

North Shore Chelan Substation

Summary of public comments received

Summarized below are comments received from Aug. 9-Sept. 13, 2016, including the Aug. 24 community meeting. Full comments are available on our website at chelanpud.org/newchelansubstation. Last updated, 9/13/2016, 3:00pm.

Full video from the August 24 community meeting can be found here: <https://youtu.be/eXHFdXIGgoQ>. Comments were not transcribed; the video has been made part of the public record.

All public comments will be made available to Chelan County PUD Commissioners.

Summarized comment:

No. received:

The substation will: -have impact on the use and enjoyment of neighboring properties -cause undue hardship to neighboring property owners -decrease the quality of living and peacefulness -damage neighboring properties	IIII III (8)
The substation will devalue neighboring properties.	IIII III (8)
The Chelan County assessor will not agree the value of properties neighboring a substation will be less.	I
As a real estate professional, I can guarantee that every property affected by the location of a substation will be worth less in the eyes of every potential buyer from now into the distant future.	I
The substation will be seen and heard from neighboring properties.	IIII IIII II (12)
Design variables/mitigations are not sufficient.	IIII (4)
Health concerns about living near a substation.	II (2)
There is concern about the type of chemicals inside a substation and the routine maintenance associated with the substation.	II (2)
Wildlife in the area would be negatively impacted.	IIII II (7)
A substation should not be built in a residential area - a different area, not residential, should be considered.	IIII IIII IIII(14) 18 families
More growth is anticipated near area 14 and therefore the new substation should be located there.	III (3)
No one was representing area 9/10 on the community focus group and through the evaluation process.	IIII I (6) 18 families
Area 9/10 should not have been rated as high as it was through the evaluation process. The recommendation from the staff and community focus group has an inherent flaw.	IIII (4) 18 families
The narrowing process identifying area 9/10 creates a potential burden on the residents and is not a defensible process.	18 families
There appears to be a sever lack of due process and in spite of statements to the contrary, a lack of accountability to the neighbors of area 9/10 who have submitted written comment and made public statements opposing the location.	I
Area 7 would be equally, if not more, objectionable.	I
I was not made aware of this project earlier enough in the process.	IIII I (6)
The PUD needs to do a much better job of communicating and forewarning on such incredibly important matters.	I
Residents don't want to be treated as being too late in the process to participate.	I
The areas of most recent growth and development should be required to make space for a substation to serve those developments.	IIII (5)
People feel the substation is being built to support future growth.	I

Development should be slowed, if necessary, until PUD can adequately accommodate the needs of the new development without sacrificing the current property owners' enjoyment of their property or introducing any risk of property value reduction as a result.	I
Timeframes and deadlines can always be altered to assure that what is delivered and what is decided meets the needs and rights of all.	18 families
We have to take time to find other willing sellers in appropriate site that are in line with the criteria met by the South Shore, Wapato and Union Valley Substations.	18 families
It should not be an impossible task to find a piece of property, with a willing seller, that is appropriate for the placement of a substation.	I
The north shore of Chelan is a small part of a larger PUD-service territory and needs to be kept in mind when costs are discussed.	I
PUD Commissioners should be stewards of all rate-payers.	I
The PUD should bear the cost of putting the substation in a remote location.	II (2)
As a ratepayer, I/we would be willing to pay higher rates to site this substation in a less-residential area.	II
Convenience of neighbors should take priority over cost to the PUD. The cost comes from all rate-payers.	I
People bought property before the need for a substation versus people moving into an area where a substation already exists.	II (2)
Question the wisdom of the PUD's plan to continue spending ratepayer dollars to move forward with studying, analyzing and planning as if a site were going to be located on the Franzen Orchard property since the information the PUD gleans from this process can be applied to other sites in the future.	I
Information on the costs to run additional [distribution] lines from a substation located in, for example, area 14, is necessary to obtain as part of the complete and accurate analysis	I
Owner of the Franzen property feels a small piece of the 18 acre orchard could be situated in a manner that would allow for both a substation and the continued operation of the orchard, would not be seen by neighboring properties and would still allow for wildlife to use the area as they do now.	I
People don't think the substation will keep wildlife out of the area.	I
Do not oppose a substation on the Franzen property, do not feel it interferes with property, feel it is a logical location for a new substation. Feel the community should have an open mind as people in the area did so before current residents came to the area.	II (2)
Request to stop the evaluation of the Franzen property in area 9/10	III (3) 18 families
The majority of written and spoken input through the website Comment Form, emails and at the Aug. 24 th community meeting has been expressed concern and opposition to a site in area 9/10 and for good reason.	18 families
Hope the PUD listens to people and do not exercise their legal right to condemn property.	I
It is not acceptable to promote the financial well-being of one person while adversely affecting 17-20 of their neighbors whose properties will be subjected to the negative aspects of the proposed substation for many, many, many years to come	II (2)
Placing the substation on the Franzen property seems antithetical to Chelan County PUD's stated mission to provide sustainable, reliable utility services that enhance the quality of life in Chelan County.	I

Questions:

<p>What are the costs to move the substation farther away from area 9/10 - to area 13 or 14?</p>	<p>We won't know the answer until after the cost analysis is performed.</p>
<p>Why aren't the new developments in the area required to set aside space for a new substation?</p>	<p>From Q&A on the website: The last substation that was built in the Chelan – Manson area was in 1980. A lot of growth has occurred since then, including the developments identified. The Site Selection Criteria developed by the Chelan community focus group identifies PUD system considerations as well as neighborhood and aesthetic values. Proximity to the existing transmission lines is important for aesthetics and costs. These areas of new development were evaluated through the community partnership process and received a lower ranking on the Site Evaluation Matrix than the Top 3 Areas currently being evaluated. For example, one of the areas scored low on its proximity to existing transmission because it would require a new transmission line from the upper Boyd Road area down towards the lake, crossing the highway. The further away from the transmission line the more wire and infrastructure would have to be built and the associated costs would be higher.</p>
<p>Why would the PUD consider a substation in a residential area when there is property available in a less residential area?</p>	<p>From Q&A on the website: It is necessary to locate substations at or near the electrical demand. The substation will be located in the demand area whether it is serving residential, commercial or industrial. Substations convert the power system voltage from transmission levels to distribution levels so that it can be safely and efficiently delivered down our streets. If distance thresholds are exceeded, low voltage levels will result. The PUD currently has nine substations in the Wenatchee and Cashmere area that are immediately adjacent to residential neighborhoods. The PUD also has four substations in the Chelan area that are within 1,000 feet of residences. (Please see Wenatchee residential locations map)</p>
<p>How much opposition has been submitted to [the PUD] from residents in area 14?</p>	<p>To date, we haven't heard from residents in area 14 around the Chelan Heights parcel. PUD staff is currently reaching out directly to property owners in the vicinity of the Chelan Heights parcel to hear their comments and concerns, if any.</p>
<p>Why was area 8 taken off the table a year ago?</p>	<p>The piece of property that was originally investigated by the PUD was removed from the list of consideration shortly after a Purchase and Sale Agreement was made public. The PUD recognized that it had not done an adequate job of reaching out to the community. Since then, we have held three community meetings; sent three direct mail pieces to residents of Chelan and Manson; communicated on numerous occasions to the email list that was developed as a result of last year's misstep; and posted information with the Chelan Mirror, GoLakeChelan and been on KOZI radio numerous times. We have worked with our community focus group formed out of last year's discussion and we also have worked closely with the City of Chelan and the Chelan City Council. We have been open, candid and transparent in our process.</p>