

Comments by James Adcock on the Response to the request from CENSE by Puget Sound Energy re  
Docket: UE-180607

Docket number of this proceeding: UE-180607

Commenting party's name: James Adcock, Electrical Engineer

The title and date of the comment or comments:

Comments by James Adcock on the Response to the request from CENSE by Puget Sound Energy  
8/23/2019

James Adcock  
5005 155th PL SE  
Bellevue WA 98006  
jimad@msn.com

I am a member of what PSE now calls "TAG" but previously called the "IRP" process. I have been so for about the last 10 years.

I am not a member of CENSE. I live in Eastgate -- South Bellevue -- about one mile away from the Energize Eastside project.

I am an Electrical Engineer, MIT.

I have been actively involved in the "public" process for Energize Eastside.

I agree in part, and disagree in part with CENSE's statements about Energize Eastside.

I also agree in part, and disagree in part with the recent letter from PSE/Steve Seerist.

Energize Eastside profoundly impacts two of our most beautiful neighborhoods in Bellevue -- Somerset and Bridle Trails -- and PSE has completely failed to recognize this reality.

Here I will "push back" on the contents of this PSE/Steve Seerist letter, which I feel is generally unfair, and written in a tone which is unproductive to both the "TAG" and "IRP" process.

I have been, and continue to be, greatly disturbed by PSE's actions in general re Energize Eastside, and also by City of Bellevue's actions in "reviewing" this project.

I will not here attempt to repeat all of my knowledge, and attempted involvement in these "public" processes, but rather will only mention a few "highlights" [lowlights?]

\* PSE's initial "Linear Routing Study" which picked the routes was fundamentally flawed, in that it used criteria that could not be met -- and which PSE then manually "opened a channel" for their preferred route by pretending that houses which are too close to the power lines are farther away than they really are.

\* When I tried to speak publicly at public meetings PSE's "moderator" repeatedly prevented my opportunity to speak -- heavy handedly even in comparison to PSE's actions at TAG/IRP meetings.

\* When I tried to review the ColumbiaGrid documents related to Energize Eastside (to inform my participation in IRP/TAG) PSE blocked my access to these documents.

\* Those ColumbiaGrid documents which I could review showed that Energize Eastside \*was not\* considered a necessary project by a "jury of PSE's peers" -- namely PSE's peer utility members of ColumbiaGrid. Rather it was priority about #50. But those peer utilities indicated that they would be happy to "free load" off of Energize Eastside if PSE was going to build it anyway.

\* For at least the last couple IRP cycles I have pointed out to PSE that "Transmission is a Resource" and needs to be included in the IRP planning process. PSE always refused to do so, presumably because they knew that they were planning to do the Energize Eastside project in future years. I will acknowledge that Mr. Popoff did recently find a BPA transmission line "Transmission as a Resource" opportunity -- which is exactly the kind of action which should \*routinely\* be examined as part of TAG/IRP planning. Unlike other resources, Transmission Lines cannot "generically" be discussed in an TAG/IRP setting, since Transmission Lines only have any meaning in the context of a "Line from Point A to Point B" -- such a [hypothetical] TAG/IRP discussion needn't get into the exact details of routing or pole design -- but may get into general discussions of environmental impacts, such as "Hey, Isn't building a major transmission line through the middle of a known Washington State Scenic Area a really bad idea?]

\* One set of Energize Eastside poles are basically planted right on top of the major East/West earthquake fault line -- a concern especially given that Energize Eastside is being built on top of a major fuel pipeline.

\* PSE hid the fact that they were planning to condemn and destroy two houses on the route, until I forced them to reveal this fact.

\* PSE in a written presentation to King County Council stated that this is a "Regional Transmission Project" but then when CENSE took them to FERC court swore instead that "No no, this is just a Local Transmission Project."

\* To overcome objections PSE claimed to switch to a "low and wide" transmission line layout through Somerset [similar to the existing line layout] but then as soon as they overcome that objection they just switch back to the more obtrusive "tall and narrow" layout.

\* PSE/City of Bellevue "gaming" of the EIS public comment time periods, requiring public comment prior to close of PSE changes.

\* The City of Bellevue's "Independent Consultant Review" documents do not appear to me to have in fact been conducted independent of PSE involvement.

\* Etc.

James Adcock

jimad@msn.com