

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY,

Respondent.

---

DOCKET UG-230393

**ROBERT L. EARLE  
ON BEHALF OF THE  
WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT**

---

**EXHIBIT RLE-11**

Public Comment Matrix, Docket UG 151663

**September 8, 2023**

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142

**In Favor:** 12

**Opposed:** 130

**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
----------------	-----------	--------	----------

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

## Public Comments by Case

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Ann Locsin	E-mail	<p>As a ratepayer and customer of PSE I am asking the UTC to not allow PSE to build the LNG facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE is inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project in order to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE prove their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi million dollar facility for 3 days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Ann Locsin          Tacoma Resident</p> <p>Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.          ~ Margaret Mead</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p> <p>***SECOND COMMENT - Received via email 10/20/2016, 10:51 am***</p> <p>It has come to my attention that another project, the Jordan Cove LNG project was not approved because they did not establish that there was really a "need" for it. I would say the PSE Tacoma LNG is also unneeded. We do not need additional peak shaving capacity and we definitely don't need it where they want to put it. This proposal is not about the public interest. It is about PSE making \$\$\$. This should be a private venture.</p> <p>Regards,          Ann Locsin</p> <p>Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.          ~ Margaret Mead</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Cathy Lysne	E-mail	<p>Subject Line: Funding of the LNG Tank</p> <p>Dear UTC:</p> <p>As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), I am asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) not to allow PSE to build the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE (which is a private company) may be inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE proves their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi-million-dollar facility for three days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.</p> <p>I will continue to follow this closely, in addition to many other concerned citizens. PSE's method of funding is garnering much media and public exposure and will continue to do so.</p> <p>Sincerely,            Catherine lysne            Tacoma Wa 98422</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sydney England	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC:</p> <p>As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), I am asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) not to allow PSE to build the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE (which is a private company) may be inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE proves their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi-million-dollar facility for three days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.</p> <p>I will continue to follow this closely, in addition to many other concerned citizens. PSE's method of funding is garnering much media and public exposure and will continue to do so.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Sydney England          Tacoma          Sent from my iPhone</p>
	Chiara Rose	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Ann Rendahl, David Danner and Philip Jones, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy in Bellingham Washington, to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington</p>

UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”          I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Chiara Rose          Bellingham Washington</p>
	<p>Michael Lafreniere</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear UTC:          I am asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) not to allow PSE to build the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. Please demand that PSE proves their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. I believe PSE (which is a private company) may be inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project to use public funds to build it. As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), I feel that ratepayers should not have to fund a multi-million-dollar facility for three days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.          I will continue to follow this closely, in addition to many other concerned citizens. PSE’s method of funding is garnering much media and public exposure and will continue to do so.          Sincerely,          Michael Lafreniere          815 N Proctor St.          Tacoma, WA 98406</p>
	<p>Suzanne Clemens</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - page from EIS***           Dear UTC:           As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), I am asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) to not allow PSE to build the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE will be inflating the "peak</p>



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

shaving"

portion of this project to use public funds to build it. To document this, I am forwarding an email I received from Roger Garratt, an executive from PSE, outlining how the cost of running the LNG tank will be appropriated. I am also attaching a page from the EIS that breaks out the percentage of proposed use of the LNG product. From the email from Mr. Garratt, starting in paragraph 2, you will see that 50% of the cost of running the LNG facility will be attributed to the 7% of product for a peak shaver. From a business standpoint, it only seems appropriate that if a partner (ratepayer) is being charged with 50% of the cost of doing business, then it should also share in the profits. I doubt very much ratepayers will: a) - be a member of the LLC created for this project or b) -have any share in profits earned. So then why should ratepayers be saddled with 50% of the cost of PSE doing business?

Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a \*private venture only\* should they move forward. The Risk/Reward should be a PSE/new company exposure, and not an exposure the ratepayers should have to experience. If a new entity is created, it should not be treated as a public utility where ratepayers pay for services. It should actually be more like a corporation that can sell shares and get their funding from interested and informed investors that will share in the risk/reward.

I will continue to follow this closely, in addition to many other concerned citizens. PSE's method of funding is garnering much media and public exposure and will continue to do so.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Clemens  
Tacoma

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: RE: lng info on 7% peak shaver  
Date: Fri, 22 Jul 2016 01:52:11 +0000  
From: Garratt, Roger <roger.garratt@pse.com>  
To: 'Sue Clemens' <sclemens@harbornet.com>

Ms. Clemens,

Thank you for sharing this page with me. It's useful in understanding where the 7% figure is coming from. As you indicate, 7% is an accurate number when one is simply talking about how much LNG is used each year for peak shaving as compared to other uses on a volumetric basis. However, that figure ignores how the LNG is used and the components and costs of the LNG facility. The LNG that is used for peak shaving (6.3 million gallons) needs to be liquefied and sitting in the storage tank by the beginning of winter each year to meet the needs of our residential and business customers during a cold-weather, peaking event.

The LNG that is sold as maritime fuel gets liquefied and sits in the storage tank for a couple of days before being provided to TOTE or other customers. So, the peaking facility has much greater usage and reliance on the tank than the LNG fuel sales portion of the plant. Accordingly, a much higher percentage of the cost of the storage tank is allocated to the peaking service. Conversely, the LNG fuel sales portion of the plant makes greater use of the liquefaction equipment and more of that cost is allocated to that portion.

As it turns out, each of the major components of the facility are separately allocated to peaking and LNG fuel sales: liquefaction, storage, bunkering (the system for proving LNG to maritime vessels), vaporization (the equipment to convert LNG back to natural gas during a peaking event), and truck loading. When one breaks down the components of the plant and allocates them between peaking and LNG fuel sales and does so, taking into account the cost attributable to each, then we get to a weighted-average figure along the lines of 50:50. In the utility industry, we are accustomed to allocating our capital costs and separately allocating our operating costs (for example, the cost of labor, rent, and electricity). The 50:50 allocation is the allocation of capital costs. For the most part, operating costs are allocated based on what is giving rise to that cost. For example, in the case of electricity consumption for the LNG facility, most of the electricity is used by the compressor which is part of the liquefaction process and so most of that cost will be allocated to fuel sales customer, not utility customers.

One other piece of background that might be helpful for you: In the utility industry we have an obligation to have adequate service under all circumstances. When demand increases because of

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

cold weather, we have to have the equipment and plans in place to serve all of our customers' needs. Imagine, if you can, if the airlines had to have enough airplanes to fly everyone who wanted to fly the day before Thanksgiving and couldn't charge extra for a ticket that day. As you can imagine, there would be a lot of airplanes sitting around much of the rest of the year and the cost of those idle airplanes would be factored into the price you paid anytime during the rest of the year when you bought an airline ticket. To a large extent that is how utilities operate because energy is an essential product and can be a matter of survival during peak periods. The cost of that standby equipment is part of the cost of natural gas service (and there's a similar peaking concept on the electricity side). I hope this helps explain the difference in the numbers.

Thank you for your interest,  
Roger

-----Original Message-----

From: Sue Clemens [mailto:sclemens@harbornet.com]  
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 5:55 PM  
To: Garratt, Roger  
Subject: lng info on 7% peak shaver

Dear Mr. Garratt

Attached is a page from your final EIS - page 299 from the attachments to the EIS. This shows annual LNG production which, since PSE ordered the EIS, my guess is that PSE provided these numbers. As you can see, peak shaving represents a very small portion of the total production and that we are not making up this information.

Last month at the Port meeting, your communications director was given the same information. It seems strange that two intelligent men that are representing a very large utility wouldn't have access to this information.

If there is anyone else that needs to be reminded of this information, I'll be glad to share this with them.

Sincerely,

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			Sue Clemens 253-383-5723
	Deneise L Kopetzky	E-mail	Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss: As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE) I am asking the UTC to not allow PSE to build the LNG facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE is inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project in order to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE prove their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi million dollar facility for 3 days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward. Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. This issue is very important to me. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Deneise L Kopetzky NE Tacoma resident

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sara Wood	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>As a ratepayer and customer of PSE I am asking the UTC to not allow PSE to build the LNG facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE is inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project in order to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE prove their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi million dollar facility for 3 days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sara Wood Saraewood@hotmail.com Tacoma Resident Get Outlook for Android</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p> <p>***RECEIVED EMAIL - 10/21/16***</p> <p>Robert,</p> <p>Could you please pass along my gratitude to the 3 panel judges that presided over the UTC meeting regarding the PSE LNG Proposal? They were so attentive to our comments and I feel they truly listened to us all (both sides). My friends and I were very pleased and want them to know that they are appreciated!</p> <p>Sincerely, Sara Wood Tacoma Resident saraewood@hotmail.com 253-576-1055</p>

	Tressie Schindele	Web	<p>PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663 Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss: Below is a Form Letter. But here, it's personal, because Much of my family lives within a MILE of the Port of Tacoma, where this horrid plant might be built. Please think of us. Would you want to live next door to me? And the boondoggle of the \$\$\$ rates is a failure of your duty to protect me, and my family, the citizens, from the predation of corporations. I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you Please keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe." This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able. As a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas. It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following: Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit. The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis. Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These</p>
--	-------------------	-----	--

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.&lt;br /&gt; As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. &lt;br /&gt;Thank you for your consideration.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Sincerely,&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Tressie Schindele</p>
	<p>JODY ALFIERE Web</p>	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Consider the following:&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt; Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business.</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.<br /> The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.<br /> Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.<br /> As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.<br /><br />Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.<br /><br />The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”<br /><br />I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”<br /><br />I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.<br /><br />This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.<br /><br />Thank you for your consideration.<br /><br />Jody Alfieri<br />



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142

**In Favor:** 12

**Opposed:** 130

**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Heather Valdez	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC:</p> <p>As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), I am asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) not to allow PSE to build the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE (which is a private company) may be inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE proves their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi-million-dollar facility for three days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.</p> <p>I will continue to follow this closely, in addition to many other concerned citizens. PSE's method of funding is garnering much media and public exposure and will continue to do so.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Heather Valdez, Tacoma WA</p>

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Christina Schuck	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC:</p> <p>As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), I am asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) not to allow PSE to build the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE (which is a private company) may be inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE proves their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi-million-dollar facility for three days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.</p> <p>I will continue to follow this closely, in addition to many other concerned citizens. PSE's method of funding is garnering much media and public exposure and will continue to do so.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Christina Schuck          Browns Point, WA</p>
	Tim & Toni Webb	E-mail	<p>A call to action!!</p> <p>My Family is writing this email for a Call to Action!!</p> <p>We have serious concerns regarding the funding of an LNG tank for a company that is owned by a powerful financial group from Australia.</p> <p>It has come to our attention that PSE wants to use our family's ratepayer money to fund a portion of their proposed LNG project. We oppose this!! No matter what amount of it would be used for this project, We oppose.</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>If any persons were to approach us about this, we would NOT consider it. Because it's our politicians and (what WAS thought) a publicly owned utility I am writing to get your input.</p> <p>Is this true??</p> <p>It sounds like this is simply a private/International for profit venture, WITH NO REGARD FOR CITIZENS SAFETY, trying to FULFILL THEIR pockets at our community's expense putting HARMS WAY with NO REGARD FOR THE HEALTH, WELFARE, OR SAFETY of our loved ones or Community.</p> <p>As a longstanding customer of PSE, we are asking the UTC to not allow PSE to build the LNG facility in Tacoma using our ratepayer money. This abuse of our money should not be allowed.</p> <p>It has come to my attention that many who are more knowledgeable than we are, actually believe PSE is inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project in order to use public funds to build it. We have heard of this type of goings-on before and caution our little city to not be taken in by big international businesses like this. To verify these possibly inflated numbers We are asking that you demand that PSE prove their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi million dollar facility for 3 days per year of usage.</p> <p>Do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only.</p> <p>This issue is getting a lot of news coverage right now and recently was on KOMO 4.</p> <p>We are watching closely to see what will be done.</p> <p>Sincerely, Tim &amp; Toni Webb Tacoma Resident</p>
	David Caffee	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by</p>

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.      Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>David Caffee      Tacoma</p>
	<p>Sherry Meyer</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663      Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:      As a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy, I ask you to deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial</p>

guarantee for and to subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe." I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is extremely important to me, as well as my family. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Sherry Meyer Edgewood</p>
	William Meyer	E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>As a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy, I ask you to deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and to subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.</p>

Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is extremely important to me, as well as my family.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>William Meyer</p> <p>Edgewood</p>
	Susan Petersen	E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to plead with you to deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis).</li> </ul> <p>That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers</p>

should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also beg you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

			<p>Susan Petersen          Federal Way WA</p>
	<p>Dana Hollaway</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</li> </ul> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.</p> <p>The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Dana Hollaway        Federal Way WA</p>
	<p>Susan McRae</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers</p>

from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>I care about the future of our world. My husband and I installed solar panels on our house to generate as much of our own power as possible. My husband converted a 1986 Mazda pickup into an electric vehicle, and we ride recumbent tricycles so that our around town transportation does not use fossil fuel.</p> <p>Like Big Tobacco, the fossil fuel companies will eventually be held accountable for the damage that their toxic products have caused in our world and the disinformation campaign that they funded for more than 50 years to influence public opinion. PSE customers should not be asked to underwrite a risky fossil fuel venture.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Susan McRae 1231 Miller Ave NE Olympia WA 98506</p>
Rod Tharp	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its</p>

LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          I care about the future of our world. My wife and I installed solar panels on our house to generate as much of our own power as possible. I converted a 1986 Mazda pickup into an electric vehicle, and we ride recumbent tricycles so that our around town transportation does not use fossil fuel. Like Big Tobacco, the fossil fuel companies will eventually be held accountable for the damage that their toxic products have caused in our world and the disinformation campaign that they funded for more than 50 years to influence public opinion. PSE customers should not be asked to underwrite a risky fossil fuel venture.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Rod Tharp          1231 Miller Ave NE          Olympia WA 98506</p>
	<p>Keri Klaiber</p>	<p>E-mail          Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.          It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:  <input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers</p>



should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>Keri Klaiber City of Auburn</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
Casey Lowe	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I am sure you recieved many copies of the letter below. I would like to add that I have a chemical engineering degree and am a Professional Engineer. I am far enough from the facility so as it not to be an immediate threat to me. However, talking to my many friends in industry they mention that a large failure is not common and that it is typically contained in the facility, which sounds good. But they used the words usually and said it should not be near a population center. I would like you to consider the possibility of catastrophic failure and what it would do to Tacoma. I would also like to point out another industry, the nuclear industry, has a pretty good track record too except for those three accidents two of which made large swaths of countries unlivable. If this facility is allowed it needs more protections not less. Sooner or later one of the tanker trucks, facility, or boats will have an accident and the public outcry will be frightening as well as the political fallout.</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis).</li></ul> <p>That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers</p>

should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>Thank you,          Casey Lowe, PE          Tacoma Resident</p>
	<p>Janet Wilson</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</li> </ul>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Janet Wilson  
Auburn, WA

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lisa Eyre	E-mail	<p>Dear Port Commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing to you to ask that you do not allow PSE to remove the “ring fencing” that only protects PSE and leaves it’s customers to pay the bills for something that we don’t want here in the first place.</p> <p>Why should the residents, who clearly do not want the LNG facility so close to our houses and schools, be left to help foot the bill for a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme?</p> <p>Please listen to those that you are representing, do not let LNG get away with this.</p> <p>Thank you,          Lisa Eyre</p> <p>1727 Pointe Woodworth Dr.          Tacoma, WA 98422</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p>
	Susie Litts	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>As a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy I ask you to deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. This current request changes the original pledge made by PSE’s Australia-based owners. This is a private company with a foreign base that is concerned with profits, and who knows what requests and additional business ventures they will request next and inject into the rates paid by the consumers. Consumers who largely have no other option but to use their services.</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

We have seen this project and the funding requests change several times throughout this project. It is a financial and environmental concern to the nearby industries, neighborhoods and customers of PSE.

We do not want to be left "on the hook" for rate increases to cover cost overruns, breakdowns or catastrophic damage and pollution to what continues to be a polluted area.

The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.

Specific examples include the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity is doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline. Literally being built right next to adjacent residential dwellings.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our comments and please consider the impacts of this decision on the consumers and the local area.

Sincerely,  
Susie Litts  
Tacoma, WA

\*\*\*SECOND COMMENT - received 10/19/16, 4:19 pm\*\*\*

Greetings,

I am unable to attend tonight, but I want to present a concern I have about removing the "ring fencing" provision being discussed.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>As an Accounting and Finance professional, I am concerned about how rate payers will be affected with the LNG plant and it's usage for both peak shaving and other resources. How will the asset and maintenance costs be divided? As a business, there are many ways that they could legitimately allocate the costs between the two businesses and pass along costs to the consumers that are beyond what was expected.</p> <p>Let's say they save 3% for peak shaving...does that mean 3% of all costs go to PSE vs LNG? How will that be managed? What if nothing ever is used for peak shaving, just reserved? What if major upgrades or repairs are to be made? How will they allocate those costs? Who will be auditing their books to ensure the costs are fairly allocated? While no gas could be used for peak shaving, the fact that it's reserved could pass along costs to the consumer just based on allocation methods.</p> <p>Additionally, as a privately held entity, operating for profit, why should tax payers subsidize so much of the construction capital (43% I believe), while using a minimal amount of the resources that the the facility will provide?</p> <p>Thank you for your review of these comments,</p> <p>Susie Litts        Tacoma, WA</p>
	<p>Valarie Peaphon</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers</p>



from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Valarie Peaphon        Tacoma, WA</p>
	Shirley Storms	E-mail	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>The LNG plant being proposes by PSE is not in the public's best interest. They claim it will reduce the emissions from the Tote ships and declare it is a green fuel good for Tacoma. In reality, it will increase the emissions in Tacoma and the Port. We just were removed from being a non-attainment area. The small incremental reduction in emissions will only occur from the ships during the few hours the enter and leave the port. Maybe 4 of the 24 hours they are in Port. The remaining time, they will be hooked up to dock power. This reduction in emissions is small compared to the emissions emitted from the plant that operates 24 hours per day 365 days per year. In addition, there will be several thousand round trips by LNG tanker trucks delivering the excess capacity to as yet unknown customers. These emissions alone will be greater than any reductions by the two ships when in Port. This is not a green project. Starting with the natural gas that is obtained from fracking wells and ending with increased emissions in Tacoma, PSE neglects to mention any of the major emission sources. They have spent thousands, if not million of dollars, in advertising the benefits of LNG. They are trying desperately to convince everyone that it is both safe and friendly, when in truth it is neither. How they are allowed spend rate payers money on a project that the residents do not want. There is no benefit to the public, only increased safety and financial risks. Please do not allow this to happen. Please represent the public and prevent this disaster from being built.</p> <p>Shirley Storms        1316 Browns Pt Blvd        Tacoma, WA 98422</p>
	Leah Dunigan	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge</p>

Dennis Moss:

I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Leah Dunigan Olympia, WA Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android</p>
	Kristina K. Brown E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and potentially dangerous scheme. As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>unregulated rates for natural gas.          It appears that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.” I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,</p> <p>Kristina K. Brown          Tacoma, WA 98422</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p>
	<p>Cody Reetz</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge</p>

unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Cody Reetz          Tacoma, WA</p>
	Shannan St.Clair	E-mail	<p>Dear Commission -          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Please do not allow this huge and extremely dangerous LNG plant to be built in the Tacoma Tide Flats. It is very close to my neighborhood (I live inside the three mile safety zone) and the proposed location goes against the advice of nearly every safety association and organization. The common distance from populated residential areas prescribed by these organizations is a minimum of three (3) miles. Some models used by Fire Departments and other first responder organizations indicate that even more distance is required. The objective safety risks alone clearly out weigh any subjective (perceived) benefits. The fire and explosion risk just can not be allowed.</p> <p>Because of "closed door communication" between the local Tacoma government agencies, the Port of Tacoma, and PSE, the public is just now being made aware of the terrible problems and substantial risks associated with this proposal. All of the Native American Tribes voted against it and I am reasonably certain that the cities of Fife, Federal Way, Milton, Ruston &amp; Puyallup will oppose as well. The reduction in property property value and increased insurance for an area of several miles around the plant should make everyone oppose it.</p> <p>Besides all the physical dangers that can be fully documented and the reduction in property values, this proposed plant will add incremental financial risk to all PSE rate paying customers. Many of the proposed financial calculations are wrong or have changed since the original proposal. It appears that PSE had to offer Tote extremely low prices in order to get their business. They hoped</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>to sell the remaining 50% capacity to other customers at an increased margin to earn enough profit to pay for the capital and operating costs. Under perfect conditions, they could show they could share some of the profits with the ratepayers. Currently, conditions have changed so much that Tote is slowing down the conversion of it's ships to LNG and they have no other customers to buy any LNG. The only way that PSE can pay for the project is from the only source of revenue at their disposal, which is through increased rates from their customers. This is not in the financial best interest for the rate payers.</p> <p>In total, there is very little benefit to anyone besides PSE in this whole project. There are only 18 relatively low paying jobs created. The number of ships entering the port remains the same. There is no increase in the container volume. Even the multiplying effect of adding a business is reduced because the profits will go to a foreign country instead of being reinvested here. Not even the state reaps as much benefit because of the reduced fuel tax given to the project.</p> <p>If this plant is allowed to move forward, what the PSE rate paying citizens and the citizens of the state actually get is a highly dangerous plant that could cause hundreds of millions (possibly billions) of dollars in damage/health risk and the potential for thousands of lost lives. Additionally, there will be several thousand LNG tanker trucks making deliveries driving through our neighbors and on our highways. This is another layer of risk the PSE rate payers will be put on the hook for; in both the safety and financial arena.</p> <p>Please, I beg you, do not allow this LNG plant to be built. It is no one's best interest. This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Appreciatively ~        Shannan St.Clair        Federal Way, WA 98023</p>
	Trisha VanderGiessen	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a concerned residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer</p>



utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquefaction and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

I am very concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme that will be in my backyard as a resident of NE Tacoma.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers and is a danger to the surrounding community and the beautiful Puget Sound in the event of an incident.

Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me, my friends and my neighbors. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,      Trisha VanderGiessen      Tacoma, WA Resident</p> <p>Trisha VanderGiessen      Human Resources   Pro Refrigeration, Inc      WA: 326 8th Street SW, Auburn, WA 98001      NC: 319 Farmington Road, Mocksville, NC 27028      Tel: 253-205-0410  Mobile: 253-732-8007  Fax: 253-735-2631      www.prochiller.com   www.prochillerparts.com   Trishavg@prorefrigeration.com</p>
	<p>Lauren Johnson</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p>

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.

Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Lauren Johnson Tacoma, WA</p> <p>-- Sent from Gmail Mobile</p>
	Jan Zimmer	E-mail	Please read the linked article below published in the "Tacoma Weekly" concerning PSE attempting to set up a shell company to shift LNG liabilities to their customers. Please stand up for the interests of your constituents and do not waive the two "ring-fencing" provisions that protect PSE customers. Granting PSE this exemption would only benefit their share holders, not Washington

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

state residents who are their customers. As a PSE customer and Washington state resident whose best interests your job is to protect, please do not allow PSE to shift their liability and responsibility to customers. Please note this is in direct opposition to the "three rings of protection" required of PSE by the utility commission to protect customers.

Thank you,  
Jan Zimmer  
PSE customer, represented by WA UTC

<http://www.tacomaweekly.com/news/article/lng-plants-business-plan-raises-concern-with-state-utility-watchers>

Sent from my iPhone

\*\*\*Customer >> PubInvolve@utc.wa.gov 7/16/2016 11:10 PM\*\*\*

Re: PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663 Dear UTC commissioners, I am writing to strongly urge you to keep in place the utility customer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank Macquarie Group purchased Puget Sound Energy (PSE). PSE petitioned UTC in August 2015 to remove those ring-fencing provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from financial harm possible as a result of PSE's LNG business venture, Puget LNG, under the proposed ownership structure.

During the last Port of Tacoma public meeting on June 16, 2016, PSE resource director Roger Garratt stated that PSE does not have clients or contracts for the LNG they propose to produce in the Port of Tacoma. Only 7 % of the LNG would be sold to utility customers, the remaining 93% is intended for marine and truck transportation.

PSE's Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety and financial risks for consumers:

- Residents live within a half mile of the proposed site of the 180-foot, 8-million gallon LNG tank. Pierce County Superior Court Judge Cuthbertson ordered the release of safety-related public documents that are part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—a ruling that PSE is appealing.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the PSE LNG proposal, oil and gas prices have fallen drastically, and financial feasibility and profitability are not guaranteed.</li> <li>• The facility would have 18 staff at annual salaries of \$35,000, according to PSE. That is a very small benefit to the community while potential risks are serious.</li> <li>• The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is riddled with contradictions regarding barging, fueling and trucking of the LNG.</li> <li>• PSE's LNG facility is one of the first bunkering facilities in the nation. Regulations are still not fully in place, and removing customer protections would set a precedent for other facilities to build risky gas infrastructure without sufficient financial stability.</li> </ul> <p>Potential investors in PSE's new Puget LNG Corporation expect returns from their investment. Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations, and virtually no other options for electric utility providers. Citizens effectively are not in a position to vote with their dollars by choosing a PSE competitor.</p> <p>Investments carry both risks and rewards. It is inherently unfair to burden consumers with potential losses while profits would be paid out only to multinational investors. PSE and its proposed Puget LNG Corporation are and would be private companies, not public utilities. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain in place to protect PSE customers.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.        Best regards,        Jan Zimmer        Tacoma resident and PSE customer</p>
	<p>Claudia Riedener</p> <p>E-mail</p>	<p>Re: PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663</p> <p>Dear UTC commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing to strongly urge you to keep in place the utility customer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank Macquarie Group purchased Puget Sound Energy (PSE). PSE petitioned UTC in August 2015 to remove those ring-fencing provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from financial harm possible as a result of PSE's LNG business venture, Puget LNG, under the proposed ownership structure.</p> <p>During the last Port of Tacoma public meeting on June 16, 2016, PSE resource director Roger Garratt stated that PSE does not have clients or contracts for the LNG they propose to produce in the Port of Tacoma. Only 7 % of the LNG would be sold to utility customers, the remaining 93% is intended for marine and truck transportation.</p> <p>PSE's Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety and financial risks for consumers:</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

- Residents live within a half mile of the proposed site of the 180-foot, 8-million gallon LNG tank. Pierce County Superior Court Judge Cuthbertson ordered the release of safety-related public documents that are part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—a ruling that PSE is appealing.
- Since the PSE LNG proposal, oil and gas prices have fallen drastically, and financial feasibility and profitability are not guaranteed.
- The facility would have 18 staff at annual salaries of \$35,000, according to PSE. That is a very small benefit to the community while potential risks are serious.
- The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is riddled with contradictions regarding barging, fueling and trucking of the LNG.
- PSE's LNG facility is one of the first bunkering facilities in the nation. Regulations are still not fully in place, and removing customer protections would set a precedent for other facilities to build risky gas infrastructure without sufficient financial stability.

Potential investors in PSE's new Puget LNG Corporation expect returns from their investment. Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations, and virtually no other options for electric utility providers. Citizens effectively are not in a position to vote with their dollars by choosing a PSE competitor.

Investments carry both risks and rewards. It is inherently unfair to burden consumers with potential losses while profits would be paid out only to multinational investors. PSE and its proposed Puget LNG Corporation are and would be private companies, not public utilities. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain in place to protect PSE customers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Claudia Riedener

Tacoma resident and PSE customer

\*\*\*Customer >> Online comment form 7/20/16\*\*\*

Review Status: Not Reviewed Submitted Date: 07/20/2016

Name: Claudia Riedener Address: 1004 S Steele

City: Tacoma State: Washington

Zip Code: 98405 Email Address: ixia@harboret.com

Primary Phone: 253-274-0655 Secondary Phone:

Utility Company Name: PSE / Docket UG-151663 Support the Filing Issue: No  
Contact Method: E-mail

Comments:

Re: PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663

Dear UTC commissioners,

I am writing to strongly urge you to keep in place the utility customer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank Macquarie Group purchased Puget Sound Energy (PSE). PSE petitioned UTC in August 2015 to remove those ring-fencing provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from financial harm possible as a result of PSE's LNG business venture, Puget LNG, under the proposed ownership structure.

During the last Port of Tacoma public meeting on June 16, 2016, PSE resource director Roger Garratt stated that PSE does not have clients or contracts for the LNG they propose to produce in the Port of Tacoma. Only 7 % of the LNG would be sold to utility customers, the remaining 93% is intended for marine and truck transportation.

PSE's Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety and financial risks for consumers:

- Residents live within a half mile of the proposed site of the 180-foot, 8-million gallon LNG tank. Pierce County Superior Court Judge Cuthbertson ordered the release of safety-related public documents that are part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—a ruling that PSE is appealing.
- Since the PSE LNG proposal, oil and gas prices have fallen drastically, and financial feasibility and profitability are not guaranteed.
- The facility would have 18 staff at annual salaries of \$35,000, according to PSE. That is a very small benefit to the community while potential risks are serious.
- The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is riddled with contradictions regarding barging, fueling and trucking of the LNG.
- PSE's LNG facility is one of the first bunkering facilities in the nation. Regulations are still not fully in place, and removing customer protections would set a precedent for other facilities to build risky gas infrastructure without sufficient financial stability.

Potential investors in PSE's new Puget LNG Corporation expect returns from their investment. Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations, and virtually no other options for electric utility providers. Citizens effectively are not in a position to vote with their dollars by choosing a PSE competitor.



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Investments carry both risks and rewards. It is inherently unfair to burden consumers with potential losses while profits would be paid out only to multinational investors. PSE and its proposed Puget LNG Corporation are and would be private companies, not public utilities. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain in place to protect PSE customers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Claudia Riedener

Tacoma resident and PSE customer

\*\*\*Customer >> UTC staff 7/20/16, 12:50 PM\*\*\*

From: claudia riedener [mailto:ixia@harbornet.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2016 12:50 PM

To: Oshie, Patrick (UTC); Gomez, David (UTC); King, Steve (UTC); Vasconi, Mark (UTC)

Subject: Re: PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663

Re: Docket # 151663, PSE LNG

Dear Commissioners,

I am sending you my petition via e-mail. I also sent it in via UTC webpage comment section, but it has not made it on the docket doc list for some reason.

Thank you

Tacoma, July 15th 2016

Re: PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663

Dear UTC commissioners,

I am writing to strongly urge you to keep in place the utility customer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank Macquarie Group purchased Puget Sound Energy (PSE). PSE petitioned UTC in August 2015 to remove those ring-fencing provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from financial harm possible as a result of PSE's LNG business venture, Puget LNG, under the proposed ownership structure.

During the last Port of Tacoma public meeting on June 16, 2016, PSE resource director Roger Garratt stated that PSE does not have clients or contracts for the LNG they propose to produce in the Port of Tacoma. Only 7 % of the LNG would be sold to utility customers, the remaining 93% is intended for marine and truck transportation.

PSE's Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety and financial risks for consumers:

- Residents live within a half mile of the proposed site of the 180-foot, 8-million gallon LNG tank. Pierce County Superior Court Judge Cuthbertson ordered the release of safety-related public documents that are part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—a ruling that PSE is appealing.
- Since the PSE LNG proposal, oil and gas prices have fallen drastically, and financial feasibility and profitability are not guaranteed.
- The facility would have 18 staff at annual salaries of \$35,000, according to PSE. That is a very small benefit to the community while potential risks are serious.
- The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is riddled with contradictions regarding barging, fueling and trucking of the LNG.
- PSE's LNG facility is one of the first bunkering facilities in the nation. Regulations are still not fully in place, and removing customer protections would set a precedent for other facilities to build risky gas infrastructure without sufficient financial stability.

Potential investors in PSE's new Puget LNG Corporation expect returns from their investment. Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations, and virtually no other options for electric utility providers. Citizens effectively are not in a position to vote with their dollars by choosing a PSE competitor.

Investments carry both risks and rewards. It is inherently unfair to burden consumers with potential losses while profits would be paid out only to multinational investors. PSE and its proposed Puget LNG Corporation are and would be private companies, not public utilities. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain in place to protect PSE customers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,  
Claudia Riedener

Tacoma resident and PSE customer

\*\*\*SEE ATTACHMENT - 7/17/16 email Customer >> Commissioners\*\*\*

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p> <p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - Comments from this consumer exceeded the 10,000 character limit. See attached "151663RiedenerAdditionalComments" for additional comments***</p>
	<p>Debby Herbert</p> <p>E-mail</p>	<p>Re: PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663</p> <p>Dear UTC commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing to strongly urge you to keep in place the utility customer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank Macquarie Group purchased Puget Sound Energy (PSE). PSE petitioned UTC in August 2015 to remove those ring-fencing provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from financial harm possible as a result of PSE’s LNG business venture, Puget LNG, under the proposed ownership structure.</p> <p>During the last Port of Tacoma public meeting on June 16, 2016, PSE resource director Roger Garratt stated that PSE does not have clients or contracts for the LNG they propose to produce in the Port of Tacoma. Only 7 % of the LNG would be sold to utility customers, the remaining 93% is intended for marine and truck transportation.</p> <p>PSE’s Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety and financial risks for consumers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents live within a half mile of the proposed site of the 180-foot, 8-million gallon LNG tank. Pierce County Superior Court Judge Cuthbertson ordered the release of safety-related public documents that are part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—a ruling that PSE is appealing.</li> <li>• Since the PSE LNG proposal, oil and gas prices have fallen drastically, and financial feasibility and profitability are not guaranteed.</li> <li>• The facility would have 18 staff at annual salaries of \$35,000, according to PSE. That is a very small benefit to the community while potential risks are serious.</li> <li>• The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is riddled with contradictions regarding barging, fueling and trucking of the LNG.</li> <li>• PSE’s LNG facility is one of the first bunkering facilities in the nation. Regulations are still not fully in place, and removing customer protections would set a precedent for other facilities to build risky gas infrastructure without sufficient financial stability.</li> </ul> <p>Potential investors in PSE’s new Puget LNG Corporation expect returns from their investment. Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations, and virtually no other options for electric utility</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

providers. Citizens effectively are not in a position to vote with their dollars by choosing a PSE competitor.  
Investments carry both risks and rewards. It is inherently unfair to burden consumers with potential losses while profits would be paid out only to multinational investors. PSE and its proposed Puget LNG Corporation are and would be private companies, not public utilities. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain in place to protect PSE customers.

Thank you.

Debby Herbert  
Tacoma resident and PSE customer( through our H.O.A. )

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

\*\*\*Second comment received 10/5/16\*\*\*

Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:

As a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy I ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am very concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee and subsidize a risky scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.

Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity is doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am very concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. It is evident that PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy. The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>mediation even though it is highly likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Debby Herbert        Tacoma, WA</p>
	<p>Anneliese Simons</p>	<p>Web</p>	<p>Re: PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663</p> <p>Dear UTC commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing to strongly urge you to keep in place the utility customer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank Macquarie Group purchased Puget Sound Energy (PSE). Citizens and consumers need to be protected from potential poor decision making and risky financial investments of private owners of the only utility company servicing our area.</p> <p>Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations and virtually no other options for electric utility providers. Citizens effectively are not in a position to vote with their dollars by choosing a PSE competitor.</p> <p>PSE petitioned UTC in August 2015 to remove those ring-fencing provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from financial harm possible as a result of PSE’s LNG business venture, Puget LNG, under the proposed ownership structure.</p>

During the last Port of Tacoma public meeting on June 16, 2016, PSE resource director Roger Garratt stated that PSE does not have clients or contracts for the LNG they propose to produce in the Port of Tacoma. Only 7 % of the LNG would be sold to utility customers, the remaining 93% is intended for marine and truck transportation.

PSE's Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety and financial risks for consumers:

- Residents live within a half mile of the proposed site of the 180-foot, 8-million gallon LNG tank. Pierce County Superior Court Judge Cuthbertson ordered the release of safety-related public documents that are part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—a ruling that PSE is appealing.
- Since the PSE LNG proposal, oil and gas prices have fallen drastically, and financial feasibility and profitability are not guaranteed.
- The facility would have 18 staff at annual salaries of \$35,000, according to PSE. That is a very small benefit to the community while potential risks are serious.
- The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is riddled with contradictions regarding barging, fueling and trucking of the LNG.
- PSE's LNG facility is one of the first bunkering facilities in the nation. Regulations are still not fully in place, and removing customer protections would set a precedent for other facilities to build risky gas infrastructure without sufficient financial stability.

Potential investors in PSE's new Puget LNG Corporation expect returns from their investment. Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations, and virtually no other options for electric utility providers. Citizens effectively are not in a position to vote with their dollars by choosing a PSE competitor.

Investments carry both risks and rewards. It is inherently unfair to burden consumers with potential losses while profits would be paid out only to multinational investors. PSE and its proposed Puget LNG Corporation are and would be private companies, not public utilities. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain in place to protect PSE customers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Anneliese Simons  
2905 South 17th Street

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>Tacoma, WA 98405          PSE customer</p>
	<p>M. Judith          Ferguson</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear UTC Commissioners:</p> <p>I am writing to request that you maintain the 2008 protections for utility customers that were established when Puget Sound Energy was purchased by Macquarie Group, an Australian investment bank.</p> <p>PSE petitioned your Commission to remove the "ring-fencing" provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from possible financial harm as a result of PSE's LNG business venture. During a June 16, 2016 Port of Tacoma public meeting, PSE resource director Roger Garratt stated that PSE does not have clients or contracts for the LNG they propose to produce in the Port of Tacoma. Only 7 % of the LNG would be sold to utility customers, the remaining 93% is intended for marine and truck transportation.</p> <p>Sadly, PSE has shown itself to be both disingenuous and deceptive in its dealings with its customers and the public, per their own Tacoma LNG FAQ's at <a href="http://tacomacleanlng.com/general-project">http://tacomacleanlng.com/general-project</a>. The LNG facility is not intended as a peak shaving facility in any way, shape or form. Its primary purpose is to ultimately be a bunkering facility. In their FAQ's PSE states that their LNG experience stems from their service to 800,000 natural gas customers, as well as owning and operating a peak shaving facility in Gig Harbor. They have no experience in operating a bunkering facility that will be located in a densely populated urban area.</p> <p>PSE must be held financially accountable for all of their business ventures. The Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety and financial risks for consumers, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents living within a half mile of the proposed site of the 180-foot, 8-million gallon LNG tank. Pierce County Superior Court Judge Cuthbertson ordered the release of safety-related public documents that are part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)—a ruling that PSE is appealing.</li> <li>• Since the PSE LNG proposal, oil and gas prices have fallen drastically, and financial feasibility and profitability are not guaranteed. PSE's utility customers would be the first to be at financial risk if the shell company struggles to find other customers for the liquefied natural gas, but then not benefit from lower utility rates when there are profits from those private sales. Those would go to investors, not ratepayers.</li> </ul>



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The facility would have 18 staff at annual salaries of \$35,000, according to PSE. That is a very small benefit to the community while potential risks are serious.</li> <li>• The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is riddled with contradictions regarding barging, fueling and trucking of the LNG.</li> <li>• PSE’s LNG facility is one of the first bunkering facilities in the nation. Regulations are still not fully in place, and removing customer protections would set a precedent for other facilities to build risky gas infrastructure without sufficient financial stability.</li> </ul> <p>Under the new Puget LNG Corporation, the 7% “peak shaving” side of the LNG facility would be state regulated, while the remaining 93% of the LNG production could be sold through private contracts at higher prices. Potential investors in PSE’s new Puget LNG Corporation expect returns from their investment. Any losses from the private LNG facility must to be carried by investors, not the general public who have no voice in productions or operations. Investments carry both risks and rewards. It is inherently unfair to burden consumers with potential losses while profits would be paid out only to multinational investors. PSE and its proposed Puget LNG Corporation are and would be private companies, not public utilities. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain in place to protect PSE customers</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my concerns. I urge you to follow your duty to protect customers.</p> <p>M. Judith Ferguson        7219 East Side Dr NE        Tacoma, WA 98422</p>
	Judi Chelotti	E-mail	<p>July 27, 2016</p> <p>Utilities and transportation commission</p> <p>Please do not let Puget Sound Energy reverse the ruling on the financial arrangements that were put in place by your commission regarding PSE and the LNG shell company. This request by a foreign owned LLC, PSE, will place at risk the citizens of Washington and PSE customers.</p> <p>PSE is trying to reconfigure the company responsibility by creating and then asking you to approve</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

a “shell” company with little if no regulations of LNG production, sale and distribution in our state. This is a very dangerous product and MORE regulation and accountability needs to be placed on PSE not less.

Please do not allow the LNG shell company to be formed by PSE. It is the commissions legal obligation to defend and protect the citizens of Washington, not allow companies to skirt, hide, and avoid responsibility and liability with the use of our utilities.

Thank you for your time in reading this email. I understand that previous emails sent to this address have been “lost?”. Please let me know if you have difficulty in receiving this message.

Judi Chelotti  
Tacoma resident  
PSE customer

\*\*\*Email comment from customer>> records@utc.wa.gov 8/9/16, 6:24 AM\*\*\*

From: judith chelotti [mailto:jactacomawa@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 6:24 AM  
To: UTC DL Records Center <records@utc.wa.gov>  
Subject: Fwd: LNG shell company

Please see the below email sent to your address on July 27, 2016. This email DOES NOT appear in the document as correspondence regarding this matter. Interesting is was “lost”?? Please add this to the official record as soon as possible.

Judi Chelotti

Begin forwarded message:

From: judith chelotti <jactacomawa@yahoo.com>  
Subject: LNG shell company

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>Date: July 27, 2016 at 11:31:20 AM PDT To: records@utc.wa.gov</p> <p>July 27, 2016</p> <p>Utilities and transportation commission</p> <p>Please do not let Puget Sound Energy reverse the ruling on the financial arrangements that were put in place by your commission regarding PSE and the LNG shell company. This request by a foreign owned LLC, PSE, will place at risk the citizens of Washington and PSE customers.</p> <p>PSE is trying to reconfigure the company responsibility by creating and then asking you to approve a “shell” company with little if no regulations of LNG production, sale and distribution in our state. This is a very dangerous product and MORE regulation and accountability needs to be placed on PSE not less.</p> <p>Please do not allow the LNG shell company to be formed by PSE. It is the commissions legal obligation to defend and protect the citizens of Washington, not allow companies to skirt, hide, and avoid responsibility and liability with the use of our utilities.</p> <p>Thank you for your time in reading this email. I understand that previous emails sent to this address have been “lost?”. Please let me know if you have difficulty in receiving this message.</p> <p>Judi Chelotti Tacoma resident PSE customer</p>
	Steven Storms	E-mail  ***SEE ATTACHED - PDF copy of consumer comment and supplemental comment***  Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  I am writing this in reference to: In the Matter of the Petition of Puget Sound Energy For Approval of a Special Contract for Liquefied Natural Gas Fuel Service with Totem Ocean Trailer Express, Inc., and a Declaratory

Order Approving the Methodology for Allocating Costs between Regulated and Non-regulated Liquefied Natural Gas Services, Docket UG-151663

PSE is filing for some exemptions and considerations from the WUTC that should never be granted. First they want to build an LNG plant that they state is for peak-shaving and will benefit the ratepayers. This is a total falsification and exaggeration of the facts. Depending on the weather, they only forecast about 7% of the total plant production will be used for peak-shaving that will benefit the ratepayers. By calling it a peak-shaving facility, they are also able to skirt around some of the EPA regulations that would be required for an LNG production facility.

The primary purpose of the facility is to provide fuel for Tote and other large commercial fuel users, not to benefit the ratepayers. In fact, the LNG plant location has a large portion of the residents opposed to the plant. It is extremely dangerous and has the potential to cause explosions or fires that might impact several miles away. LNG production facilities are classified as a potential terrorist target by the Department of Homeland Security and the 18 million gallon storage tank located in one of the largest port in the US would be a prime target. PSE has a court order to share their safety modeling information, but is appealing the court order. While they say there is no danger from explosions or fires at the plant, their reason for not sharing the safety information is that it would be too dangerous to let a terrorist have the information. To make matters worse, the plant would be located near the Targa Sound Terminal tank farm which holds over 40 million gallons of fossil fuels. A fire or explosion at either facility could cause an epic disaster involving both sites. The contorted financial arrangement that PSE is seeking might shield them from the risk. This would leave the ratepayers exposed to an impossible financial risk.

Please do not put the rate-paying customers at financial or hazardous risks for a facility that is primarily designed to serve LNG marine ships. If PSE's requirement is to serve the ratepayers, the facility can be built at a different location. It could be built in some remote location out of the residential neighborhoods. A true peak-shaving facility is much more in the public and ratepayer's interest. While it might not be as profitable for the foreign investors, it would better serve the community.

Please protect our interests. Do not contort the existing regulations in order to approve an LNG plant that is designed to have 93% of the production for commercial use.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Thanks

Steven Storms

1316 Browns Point Blvd NE  
Tacoma, WA 98422

253 202-9925

\*\*\*Email supplemental comment Customer >> Steve King 7/12/16, 11:46 PM\*\*\*

From: King, Steve (UTC)  
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 6:45 AM  
To: UTC DL Records Center records@utc.wa.gov  
Subject: FW: PSE Petition - Docket UG-151663

Please add this comment to the file for docket 151663. Thank you. Steve

From: Steve [mailto:storms123@aol.com]  
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 11:46 PM  
To: storms123@aol.com; Oshie, Patrick (UTC); Gomez, David (UTC); King, Steve (UTC); Vasconi, Mark (UTC)  
Subject: Re: PSE Petition - Docket UG-151663

Dear WUTC

I like to be factual, so I need to correct the typo that was included in the middle of the large paragraph. It should read "LNG production facilities are classified as a potential terrorist target by the Department of Homeland Security and the 8 million gallon storage tank located in one of the largest port in the US would be a prime target." Somehow I typed 18 million by mistake and needed to correct it.

Thanks

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Steven Storms

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve storms123@aol.com

To: poshie <poshie@utc.wa.gov>; dagomez <dagomez@utc.wa.gov>; sking  
<sking@utc.wa.gov>; mvasconi mvasconi@utc.wa.gov

Sent: Mon, Jul 11, 2016 11:23 pm

Subject: PSE Petition - Docket UG-151663

Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

I am writing this in reference to:

In the Matter of the Petition of Puget Sound Energy For Approval of a Special Contract for Liquefied Natural Gas Fuel Service with Totem Ocean Trailer Express, Inc., and a Declaratory Order Approving the Methodology for Allocating Costs between Regulated and Non-regulated Liquefied Natural Gas Services, Docket UG-151663

PSE is filing for some exemptions and considerations from the WUTC that should never be granted. First they want to build an LNG plant that they state is for peak-shaving and will benefit the ratepayers. This is a total falsification and exaggeration of the facts. Depending on the weather, they only forecast about 7% of the total plant production will be used for peak-shaving that will benefit the ratepayers. By calling it a peak-shaving facility, they are also able to skirt around some of the EPA regulations that would be required for an LNG production facility.

The primary purpose of the facility is to provide fuel for Tote and other large commercial fuel users, not to benefit the ratepayers. In fact, the LNG plant location has a large portion of the residents opposed to the plant. It is extremely dangerous and has the potential to cause explosions or fires that might impact several miles away. LNG production facilities are classified as a potential terrorist target by the Department of Homeland Security and the 18 million gallon storage tank located in one of the largest port in the US would be a prime target. PSE has a court order to share their safety modeling information, but is appealing the court order. While they say there is no danger from explosions or fires at the plant, their reason for not sharing the safety information is that it would be too dangerous to let a terrorist have the information. To make matters worse, the plant would be located near the Targa Sound Terminal tank farm which holds over 40 million

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>gallons of fossil fuels. A fire or explosion at either facility could cause an epic disaster involving both sites. The contorted financial arrangement that PSE is seeking might shield them from the risk. This would leave the ratepayers exposed to an impossible financial risk.</p> <p>Please do not put the rate-paying customers at financial or hazardous risks for a facility that is primarily designed to serve LNG marine ships. If PSE's requirement is to serve the ratepayers, the facility can be built at a different location. It could be built in some remote location out of the residential neighborhoods. A true peak-shaving facility is much more in the public and ratepayer's interest. While it might not be as profitable for the foreign investors, it would better serve the community.</p> <p>Please protect our interests. Do not contort the existing regulations in order to approve an LNG plant that is designed to have 93% of the production for commercial use.</p> <p>Thanks        Steven Storms</p> <p>1316 Browns Point Blvd NE        Tacoma, WA 98422</p> <p>253 202-9925</p> <p>***Comments for this customer exceeded the 10,000 character limit allowed by the program. Please see attachments (8) for additional comments***</p>
	Joseph M. Hiss	Web	<p>Any action that facilitates additional use of fossil fuels locks un into a pattern that will surely add to the degradation of the earth's climate. Even though natural gas will burn cleaner than diesel, making it more available does relatively little to slow climate change, and does nothing at all to reverse it. In other words, liquefying natural gas is bad for the whole planet. Please, don't allow this venture!</p>
	Deborah Hill	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by</p>

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.

I have never been asked if I would approve of and be willing to subsidize this LNG facility. I not only do not approve of it, I think it is a dangerous facility that should not be located anywhere near the Port of Tacoma businesses, the Northeast residential neighborhood, and transportation infrastructure like I-5 and the 509 freeway in Tacoma among other things. I am not at all willing to subsidize this LNG facility and I believe it to be a very questionable business model for PSE as a utility to try to put ratepayers in the position of having to subsidize PSE's business venture which actually appears to be unrelated to their function as a utility.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.” I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture. This issue is extremely important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able. Thank you very much for your consideration. Sincerely, Deborah Hill Tacoma, WA</p>
	Kathleen Dial	E-mail	<p>Get Outlook for iOS</p> <p>----- Forwarded message ----- From: "radial75" &lt;radial75@gmail.com&gt; Date: Thu, Oct 20, 2016 at 11:33 AM -0700 Subject: can you please send an email by 5pm today? To: "jdial4122@msn.com" &lt;jdial4122@msn.com&gt;, "Kathleen Dial" &lt;kcdial4122@msn.com&gt;, "Evelyn Dial" &lt;dialophone@gmail.com&gt;</p> <p>Hi guys,</p> <p>It would help in the battle against the LNG plant if each of you could send this email to the following address: <a href="mailto:comments@utc.wa.gov">comments@utc.wa.gov</a></p> <p>We're writing to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.</p> <p>The deadline is 5 pm.</p> <p>Here is the email to copy, paste, and sign:</p> <p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663 Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss: I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business</p>

of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>\$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.” I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.” I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture. This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, [name of resident] [city of resident]</p>
	Diane M. Martin	E-mail	<p>Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW Olympia, WA 98504</p> <p>October 20, 2016</p> <p>Subject: PSE LNG Proposal; Docket UG-151663</p> <p>Dear WUTC Commissioner Chair David Danner, Commissioners Philip Jones and Ann Rendahl and Administrative Law Judge Dennis Moss,</p> <p>I was privileged to have attended the public hearing last night regarding the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for its LNG proposal. And I thank you for the opportunity to hear many sides of this important issue that directly affects Tacoma. I did not testify at the hearing because I needed to learn more about the pros and cons of your imperative decision.</p>

Now a citizen of Pierce County for four years, I moved from a small town in Northwest Pennsylvania. That town was and continues to be “economically distressed” ever since the oil companies found new sources in the mid-west and left its’ workers and citizens scrambling for jobs at a fraction of the previous living they had enjoyed. In its wake, those companies also left a mess in our beautiful forests and farmland. Unattended oil rigs, pump houses, miles and miles of sucker rods and a black slick of oil on the land can still be seen in a hike on the Allegheny Mountains. But along comes a new wave of technology that will save the day for Pennsylvania and surrounding states, called Fracking. After visiting a few of the “fracked” sites and watching the documentary “Gasland” I felt it was too expensive for so little gain. Our own town experienced the ill effects of natural gas drilling, as two homes in an area not far from a drilling site were destroyed in an explosion. In one, the home owners were not there, however, in the other serious injuries occurred to one of the home owners.

As I listened to the testimonies last night (11 in support of the settlement, 24 against), I understand the difficulty of your decision. Here are some of my thoughts:

- 1.) The fossil fuel industry is dying. It is no longer a viable option for our energy needs. Not only Is it extremely expensive, it prevents us as a nation to put resources into renewable alternatives.
- 2.) The location of this proposed plant is a short distance from a large residential area, plus an Elementary school. The two homes that I describe above were in a rural area; imagine the Catastrophic damage to both lives and assets should there be an earthquakes, a fire, an Explosion. Plus the current method for safeguarding the safety of those held at the NW Detention Center is unacceptable.
- 3.) PSE’s proposal weakens the “ring fencing” provisions that were designed to protect their rate Payers from unregulated private business.
- 4.) Although, TOTE Maritime Alaska supports PSE’s request, they are the only customer to date in support of this. Will one customer be enough to prevent a bankruptcy?

I would urge you to reject this proposal by PSE. Please be courageous enough to say that our citizens deserve better. Thank you.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Diane M. Martin          Gig Harbor, WA 98332</p>
	<p>Julia Galleher</p> <p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy and as a home owner how will be looking directly at the proposed LNG plant to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li>• As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility</li> </ul>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,  
Julia Galleher

--

#1 Real Estate Company in the US!

[www.facebook.com/JuliaGalleherRE](http://www.facebook.com/JuliaGalleherRE). for the latest in Real Estate/Financing news.

Are you looking to buy or sell in King or Pierce County, or just curious if the market has stabilized? For a free report specific to YOUR home or any neighborhood that you or anyone you know may be looking to buy in, please visit <http://www.JGalleherHomes.com>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>Julia Galleher          Keller Williams Realty Puget Sound          (253) 222-6699          (253) 449-0572 E-Fax.          If you want to be successful, it's just this simple; Know what you're doing, love what you're doing and believe in what you're doing!</p> <p>This e-mail message, including any attachments, may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer.</p>
	Peter Altmann	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing you in regards to Docket # 151663.          I am opposed to rate payers being an investor in the business of lng marine shavings for many good reasons.          Thank you          Peter Altmann          3111 6th AV          Tacoma Wa 99406</p>
	Jeff Dial	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge</p>

unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          [name of resident] Jeff Dial          [city of resident] Seattle</p>
	Joann McGovern	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,          I’m sure you’re receiving many copies of this letter or something like it.          The personal note that I would like to add is that many of us are retired, on limited incomes and that we depend upon you to make sure that Washington stays affordable for us to remain living here. We rely on you to recognize what is right for the citizens and help protect us from undue hardships. Please deny the PSE request to remove the protections that could place us all in financial risk.          Joann McGovern,          Federal Way, WA          SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663          Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.          It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.</p>

Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe." I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.  
Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,

	Jess Woodruff	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners</p> <p>PSE keeps claiming the need of an LNG facility in Tacoma. They have spent thousands of dollars trying to convince the public it is in their best interest. There is one big glaring problem with all their rhetoric, there is no need by the public rate paying customers for the plant. The minuscule proportion of the production could be filled in several other ways. The need for peak-shaving is actually just an indication that the current system is undersized. PSE already has plans to grow their system because of population growth in the region. Including an incremental capacity to prevent the need for peak-shaving is as easy as increasing the size of a new pipe by one or two inches.</p> <p>The obvious reason that PSE wants to include the peak-shaving capability in their new "for profit" company is to get the residential ratepayers to cover a great deal of the cost and assume a large portion of the risk. Trying to have two different companies with two different financial motives will never work. The new "for profit" company is trying to maximize returns for their owners, while the "public utility" company is mandated to protect the ratepayers. The UTC is the watchdog.</p> <p>The only true way to make this cobbled scenario work is to make the new PSE "for profit" company build the proposed LNG facility with it's own money. This new company could sell LNG to the current PSE company on the few days a year that extra capacity is needed. It would become immediately obvious that they would not want to continue the project without the financial contribution from the residential ratepayers. It would also become obvious that only the "for profit" company is reaping the benefits.</p> <p>There is no actual need for this project. There are other simple options to manage peak-shaving demands. Continuing with their current system has proven satisfactory in the past. Gig Harbor has a peak-shaving storage tank. There are huge gas reservoirs available. There are incremental growth plans that can include this demand. Their only need is for the rate paying customers to help pay the cost for the plant in order to maximize the profits for the foreign owners. The WUTC has the responsibility to protect the public ratepayers, not to help maximize the profits for the foreign owners.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Jess Woodruff</p>
--	---------------	--------	--

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

	Mary Stewart	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I am a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy. I am extremely opposed to them putting their LNG tank in the densely populated Tacoma Port. I am greatly concerned about the safety, especially since my family lives a short 2 miles away from the proposed plant. My children, who attend Stadium High School and Bellarmine High School, must drive past this potential bomb twice a day just to get to school. Our only high school is on the other side of the port. We have no choice about driving past this LNG tank, if they want to go to public school. If there was an accident with the LNG tank, my children would be cut off from us and unable to get home. What is their evacuation plan? My two younger children attend elementary and middle school 2 short miles away.</p> <p>This giant LNG tank will sit on a fault line, and right in the path of the lahar should Mt. Rainier decide to blow. No facility has been tested against this kind of Mother Nature. Why are we put in such danger? For 18 jobs? Tacoma doesn't have to be a cancer alley or a potential time bomb to be a great city. We all believe that, but our own city council does not.</p> <p>Please help us. Please help us prove that such a densely populated port, with 7 schools, including UWT with 5,000 students, is not the place for this giant LNG tank. When they approved neighborhoods, museums, restaurants, schools, university within a 3 mile radius of the port, they should have considered how this would change what companies put in the port and seriously look at the safety involved. New York governor, Mr. Cuomo, said no to an LNG tank they wanted to put 19 miles off the coast of Jones Beach. He said, "The risks far outweigh the rewards." That was 19 miles off the coast!! He said it would attract fracking and, after Sandy, they learned nothing can hold up to Mother Nature.</p> <p>Please help us in Tacoma.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mary Stewart Resident</p>
--	--------------	--------	--

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			NE Tacoma, Brown's Point
	Meng Li Che	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Meng Li Che. I am a resident of NE Tacoma and I am a PSE customer. I drive along the SR-509 corridor daily on my commute to work in Olympia.</p> <p>I oppose the LNG facility. I oppose amending Merger Commitment 56 from Merger Order 08 of Docket U-072375.</p> <p>When the merger commitment was made with a foreign corporation, I understand that the contract indicated that PSE would not own, operate, and/or finance another venture or company.</p> <p>This provision was put into the agreement for specific purposes at the time and there has been no change in circumstance to require any changes. The only reason to seek creating the agreement is income with little risk.</p> <p>I am curious if the merger commitment would have been approved in 2008 if the Commitment 56 were not included.</p> <p>PSE has not partnered with the community - its customers! It sends us mail every month! It has not asked us to participate or comment.</p> <p>Their request should be denied and/or rejected.</p> <p>Sincerely, Meng Li Che</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lena Gibson	E-mail	<p>We should be moving away from fossil fuels, not building new infrastructure to support our dependence on them. Renewables are getting cheaper and more viable all the time, and incentives support their continued development. The need for natural gas peak shaving will lessen as alternative sources of energy come on line.</p> <p>It is unclear how PSE's 1.1 million electricity customers receive any possible benefit from this project. What protects electricity customers from seeing their rates increase in order to subsidize natural gas business?</p> <p>I urge the Commissioners to protect nearly two million Washington State utility customers from PSE's speculative, risky business venture. Keep the original merger stipulations intact, and REJECT Puget Sound Energy's proposal. Thank you!</p> <p>Lena Gibson</p>
	Leasa S. Brittenham	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customers are being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize an unnecessary, risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p>

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe." I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

Along with being risky, as I stated before it is unnecessary.



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

PSE is a privately owned utility company. It should be operated to provide their customers with secure, low cost utilities. The conflict starts because it is also a private company that is profit driven. It is hard to both maximize profits for the stockholders and minimize costs for the ratepaying customers. In fact, you can not do both. The Tacoma LNG plant is a case in point. PSE is starting a new business venture outside their specific utility business. This business will allow them to purchase raw fracking gas and produce LNG for commercial customers, not their regular residential customers. This is all cloaked in a green washed package that says it is needed to clean up the environment and provide the ratepayers a peak shaving facility. Neither objective is true. It will actually increase the emissions in Tacoma and any peak-shaving benefits could be handled with the new capacity that will be needed with the normal anticipated growth in customers. Providing LNG is not in the charter for their public utility role. Tote container ships that are contracted for about half of the production us not a residential customer. The additional extra 50% capacity is also directed at their profit making role. The only reason that the peak-shaving capability was required was to help cover the cost for their new profit making corporation. It also absorbs a great deal of the risks. PSE does not care about reducing costs for their customers, they are interested in gaining the dominate position in what they believe will be a lucrative business. The utility side of PSE and the new "for profit" side should never be mixed together because they operate on two different motives. Clearly there is no need for the plant from the ratepaying customers. We should be able to show that as easy as Jordan Cove did. While I would vigorously protest the current location, I can think of a simple test to see if PSE actually believed what they were trying to convince everyone that they have pure motives. The test would be to let them build the plant totally with their new "for profit" company capital. They could spend their own money and take all the risks. They would be able to sell any peak-shaving demand to their utility company to meet the residential demand on the 6.3 days per year. This would cleanly separate the two businesses and prove that the customers were not being taken advantage of. PSE would never do this because it would be too costly without the utility side picking up half the cost and sharing the risks. They would fail the test and prove that it is not in our best interest. They are only looking after one thing and that is their own pocket book. I hope the WUTC understands this. This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,  
Leasa S. Brittenham

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Colleen Gray and Stan Shaw	E-mail	<p>I am appalled to learn PSE is poised to install a liquid natural gas storage facility in our port. I am writing to urge the attorney general to stop this venture due to risks forced on ratepayers and local citizens.</p> <p>Thank you,            Colleen Gray and Stan Shaw            3818 S 9th St, Tacoma</p>
	Florence Vincent	E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663            Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis).</li> </ul> <p>That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers</p>

should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		Florence Vincent P. O. Box 162 Rainier, WA 98576
Nicholas Curtright	E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I am writing to you as a resident of Puget Sound to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.</p> <p>Consider the following:</p> <p>Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</p> <p>The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</p> <p>Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest</p>

Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat. As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

The peoples' gratitude will flow your way if you use your backbone and stand up today. Thank you for doing your part to keep all Puget Sound residents safe.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Nicholas Curtright          5406 Doon way          Anacortes WA          98221</p>
	Sarah Stockholm	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> </ul>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>• As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</p> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.</p> <p>The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sarah Stockholm Olympia, WA</p>
	Patrice M. Bunge	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>It was brought to my attention today that the mayor of University Place, WA, Jose Figueroa, gave a sworn statement to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission saying that all</p>

University Place residents support Puget Sound Energy's LNG facility. This is not true, because I am one of those residents and I do not support this endeavor. Please hear me out.

I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline. Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.</p> <p>The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Patrice M. Bunge 8414 41st ST W University Place, WA 98466</p>
	Bobbi Abeqlan	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Melissa Hubbard	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Mary Kimmerling	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Karen Kounat	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Richard Lovering	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Sara Morgan	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Susan Ryan	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Tracy Wiegman	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Andrea Lumley	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its</p>

LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.

Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able. We live in the North End of Tacoma. We value the beauty of Tacoma, and want a safe area to live in. We want a sustainable future for all of the Pacific Northwest. We feel if the PSE LNG Proposal is granted, it will be a blow not only to Tacoma, but the entire region, as well.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andrea Lumley  
3111 N 32nd St  
Tacoma, WA 98407  
Pierce County  
253.584.9161  
253.318.3362

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy Tab® S

\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED - via email 10/20/16, 5:16 pm\*\*\*

Dear Commissioners,

PSE keeps claiming the need of an LNG facility in Tacoma. They have spent thousands of dollars trying to convince the public it is in their best interest. There is one big glaring problem with all their rhetoric, there is no need by the public rate paying customers for the plant. The minuscule proportion of the production could be filled in several other ways. The need for peak-shaving is

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

actually just an indication that the current system is undersized. PSE already has plans to grow their system because of population growth in the region. Including an incremental capacity to prevent the need for peak-shaving is as easy as increasing the size of a new pipe by one or two inches.

The obvious reason that PSE wants to include the peak-shaving capability in their new "for profit" company is to get the residential ratepayers to cover a great deal of the cost and assume a large portion of the risk. Trying to have two different companies with two different financial motives will never work. The new "for profit" company is trying to maximize returns for their owners, while the "public utility" company is mandated to protect the ratepayers. The UTC is the watchdog.

The only true way to make this cobbled scenario work is to make the new PSE "for profit" company build the proposed LNG facility with its own money. This new company could sell LNG to the current PSE company on the few days a year that extra capacity is needed. It would become immediately obvious that they would not want to continue the project without the financial contribution from the residential ratepayers. It would also become obvious that only the "for profit" company is reaping the benefits.

There is no actual need for this project. There are other simple options to manage peak-shaving demands. Continuing with their current system has proven satisfactory in the past. Gig Harbor has a peak-shaving storage tank. There are huge gas reservoirs available. There are incremental growth plans that can include this demand. Their only need is for the rate paying customers to help pay the cost for the plant in order to maximize the profits for the foreign owners. The WUTC has the responsibility to protect the public ratepayers, not to help maximize the profits for the foreign owners.

I am extremely concerned ... not only about the safety factor (I am a homeowner in North Tacoma) but also the economic impact this will have on me and the region. I want to stay in our North Tacoma home for another 20+ years. If this plant is built, our future in Tacoma is over.

Thank you for your time in reading this letter.

Respectfully,

			<p>Andrea Lumley          Tacoma WA 98407</p>
	<p>Roxy Murray</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquefaction and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li>• As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</li> </ul> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>\$49 million public subsidy.          The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”          I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”          I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p>
	Carol Colleran	E-mail	<p>The email is attached. It is not a comment directed to the commission. It is a statement directed to Phil Brooke. The public involvement email address was included.</p> <p>***COMMENT RECEIVED - Customer submitted comment through the online complaint portal, 10/20/16, 5:01 pm***</p> <p>The proposed PSE LNG plant in Tacoma should not be approved. The need is not there for this outdated technology &amp; ratepayers should NOT have to pay for it.</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p>
	Cindy Feist	E-mail	<p>The email is attached. It is not a comment directed to the commission. It is a hyperlink to a news article from Daily Energy Insider about UTC staff reaching a settlement agreement in the PSE LNG case. The public involvement email address was included in a reply all in an email initiated by Phil Brooke. SEE ATTACHMENT for email, link copied below.</p>

[https://dailyenergyinsider.com/industry/1844-conditions-tacoma-lng-facility-agreement-set-washington-utc/?utm\\_campaign=shareaholic&utm\\_medium=aol\\_mail&utm\\_source=email](https://dailyenergyinsider.com/industry/1844-conditions-tacoma-lng-facility-agreement-set-washington-utc/?utm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=aol_mail&utm_source=email)

\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED - 10-18-16\*\*\*

Dear Commission:

Please do not allow PSE to build their proposed LNG plant in the tide flats of Tacoma. Besides all the dangers that can be fully documented it will add incremental financial risk to the ratepaying customers. Many of the proposed financial calculations are wrong or have changed since the original proposal. It appears that PSE had to offer Tote extremely low prices in order to get their business. They hoped to sell the remaining 50% capacity to other customers at an increased margin to earn enough profit to pay for the capital and operating costs. Under perfect conditions, they could show they could share some of the profits with the ratepayers. Currently, conditions have changed so much that Tote is slowing down the conversion of it's ships to LNG and they have no other customers to buy any LNG. The only way that PSE can pay for the project is from the only source of revenue at their disposal, which is through increased rates from their customers. This is not in the financial best interest for the rate payers.

In total, there is very little benefit to anyone besides PSE in this whole project. There are only 18 relatively low paying jobs created. The number of ships entering the port remains the same. There is no increase in the container volume. Even the multiplying effect of adding a business is reduced because the profits will go to a foreign country instead of being reinvested here. What we do get with the proposed plant is a highly dangerous plant that could cause millions of dollars damage and thousands of lost lives. There will also be several thousand LNG tanker trucks making deliveries driving through our neighbors and on our highways. The PSE rate payers will be put at risk for both the safety risks and financial risks. This should never be allowed to happen. The public is just now awakening to the terrible problems and risks associated with this proposal. All of the Native American Tribes voted against it. Just the potential of reduced property value and increased insurance for an area of several miles around the plant should make everyone oppose it. The fire and explosion risk just can not be allowed.



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>Please do not allow this huge plant to be built in our neighborhood against the advice of nearly every safety association and organization. The common distance from populated residential areas prescribed by these organization is 3 miles. Some models used by Fire Departments and other First Responder indicate that even more distance is required. The risks clearly out way the miniscule benefits. Not even the state reaps as much benefits because of the reduced fuel tax given to the project. This is a no win project that must not be approved.</p> <p>Cindy Feist 4102 N. 32nd Tacoma, WA 98407 PSE customer</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
	Catherine Doty	Web	<p>***This comment came in through the complaint web form***</p> <p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p>

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.

Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Catherine Doty</p> <p>Lakewood</p>
	Tracy Martinez	E-mail <p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663 Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss: I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas. It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its</p>

LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Tracy Martinez          Tacoma WA</p>
	<p>Angelina Carrillo</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety</li> </ul>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Angelina Carrillo

Resident of Tacoma, Washington

Sent from my iPhone

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142

**In Favor:** 12

**Opposed:** 130

**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Claudia Woodward-Rice	E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that residential PSE customers will asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. This is the ultimate Corporate chicanery and must not be allowed to happen.</p> <p>Claudia Woodward-Rice          6711 Larson Lane, Aberdeen 98520</p>
	Lisa J. Keating	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington</p>

UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”          I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Lisa J. Keating          City of Tacoma resident</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
	Patricia A. Holm	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis).</li> </ul>

That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>Sincerely,          Patricia A. Holm          Olympia, WA 98506</p>
	<p>Dmitri J Keating</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663          Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.          It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li>• As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility</li> </ul> </p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.        Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.        The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”        I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”        I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.        This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.        Thank you for your consideration.        Sincerely,        Dmitri J Keating        Tacoma WA</p>
	<p>Lisa Campos</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:        I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.        Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.        As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington</p>

UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”          I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Lisa Campos          Tacoma, WA Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone</p>
	<p>Rose M Moor</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663          Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.          It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:  <input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Rose M Moor

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

	Kelly Lynch	E-mail	<p>Federal Way Wa.</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</li> </ul> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a</p>
--	-------------	--------	---



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

\$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.” I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kelly Lynch  
Tacoma, WA

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142

**In Favor:** 12

**Opposed:** 130

**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ronald Morrison	Web	<p>I am against it. And I will tell you good reason why everyone should be against it. We have experience in the not very far past of whoops, with the Washington Power System, They sold a lot of bombs. with state electric power and the forecast the huge need for hydropower they could not meet. And that went broke cause they figured out their beliefs and predictions were largely wrong. one nuclear power plant in Hanford others were partially build and tax payers are still paying today</p> <p>With respect to the PSE proposal. Part of LNG plant to store nat. gas by the people who use natural gas and sell rest to ships tote ships will cost a lot to modify and expecting further ships and trucks who use LNG too. And some are using as fuel not many but a few. LNG burns cleanly in engines. but issues in producing CO, MT and they leak in atmosphere. net results is that probably pollution level is not reduced that month than what we are currently doing, we are burning heaving oil relatively safely. but there is new tech improvement which doesn't req. huge modification to burn cleaning. REF: page 93 October issue popular Mech. Field Upgrading thru Calgary Alberta to remove sulfur from oil. and remove from oil what trucks possibly. Fuel upgrading as tech to make cleaner. They are producing 10 barrels a day as test. expecting to move up to 10000 per day. So if I owned a ship, or a big trucking company that burned oil to transport goods to burn LNG would take to modify fleet, and yet I saw this was coming along, to get a cleaner oil and would not have to modify and its going to be available, I would not do it and I would wait until 2019 to see how it tests out. Which requires a lot of modification and training and risk that are not well understood.</p> <p>The question I have is how do we know if we aren't going to settled with some of these cost on our gas bills if this LNG does not pan out? That are not attributable to our capacity to the couple of days they store the LNG.</p> <p>How do we know the costs are not going to be passed to the use if the plan doesn't work out. Instead of using better qualify refined oil as fuel.</p> <p>(Typed by Kathy McPherson, you may call the consumer if you wish per consumer)</p>
	Dorothy Walker	E-mail	<p>Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission          1300 S Evergreen Park Drive SW          Olympia, WA 98504</p>

SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663

Dear WUTC Commission Chair David Danner, Commissioners Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Law Judge Dennis Moss:

I am a resident of Pierce County and Chair of the Sierra Club Tatoosh Group of Pierce County, and am asking that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gal. LNG liquefaction and storage facility on the seismically vulnerable tidelands at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, residential PSE customers in the Pierce County region are being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company called Puget LNG [Note: this entity will headed by a board appointed by the very same one dozen directors that head PSE and will have no employees] can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas to its customers in the Pierce County Region. It is obvious that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefits and could impose increased risks to residential customers.

Here are some examples:

1. Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without a clear public benefit.
2. The need for additional peak shaving capacity is questionable, since PSE currently stores 47 billion cu. ft. of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
3. Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and this concerns me that public interests are not adequately represented.
4. WUTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gal. LNG storage facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

Advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663 is appreciated, since residential customers are not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect them directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind WUTC’s own mission statement: “... to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”

The thousands of residential PSE rate payers and the 1,400 + Sierra Club members of Pierce County ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. We also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.

This issue of public and financial safety is very important to us, and we will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as we can.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Walker, Chair  
Sierra Club Tatoosh Group  
6116 N Park Ave  
Tacoma, WA 98407

\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED - 10/20/16, 4:59 pm, SEE ATTACHED 3 files from Ms. Walker in

reference to Wilma Subra\*\*\*

Commissioners,

Several comments at the Oct 19 Commission hearing referenced analysis by Wilma Subra regarding the emissions the LNG plant would release. I have attached that analysis and a bio of Wilma who is a recipient of the MacArthur Fellowship Genius Award, lives in “cancer alley” in LA. and is an expert in petro-chemical environmental hazards.

Below are the comments I made at the hearing:

Respectfully,  
Dorothy Walker

My name is Dorothy Walker. I am a resident of Pierce Co. and of the Earth.  
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this stipulated agreement

I would like to challenge the underlying assumption driving this agreement. That is, that there is a need for a peak shaving facility and that it is in the public interest. I do not believe that PSE has demonstrated that there are customers who have gone without heat 6 days of the year. I have to conclude then that any need would be driven by anticipated area population growth. Growth in energy needs of the area should be met by ever more plentiful and cheap renewable energy. We should continue to encourage the change to heat pumps, solar installations and other clean (not fossil fuel) solutions. PSE would like to sell more gas. PSE will not tell you to turn down your thermostat.

Second, creating infrastructure that would increase demand for dirty fossil fuel is not in the public interest! PSE is not selling “clean natural gas”. PSE is selling dirty fossil fuel. The gas is to be fracked and transported by pipelines prone to leaking from Alberta. It is at least as contributory to greenhouse gases as coal. Methane (natural gas) contributes to greenhouse gases at 86 times the rate of CO2 over a 20 year period. Jim Hogan of PSE testified before the Shorelines Hearing Board that emission reductions in the two TOTE vessels “did not represent a significant reduction of emissions” in the Puget Sound Region.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>I have some concerns with the agreement itself.          I would strongly urge you not to remove the “ring fencing” protections agreed to by Puget Energy when they were allowed to purchase PSE. The “amendments” to commitments 56 and 58 allow what the commitments were designed to prevent, allowing Puget Energy to form another corporation and to use its credit in its behalf. Puget LNG will pay its share of development costs with PSE credit. PSE will pay its share with increases to its rate payers.</p> <p>The underlying logic for the “ownership share” percentages should be available to the public. PSE’s share (for peak shaving) of the storage facility is 79%. Yet the LNG used for peak shaving would be in the neighborhood of 7%. This seems really high, unless of course, PSE has plans we are not privy to for the rest of the capacity.</p> <p>In Attachment D the Common Ownership Share calculation is based on PSE and Puget LNG ownership shares, and is 43% and 57% respectively.          Setting aside the fact that this seems a contrived way to allocate operating costs and liabilities, with no transparency in the allocations of capital expenditures, tell me what you want the common allocations to be and I guarantee that I can change the allocated capital (and ownership shares) to arrive at that number.</p> <p>In conclusion, my reading of the agreement tells me that the protections afforded are for Puget Energy and PSE. PSE’s losses will be passed on to its ratepayers. Ratepayers are protected from liabilities of Puget LNG, LLC but the community most certainly is not. In the case of bankruptcy or God forbid a catastrophic failure or accident, the Port of Tacoma and the City of Tacoma (i.e, taxpayers) would be left to pick up the pieces, clean up the mess and try to make residents who suffered property damages, death or injury whole again. Puget LNG could just walk away.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p>
	<p>Jennifer Sprague</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port</p>

of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity is doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.” I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Jennifer Sprague        PSE Customer        Olympia, WA</p>
	<p>Carole Sue Braaten</p>	<p>Phone</p>	<p>***This comment was transcribed by telephone with the customer. The call quality was poor and the comment was technical in nature. Due to the difficulties the customer was advised to file comment via email as well.***</p> <p>To stop PSE LNG plant due to dangerous and hazardous geologic and seismic hazards that have not been adequately addressed along with other hazards.</p> <p>The Cascadia earthquake fault line is due to go off anytime with a magnitude of 9.0. This fault line along with other fault lines poses a great danger to the Port of Tacoma because it can cause a massive tsunami to come into the port. The port soil is landfill it sits in liquefaction soil which becomes unstable during an earthquake and becomes liquid. They are using the Nisqually level earthquake which was deep earth quake and lasted 40 seconds compared to the Cascadia Earthquake fault line that can produce magnitude 9 earthquakes lasting up to 5 minutes. The tsunami can bring in ships, containers or anything else and hit buildings just like the Japanese 2011 earthquake. There are two Tacoma earthquake fault lines. One is less than one mile, running directly towards the PSE energy plant. The entire Port of Tacoma sits on historic land fill that is known as erosion non-stable soil and it is in the lahar/mudflow from a Mr. Rainier volcanic</p>



eruption or a fast glacier melt. Also it is a historic flood zone, which can flood from the Puyallup River. The site sits between two creeks the Wapato and the Hylobos which have endangered species salmon and Steel Head. Both creeks are part of the Puyallup tribes reservation. The proposed plant would, during a major magnitude earthquake the land would experience severe liquefaction, causing a pipeline to rupture and break. The only City of Tacoma fire department that is certified to work the port for a fire of the type that the LNG plant could generate is from the City of Fife, it is the citizens of Fife pay for the fire services. The LNG site is in a major landslide area, a landslide could cut off the ability of first responders to respond to an emergency at the plant. The only building in the United State that is engineered to survive a tsunami is in Westport, WA, it cost a prohibitive five times what a normal building would cost. They have not figured in the burden of cost for emergency management personnel to manage any catastrophe or how to evacuate people out of the area. The pipeline will actually run 2/10 of a mile from a local high school and 4/10 of a mile from a public swimming area. They want to join another pipeline in a liquefaction zone near a school. The pipeline could damage I5 if something happens. The pipeline that comes from the liquefaction zone is located in 54 Ave NE which is a major evacuation route out of the port in the case of a tsunami. If the pipeline ruptured it could damage the road and make evacuation difficult. The plant could explode next to one of the oil tankers. This project poses a threat and a possible terrorist target. The plant also would sit where the new 167 highway extension is proposed, possibly compromising that project. Structural design has not been adequate looked at considering the geological and seismic hazard that would far exceeded and overburden the emergency personnel that would have to deal with this. The explosion from this plant could cause the Targa Plant with 27 tanks to explode releasing chemicals into the air. The chemicals from this plant would have catastrophic effects on marine life and have effects for miles with no way to stop it. This area of the Puyallup Valley is on the Pierce County major recharge area. Any ruptured lines or contamination from the plant could affect the water due to the high water table. The water usage from this plant has not adequately been addressed, nether have the chemicals coming from this plant to the Tacoma waste water treatment plant. This plant produces fertilizer which could be affected by the chemicals.

\*\*\*SEE ATTACHMENT - Customer submitted comment via email 10/20/16, 4:57 pm\*\*\*  
\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED - 10/20/16, 5:05 pm\*\*\*

Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,

			Carole Sue Braaten
	Will Swoveland	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</li> </ul> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Will Swoveland  
Tacoma, WA

Sent from my iPhone

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Barbara Rhoades	E-mail	<p>Hello Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>Please know that there are many Tacoma residents, myself included, who are staying informed on the proposed development of an LNG plant and we are strongly opposed. Frankly, I find the whole issue complicated, but even more confusing is that there are NO politicians taking accountability for this horrific decision. My only recourse is simply with my vote and to that end I keep a list of everyone's names, yours included, to make sure I, and my family and friends, don't ever accidentally vote for any of you in any future election. I am old, and only one voice, but social media goes far. Stop PSE and LNG.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Barbara Rhoades          4616-4618 Slayden Rd          Tacoma, WA 98422          (206)735-8497</p> <p>***EMAIL RECEIVED - 10/19/16***</p> <p>Dear Mr. Roberts:</p> <p>The presidential debates have been set for months now. I'm at a loss as to why you would place the PSE/LNG issue for public comment on not only the very date the last of the 3 debates were said to occur, but the EXACT time it was to start as well (PST). Really??? I feel like I've been undermined.</p> <p>Sadly disillusioned with the UTC,</p> <p>Barbara Rhoades</p>

	Judith Lienhard	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li><li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li><li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li><li>• As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</li></ul> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a</p>
--	-----------------	--------	---

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>\$49 million public subsidy.          The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”          I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”          I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Judith Lienhard          Portland, Oregon</p>
	<p>Judy Ferguson</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>***Second comment - received 10/19/16 9:21 am***</p> <p>Commissioners and Administrative Judge Moss -</p> <p>Last night as my 9 hour work day and 'at home' responsibilities ended, I began an email to you asking your denial of PSE's request to remove the 'ring fencing' consumer protection of their 2008 agreement. I was using a 'template' for that email that provided me with your contact information, as well as some facts. To my chagrin, a spasm of my aging laptop sent that email to you in a most unfinished state. I'm embarrassed that this was sent and could undermine my worry and hours of study on this issue, but not embarrassed enough to slink away without making sure my sincere concerns are shared.</p>

In a nutshell and in my very own words, PSE has been less than transparent and forthcoming regarding their intentions for the LNG facility in the Port of Tacoma. They are proposing a massive structure that will store 8 million gallons of LNG, yet they state that less than 50% of that amount will be used for peak shaving and TOTE fueling. They have not publicly stated the use of the other 51% of their stored product.. It is notable that our area has not had need to use 'peak shaving' reserves for some period, if ever, and TOTE at this time has put their ship retrofitting on hold for yet another year. At the end of this month, the feasibility portion of PSE's lease with the Port of Tacoma comes to an end after two extensions, and the next lease phase begins with much, much larger lease payments.

PSE's attitude and behavior over the last months is one of half truths, fact manipulation and outright falsehoods. PSE has a plan in mind for the other 51% of their product and the assumption by citizens and experts in the field is that it will be exported, and perhaps bunkered. PSE's new shell company and their request to you for a change from their original 2008 agreement will put PSE rate payer's at risk of financial participation in PSE's scheme of complicated machinations.

The Macquarie Group is a privately owned, foreign corporation. Their interest is not in the financial well being of PSE rate payers, but with their investors. They are already receiving enormous tax breaks from the State and their lease with the Port practically gives away the farm. Their lease requires only a pittance from them for road improvements and the reopening and manning of a Fire station. The residents of Tacoma will participate in paying the majority of those costs, while the primary user of the infrastructure keeps their \$\$ in their pocket.

I am a 30 year resident of Browns Point and am living with the aftermath of the Asarco smelter. My 1935-ish home is directly across the bay from the smelter site and its smoke plume. My .90 acre lot is contaminated with arsenic in its soil, but we are not in the 'zone' that provides \$\$ compensation to have the top soil removed. Asarco was also under foreign ownership that walked away and left the tremendous cleanup to others. Tacoma should not have to play 'Round 2' of this game.

I have been astounded and disgusted by PSE and their actions. Their disdain of citizens that question their project is more than unacceptable. They are quick to file suit against others, but refuse to share safety information that thousands of local residents deserve to know. They are behaving this way now - - - long before construction has even begun. It can only get worse from

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

here if you grant their request. I equate them to a young child that wants what they want when they want it and are relentless. Wisdom and 'tough love' discipline need to prevail.

In the past year I have become more knowledgeable than I ever expected to be about methanol and LNG. These are two projects that did not and do not belong in Tacoma, particularly as the fossil fuel industry is now under intense scrutiny and is nosediving. The industry boom has waned and the financial consequences of fracking, etc. are now being revealed. PSE and the Macquarie Group need to live and operate under their 2008 agreement with the UTC.

My evening email 'missend' was sent at 9:30 PM and I began this morning's redo at 6:10 AM. That should add credence to the fact that a community of citizens is worried enough about PSE and their LNG project that it has a daily place in our lives. While my work and home responsibilities do not allow me to attend tonight's public session, I hope my written concerns will be considered.

I wish you the best in this long day of great importance.

Judy Ferguson  
7219 East Side Dr NE  
Tacoma, WA 98422

\*\*\*First Comment - received 10/18/16 9:21 pm\*\*\*

Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, Ann Rendahl and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:

I ask that you deny the request of Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Your approval of PSE's request would remove the protection that residential customers currently have in regard to financial risks that PSE may engage in.

PSE should be held to the pledge that owner Macquarie Group made to state and federal regulators in 2008 when trying to win permission to purchase the Utility. 8 years after the fact, PSE is at the end of a lease extension with the Port on October 31, 2016. At that time, the lease



PSE's attitude and behavior over the last months is one of half truths, fact manipulation and outright falsehoods. Puget LNG, PSE's new shell company, will now run the proposed LNG facility in the Port of Tacoma and will be able to charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.

Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.” I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.        This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.        Thank you for your consideration.        Sincerely,        [name of resident]        [city of resident]</p>
	<p>Julie Andrzejewski</p>	<p>E-mail        Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:        As a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy, I am writing to ask you to deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.        Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. I strongly oppose such a guarantee.        As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.        It seems that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:  <input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear</p>

public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity is doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Julie Andrzejewski

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Barbara Roberts	Mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT - letter from consumer***
	Debra Olsen	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> </ul>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>• As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</p> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.</p> <p>The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Debra Olsen Tacoma, WA</p>
	Janice Lapiana	E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business</p>

of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>\$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”          I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”          I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Janice Lapiana          Tacoma Resident and Customer</p>
	<p>Daniel Cherniske</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.          It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:  <input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one</p>

considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe." I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, -- Daniel Cherniske Co-Founder at Symbiotic Cycles Aquaponics Design - Build - Teach www.symbioticcycles.com</p> <p>Olympia resident</p>
Kyle Taylor Lucas	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - Word document copy of customer comment***</p> <p>Dear Commissioners and Administrative Judge Moss: Please accept my formal comments inserted below and on the attached document in response to: Puget Sound Energy - Docket UG-151663</p> <p>Kyle Taylor Lucas</p> <hr/> <p>October 19, 2016 Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss 1300 Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, WA 98502 RE: Petition of PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC., for (i) Approval of a Special Contract for Liquefied Natural Gas Fuel Service with Totem Ocean Trailer Express, Inc., and (ii) a Declaratory Order Approving the Methodology for Allocating Costs Between Regulated and Non-regulated Liquefied Natural Gas Services, Docket UG-151663 Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss: I write as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to urge your denial of PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" protecting consumers from PSE's plan to build an 8 million-gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. As a residential PSE customer, I strongly object to being forced to provide the financial guarantee for and to subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p>

Puget Sound Energy spent millions opposing my local public power effort a few years ago, so we remain hostage to a foreign private interest controlling our rates and policies. You are our only hope for fairness.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE seeks to dismantle that ring fencing residential protection so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

Clearly, PSE seeks to force residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility offers no tangible benefit to residential customers.

Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity is doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediation meetings have been neither public nor transparent. Public interests are not served.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>\$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your commitment to protect Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is critically important to me and my family and neighbors. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Kyle Taylor Lucas Tumwater, WA</p>
	Sherri Goulet	E-mail SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663 Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss: I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you represent me and deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. I was at the public meeting in 2008 when we were asked to testify about the Macquarie Group purchasing PSE. The overflow crowd attending that meeting was 99.9% against a foreign

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

government purchasing our utility. You ignored the will of the people and went forward with that transaction.

The Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas. This is unacceptable.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.” So again, the public pays and the private profits...again unacceptable.

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sherri Goulet

Olympia, Washington

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Natalie Molfino	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I am writing about DOCKET UG-151663 and the plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>When I first heard that our health could be put at risk just to profit a foreign-owned business, I was absolutely shocked to hear that Tacoma would even consider allowing it to store all of that fossil fuel here.</p> <p>I am also pleading with you to deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able. I am telling all my friends who are mothers about Redline Tacoma. They may be too busy with the chaos of babies to write you, but I can assure you they are just as concerned as I am. If this ever proceeds, they will feel betrayed by Tacoma.</p> <p>Tacoma is not some remote port. It is located very close to hundreds of thousands of families. We ourselves are a military family that recently went through much effort to retire in this area and are very saddened to learn about this initiative that could horribly pollute our area. No amount of money is worth that cost!!! Whatever way Tacoma thinks they could benefit from this proposal is utterly shameful. My family is Libertarian thinking, but if a business threatens the lives of children, then the people should rise up against it to keep it out!</p> <p>Insisting on Desistance,  caring mother Natalie</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

	Kim M Dobson	E-mail	<p>PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>My name is Kim Dobson , a long time resident of Thurston county. I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme. We as rate payers on PSE 's electric grid already pay almost 11 cents per Kilowatt hour ,highest in the state .</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</li> <li>• As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</li> </ul> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility</p>
--	--------------	--------	--

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.</p> <p>The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Kim M Dobson        Olympia Washington 98502</p> <p>PARALLEL UNIVERSITY radio show on KAOS 89.3FM Olympia Community Radio  <a href="http://www.kaosradio.org">http://www.kaosradio.org</a> (Air Studio (360) 867-5267) Thursdays 12 to 1pm (pacific time)  <a href="mailto:parralleluniversity@yahoo.com">mailto:parralleluniversity@yahoo.com</a> THE TRUTH IS VERY NEAR</p>
	Mary Abramson	Web	<p>10/19/2016 2:25 p.m. The customer called does not have internet and would like to comment:&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;She wants it noted that she is against the storage facility for gas in Tacoma proposed by PSE.</p>
	Yanah Cook	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a 23 year residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer</p>

utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.

Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and to many people I know, a very dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,        Yanah G Cook        Roy, WA</p>
	<p>Laura Woodruff</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear UTC,</p> <p>I am writing to urge you to deny PSE's request to allow the creation of Puget LNG which is in direct violation of Macquarie's 2008 agreement with the UTC when purchasing PSE.</p> <p>Allowing PSE to create a shell company, Puget LNG, would unfairly put risk on the utility consumers you pledge to protect. The LNG facility is a risky venture for several reasons including but not limited to: LNG is considered a bridge fuel so how long will it be a viable business and, the placement of this facility is unprecedented by industry standards because it is within 3 miles of residents and other businesses and it is being placed on a fault line and in a lahar zone. Their current insurance policy and terms of lease with the Port of Tacoma state that they are not liable for damages if caused by a natural disaster, a third party, nor act of terrorism. They have already stated that they are concerned that they will be a terrorist threat, a natural disaster is plausible, and an accident caused by a third party human error is also plausible.</p> <p>And what if for some reason the permits aren't approved for the Port of Tacoma LNG facility? Or</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>what if the Puyallup Tribe wins the suit to stop PSE from building this plant? They have the support of 28 Native American tribes to fight PSE. They will be too far in their lease to cancel it and PSE will be stuck with rent in excess of \$2 million per year for 30 years. And who will pay for that? It will certainly be passed on to PSE customers in rate hikes.</p> <p>If any of these things were to happen, it would put the rate payers of PSE in a position of higher rates. At the same time, if the LNG facility booms in business, the rate payers will not see a rate drop. There is no benefit and only risk for PSE Customers if Puget LNG is allowed to exist. It would also allow Puget LNG to be largely unhampered in the current, mainly unrestricted, LNG business. This alone should be enough to want to keep a close eye on PSE and their LNG experiment.</p> <p>This LNG project is most certainly an experiment on PSE's part. They have no experience in anything beyond storing facilities. They are ignoring industry standards. They are telling people all damages will stay within their property, which is a ridiculous claim when you look at the two recent gas explosions in Greenwood and today in Portland. They are suing citizens and business that want to see safety models.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>Laura Woodruff</p>
	Janice Klinski	E-mail <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p>

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe." I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,</p> <p>Janice Klinski          Olympia, WA</p>
	Betsy Bullman	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> <li>• The need for additional peak shaving capacity is doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</li> <li>• Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been</li> </ul>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Betsy Bullman  
Olympia, WA

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Heidi Neidlinger	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Dinner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss,</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build 8 million gallon LNG liquidification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>I am not willing to assume the risk for LNG and this proposed LNG facility. This does not offer any tangible benefits to residential customers.</p> <p>I should not have to support a foreign -owned, for profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.</p> <p>This will likely affect me directly. Please keep in mind the mission to protect consumers from predatory schemes like this one proposed by PSE/Macquarie Group to remove the "ring fencing" provisions.</p> <p>This issue is important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and will speak out in opposition.</p> <p>Thank you for your time in considering my concerns and what is best for the residents who are impacted.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Heidi Neidlinger          Tacoma resident</p>

Russell A. Dial

E-mail

Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:

I write to you as a Tacoma home owner to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Specifically, I am concerned that residential PSE customers are being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”</p> <p>I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since residential customers are not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect them directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”</p> <p>I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.</p> <p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Russell A. Dial</p> <p>Tacoma, WA</p>
	<p>Aries M. Dial</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a Tacoma home owner to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Specifically, I am concerned that residential PSE customers are being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p>



It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since residential customers are not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect them directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Aries M. Dial</p> <p>Tacoma, WA</p>
	Sally Marie	E-mail	<p>If you can't go at least email by Thursday at 5 pm a comment to:  <a href="mailto:Comments@utc.wa.gov">Comments@utc.wa.gov</a></p> <p>PLEASE deny the PSE request to create a shell company Puget LNG which will put rate payers at risk if the LNG facility fails and not cut their rates if the LNG facility is wildly profitable. The profit will benefit the Australian owners and losses will be in the backs of hard working Americans like you in the form of rate hikes!</p> <p>Sent from XFINITY Connect Mobile App          Sally and Robin Branson          32 ys in NE Tacoma</p>
	Alison Eastlake	E-mail	<p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663          Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge</p>

unregulated rates for natural gas.

It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:

- Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.
- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.          Thank you for your consideration.          Sincerely,          Alison Eastlake          Olympia, WA</p>
	<p>Yvonne McCarty</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - 9/12/16 3:31 PM email customer &gt;&gt; Commissioners***           ***COMMENT RECEIVED 10/20/2016, 3:28 PM***</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.          It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</li> </ul>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

- The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.
- Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.
- As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Yvonne McCarty

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Gareth Barkin	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT - 9/14/16 7:36 PM email Customer >> Commissioners***
	Mel and Suzanna Berglund	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - 9/27/16 2:48 PM email Mel and Suzanna Berglund &gt;&gt; Phil Brooke***</p> <p>This email is a question directed to Phil Brooke and not a comment directed to the commission. Taken in context this person appears to be interested in the case. This commissioners were copied on this email.</p> <p>***10/13/16 6:46 pm Customer submitted comment via email***</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; My wife and I are writing this email because we have serious concerns regarding the funding of an LNG tank for a company that is owned by a powerful financial group from Australia.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; It has come to my attention that PSE wants to use my ratepayer money to fund a portion of their proposed LNG project even though only 3% of it would actually be used for us.</p> <p>&gt; If any other sales person were to approach me about this I would consider it a scam. However because it's our politicians and (what I thought was) a publicly owned utility I am writing to get your input.</p> <p>&gt; This can't be true is it??</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; It sounds like this is simply a private/International for profit venture trying to get something for nothing from us.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; As a longstanding customer of PSE I am asking the UTC to not allow PSE to build the LNG facility in Tacoma using our ratepayer money. This abuse of our money should not be allowed.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; It has come to my attention that many who are more knowledgeable than me actually believe PSE is inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project in order to use public funds to build it.</p> <p>&gt; I have heard of this type of goings-on before and caution our little city to not be taken in by big international businesses like this.</p> <p>&gt;</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

> To verify these possibly inflated numbers I am asking that you demand that PSE prove their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving.  
>  
> Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi million dollar facility for 3 days per year of usage.  
>  
> Do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only.  
>  
> This issue is getting a lot of news coverage right now and recently was on KOMO 4.  
>  
> We are watching closely to see what will be done.  
>  
>  
> Sincerely,  
> Mel and Suzanna Berglund  
> Tacoma Resident  
>  
>

\*\*\*Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.\*\*\*

\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED - 10/20/2016, 4:49 pm\*\*\*

The owners of PSE have sufficient litigation against them in other business ventures that they have taken risks on that it should be a STOP against them owning and operating a LNG manufacturing facility within our community. Please research this very closely.

They are a high risk investment system that is offering nothing of benefit to our community or citizens.

We don't need them and we don't want them.

---

We have sufficient natural gas to meet our needs.

If they build this manufacturing and storage facility there is a real possibility they will sell to

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>another company &amp; it will put us yet another step closer to potential financial or even physical risk to our community.</p> <p>I'm shocked that we are even considering this.</p> <p>---</p> <p>President Obama has just announced a major initiative to clean up areas of the Puget Sound that have been neglected.        This definitely would include the area where PSE wants to put this 19th century fossil fuel monstrosity.</p> <p>This proposal would hurt that presidential cleanup effort for our Northeast Tacoma waterfront that has been an industrial sacrifice zone for 100 years.</p> <p>Highest and best use for that waterfront land demands that you reject this foolish proposal.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Just think, they would consider creating a shell company with such a strange arm's length reach into PSE to protect their own finances while risking everything of ours is next to criminal.</p> <p>MelBerglund</p>
	Lynn Buckner	Web	No to the LNG facility in the Tacoma Tide flats!
	LaDonna Robertson	Web	<p>1709 S G Street, Apt. 113        Tacoma, WA 98405-5104        October 5, 2016        Subject: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663        Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and the Honorable Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:        I write to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquefaction and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.        Specifically, I am concerned that residential PSE customers are being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and to subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.        As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run</p>



the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.<br /><br />It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.<br /><br />Please consider the following:<br /><br />Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.<br /><br />The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.<br /><br />Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.<br /><br /><br /><br />Page 2<br /><br />As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.<br /><br />Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.<br /><br />The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016, response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”<br /><br />I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation, even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable, and safe.”<br /><br />I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/The Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;This issue is and has been very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Sincerely,&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;LaDonna Robertson&lt;br /&gt;Resident of the&lt;br /&gt;City of Tacoma, WA&lt;br /&gt;</p> <p>***Comments from this customer exceeded the 10,000 character limit see attached email"151663Robertson 10-20-16 Comment" for customer comment***</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p>
	Ken Roberts	Web	
	Bradley Thompson	E-mail	<p>October 3, 2016</p> <p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission        1300 Evergreen Park Dr SW        Olympia, WA 98502</p> <p>Re: Docket UG-151663</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl:        I write, as a Tacoma citizen and PSE residential customer, in opposition to Puget Sound Energy’s proposal to form a shell company "Puget LNG" for the following reasons:        1) There was substantial public opposition when PSE was transformed from a publicly traded company to private equity ownership. In fact, even Commissioner Philip Jones dissented, recommending against approval of the Merger Stipulation based on “the risks in the current and future markets of the financial leverage embedded in the proposal, and the risks arising from the lack of transparency and complexity of the structure of the investor consortium.” Looking ahead at the time of the merger, it was anticipated that PSE or their parent company Macquarie might seek to pursue new business opportunities that could expose the company and its customers to increased financial risk. It was precisely for this reason that many of the protections in the Stipulation and Merger Order were originally adopted, and I therefore urge you to deny PSE’s request to alter them.        2) As a PSE residential customer, I’m extremely concerned that my voice has not been adequately represented in these proceedings. I wouldn’t have even learned about these proceedings</p>

had it not been for a public records request. To date, I have only seen one news article about PSE seeking exemptions from the Merger Stipulations, and that was in a weekly community newspaper. No major daily newspaper has covered this potentially controversial story. The Tacoma LNG project proposal has been broadly criticized locally for being unneeded and for being poorly (and potentially dangerously) sited. If there was substantial public opposition when PSE was allowed to be acquired by a private equity group, then I predict that nearly 2 million PSE residential customers will be even more vociferously opposed when it is learned that the original ring fencing Merger Stipulations have been weakened by UTC.

3) PSE has not demonstrated need for a peak shaving facility in Tacoma. PSE already has contractual access to two large underground storage projects: Jackson Prairie and Clay Basin. PSE could seek to expand pipeline access to meet peak needs. I am unaware of any other hybrid LNG facility in North America that incorporates LNG liquefaction, LNG peak shaving, LNG marine/truck/rail bunkering, and regasification into a single facility located in the middle of a busy port within ½ mile of neighboring homes. It seems rather transparent that peak shaving was included in the project proposal for the sheer purpose of obfuscating the distinction between regulated and unregulated business. Based upon the calculations in the settlement stipulation, it appears that PSE ratepayers will eventually assume \$134 million (or 43%) of the capital expenditures, whereas Puget LNG will assume \$177 million (or 57%) of the capital expenditures – a pretty generous subsidy for Puget Sound Energy considering that the estimated need for peak shaving (regulated business) represents only 7% of the LNG produced annually by the facility and is needed for, at most, 6 inclement weather days out of 365 days/year.

4) As a concerned Tacoma citizen and PSE ratepayer, I feel powerless in these proceedings. Communication with Public Counsel – who I presume represents the interests of PSE customers – has been frustrating and virtually nonexistent. UTC hearings that were supposedly public were twice canceled. Public comments that once appeared on the docket have now disappeared. I am equally puzzled in reading through the lengthy docket documents. Whereas there seemed to be adamant opposition to PSE merger exemptions from Public Counsel and UTC staff suddenly, just two months later, there appears to be unified agreement in the settlement stipulation. There is a lack of transparency in the process, as a signed non-disclosure agreement prevents the public from learning what transpired during the mediation meetings. I am not satisfied by the language in the settlement stipulation that claims to hold PSE ratepayers “harmless” when it’s clear that costs associated with running unregulated business will eventually be subsidized by utility ratepayers. Is there a guarantee in the settlement stipulation that electricity customers’ rates won’t rise as a result of paying for unregulated natural gas infrastructure capital costs? Where is the public benefit in

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>this proposal to the 1.1 million residential electricity customers?          I urge the Commissioners to prioritize public ratepayers' interests and deny PSE's proposal. As UTC's mission states: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe." This proposal clearly doesn't protect consumers. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Bradley Thompson          2314 S. Ainsworth Avenue          Tacoma, WA 98405          (206) 601-5442          bradleythomp@gmail.com (preferred communication)</p> <p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - For Additional Comments***</p>
	<p>Emily Boyle</p> <p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis).</li> </ul> <p>That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers</p>

should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

			<p>Emily Boyle Tacoma, WA</p>
	<p>Frank Dimayuga</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquefaction and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers. Consider the following:</p> <p>Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest’s Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.</p> <p>The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.</p> <p>Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.</p> <p>As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle’s Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.</p> <p>Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>\$49 million public subsidy.          The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General’s Office: “PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers.”          I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General’s Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC’s own mission statement: “to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe.”          I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE’s request to remove the “ring fencing” provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE’s speculative, private business venture.          This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p>
	<p>Nanette Reetz</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>SUBJECT: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663          Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:          I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.          Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.          As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required “ring fencing” provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.          It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.</p>

Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Nanette Reetz

Tacoma, Wa 98422

\*\*\*Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.\*\*\*

\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED 10/20/2016, 3:29 pm\*\*\*

Dear Commissioners

PSE keeps claiming the need of an LNG facility in Tacoma. They have spent thousands of dollars trying to convince the public it is in their best interest. There is one big glaring problem with all their rhetoric, there is no need by the public rate paying customers for the plant. The minuscule proportion of the production could be filled in several other ways. The need for peak-shaving is actually just an indication that the current system is undersized. PSE already has plans to grow their system because of population growth in the region. Including an incremental capacity to prevent the need for peak-shaving is as easy as increasing the size of a new pipe by one or two inches.

The obvious reason that PSE wants to include the peak-shaving capability in their new "for profit" company is to get the residential ratepayers to cover a great deal of the cost and assume a large portion of the risk. Trying to have two different companies with two different financial motives will never work. The new "for profit" company is trying to maximize returns for their owners, while the "public utility" company is mandated to protect the ratepayers. The UTC is the watchdog.

The only true way to make this cobbled scenario work is to make the new PSE "for profit" company build the proposed LNG facility with it's own money. This new company could sell LNG to the current PSE company on the few days a year that extra capacity is needed. It would become immediately obvious that they would not want to continue the project without the financial contribution from the residential ratepayers. It would also become obvious that only the "for profit" company is reaping the benefits.

There is no actual need for this project. There are other simple options to manage peak-shaving demands. Continuing with their current system has proven satisfactory in the past. Gig Harbor has a peak-shaving storage tank. There are huge gas reservoirs available. There are incremental growth plans that can include this demand. Their only need is for the rate paying customers to help pay the cost for the plant in order to maximize the profits for the foreign owners. The WUTC has the responsibility to protect the public ratepayers, not to help maximize the profits for the foreign owners.

Nanette Reetz  
5026 Galleon Drive NE  
Tacoma, Wa 98422

\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED 10/20/16, 4:59 pm Please see attached Outlook message file for attachments\*\*\*

This is so important to de-bunk the EDB comments at the beginning of the meeting last night about improving air quality at the Port/Tacoma. Maybe mention that the Tote ships will be plugged into shore power while docked in port and not burning LNG. Also the health costs to residents from the toxic/carcinogenic particulate matter released from the cleaning, flaring process from turning fracked gas to LNG. Here is the Docket info: PSE LNG Proposal; DOCKET UG-151663 and here is their email: [comments@utc.wa.gov](mailto:comments@utc.wa.gov) to make it easy. Any additional thoughts on this?  
Nanette

Dear commissioners,

Thank you for hearing our concerns last night at the public forum. I would like to address something the EBD members talked about. They stated that this PSE LNG proposal would be good for the environment and improve air quality at the Port of Tacoma. I disagree with this statement and am attaching documents to support my reasoning. The 2 Tote ships that are currently contracted with PSE will be plugged into shore power while docked at the Port and will not be burning LNG. However, the particulate matter released from the cleaning and flaring process from turning fracked gas to LNG at the plant itself will lower air quality standards and put nearby

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>residents in harms way from it's toxic/carcinogenic emissions. The released of these pollutants will have a detrimental effect on the health of the Tacoma community. As a result from the increase in health issues, this will also be a burden on the residents for additional health care cost.          Thank you for time and consideration in this matter,          Nanette Reetz          5026 Galleon Drive NE          Tacoma, Wa 98422</p> <p>***COMMENT RECEIVED 10/20/16, 5:06 pm Please see attached Outlook message file for attachments***</p> <p>Dear commissioners,</p> <p>Thank you for hearing our concerns last night at the public forum. I would like to address something the EBD members talked about. They stated that this PSE LNG proposal would be good for the environment and improve air quality at the Port of Tacoma. I disagree with this statement and am attaching documents to support my reasoning. The 2 Tote ships that are currently contracted with PSE will be plugged into shore power while docked at the Port and will not be burning LNG. However, the particulate matter released from the cleaning and flaring process from turning fracked gas to LNG at the plant itself will lower air quality standards and put nearby residents in harms way from it's toxic/carcinogenic emissions. The released of these pollutants will have a detrimental effect on the health of the Tacoma community. As a result from the increase in health issues, this will also be a burden on the residents for additional health care cost.          Thank you for time and consideration in this matter,          Nanette Reetz          5026 Galleon Drive NE          Tacoma, Wa 98422</p>
	<p>Liz Biviano</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the “ring fencing” that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.

As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.

Liz Biviano

David Caffee

5014 Tower Dr. NE

Tacoma, WA 98422

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

\*\*\*Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.\*\*\*

\*\*\*COMMENT RECEIVED 10/20/16, 5:01 pm\*\*\*

Dear Commissioners:

I have additional comments to add to my original letter, in light of new items that I have learned. PSE keeps claiming the need of an LNG facility in Tacoma. They have spent thousands of dollars trying to convince the public it is in their best interest. There is one big glaring problem with all their rhetoric, there is no need by the public rate paying customers for the plant. The minuscule proportion of the production could be filled in several other ways. The need for peak-shaving is actually just an indication that the current system is undersized. PSE already has plans to grow their system because of population growth in the region. Including an incremental capacity to prevent the need for peak-shaving is as easy as increasing the size of a new pipe by one or two inches.

The obvious reason that PSE wants to include the peak-shaving capability in their new "for profit" company is to get the residential ratepayers to cover a great deal of the cost and assume a large portion of the risk. Trying to have two different companies with two different financial motives will never work. The new "for profit" company is trying to maximize returns for their owners, while the "public utility" company is mandated to protect the ratepayers. The UTC is the watchdog.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>The only true way to make this cobbled scenario work is to make the new PSE "for profit" company build the proposed LNG facility with its own money. This new company could sell LNG to the current PSE company on the few days a year that extra capacity is needed. It would become immediately obvious that they would not want to continue the project without the financial contribution from the residential ratepayers. It would also become obvious that only the "for profit" company is reaping the benefits.</p> <p>There is no actual need for this project. There are other simple options to manage peak-shaving demands. Continuing with their current system has proven satisfactory in the past. Gig Harbor has a peak-shaving storage tank. There are huge gas reservoirs available. There are incremental growth plans that can include this demand. Their only need is for the rate paying customers to help pay the cost for the plant in order to maximize the profits for the foreign owners. The WUTC has the responsibility to protect the public ratepayers, not to help maximize the profits for the foreign owners.</p> <p>Thank you for protecting the public's interest.</p> <p>Elizabeth (Liz) Biviano        Tacoma, WA        PSE Customer</p>
	<p>Amy Siltanen</p>	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned that as a residential PSE customer, I am being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.</p>

Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

		<p>This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Amy Siltanen Federal Way, Wa. 98023</p> <p>***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***</p>
	Nola V. Tresslar	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>You will probably receive this letter from many people, and because I couldn't write my feelings any better, I'm copying this and sending it to you.</p> <p>I write to ask that you deny the request by Puget Sound Energy (PSE) to remove the "ring fencing" that protects the consumer utility business of PSE from its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquefaction and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. Specifically, I am concerned that residential PSE customers are being asked to provide the financial guarantee for and subsidize a risky, polluting, and dangerous scheme.</p> <p>As you know, when the Australian Macquarie Group purchased PSE in 2008, the Washington UTC required "ring fencing" provisions to be added to the sale to protect residential customers from financial risk. Now PSE is asking to dismantle the ring fencing so that a shell company it created called Puget LNG can run the proposed Port of Tacoma LNG business and charge unregulated rates for natural gas.</p> <p>It is clear to me that PSE wants its residential customers to subsidize and assume the risk for its LNG scheme. The proposed LNG facility would offer no tangible benefit to residential customers.</p>

Consider the following:

Peak shaving is a tiny percent of the total project (3.5% to 7%, depending on whether one considers PSE claims or the figures provided by ECO Northwest's Economic Impact Analysis). That means that the bulk of this project (93% to 96.5%) is unregulated business. Utility ratepayers should not assume any risk for a venture that is essentially unregulated business without clear public benefit.

The need for additional peak shaving capacity doubtful, as PSE currently stores 47 billion cubic feet of natural gas at Jackson Prairie in Chehalis.

Utility ratepayers should have a place at the table in the mediations between PSE, Northwest Industrial Gas Users, and Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities. These mediations have been neither public nor transparent, and I am concerned that public interests will take a back seat.

As you know, the UTC filed a complaint against PSE for violations of pipeline-safety regulations resulting in the 2004 natural gas explosion in Seattle's Greenwood neighborhood. PSE could face up to \$3.2 million in penalties. Although this was a relatively small leak, it injured nine firefighters and damaged two buildings. PSE cannot be trusted with an 8 million gallon LNG facility connected to hundreds of miles of pipeline.

Most of the nearly 2 million PSE customers in the Washington State have no other choice of utility and should not have to support a foreign-owned, for-profit fossil fuel business that is asking for a \$49 million public subsidy.

The amount of this public support—in the form of subsidy and underwriting of risk— was made clear in a May 18, 2016 response brief by Public Counsel from the WA Attorney General's Office: "PSE (effectively Puget Energy) now states that it will not enter into this new risky business venture with Puget LNG unless PSE ratepayers share in the risks and unless Puget LNG receives a \$49 million subsidy (share of the benefits) from PSE ratepayers."

I am grateful for the advocacy of the WA Attorney General's Office in the matter of Docket UG-151663, since as a residential customer I am not allowed to participate in the ongoing mediation even though it is likely to affect me directly. During this mediation process, I respectfully ask that you keep in mind the UTC's own mission statement: "to protect consumers ensuring that utility and transportation services are fairly priced, available, reliable and safe."



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

I ask you to honor your historic commitment to protecting Washington State utility customers from predatory schemes such as those proposed by PSE/the Macquarie Group by denying PSE's request to remove the "ring fencing" provisions. I also ask that you deny any future scheme that PSE may propose that would involve residential customers either to subsidize or assume the risk for PSE's speculative, private business venture.

Sincerely,

Nola V. Tresslar  
1441 Evergreen Pl.  
Fircrest, WA 98466

This issue is very important to me. I will continue to follow it closely and to speak out about it as widely and as publicly as I am able.

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rochele Gardner	Web	<p>NO LNG and NO rate hikes</p> <p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - Customer sent second comment via mail received 10/10/16***</p> <p>***Third Comment received 10/14/16 9:29 am***</p> <p>Dear UTC</p> <p>As a ratepayer and customer of Puget Sound Energy (PSE), I am asking the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC) not to allow PSE to build the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) facility in Tacoma using ratepayer money. I believe PSE (which is a private company) may be inflating the "peak shaving" portion of this project to use public funds to build it. Please demand that PSE proves their historical usage in Western Washington for peak shaving. Ratepayers should not have to fund a multi-million-dollar facility for three days per year of usage. Please do the right thing and insist PSE fund this as a private venture only should they move forward.</p> <p>I will continue to follow this closely, in addition to many other concerned citizens. PSE's method of funding is garnering much media and public exposure and will continue to do so.</p> <p>Sincerely,          Rochele Gardner          Tacoma</p>
	Phil Brooke	E-mail	<p>***Customer &gt;&gt; PubInvolve@utc.wa.gov 7/26/16, 5:23PM***</p> <p>***SEE ATTACHMENT - PSE LNG ground lease with Port of Tacoma***</p> <p>Greetings, WUTC:          I wanted to provide you with a copy of the PSE-LNG ground lease with the Port of Tacoma, as it</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

may be cogent to the current matter you are considering. Much of your firm objection to PSE's petition is due to exposing ratepayers to unregulated business venture financial and operational risk in a venture PSE admits is too risky to go it alone.

Possibly relevant to your proceedings, as these are standard ground lease terms, also offered to the now defunct methanol refinery, terms and a lease which Port of Tacoma Commissioners concluded was severely flawed, as the ground lease may have left Port of Tacoma taxpayers fully exposed to a number of very very common catastrophic loss scenarios.

Respectfully submitted for the record,

Phil Brooke  
Summit-Waller, WA  
oldbrickhousefarm@yahoo.com  
253.531.3353

\*\*\*Customer >> public comment web form 7/26/16\*\*\*

RE: Docket #151663. Speaking as a private citizen, who is a corporate risk manager by profession, I'm watching PSE's extensive campaign of LNG half-truths in the Pierce County area, and have serious concerns with the way they have characterized this project with the public. First, their PR campaign does not reply on the actual facts or science around large scale LNG. I wanted to get some of this into your official record. PSE has not been forthcoming with their plans to produce and store, and transport LNG within the urban core of Tacoma, WA. Only 7% of this facility's production would be designated for 'peak-shaving' activities. Federal regulation of LNG was authored by the LNG industry and is highly inadequate to protect the public. PSE continues to appeal release of safety data to the public--an appeal pushed out to January 2017. From what I can currently surmise, they provided incomplete information to the EFSEC, as a way to move SEPA lead agency to the City of Tacoma. Some reference materials for your benefit:

Tacoma Weekly Op-Ed on the secrecy surrounding safety information:  
<http://www.tacomaweekly.com/news/article/our-view-those-with-nothing-to-hide-hide-nothing>

Tarika Powell Presentation on LNG:

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

<http://www.neighborhoodparish.org/tarika-powell---lng-presentation.html>

Sightline Institute-search for LNG:  
[www.sightline.org](http://www.sightline.org)

Tacoma Weekly guest article:  
<http://www.tacomaweekly.com/news/article/guest-editorial-the-lng-fairy-tale-as-told-by-pse/>

Peak-shaving itself (again, only 7% of the project) is all about corporate profits, and not benefiting local ratepayers. PSE has cancelled public presentations on LNG and refuses to meet with the public. LNG production using fracked natural gas in this case comes at the expense of community safety and significant upstream pollution/impacts. Placing 2 million utility ratepayers at financial and operational risk and violating 6 ring fencing requirements of the PSE agreement makes absolutely no sense. Please stand firm in your strong opposition to this proposal.

Sincerely,  
Phil Brooke

\*\*\*Customer >> PubInvolve@utc.wa.gov 7/27/16, 1:04 PM\*\*\*

RE: Docket #151663. Speaking as a private citizen with a personal interest in LNG risk, who is a corporate risk manager by profession, I'm watching PSE's extensive & expensive PR campaign of LNG half-truths in the Pierce County area, and have serious concerns with the way they have characterized this project with the general public. First, their PR campaign minimizes the risks and scientific facts around large scale LNG, then compares the project to a true peak shaving storage unit less than 1 percent its size. I wanted to get some of this into your official record.

PSE has not been completely forthcoming with their plans to produce and store, and transport LNG within the urban core of Tacoma, WA. Only 7% of this facility's production would be designated for 'peak-shaving' activities. Federal regulation of LNG was authored by the LNG Industry and is highly inadequate to protect the public. While the City of Tacoma can see no reason to not release safety studies on this project, PSE continues to appeal release of safety data to the public--an appeal now pushed out to January 2017. From what I can currently surmise, they may have provided incomplete information to the EFSEC, as a way to move SEPA lead agency to

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

the City of Tacoma. Some reference materials for your benefit:

Tacoma Weekly Op-Ed on the secrecy surrounding safety information:

<http://www.tacomaweekly.com/news/article/our-view-those-with-nothing-to-hide-hide-nothing>

Tarika Powell Presentation on LNG:

<http://www.neighborhoodparish.org/tarika-powell---lng-presentation.html>

Sightline Institute-search for LNG:

[www.sightline.org](http://www.sightline.org)

Tacoma Weekly guest article:

<http://www.tacomaweekly.com/news/article/guest-editorial-the-lng-fairy-tale-as-told-by-pse/>

PSE has cancelled public presentations on LNG and refuses to meet with the public. LNG production using fracked natural gas in this case comes at the expense of community safety and significant upstream pollution/environmental impacts. Now placing 2 million utility ratepayers at financial and operational risk by violating or undermining 6 ring fencing requirements of the PSE merger agreement makes absolutely no sense.

Please stand firm in your strong opposition to this proposal. It is inspiring.

Sincerely,

Phil Brooke  
Summit-Waller, WA  
[oldbrickhousefarm@yahoo.com](mailto:oldbrickhousefarm@yahoo.com)  
253.531.3353

\*\*\*Customer >> Public Comment Web Form 8/17/16 1:55\*\*\*

Why are only certain public comments submitted to the WUTC appearing on the Docket? I submitted 2 emails related to PSE's proposed LNG facility in Tacoma via email last month, neither of which appear, however, other citizen's comments have been attached to the docket.<br /><br />

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

			<p>/&gt;Please advise at your earliest. Thank you!</p> <p>***SEE ATTACHMENTS - For additional comments from this customer contained in 6 attachments***</p>
	Margaret Ainscough	E-mail	<p>As a Puget Sound Energy customer, I am OPPOSED to Puget Sound Energy's request under UTC Docket # 151663.</p> <p>Margaret Ainscough          610 N M St          Tacoma WA 98403</p> <p>***Customer &gt;&gt; public comment web form 7/26/16***</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposal to hold ratepayers responsible for the proposed LNG plant. I am also opposed to construction of the plant in Tacoma.</p> <p>***Customer &gt;&gt; public comment web form 7/26/16***</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposal to hold ratepayers responsible for the proposed LNG plant. I am also opposed to construction of the plant in Tacoma.</p>
	Mrs. Teodora	Web	<p>Dear UTC commissioners,&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Please keep in place the protections established in 2008 for utility customers. In 2015 Puget Sound Energy petitioned to have those "ring fencing" protections removed, placing its 2 million customers at financial risk for private ventures (Puget LNG). LNG is a risky business, PSE's plans (both financial and safety) are riddled with unanswered questions and contradictions and frankly do not inspire confidence. It is doubly unfair to burden customers with only the financial risk and not the reward of private business ventures, and do so when customers have virtually no voice in a business' decisions and operations. The utility customer protections established in 2008 must remain intact to protect PSE customers. Thank you for your consideration. Teodora Weisdepp, Tacoma Resident/PSE customer</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Joann McGovern	Web	I am writing to strongly urge you to keep in place the utility customer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank Macquarie Group purchased Puget Sound Energy (PSE). PSE petitioned UTC in August 2015 to remove those ring-fencing provisions protecting the 2 million regional PSE utility customers from financial harm possible as a result of PSE's LNG business venture, Puget LNG, under the proposed ownership structure. It is unfair for rate payers to be responsible for PSE screw ups.
	Timothy Waters	Web	I am adamantly against holding ratepayers liable for the proposed plant, which I am also against.
	Leah Boehm Brady	Web	Regarding PSE Petition for Declaratory Order, Docket UG-151663 Dear UTC Commissioners, I am writing to beg you to keep in place the utility consumer protections established in 2008 when Australian investment bank purchased PSE. This is vital to protect 2 million customers from financial harm. Moreover, please do not allow these foreign investors to create a 'shell company' to oversee this proposal. PSE must be responsible, on all levels for this proposed factory. Roger Garrett at the Port of Tacoma said that only 7% of the gas there is for utility customers, so why should the people be taking a risk? Make the foreign owners be responsible. I rely on your good judgement, and protection for the people. PSE's Puget LNG proposal presents too many safety risks too, with proximity to homes and schools in case of an emergency, and too many financial risks for consumers. I am retired, on a fixed income. I hate it that PSE is trying to make me, along with other utility customers take risks with them. I already have a huge bill. If they pass on their fees, I don't know how I will make my bills, and like many others, I too can be in financial trouble. Please protect the people and vote NO on the PSE proposal. thank you, Sincerely, Leah Boehm Brady
	William Kupinse	E-mail	Dear Washington Utilities and Trade Commission, Shirley Schultz, and Ian Munce: I write as a long-time resident of Tacoma to ask that a supplemental EIS (SEIS) be opened for Puget Sound Energy's LNG facility planned for the Port of Tacoma. I write to the WUTC, SEPA

Officer Shirley Schultz, and Tacoma City Planner Ian Munce as I believe that any one of these parties is in the position to initiate a supplemental EIS.

The most significant reason for my request is that records obtained by Tacoma citizens' groups have revealed that PSE, which is owned by the privately held Australian Macquarie Group, has created a shell company owned by private equity investors called "Puget LNG" in an attempt to avoid proper state oversight. PSE/Puget LNG is petitioning the state to relax its "ring fencing" rules that were designed to protect Washington state utility customers when Macquarie purchased PSE back in 2008. The result is that state utility customers could be liable for Puget LNG's speculation in building a liquid natural gas processing and storage facility far larger than the demonstrated customer interest by TOTE Shipping. A recent article in the Tacoma Weekly explains the scheme well: <http://www.tacomaweekly.com/news/article/lng-plants-business-plan-raises-concern-with-state-utility-watchers>

Here is what the Washington State Attorney General's office had to say about the Puget LNG scheme in a May 18, 2016 filing, "RESPONSE BRIEF OF PUBLIC COUNSEL FIRST PHASE — BIFURCATED PROCEEDING," which Tacoma citizens have accessed through a public records request:

So risky is the enterprise that PSE states emphatically that it will not embark upon these risky waters unless PSE's customers also climb into the boat along with the company to share the risks. PSE states: "[a]bsent the assumption of such greater business and financial risk, the Tacoma LNG Facility will not be built[.]

I believe that since the original EIS was conducted under the name "Puget Sound Energy," and since Puget Sound Energy is also the entity that has signed a lease with the Port of Tacoma, proceeding without an additional supplemental EIS may well be a violation of various state laws. The EIS that was conducted in no way represents the plan being pursued by Puget LNG, either in its corporate structure or in its scope.

Additionally, as I have communicated previously to Shirley Schultz, the LNG project has changed substantially from its initial proposal. Among those changes is the fact that PSE now plans to use the Blair waterway rather than the Hylebos waterway. This change creates new potential risks and environmental impacts, and thus merits a new round of public comment and evaluation.



Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

Furthermore, since the public comment period ended for the initial EIS, media outlets have since reported that PSE has actively sought to suppress crucial safety information about the project's blast zone. The Superior Court of the State of Washington has repeatedly ruled that the public has a right to this information that could profoundly impact the health of Tacoma residents, yet the privately owned PSE continues to appeal these decisions and to withhold this essential information.

Thank you for your consideration. I would appreciate it if you would inform me of any further developments regarding the PSE/"Puget LNG" proposal, particularly as they relate to my request for a supplemental EIS. Notification by email would be my preference, but I have also included my mailing address below.

Sincerely,

William Kupinse  
2522 N Proctor St #57  
Tacoma, WA 98407

\*\*\*SEE ATTACHMENT - email 9/12/16 3:17 PM Customer >> Commissioners\*\*\*

\*\*\*Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.\*\*\*

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142

**In Favor:** 12

**Opposed:** 130

**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Roxann Murray	E-mail	<p>I want to make it known (and I want the comment made public) that I, and many other Tacoma residents, do not want the LNG facility to be built. It is too dangerous for the community and "natural" gas is not cleaner than other fossil fuels. PSE claims that using LNG will help reduce carbon greenhouse gas emissions. That is not true. According to the EPA methane has a warming potential more than 25 times greater than carbon dioxide. They are trading one greenhouse gas emission for another (only much worse). But according to new research, those numbers are inaccurate. It is actually more than 25 times.</p> <p>Although PSE has said LNG is safe, when a citizen filed a public information request that would reveal the safety risks, PSE filed an injunction to prevent public disclosure.</p> <p>Here are a few articles that you need to read:  <a href="https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-releases-first-ever-standards-cut-methane-emissions-oil-and-gas-sector">https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-releases-first-ever-standards-cut-methane-emissions-oil-and-gas-sector</a>  <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/19/science/methane-leaks-in-natural-gas-supply-chain-far-exceed-estimates-study-says.html?_r=0">http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/19/science/methane-leaks-in-natural-gas-supply-chain-far-exceed-estimates-study-says.html?_r=0</a>  <a href="http://www.sightline.org/2016/01/13/tacoma-steering-into-uncertain-waters/">http://www.sightline.org/2016/01/13/tacoma-steering-into-uncertain-waters/</a>  <a href="http://www.sightline.org/2016/02/08/how-industry-and-regulators-kept-public-in-the-dark-after-2014-lng-explosion-in-washington/">http://www.sightline.org/2016/02/08/how-industry-and-regulators-kept-public-in-the-dark-after-2014-lng-explosion-in-washington/</a>  <a href="http://www.sightline.org/2016/05/17/tacomas-proposed-lng-plant-raises-safety-concerns/">http://www.sightline.org/2016/05/17/tacomas-proposed-lng-plant-raises-safety-concerns/</a>  <a href="http://www.seattletimes.com/business/new-york-denies-critical-permit-for-natural-gas-pipeline/">http://www.seattletimes.com/business/new-york-denies-critical-permit-for-natural-gas-pipeline/</a>  <a href="http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/08/20/3692726/epa-wrong-methanes-warming-impact/">http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/08/20/3692726/epa-wrong-methanes-warming-impact/</a>  <a href="http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/10/02/2708911/fracking-ipcc-methane/">http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/10/02/2708911/fracking-ipcc-methane/</a>  <a href="http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-bad-of-a-greenhouse-gas-is-methane/">http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-bad-of-a-greenhouse-gas-is-methane/</a></p> <p>-RMurray</p>

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Donna Albert	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners David Danner, Philip Jones, and Ann Rendahl, and Administrative Judge Dennis Moss:</p> <p>I write to you not as a residential customer of Puget Sound Energy but as a person who will be negatively affected by climate change. I ask that PSE abandon its plan to build an 8 million gallon LNG liquification and storage facility at the Port of Tacoma. In order to avoid exceeding 2 degrees C of warming, we must not build any more long-lived fossil fuel infrastructure. This new fossil fuel facility will enable the extraction and burning of fossil fuels for 50 years or more. COP 21, the international climate agreement recently signed by more than 100 countries, has a goal of staying below 1.5 degrees C of warming, which requires leaving most of the fossil fuels already accessible in the ground. Unless we intend to exceed the limits set in COP 21, and unless we plan to leave a devastated planet to our children, this proposed plant cannot be built. If built, it would have to be abandoned long before the end of its lifetime, at a financial loss to PSE customers. You must consider the the very large external consequences of building any major fossil fuel infrastructure. This pollution affects all of us, and affects our children thousands of years into the future. PSE should be investing in a rapid transition to nearly 100% wind, water and solar electricity. Dr. Mark Jacobson of Stanford University has developed such a plan for Washington State. Socially responsible companies will not invest in fossil fuel infrastructure.</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142  
**In Favor:** 12  
**Opposed:** 130  
**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
Yes			
	Timothy P. Downes	E-mail	Please see attachment for a letter on public comment in support of the PSE/LNG request.  Thank You for your time!  Timothy P. Downes Business Agent Plumbers & Steamfitters U.A. Local 26 8501 Zenith Ct. NE. Lacey Wa.98516 360-486-9309 Office 253-606-8799 Cell timdownes@ua26.org
	Jeff Brown	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Hartleigh Caine	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Denise Dyer	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Javier Figueroa	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Todd Iverson	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Bruce Kendall	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Jane Knottingham	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Mark P Martinez	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	Dean McGrath	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***

Case: 151663

Title: PSE Tacoma LNG Facility

PI Coordinator: Roberts, Andrew

**Total Comments:** 142

**In Favor:** 12

**Opposed:** 130

**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Terry Oxley	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***
	David Schroodel	In person	***Spoke at the public comment hearing on Wednesday, October 19, 2016.***