

Public Comments by Case

Total Comments: 20

In Favor: 1

Opposed: 14

Undecided: 5

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Janet Burcham	E-mail	<p>June 4, 2024</p> <p>Docket number UE-230877 filed by Pacific Power Oct. 24, 2023</p> <p>r.e. PacifiCorp/Pacific Power proposed tariff amendments to limit damages from the Company's provision of electric services, etc., etc.</p> <p>Janet Burcham contact: siTTa2@outlook.com</p> <p>I am submitting these comments to the proposed tariff amendments described in Docket number UE-230877. A news article published by Associated Press on June 4, 2024, has provided more details to the litigation that PacifiCorp/Pacific Power is undergoing due to power lines sparking fires in Oregon on Labor Day, 2020, that resulted in loss of lives, destruction of thousands of homes and other structures and burning more than 1,875 sq. miles of land.</p> <p>The article states that "Last June, a jury found PacifiCorp liable for negligently failing to cut power to its 600,000 customers despite warnings from top fire officials. The jury determined it acted negligently and willfully and should have to pay punitive and other damages — a decision that applied to a class including the owners of up to 2,500 properties." Furthermore, "Last week, Oregon utility regulators rejected a request from PacifiCorp that sought to limit its liability in wildfire lawsuits. Under the proposal, the utility would only have been responsible for paying out actual economic damages in lawsuit awards. The Oregon Public Utility Commission said the request was too broad, and that such a move would prohibit payouts for noneconomic damages such as pain, mental suffering and emotional distress."</p> <p>I would add that limiting the companies' liability to actual economic damages would also preclude payment</p>

			<p>for death expenses and benefits for surviving relatives in addition to costs not covered by homeowners' insurance. I completely agree with the Oregon Public Utility Commission's decision that the request is too broad and leaves consumers with a large burden of financial loss.</p> <p>The previous statement that PacifiCorp was given warnings from top fire officials about fire hazard at that time when winds were extremely high but chose to ignore them makes this request for a tariff amendment even more suspect. How can consumers trust that the company will act more responsibly if warned of future similar scenarios?</p> <p>I live in Kittitas and Yakima counties. The winds are usually very high in Kittitas County for long periods. This year has been exceptional with winds often gusting above 40 mph for days and even reaching near 70 mph. Yakima County has had unusually high winds gusting to over 25 mph for long periods unlike in years past. Climate change is likely bringing these changes. Both counties are extremely dry for this time of year. The Dept. of Ecology issued a statewide declaration of emergency drought, and both Yakima and Kittitas Counties are the most severe. Extensive areas in both counties that have been burned in the last 2 years are now grown up in cheat grass which is one of the most combustible fuels for wildfires.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to reject this proposed tariff amendment as the Oregon Public Utility Commission has done. We should learn from the tragedy that occurred there and not have it repeated in Washington. PacifiCorp was warned and chose not to act. Let's not have that happen in Washington.</p>
	Paul Franzmann	E-mail	<p>Absolutely NOT re: Pac Pwr's proposed tariff changes, ESPECIALLY the notion to limit their liability when a disaster is its fault. That's our insurance policy that the company will act on our behalf instead of the corporate bottom line.</p> <p>Paul Franzmann Walla Walla, WA</p>
	Geri Pollock	E-mail	I hope this doesn't mean that we are approving of the company having planned power outages.
	Gary Seeman, Ph.D	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I strongly believe that no one should be above the law, and that includes businesses, corporations and government entities. Pacific Source has filed to remove its liability against legal judgments if citizens sue</p>

			<p>because its negligence has caused their homes to burn down because of a wildfire. This is just one instance of the liability from which the company wants immunity.</p> <p>We have laws in place as motivation so that they don't cut corners and are diligent in preventing mistakes and negligence and cost cutting that can cost lives. No one is above the law. Let's not grant that company its outrageous request, which would set a precedent for wildly dangerous corporate negligence.</p> <p>Thank you, Gary Seeman, Ph.D. Vancouver, WA</p>
	Laurie Rubin	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I urge you to deny PacifiCorp's proposal to limit its liability to only economic damage. A utility should be held to the same standards as any corporation or person, and should be responsible for all the damage it causes through negligence.</p> <p>Sincerely, Laurie Rubin</p>
	Peter Fels	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I urge you to deny PacifiCorp's request to amend its tariffs to limit liability to economic damages only.</p> <p>I agree with the Washington Attorney General and the Sierra Club briefs that the proposal is both illegal and against public policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, if approved the amendment would set a bad precedent that could be followed by other businesses and industries regulated by the UTC.</p> <p>If a company wishes to do business in Washington, they should expect to be responsible for the full extent of any harm caused by their business practices. Relieving them of liability will encourage them to cut corners and not maintain their equipment, which can cause tremendous losses and harm to customers, including loss of many lives.</p> <p>Please do not approve this proposed change.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

			Peter Fels Vancouver
	Gary Bailey	E-mail	I've been a PP&L customer for over 30 years and their position regarding customer service lately has been "the customer be damned". Apparently they have decided that if a brush fire is within 2 miles of one of their service line they will shut down power regardless of the customer. There have been 2 fires in my general area in the last 5 days and PP&L arbitrarily shut off power to our neighborhood 3 times for hours at a time. I called the local contact and was told that it wasn't a safety issue but a liability issue to PP&L. Every time they shut our power off we not only lose power we lose water from our community well. We can't run sprinklers to help abate the fires and protect our homes. The local contact for PP&L said that it was a corporate decision and it was a hard decision and they would not back of the decision. As a customer of PP&L and a citizen of Washington I ask that the Utility Commission look into this decision by PP&L and their "public be damned" attitude. Is PP&L going to pay for the damages to our well pump, A/C or refrigerators because of the power being shut off and on numerous times in just a few days? Please stand up for us citizens! Thanks you for any help on this matter.
	John Anderson	Web	
	Becky Wilson	Web	Tariff Amendments to limit damages to actual economic damages would allow the company to avoid paying for radiation poisoning illness and death of people and pets. Smart meters have caused numerous fires and physical problems. STUPID IDEA. They should NOT be allowed to do this.
	Jackie Durbin	Web	I believe that the company should be responsible for damages caused by their operations, and apply to past, present , or future situations. Also, as a senior citizen on a fixed income, a 20% increase in my electric bill would create a hardship (in the midst of the current inflationary situation that the country is in).
	Kathleen A. Robson	Web	They want to limit potential damages to the provision of electrical services, to "actual economic damages" - they do not define these, and they must for their proposal to be considered. They should not be allowed to exclude "a-typical damages (including special, non-economic, punitive, incidental, indirect, consequential)." It is not the place of PacifiCorps to decide definitions of damages or whether they should be liable. They do not want to be responsible for any role they may have in any incident more serious than a power failure. Tell them "No" to their proposed tariff change.
	Nancy Helget	Web	My comment relates to PaciriCorp's proposal to amend its tariff to limit its liability, docket # 240877. PacifiCorp's desire to limit its liability may be justifiable from a corporate business standpoint. But granting PacifiCorp's request would be detrimental to Washingtonians. Every entity doing business in Washington should be (and is) accountable to Washington consumers for the damage its business activities cause. That is particularly true of an electric provider, an essentially monopolistic business. I'm not a PPL

			<p>consumer. But if you allow this immunity to PPL, other providers will be incentivized to request the same, particularly privately owned utilities accountable to their shareholders. I fear even my utility, Clark Public Utilities, could follow suit. Your job is to protect Washington consumers of electricity. Allowing this proposal would harm Washingtonians. The proposal's only benefit would be to PPL and its shareholders. I urge you to deny the request.</p> <p>Thank you, Nancy Helget</p>
	Jackie Durbin	Web	<p>I believe that the company should be responsible for damages caused by their operations, and apply to past, present , or future situations.</p> <p>Also, as a senior citizen on a fixed income, a 20% increase in my electric bill would create a hardship (in the midst of the current inflationary situation that the country is in).</p>
	Peter Fretwell	Web	<p>PP&L's proposed rule change (UE-230877) greatly weakens protections for Washington consumers, business owners, and property owners. It seems impossible to argue that it serves the public interest in any way.</p> <p>The rule proposes limiting PP&L's liability as a regulated utility, which appears to conflict with existing state law (RCW 80.04.440). Because of that conflict, it likely exceeds the authority of the WUTC by attempting to remove statutory requirements established by state lawmakers.</p> <p>Simply stated, the proposed change would prevent PP&L customers from being made whole when they are damaged by PP&L, even in the face of negligence, recklessness, or knowingly unlawful decisions by PP&L.</p> <p>That breathtaking "ask" ignores the history and purpose of regulations on granted monopolies. A regulated monopoly must adhere, at minimum, to the duty of care that public and private companies face when they compete in the marketplace.</p> <p>When that duty of care is breached, parties injured by the regulated utility must be able to seek judicial redress for all damages, including special, non-economic, punitive, incidental, indirect, or consequential damages, including lost profits.</p> <p>PP&L's proposed rule change requires customers to waive and release PP&L from all those claims. The damage exemptions listed above are copied directly from the wording of their desired rule change.</p> <p>I respectfully encourage the Commission to deny this proposed rule modification.</p>

Undecided			
	Denise Edwards	E-mail	<p>What prompted this change?</p> <p>Users of pacific power require common language describing how this would change what is now in place. This must include Detailed specifics of how this might change PP response to common or uncommon impacts to delivery of service. And specifically what the financial impact would be to current and future consumers of PP.</p> <p>Denise Edwards</p>
	Mateo Reyes	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>Enviado desde mi iPhone</p>
	Trina Littrell	E-mail	<p>Docket number: UE-230877</p> <p>Pacific Power, a division of PacificCorp.</p> <p>It's essential to weigh the potential cost savings and clarity against the reduced protections and accountability before deciding if this proposal benefits the general public.</p> <p>Possible Advantages where we need clarity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost Reduction Potential: Limiting damages to actual economic losses might help reduce costs for Pacific Power, which could translate to potentially lower utility bills for consumers. 2. Clearer Rules: Defining the types of damages for which Pacific Power is responsible could make it easier for both the company and its customers to understand what to expect in case of issues with electric services. <p>Possible Disadvantages that could be harmful to the public that depend on these services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduced Protections: By excluding certain types of damages, such as punitive or consequential damages, consumers might have fewer options for recourse if they suffer harm due to the company's actions. 2. Potential Impact on Vulnerable Consumers: This proposal might disproportionately affect vulnerable consumers who could experience non-economic damages, like inconvenience or health issues, without recourse. 3. Accountability Concerns: Worry that limiting damages could reduce the incentive for Pacific Power to

			<p>maintain high service and safety standards, potentially compromising overall accountability.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter and more information. Trina Littrell</p>
	Dennis Cimino	Web	<p>Generally, I see their point with indemnification, specifically because in recent times, especially in California Wild Fires, it's entirely premature to blame the power utility for wildfires without a full and impartial and complete investigation. To date, I'm not aware of one having been done, yet the Power Utility gets to foot the bill? Hogwash.</p> <p>I'm not a big fan of corporate anything, but blaming the Utility company when the actual mechanisms for these fires is anything but totally ascertained. If Pac Power is looking for being indemnified for blame, especially with the fraudulent crap in California being blamed on the utility, then I see their point. Having said this, I may participate in the online ZOOM meeting if possible on June 20th just to hear the arguments and listen, but if I hear something that doesn't wash of course I will respectfully chime in. But the State of Washington has been anything but responsible in so many venues, almost any argument the State itself would push against this idea of Pac Power's to limit their liability, is likely to be something I'd not automatically accept on face value. Much of the political class in Washington State is so OUT TO FRIGGIN LUNCH that it wouldn't surprise me that this State would do things to punish the company (Pac Power) in the event of a wildfire if it couldn't pin it on some patsy.</p> <p>Time for a good meeting I hope.</p>
	Melissa Trexell	Web	In regards to the Notice of Proposed Tariff Change (UE-230877), in layman's terms, what does this proposal even mean?!?
Yes			
	David C. Franklund	Web	Although privately held, PP is a public utility for the benefit of us all. Excess legal penalties hurt all of us. In the end we need to keep utility expenses down. I support a limitation of liabilities, a limitation of legal expenses to actual costs not a high percentage.