation by Heidleberger is the best option. This location is closest to the primary expansion of need in the Icicle Valley and is positioned the farthest from the existing facilities. The proposed location adjacent to the fire station and PUD buildings is the worst option, since there are already a heavy number of uses in this area, it is the site of an existing and proposed future expansion of trail from the Railway station to downtown, and it is directly adjacent to a residential subdivision. The proposed location at the base of Rattlesnake Mountain is also inferior, since it is adjacent to the proposed North Road, Chumstick Hwy, Titus Road connector roundabout and it would also be directly adjacent to the proposed new housing in the most recent expansion of the Leavenworth City Limits.	11/16/16
Jacob Ellis	Hello, my name is Jacob Ellis. I attended the November 2nd informational meeting about the substation addition in Leavenworth and wanted to share my comments about the options. First I would like to thank the PUD for their hard work at keeping the community informed of and involved in the process. There was more information presented than I thought there would be. Of the three possible sites listed at the meeting I believe the 8-a site would be the best one to locate the new substation at. This is due to the following reasons: 1 - the site is far enough away from town to not affect residents. 2 - the additional transmission lines would be minimal and in an area that would not adversely affect the mountain views of Leavenworth thus maintaining our town's precious resource. 3 - distribution lines from this location could be run underground to further reduce line clutter. 4 - this area is well-positioned for sharing loads both up the Chumstick and down the highway. Thank you again for keeping the public in the loop, and I look forward to hearing more as this project progresses. Have a nice day, Jacob	11/16/16