

## **SECTION 6: INTRODUCTION**

### **21<sup>st</sup> Century Alternatives**

City of Bellevue land use codes require PSE to “describe the technologies best suited to mitigate impacts on the surrounding properties.”

Electrical demand forecasts do not indicate a need for additional electrical infrastructure on the Eastside. Even if demand did increase, it would do so incrementally. Smaller, site-specific technologies would be far more cost effective than Energize Eastside. The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) requires PSE to prove that their infrastructure investments are the most prudent for ratepayers. Energize is a large front-end investment, an all-or-nothing approach that is not a prudent solution to the electrical needs of the Eastside.

The reports in this section demonstrate that PSE predicated its evaluations of alternative technologies on studies that were outdated even at the time of analysis and ignored industry-wide recognition of the quickly advancing cost-effectiveness and technical feasibility of many of the alternatives that PSE dismissed. In addition, PSE evaluated each technology as a stand-alone solution rather than as an element of an integrated resource approach.

One additional report looks at the under-explored option of using Seattle City Light Transmission lines that on the Eastside closely parallel PSE’s 115kV line.

### *Table of Contents*

- 6.1 Non-Wire Alternatives for Energize Eastside  
Ken Nichols, EQL, Expert Witness
- 6.2 Supreme Court Decision on “Demand Response” Written by Justice Kagan  
Jan Medley, CENSE
- 6.3 Bonneville Power Administration Decision to Cancel I-5 Corridor Project  
Karen Esayian, CENSE
- 6.4 ColumbiaGrid and Seattle City Light Connection  
Karen Esayian, CENSE