

Public Comments by Case

Total Comments: 2

In Favor: 0

Opposed: 2

Undecided: 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Phil Ritter	Web	<p>Docket 210795</p> <p>In their presentation to their RPAG advisory group on 10-29-24 PSE seems to assume that the UTC has the power to decide the rate at which the utility decarbonizes their electric generation portfolio. The legislature recognized in the CETA bill that the scientific consensus is that we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2030 to avoid the risk of exceeding 2 degrees centigrade in global average temperature increase, which is expected to result in an unacceptable level of climate-related damage. The interim annual targets for reduction in emissions for 2024 and 2025 of 59% and 62% are based on the physics, not on what may or may not be achievable. I urge the UTC to keep the targets in place and require the utility to provide a plan to show how they can catch up and meet the annual target of 80% by 2030. Specifically, I urge the UTC to ask for an explanation of why in the RPAG presentation (Slide #20 and #21) they only accepted 1 of the 32 proposals for solar projects which would come online by 2030. Also why there are no projects identified for large scale conservation or demand response, both of which have high potential for peak load reduction in the period 2025 – 2030.</p> <p>The scenario of PSE owning all the electric generation for their service area and getting a guaranteed return on their investment is not consistent with the contemporary power generation market, with a number of competing enterprises investing in renewable power generation and entering into long-term power purchase agreements with financial guarantees with the utility providing the distribution and some of the transmission. Microsoft has already entered into such an agreement with PSE and there is no reason why Washington cannot follow California with legislation allowing cities to form Joint Powers Entities to issue bonds to provide the financing for the much faster build-out of a renewable energy portfolio for the PSE service area. At this point it is in the ratepayers interest to keep PSE financially healthy to assure reliability of electric supply, but in the longer term unless the utility gets more creative and aggressive with its development and acquisition of renewable resources it will become a much smaller company in the future.</p>

	Pete Stoppani	Web	<p>I'm angry but not surprised about PSE's proposal. UTC's response must indicate that it is inappropriate and not approved.</p> <p>There must be some pressure on PSE to invest long term and not the indicated millions they say they need to spend in the short term to stay on target.</p> <p>I don't mind a rate hike if it is for the long term investment toward the emissions reduction targets. If PSE has to do something in the short term it needs to come out of their profits. This is what I expect the UTC will enforce.</p> <p>And this leads me to hoping there is a clear performance based rates message from UTC to PSE.</p>
--	---------------	-----	---