

Hazardous Materials

KEY FINDINGS

- Primarily petroleum products, solvents, and heavy metals expected to be encountered during excavations required for substation, transmission line and distribution system
- Contamination would be remediated to meet cleanup standards, leaving sites cleaner than existing conditions
- Best management practices would be employed to prevent, contain and clean up any spills or releases during construction (petroleum, paint, asphalt tack) and operations (petroleum, paint, pesticides, batteries)
- TL 1 would pass by two to three times as many historical gas stations as the other two alternative routes, posing the highest potential risk for encountering contamination
- Broad Street Substation Inductor Option 2 would pose a higher risk than Option 1 for managing complex contamination associated with a historical dry cleaner site and a service station
- No significant impacts to environmental health from hazardous materials anticipated

Water Resources

KEY FINDINGS

- Construction could allow sediment and runoff contaminants to enter sewer or drainage system
- Erosion and sediment controls and pollution prevention measures would minimize effects on runoff downstream
- Dewatering could increase flows in the sewer system that could lead to temporary reductions in system capacity. King County and Seattle Public Utilities would need to pre-approve these types of discharges.
- Contaminated groundwater encountered would be treated before discharge
- Once built, substation site runoff would be comparable or better than existing and would be released at lesser peak flow rates
- Inductor site improvements would not change the quality or quantity of site runoff
- No operational effects on water resources from transmission line and distribution system
- No significant impacts to water resources anticipated



Utilities

KEY FINDINGS

- All substation alternatives would require utility relocations and create challenges for future utility maintenance work
- All project components would require close coordination with service providers to minimize interruptions during construction
- No Action Alternative could result in significantly reduced reliability of electrical service due to excessive loads
- No significant impacts anticipated

Energy & Natural Resources

KEY FINDINGS

- Construction would consume fuel in amounts not considered a significant impact
- Of the substation alternatives, SA 1 would consume most fuel due to below-grade construction
- Of the three transmission line alternatives, TL 1 would consume most fuel due to length
- Substation operation would require small amounts of fuel for backup generator and electricity to power air handling, water pumping, lighting, elevator and HVAC
- Operation of SA 1 would require twice the amount of energy as SA 2 and SA 3
- No Action Alternative would require less fuel
- No significant impacts to energy and natural resources anticipated

Air Quality & GHG

KEY FINDINGS

- Construction would generate minor pollutant emissions below EPA thresholds
- Operational emissions would also generate minor pollutant emissions below EPA thresholds
- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction would be minimal, peaking in 2016 during construction of substation and distribution system
- Once operational, GHG emissions would be below State reporting threshold of 10,000 metric tons per year and would be offset by Seattle City Light
- No significant impacts related to air quality or GHG emissions are anticipated

